Loyola University Chicago
Loyola eCommons

School of Education: Faculty Publications and Other Works

2017

Creating an EdD Structure, Program and Process Fulfilling the Needs of Doctoral Candidates and the Communities They Will Serve: Applying Lessons Learned from the Redesign of a Principal Preparation Program

Marla Susman Israel
Loyola University Chicago

Felicia P. Stewart
Loyola University Chicago, fstewart1@luc.edu

Susan Sostak
Loyola University Chicago

Ahlam Bazzi-Moughania
Loyola University Chicago

Educational Leadership and Administration:

Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications

Information Resources Management Association
USA

Volume I

IGI GLOBAL
DISSEMINATOR OF KNOWLEDGE

www.igi-global.com

Chapter 20

Creating an EdD Structure, Program, and Process Fulfilling the Needs of Doctoral Candidates and the Communities They Will Serve:
Applying Lessons Learned from the Redesign of a Principal Preparation Program

Marla Susman Israel
Loyola University, USA

Felicia P. Stewart
Loyola University, USA

Susan Sostak
Loyola University, USA

Ahlam Bazzi-Moughania
Loyola University, USA

ABSTRACT

This chapter describes the program redesign, development and essential components of Loyola University Chicago's EdD principal preparation program for the Chicago Leadership Collaborative (CLC) providing a pipeline of candidates to be transformational principals within the Chicago Public Schools. This redesigned EdD focuses on creating communities of positive practice comprised of scholar- practitioners who create disciplines of inquiry that positively impact student, faculty, parent, and community outcomes while contributing to the knowledge base of preparing future educational leaders. In its third year of implementation with 30 candidates in the program, lessons learned from this program redesign will be detailed. Using the foundational principles from this new program redesign process, in conjunction with dissertation completion and graduate outcome data from Loyola's traditional EdD program, this article will explore next steps in the EdD program development process within the reality of rising expectations and continuous legislative change within the state of Illinois.

INTRODUCTION

This chapter will describe the program redesign, development and essential components of Loyola University Chicago's EdD principal preparation program for the Chicago Leadership Collaborative (CLC) providing a pipeline of principal candidates ready and able to turn-around Chicago Public Schools (CPS). This redesigned EdD focuses on creating scholar-practitioners skilled in research-based teaching and leadership practices engaging in systems of inquiry that positively impact student, faculty, parent, and community outcomes. In its fourth year of implementation with 30 candidates in the program, this chapter will discuss the literature informing the program faculty's understanding of a "transformative leader" utilized during the program redesign process. Then the processes and lessons learned from this program redesign will be detailed with specifics describing candidate selection, the 3 year coaching model, and the role and responsibilities of the faculty research chair. Finally, this article will explore the next steps in the EdD program redesign process within the reality of rising expectations and continuous legislative change within the state of Illinois.

Loyola University Chicago (LUC) is a private university founded in 1870. Currently it is one of the nation's largest, Jesuit, Catholic Universities in the country and is the only one located in the City of Chicago. The official inception of the School of Education occurred in 1969. For over 45 years, Loyola University Chicago's School of Education's Program in Administration and Supervision has educated over 1,000 candidates to fill the roles of assistant principals, principals, assistant superintendents and superintendents, with over 350 of these candidates earning the doctoral degree (both Ph.D. & EdD). As one of the premier educational leadership institutions in the state of Illinois, Loyola's administration and supervision graduates overwhelming have, and continue to, assume leadership positions in the Chicago City Public Schools and the metro-suburban community. Against this backdrop of candidate success in P-12 educational settings, in 2009, the program faculty made a conscious decision to eliminate the Ph.D. option and redesign the Administration and Supervision doctoral program to be an EdD-only program with the understanding that 99% of the graduates became educational leaders in P-12 public and private schools. These scholar-practitioners engage in a professional practice doctorate designed to intentionally inform their leadership practice in P-12 schools and their continuing professional lives in P-12 institutions.

TRANSFORMATIVE LEADERSHIP: CONCEPTUAL LENS INFORMING THE REDESIGN PROCESS

Carolyn Shields (2010) writes: "transformative leadership begins with questions of justice and democracy, critiques inequitable practices, and addresses both individual and public good (p. 558). As that the mission of Loyola's School of Education is *Professionalism in the Service of Social Justice,* it was incumbent upon the faculty to redesign the coursework and internship experiences within the doctoral program to intentionally focus on the authentic lives of principals in schools who must advocate for their children, teachers and communities on a daily basis. Christa Boske (2012) reminds us that "Leading for social justice is a highly emotional endeavor requiring courage, integrity, imaginative possibilities and self-awareness" (p. 183). While not necessarily a war per se, the current lives of educational leaders are currently under fire. In today's environment of accountability with ever-shrinking resources, and where education is seen as a commodity and not a necessary right for children to become productive members of a democratic society, it is critical for the aspiring educational leader to morally discern what is at stake

in the school-house and to advocate for change at the public house (Gross & Shapiro, 2014). Therefore, principals must become "policy mediators" who can question, investigate, and articulate on behalf of and with their communities (Rorrer & Skrla, 2005, p. 54). Loyola University Chicago is a Jesuit institution based on an Ignation foundation of social justice consisting of the:

1. Magis or the "more",
2. Cura personalis "care of the person,"
3. Inquiry or discernment,
4. Men and women for others, and,
5. Service to the underserved and marginalized (Palestini, 2013).

These five Ignatian principles of social justice comport well with current educational administration research concerning the content, meaning and place of delivery for today's educational leadership preparation programs (Darling-Hammond, LaPonte, Meyerson, Orr & Cohen, 2007; Murphy, 2006; Orr, 2006; Sanzo, 2012). Additionally, these five Ignatian principles informed the initial work of the faculty as they tried to create a "sense of urgency" (Kotter, 2012, p.24) to redesign a preparation program that connected the idea of transformative leadership "directly to the work of school leaders" (Shield, 2010, p. 559). It was no longer enough to have the 'social justice' label in the syllabi and course assignments. The faculty was convinced that to live-up to the Jesuit principles of the institution and to meet the needs of the students, teachers and families surrounding the university, that they needed to develop within themselves and their leadership candidates "moral outrage at the unmet needs of students and a desire for a caring community where relationships matter" (Marshall & Oliva, 2006, p. 7). The redesign needed to result in a preparation program that required the candidate to: question previous assumptions about him/herself and others; situate him/herself within the real work of schools and communities; and, commit and extend him/herself over a concentrated focused period of time to deeply understand the work, the students, the teachers and the community (Boske, 2012; Furman, 2002; Green, 2014; Noddings, 1984). Of equal importance, in order to truly live-up to the Jesuit principles of "more" and "men and women for others" the redesign required a reconceptualization of the notion of "faculty" including: who informs the work; who is best suited to educate the next generation of leaders; and, where this work should occur. Therefore, the redesign required all of the university teaching faculty to understand the all-encompassing nature and obligations inherent in educational leadership preparation for social justice work.

REDESIGN

Part 1

Though not connected to the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED), yet like the work of the CPED, our doctoral redesign work first focused on ensuring that we intentionally prepared the candidate to work in and for P-12 public and private institutions improving professional practice and creating a knowledge base that could inform others as they served the public good (Perry, 2013). Based on the previously discussed review of the literature, doctoral graduates' professional accomplishments (both anecdotal and positional) and the university's strategic plan on transformative education in the Jesuit tradition, we operationalized the hallmarks of a principal preparation program based on Jesuit

Principles as defined by the university in its Strategic Plan (Loyola, 2009) (Table 1 in Appendix) and the integrative experiences (Table 2 in Appendix) necessary to educate and train future candidates to become transformative leaders in the P-12 setting with the purpose of "turning around schools." (Shields, 2010). We intentionally built a developmental course sequence focused on equity and inclusivity, school improvement, professional development, research, law and policy. The goal was to continually scaffold the learning so that field work first done through equity audits (Brown, 2010; Scheurich, Skrla, & Johnson, 2000) and school improvement initiatives (Rorrer & Skrla, 2015) within the candidate's own school could be revisited throughout the program with more detail and sophistication while providing a myriad of authentic experiences to study and research for the professional practice doctorate (Lahera & Normore, 2014; Normore, 2008). This fits Colwill's (2012) definition of the doctoral program and subsequent dissertation as the "professional research doctorate that employs candidates to investigate a particular professional topic or existing problem" (p. 13).

At this stage in the redesign process, we had transitioned fully to an EdD program. We had created an intentional course sequence, intentional sequence of work products and an agreed upon outcome for the candidate as learner, scholar-practitioner, and candidate as aspiring educational leader. Due to our "aggressive hand-holding approach" during the dissertation writing process (which will be explained in greater detail later in this chapter), our candidates were completing all course work and the dissertation within the EdD doctoral program at a 98% completion rate. Our subsequent placement of our candidates in leadership positions across the state and nation-wide continued at a 94% placement within building and central office leadership positions with approximately 2/3 of the graduates leading in suburban schools and 1/3 of the graduates leading in the Chicago Public Schools. Candidates entering the professoriate were only doing so after they had served within the P-12 setting. These data were encouraging; the program was rigorous, meaningful and aligned to our candidates' future professional goals. And yet more work needed to be done as pressures from the state of Illinois mandated further change with a focus on competency-based learning and university and P-12 institutional partnerships.

Part 2

For the past decade, the state of Illinois has been a leader in bridging research and policy to improve principal preparation and now superintendent preparation statewide. The state's work has also been featured by the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) in *Preparing a Pipeline of Effective Principals: A Legislative Approach* (Shelton, 2012). With the passage of S.B. 226 in 2010, Illinois now requires "institutions of higher education and not-for-profit entities that offer principal preparation programs to redesign their programs to meet new standards that focus on instruction and candidate learning and that must be used for mentoring, evaluation and professional development in order to receive state principal preparation approval" (ISBE, 2014). And in separate rulemaking, the legislation mandates that programs that prepare superintendents meet the new superintendent requirements beginning in September of 2019. These new requirements are set forth in 23 IL Admin Code 33 requiring preparation for superintendents to focus on "instructional leadership and systems of academic support beyond the fiscal and legal stewardship roles of the Superintendency (ISBE, 2014). These legislative mandates require leadership preparation programs to incorporate research in practice on an on-going basis and recognize local school districts as consumers that demand specific leadership competencies driven by their unique contexts. Additionally, clinical experiences in these leadership preparation programs are required by the new policy to be competency based rather than seat-time or hours focused.

In this second phase of redesign, it became very important for the program faculty to focus on the direct consumers - the P-12 educational institutions in which our candidates would ultimately serve. Driven by a focus to provide a just, iterative, developmental process for candidate selection and subsequent candidate leadership development, with the ultimate goal of providing an excellent building principal or district school leader (as currently measured by the successful ascension of candidates into these positions and the tracking of student outcomes) the second redesign was built on the leadership continuum aligned to the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISSLC) leadership standards and elements, the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) activities, the Chicago Public Schools principal competencies, and National Catholic Leadership Benchmarks respectively (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2008; Southern Regional Education Board, 2008; Chicago Public Schools, n.d; Ozar, & Weitzel-O'Neill, 2012).

In order to meet the needs of our direct consumers, we created a second cohort EdD track. This second cohort track was an EdD designed for practicing CPS Assistant Principals holding a General Administrative endorsement. This doctoral cohort program leads to a Doctoral Degree in Administration & Supervision, CPS Principal Eligibility, and a Superintendent's Endorsement. Loyola University Chicago's EdD Program in Administration & Supervision for CPS provides selected candidates with a rigorous curriculum, embedded field experiences, a one-year internship/residency, and a three-year intensive coaching model within the four year doctoral program. The internship/residency and three-year intensive coaching model distinguishes this doctoral track from the other EdD track with the intent of directly meeting the partnering district's needs for a 'pipeline' of prepared leadership candidates. Candidates are expected to complete all requirements necessary to qualify for the Illinois Type 187 Superintendent Endorsement as well as complete coursework focused on school and student performance data and interpretation, combined with a research core, resulting in a Capstone Change Impact Research Dissertation. At the time of this writing, the faculty (n=11) for the CPS EdD program is comprised of one tenured professor, two non-tenure faculty on multi-year contracts, three adjuncts and five clinical coaches. All permanent, multi-year and adjunct faculty hold the terminal degree in educational leadership. All of the clinical coaches have either a masters or doctoral degree in educational leadership and are successful, retired CPS principals. All eleven members of the faculty have been educational leaders in public P-12 education and all eleven members hold valid Illinois building and/or district-level leadership endorsements.

A Focus on Candidate Selection and Candidate Future Goals

Knowing that the outcome was to develop candidates who could lead effectively in Chicago Public Schools, we began first with the creation of candidate selection activities and a candidate selection rubric based on the pertinent standards for the CPS schools and the EdD principal preparation program. Our partner, CPS plays a "major role in identifying, recommending, and sponsoring" (through a required recommendation letter from the network chief and/or principal) the potential applicants (Darling-Hammond, et. al. 2007; p.64). Candidate selection now deliberately focuses on the knowledge, skills and dispositions the candidate possesses, and can be developed within the program, so that the graduate of the program can "transform the field of professional practice" within the school districts in which the candidate will eventually lead within (Perry, 2003, p. 115). Candidate selection is now accomplished through a two part process. Part One is the "application phase" and Part Two is the "1/2 day on-site selection phase."

The Part One application phase for the EdD Principal Preparation Program consists of the following:

1. On-line application;
2. Transcripts for Bachelor and Master degrees;
3. Proof of a valid Y teachers' certificate;
4. Proof of a valid Y General Administrative (186) Type 75 Certificate;
5. Passing the Y State Basic Skills Test;
6. Currently an Assistant Principal in Z Public Schools;
7. Minimum of three years teaching on teacher certificate;
8. G.P.A. of a 3.0/4.0;
9. Current (within 4 years) GRE scores;
10. Three letters of recommendation (two of which are from CPS Public Schools – one from Current Principal and one from Network Chief);
11. Personal statement focusing on transformative leadership and social justice; and,
12. Current resume.

Once screened and accepted into the applicant pool, during Phase 2 of the selection process, the candidate engages in:

1. A ½ hour interview with the faculty around his/her experience as an educator and leader;
2. A ½ hour power point presentation in which the candidate describes how he/she has used data to create change in his/her school;
3. An interactive video session in which the candidate views an instructional video and then explains how he/she would subsequently work with the teacher in the video to improve teaching practice; and,
4. An on-site writing sample in which the candidate responds to a writing prompt concerning school improvement based on student outcome data.

During the selection process, phases 1 and 2 are assessed by at least two and up to four faculty members and/or school district partner representatives. These materials and artifacts are scored by each member of the selection team using a rubric aligned to the national, state and local partner standards. Following the paper screen and ½ day interview process, each member of the interview team individually scores the candidate. Then a discussion follows where each member of the team shares his/her ratings of the candidate. From this sharing of data, the team comes to a consensus on the applicant's potential for success in the program. A collective, summative score is reached determining whether or not the candidate is to be selected. Multiple uses of the rubric over time have provided us with opportunities to clarify and increase inter-rater reliability of scoring candidates. Anecdotal data reveals that this inter-rater reliability took time to acquire and was often affected by the number of trained assessors available. These issues are similar to those highlighted in O'Doherty and Orr's (2012) work on principal preparation program evaluation.

Upon acceptance into the program, the candidate's application data are used for constructing the on-boarding plan for each candidate. Originally, this on-boarding plan and subsequent internship portfolio were paper and pencil documents based on the appropriate program standards. However, with actual use by coaches and reflection by all during the first semester of the program's implementation, and with generous funding from the Fry Foundation, the Illinois Higher Education Advisory Council, and the Center for the Study of Education Policy at Illinois State University, the LUC faculty, in consultation

with its school district partners, created the electronic *on-boarding plan* (conducted between candidate and coach providing the gap analysis for future leadership developments) that then evolves into the subsequent *e-portfolio* that is utilized by candidate and coach for the entire three year coaching model. This e-portfolio is the documentation of the candidate's leadership development along the continuum of knowledge, skills and dispositions as the candidate ascends from teacher to assistant principal to principal to central office administrator.

By plotting each candidate's application data onto the on-boarding plan, the coach and candidate are able to create a gap analysis to underscore those leadership competencies that have already been mastered in previous leadership work and those competencies that need to be developed within the principal preparation program. This on-boarding plan and subsequent gap analysis process affords the faculty and candidate an opportunity to create an individualized leadership plan for documentation and reflection between candidate and coach for each of the leadership competencies.

A Focus on Deliberate Professional Practice

The coaching model is based on the foundation of a "support team" to ensure candidates have the breadth of experiences to be able to lead in schools. EdD candidates are assigned a coach in the first semester of the program. The coaches support candidates as they meet CPS Principal Competencies. Coaches selected to work with Loyola EdD candidates are former CPS urban leaders with a history of transforming urban schools and are hired by Loyola as adjunct professors to coach in the program. The candidate's support team is comprised of the candidate, the university faculty supervisor, the coordinator of coaches, the internship mentor principal, and the coach. The Loyola EdD Program in administration & supervision program offers a focused, in-depth coursework framework paired with a three-year coaching model allowing for immediate application in the candidate's school to create increased student, faculty and community outcomes. This three-year coaching model embraces the philosophy of the "robust internship" and extends it providing the candidate with a year-long principal internship, plus 2 years of induction and mentoring as a new CPS principal (Darling-Hammond, et. al., p. 72). This three-year coaching model immerses the candidate in the work and always pushes on the question: "How will this improve the lives of students?" in order to "refine the judgment and enhance the decision-making capacity of school leaders (Goldring & Schuermann, 2009; p. 25).

For each candidate, the *on-boarding plan* and resultant *e-portfolio* that is continually updated and evaluated by the candidate's support team, is the formative assessment communication and recording instrument documenting candidates' reflections, coaches' feedback and candidate progress ensuring that all candidates observe 100% of the leadership activities, participate in 100% of the leadership activities, and lead in at least 80% of the leadership activities. These leadership activities are the vehicle for practicing and demonstrating mastery of the leadership competencies. The on-boarding plan and resultant e-portfolio have been aligned to the *CPS Public Schools (CPS) Principal Competencies and Success Factors, the Southern Regional Education Board* (SREB) Critical Success Factors, *Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium* (ISLLC) Standards and Functions, the Loyola Principal Preparation coursework, field experiences, and internship. These leadership activities become the focus for course assessments and subsequent areas of study for the Capstone Change Impact Research Dissertation. At the time of this writing, there are 3 cohorts within this second track of EdD programming totaling 28 candidates. Of these 28 candidates, 16 have obtained CPS principal eligibility, 1 is an interim principal,

and 9 are sitting CPS principals. Eight of these CPS EdD students are now involved in the Capstone Change Impact Research Dissertation.

THE DISSERTATION IN PRACTICE: WEAVING BOTH EDD TRACKS TOGETHER

Within both EdD tracks (non-cohort and CPS cohort), course work, field experiences, and core assessments are intended to provide the candidate with multiple opportunities for experimenting with professional practice for the intent of improving outcomes for students, teachers, families and communities. In our second redesign, we intentionally created the three-year coaching model so that candidates would have a much larger pool of leadership experiences to draw upon when researching problems of practice. For each of these EdD tracks, a research core was developed. All candidates were to take three research courses: Qualitative Research, Quantitative Research and a third methodology focused on the problem of practice that the candidate wanted to study. We were intent on not allowing the EdD to become a "doctoral lite" program yet were still determined to focus on "learning how to analyze and address problems of practice and how to evaluate and communicate the results obtained" (DeLisi, 2013, p.129). For the first redesign, the third research methodology was not prescribed. For most of the students, this third research course has been Case-Study Design, Mixed-Methods Design, or Advanced Qualitative Research. And while these distinct research courses have, for the most part, fulfilled the dissertation of practice design needs of our candidates, with the second EdD redesign we were deliberate in programming "Action-Research" as the third research methodology course. In particular, action research provides educators, administrators and community leaders to study localized problems that results in solutions and action plans to address these issues (Cosner, Tozer & Smylie, 2012). As defined by Herr and Anderson (2005), "Action research is inquiry that is done by or with insiders in an organization or community, but never to or on them. Action research is oriented to some action or cycle of actions that organizational or community members have taken, are taking, or wish to take to address a particular problematic situation (p. 3-4). Therefore, action research better served the needs of our P-12 educational institutions who were our partners. Additionally, "the purpose of action research is for practitioners to investigate and improve their practices" (Hendricks, 2013, p. 3). Therefore, it seemed that this research methodology would also meet the career aspirations of our candidates. This deliberate choice of a third research methodology course ensured that all of our candidates would learn the knowledge, skills and dispositions to research, plan, implement, and plan again as scholar- practitioners to "walk on a trampoline" enduring the "ups and downs endemic to the process" of leading in schools and transforming professional practice (Welch, 2013, p. 149).

With the research courses chosen and sequenced purposefully, it was now incumbent upon us to create a unique course whose purpose was to provide "additional learning experiences that would lead to the successful completion of the research project including a support team to facilitate the task of planning a dissertation prospectus and proposal" (Ovando, 2010, p. 212). This course, comprised of whole-group lecture, mini-lessons, small-group problem-solving teams, small-group writing teams, and individualized meetings, provided the structure, space, time and resources for intensive research and writing – activities that the busy professional often leaves to chance. This required course, a formalized writing boot-camp, ensured that the actual writing of the dissertation did not become the last thing to do on the scholar- practitioner's to-do list. As Ovando (2010) writes, this "collegial group may foster opportunities to engage in the exchange of professional wisdom and experiences, to give each other constructive feedback, and

to share resources and concerns in a supportive, trusting and nurturing environment" (p. 217). As others note, "having access to a group of peers who are also engaged in the doctoral studies journey provides an excellent source of moral support. In addition, cohort members provide empathetic listening, share resources and offer honest and constructive feedback" (Ovando, Ramirez, & Shefelbine, 2008, p. 45).

Especially critical to the success of this "writing boot-camp" and the subsequent guidance needed for the candidate to complete the research and write the dissertation is the faculty chair/mentor. As we examined the historical and present successful completion rates of the rigorous, meaningful dissertation of practice work of our candidates, it became evident that the faculty mentor/dissertation chair is the number one factor predictive of successful EdD completion. Using data from multiple course evaluations over a ten year period after each "boot-camp" course section, successful graduates of the program detail the role and responsibilities that a faculty mentor/dissertation chair must assume to ensure candidate success:

- A perfect balance of challenge and support which encouraged me to complete my finished product. Dr. X met with me every month throughout the dissertation process and always provided valued and constructive feedback on my completed work to help push me to continue moving forward.
- Dr. X's firm yet gentle guidance helped me not "just to finish" my dissertation but to truly be engaged in meaningful work that I believe would contribute to the landscape of educational leaders. I was blessed by her wisdom, her extensive experience in school leadership, and by her willingness to provide me with constructive feedback to improve my work.
- Done well, the role of the dissertation chair is simultaneously one of cheerleader, teacher, critical friend, life coach and fierce supporter. The fact that Dr. X always made me and my dissertation seem like the most important priority is a testament to her unparalleled professionalism and compassion for her students.
- Dr. X consistently puts her students' needs first, even before her own, and for this, she has the reputation of being a beloved dissertation chair and mentor.

AGGRESSIVE HANDHOLDING: THE ROLE OF THE DISSERTATION CHAIR/MENTOR

From these data, and countless conversations with our graduates over the years, the theme that has emerged and that we have coined from this process is "aggressive hand-holding." The EdD candidate is one who is committed to "construct and apply knowledge to make a positive difference in the lives of children, individuals, families and communities" (Aiken & Gerstl-Pepin, 2013, p. 164). This naturally means that the EdD candidate is one who is continually steeped in the leading and managing of P-12 schools. And in today's P-12 schools, this is a 24/7 position that is complex, divisive and at-times fraught with continual internal and external pressures outside the control locus of any one individual school leader (Shapiro & Gross, 2008; Patterson, Goens, & Reed, 2009). Unlike their Ph.D. full-time counterparts, the EdD Scholar-practitioner does not have the luxury of sacred time and space to do their research and writing. The EdD Scholar-practitioner must carve out space and time within the all-consuming world of leading schools. And that is why the dissertation chair/mentor is so important and why aggressive hand-holding is so necessary. We have learned that the faculty members in a doctoral educational leadership programs must become adept at this aggressive hand-holding.

Aggressive hand-holding on the part of the dissertation chair/mentor requires the faculty member to assist the candidate in creating real time and space for research and writing in an already full schedule. Our work has demonstrated to us that the chair/mentor cannot take a passive role in the dissertation supervision process. Rather, using the concepts of backwards design (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005) and generational intelligences (Biggs & Lowenstein, 2011) in concert with adult learning theory (Conlan, Grabowski & Smith, 2003), the chair/mentor must play an active part in the teaching and learning process during the dissertation writing process, if the candidate is going to be successful in the work. This means that the dissertation chair/mentor often will need to do the following with and for the candidate:

1. Provide clear examples of theory to practice;
2. Create sizeable chunks of directed work;
3. Provide immediate and constant written feedback;
4. Provide manageable goals for the work to be accomplished;
5. Provide non-negotiable deadlines that are perceived with the same authority as those in the candidate's leadership work in schools;
6. Provide understanding and emotional support for the candidate acknowledging that adult learning is occurring within an environment of great professional and personal responsibilities;
7. Model professionalism as a leader and as a mentor of continuous adult learning; and,
8. Be accessible.

These responsibilities and qualities do not necessarily align to the current university professor's motto of "publish or perish." These responsibilities demand that the dissertation chair/mentor is one who is willing to provide a great deal of focused time on the aspirations of the candidate. This commitment to the candidate's success is not always rewarded within current academia. And yet, "Schools and colleges of education are increasingly recognizing that their role in improving the U.S. education system is one of preparing leaders who are armed with knowledge, skills and the moral imperative to be change agents and to affect practice at all levels (Perry, 2012, p. 44). And so, for those of us who believe that educating the next generation of educational leaders is paramount to the profession, this focus on the candidate's completion of a professional practice doctorate is of the highest import and is THE expression of our professional calling.

NEXT STEPS

While not part of the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate, Loyola University Chicago's twice redesigned EdD Principal Preparation program does align with many of the principals of program development and design concepts as described by Jill Perry in the special edition of *Planning and Changing* (2013). The lessons learned are many. With the current legislation that now demands that all superintendent programs be shut-down, redesigned and re-apply for state approved licensure, the faculty at Loyola University Chicago will be considering these lessons learned from the two previous redesigns and the CPED literature. This third EdD redesign will need to include:

1. A focus on P-12 university partnerships to ensure that graduates of the program acquire the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary for district-level leadership within the diverse communities across the state that they will serve.

2. An extended leadership practice through an intensive, sustained coaching model that pairs successful retired district –level leaders with candidates to continually reflect upon and assess district-level leadership development.

3. A program that is grounded in the questions of "equity, ethics and social justice to bring about solutions to complex problems of practice," (CPED, 2009)

4. A grounding in a "professional knowledge base that integrates both practical and research knowledge, that links theory with systemic and systematic inquiry to solve real-world problems of practice" (CPED, 2009)

5. A faculty that is supported by the university to acquire the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to mentor and direct candidates in the creation, implementation and completion of their professional practice dissertations.

We believe that the EdD, the professional practice doctoral degree, meets the needs of both the profession and the professional who are committed to the application of research to real-world problems in P-12 education. It is through meaningful partnerships between the university and P-12 educational institutions that we may be able to educate the future generation of educational leaders who are charged to serve the children, families and communities across this country. Through this redesign process, we have learned that to educate this future generation of leaders we must be committed to providing a flexible, meaningful, educational experience that explicitly connects theory to practice to solve real-world problems. This focus on:

1. Real-world problems of practice,
2. Course-work aligned with a rigorous three-year coaching model,
3. An intentional sequenced research-core, and,
4. A deliberate focus on creating space and time for the candidate to research and write requires the university to understand, support and value the CPED design concepts of the: "scholar-practitioner, signature pedagogy, laboratory of practice, and inquiry as practice" (CPED, 2010).

Much like the model used to educate future medical doctors, universities need to devote the resources for doctors of education who are charged with 'curing' and leading the public schools of tomorrow.

We have also learned that the dissertation mentor/chair is integral to the successful completion of this EdD leadership program. The dissertation mentor/chair, similar to the attending doctor in a university sponsored teaching hospital, must have the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to devote a preponderance of their own work product to the education of future leaders. They must be able to teach others how to lead through the application of theory to practice. They must be able to teach others how to research and solve problems of practice. They must be able to guide, facilitate and mentor leadership candidates successfully through the dissertation process. They must be willing to be a "person for others" called to develop the educational leaders of tomorrow (Loyola University Chicago, 2009). In short, today's university professor employed in an educational leadership doctoral program, an EdD of professional practice, must reclaim the role of teacher. For if the EdD is truly going to be the preferred

avenue of professional practice within educational leadership development, then the university must begin to value the professor as teacher as an integral part of the fabric of the academy.

REFERENCES

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

Barnett, B., Copland, M., & Shoho, A. (2009). The use of internships in preparing school leaders. In M. Young, G. Crow, J. Murphy, & R. Ogawa (Eds.), *Handbook of research on the education of school leaders* (pp. 371–394). New York: Routledge.

Berg, M. E., & Karlsen, J. T. (2007). Mental models in project management coaching. *Engineering Management Journal*, *19*(3), 3–13. doi:10.1080/10429247.2007.11431736

Biggs, S., & Lowenstein, A. (2011). *Generational intelligence: A critical approach to age relations*. New York: Routledge.

Bloom, G., Barrett, A., & Strong, M. (2003, April). *Supporting the new principal: Managerial and instructional leadership in a principal induction program.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Bloom, G., Castagna, C., Moir, E., & Warren, B. (2005). *Blended coaching: Skills and strategies to support principal development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Boske, C. (2012). Sending forth tiny ripples of hope that build the mightiest of currents: Understanding how to prepare school leaders to interrupt oppressive school practices. *Planning and Changing*, *43*(1/2), 183–197.

Braskamp, L. A., Braskamp, D. C., & Merrill, K. C. (2009). Assessing progress in global learning and development of candidates with educational abroad experiences. *Frontiers*, *18*, 101–118.

Brown, K. M. (2010). Schools of excellence and equity? Using equity audits as a tool to expose a flawed system of recognition. *International Journal of Education Policy & Leadership*, *5*(5), 1–12.

Bush, T. (2011). *Theories of Educational Leadership & Development* (4th ed.). London: Sage.

Carnegie Project for the Educational Doctorate (CPED). (2009). *Working principles for the professional practice doctorate in education*. Retrieved from http://cpedinitiaitve.org/resource-librar

Carnegie Project for the Educational Doctorate (CPED). (2010). *Design concept definitions*. Retrieved from http://cpedinitiative.org/design-concept-definitions

Chicago Leadership Collaborative. (2013, January 1). Retrieved October 30, 2013, from http://www.CPSleaders.com/CPS.html

Chickering, A. & Braskamp. (2009). Developing a global perspective for personal and social responsibility. *Peer Review, 11*, 27 – 30.

Colwill, D. A. (2012). *Education of the scholar practitioner in organization development*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Conlan, J., Grabowski, S., & Smith, K. (2003). Current trends in adult education. In M. Orey (Ed.), *Emerging perspectives on learning, teaching, and technology*. University of Georgia: Association for Educational Communications and Technology.

Cosner, S., Tozer, S., & Smylie, M. (2012). The Ed. D. Program at the UIC: Using Continuous Improvement to Promote School Leadership Preparation. *Planning and Changing*, *43*(1), 127–148.

Creasy, J., & Paterson, F. (2005). *Leading Coaching and Schools. National College for School Leadership*. Nottingham, UK: NCSL.

Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., Meyerson, D., Orr, M. T., & Cohen, C. (2007). *Preparing School Leaders for a Changing World: Lessons from Exemplary Leadership Development Programs*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.

DeLisi, R. (2013). Reflection, reconstruction, and transformation of the EdD A Dean's Perspective. *Planning and Changing*, *44*(3/4), 127–139.

Ely, K., Boyce, L. A., Nelson, J. K., Zaccaro, S. J., Hernez-Broome, G., & Whyman, W. (2010). Evaluating leadership coaching: A review and integrated framework. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *21*(4), 585–599. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.06.003

Fields, D. L., & Herold, D. M. (1997). Using the leadership practices inventory to measure transformative and transactional leadership. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *57*(4), 569–579. doi:10.1177/0013164497057004003

Furman, G. (2012). *School as community: From promise to practice*. New York: SUNY Press.

Furnham, A. (2010). Coaching for Leadership: Helping leaders who can potentially derail. In Leadership in Coaching. Kogan Page.

Goldering, E., & Schuermann, P. (2009). The changing context of K-12 education administration: Consequences for Ed.D. program design and delivery. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *84*(1), 9–43. doi:10.1080/01619560802679583

Green, M. G. (2014). *Caring leadership in turbulent times: Tackling neoliberal education reform*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Gross, S. J., & Shaprio, J. P. (2014). At the crossroad: Venture philanthropy or a democratic ethical vision for educational leadership? *Values and Ethics in Educational Administration*, *11*(2), 1–8.

Hendricks, C. (2005). *Improving schools through action research: A comprehensive guide for educators*. Allyn-Bacon.

Herr, K., & Anderson, G. L. (2015). *The action research dissertation: A guide for students and faculty* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hopkins-Thompson, P. A. (2000). Collegues Helping Collegues, Mentoring and Coaching. *NASSP Bulletin*, *84*(617), 29–36. doi:10.1177/019263650008461704

Huang, T., Beachum, F. D., White, G. P., Kaimal, G., FitzGerald, A. M., & Reed, P. (2012). Preparing Urban School Leaders: What Works? *Planning and Changing*, *43*(1), 72–95.

Illinois General Assembly. (n.d.). *Illinois Administrative Code, Title 23: Education and Cultural Resources, Subtitle A: Education, Chapter I: State Board of Education, Subchapter B: Personnel*. Retrieved on May 3, 2014, from http://www.ilga.gov/commission/jcar/admincode/023/023parts.html

Illinois Principals Association. (2012). Springfield, IL: Illinois Principal Evaluation Plan.

Illinois State Board of Education. (n.d.). *Illinois Principal Preparation*. Retrieved on May 3, 2014, from http://www.isbe.net/prep-eval/pdf/prin_prep_leg_overview.pdf

Israel, M. S., & Fine, J. (2012). Moving outside the comfort zone: An innovative approach to principal preparation. *Planning and Changing*, *43*(3/4), 294–308.

Israel, M. S., Fine, J., & Gordon, V. (2009). *White Paper: Implementation of transformative education in for preparing the next generation of educational leaders*. Academic Press.

Israel, M. S., Fine, J., & Sostak, S. (2013). The Loyola University (Chicago) Redesign of the Principal Preparation Program. In R. M. Young, E. L. Hunt, & L. Hood (Eds.), *The Leadership to Integrate the Learning Continuum (LINC) Tool Kit: Redesigning principal preparation programs across four Illinois institutions* (pp. 67–128). Normal, IL: Center for the Study of Education Policy, Illinois State University.

Ives, Y. (2008). What is "coaching"? An exploration of conflicting paradigms. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, *6*(2), 100–113.

Kirkpatrick, D. (1998). *Evaluating training programs: The four levels* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Berret-Kohler.

Kotter, J. P. (2012). *Leading change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

Lahera, A. I., & Normore, A. H. (2014). Sustaining school leadership programs: Planning for leadership succession, recruitment, selection and innovative curriculum. In K. Sanzo (Ed.), *From policy to practice: Sustainable innovations in school leadership preparation and development* (pp. 1–22). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Loyola University Chicago University. (2009). *Strategic Plan: Transformative Education in the Jesuit Tradition.* Retrieved from http://www.luc.edu/media/lucedu/mission/pdfs/Transformative%20Education%20document.pdf

Marshall, C., & Oliva, M. (2006). Building the capacities of social justice leaders. In C. Marshall & M. Oliva (Eds.), *Leadership for social justice: Making revolutions in education* (pp. 1–15). New York: Pearson Publishing.

McAdams, D., & Katir, D. (Eds.). (2013). *The Redesign of Urban School Systems: Case Studies in District Governance*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Murphy, J. (2006). *Preparing school leaders: Defining a research and action agenda*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (2008). *Educational leadership policy standards: ISLLC (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium) 2008*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (2011). *Educational Leadership Program Recognition Standards: Building Level*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Nodding, N. (1984). *Caring, a feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Normore, A. H. (2008). *Leadership for social justice: Promoting equity and excellence through inquiry and reflective practice*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Press.

O'Doherty, A., & Orr, M. T. (2012). Leadership Preparation Program Evaluation: Experiences and Insights. *Advances in Educational Administration*, *17*, 1–23. doi:10.1108/S1479-3660(2012)0000017004

Orr, M. (2006). Mapping innovation in leadership preparation in our nation's schools of education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *87*(7), 492–499. doi:10.1177/003172170608700706

Orr, M. T., Young, M., & Rorrer, A. (2010). *Developing Evaluation Evidence*. Austin, TX: University Council of Educational Administration and National Center for the Evaluation of Educational Leadership Preparation and Practice.

Ovando, M. N. (2010). Selecting a dissertation research topic. In *The faculty mentor's wisdom: Conceptualizing, writing and defending the dissertation*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Ovando, M. N., Ramierz, A. Jr, & Shelfelbine, J. (2008). Successfully navigating doctoral studies in school leadership: Diverse minority students' voices. *Journal of Border Educational Research*, *7*(1), 41–56.

Ozar, L. A., & Weitzel-O'Neill, P. (Eds.). (2012). *National standards and benchmarks for effective Catholic elementary and secondary schools*. Chicago, IL: Loyola University Chicago, Center for Catholic School Effectiveness.

Palestini, R. (2013). *Feminist theory and educational leadership: Much ado about something*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Patterson, J. L., Goens, G. A., & Reed, D. E. (2009). *Resilient leadership for turbulent times: A guide to thriving in the face of adversity*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Perry, J. A. (2012). To EdD or not to EdD? *Kappan*, *94*(1), 41–44. doi:10.1177/003172171209400108

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

Posner, B. Z., & Kouzes, J. M. (1988). Development and validation of the leadership practices inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *48*(2), 483–496. doi:10.1177/0013164488482024

Rorrer, A. K., & Skrla, L. (2005). Leaders as policy mediators: The reconceptualization of accountability. *Theory into Practice*, *44*(1), 53–62. doi:10.1207/s15430421tip4401_8

Sanzo, K. (2012). Learning to Lead: An examination of innovative principal preparation practices. *Planning and Changing*, *43*(3/4), 243–259.

Scheurich, J. J., Skrla, L., & Johnson, J. F. (2000). Thinking carefully about equity and accountability. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *82*(4), 293–299. doi:10.1177/003172170008200411

Shapiro, J. P., & Gross, S. J. (2008). *Ethical educational leadership in turbulent times: (Re)Solving moral dilemmas*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Shoho, A. R., Barnett, B. G., & Martinez, P. (2012). Enhancing "OJT" internships with interaction coaching. *Planning and Changing*, *43*(1), 161–182.

Southern Regional Education Board. (2008). *SERB learning-centered leadership program*. Atlanta, GA: Author.

Van Nieuwerburgh, C. (2012). Coaching and mentoring for educational leadership. In Coaching in education: Getting better results for candidates, educators, and parents, (pp. 25-45). London: Karnac Books.

Vanden Bos, P. (n.d.). *How to Build an Onboarding Plan for a New Hire*. Retrieved from http://www.inc.com/guides/2010/04/building-an-onboarding-plan.html

Welch, O. M. (2013). Interrogating our practice: Enacting a "Yes and" CPED agenda at Duguesne University. *Planning and Changing*, *44*(3/4), 149–161.

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). Understanding by Design (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

APPENDIX

Table 1. Hallmarks of a principal preparation program focused on creating "transformative" leaders

Jesuit Principles as Defined by the University in its Strategic Plan (2009)	Candidates Will	Through the Following
Expanding horizons and deepening knowledge.	Develop professional habits of mind that increase awareness of and care for multiple, diverse and global settings reflected in today's school buildings, districts and school boards.	● A learning environment that is comprised of candidates selected through a rigorous selection process in consideration of prior knowledge and professional experiences ● Multiple, diverse field and practicum placements ● International/global perspective development in study-abroad experiences that provide rich opportunities for leading, learning and conducting research
Self-appropriation or the self who leads	Discover and appreciate how their gifts and talents can best be applied towards becoming a transformative leader of schools.	● A learning environment, both within the classroom and in the field, that supports a candidate's inquiry and identification of his/her professional calling to school leadership ● Creation of a leadership development plan identifying the candidate's entry level talents, convictions and commitments and the monitoring and documenting of growth as a transformative leader throughout the X educational experience
Dialogue	Be transformed by their encounters with full-time faculty, in-the-field professionals, current practitioners, the candidate community and inter-disciplinary faculty who have a deep understanding of and commitment to social justice and equity.	● Small class size with highly trained faculty that reflect, apply and demonstrate the leadership knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to transform schools into learning communities committed to candidate success ● Multiple diverse field and practicum settings ● Research-based field study experiences linked to class work ● Both in class and on-line instructional experiences ● Opportunity to experience global and international learning options ● Opportunities to work in collaboration with peers and faculty on school improvement research
Moral Responsibility	Become moral agents of change as they develop a strong foundation in moral discernment to lead schools undergirded by core values promoting candidate achievement and school improvement.	● Class readings, discussions and experiences that challenge the candidates' preconceived assumptions, biases and beliefs through the lenses of justice, care and critique ● Class readings, discussions and experiences that build a strong foundation in ethical reasoning and decision-making ultimately impacting school leadership practices and policies ● Multiple diverse field studies and practicum experiences through which candidates will apply their understanding of moral responsibility to the realities of the school setting

Table 1. Continued

Jesuit Principles as Defined by the University in its Strategic Plan (2009)	Candidates Will	Through the Following
Care for the Planet or Leading within Various School Contexts	Become aware that school leadership does not occur in a vacuum. Candidates will be transformed through the creation of new attitudes and practices that promote a sensitivity to the various contexts in which schools function. These include historical, ideological, political, ecological, social, cultural and economic contexts.	● Experiences that include equity audits, tort walks and human resource audits in multiple school settings that require candidates to question the assumptions in various school environments. Candidates will acquire the ability to use these tools to conduct inquiries while developing the knowledge, skills and dispositions to address the data findings ● Customization of coursework, field study and practicum that recognizes that educational leadership occurs in many diverse and non-traditional settings and requires sensitivity, understanding and care to meet the diverse needs presented within each school environment ● Use of technology to expand research and teaching horizons of faculty and candidates through leadership that envisions the future possibilities of technology in their lives
Faith and Justice	Understand that injustice is essentially rooted in a problem that requires a solution grounded in a change of heart through the union of faith and justice.	● Faculty modeling, in their roles as advisors and mentors, problem-solving and leadership through faith, justice, reasoning and hope ● Classroom case-study analysis requiring reflection of school-based problems necessitating that the candidate explore the law and various ethical paradigms when formulating solutions that require a courageous change of heart ● Classroom as laboratory where role-playing and simulation give voice to various perspectives surrounding legal and ethical dilemmas ● Field experiences, collaborative research teams, and practicum in which the Loyola candidate will be required to demonstrate the integrity to act with moral leadership and conviction rooted in faith, justice, reasoning and hope, that ensures that all candidates are given the opportunity to succeed.

Table 2. Integrative experiences necessary to educate and train future candidates to become transformative leaders in the P-12 setting with the purpose of "turning around schools"

Focus of the Work	The Transformative Leader Is	The Transformative Leader Will
Student Achievement	Cognizant of and sensitive to addressing candidate achievement while meeting the needs of individual candidates and their families	● Learn to develop inclusive policies and programming that consider the unique circumstances of each child and his/her family and the challenges that they face ● Be mindful of and utilize multiple data sources to guide educational decisions that affect candidate achievement ● Be knowledgeable of and be able to apply contemporary leadership theories, best practices, research and law to candidate achievement for all candidates ● Be able to impact candidate achievement by creating an institutional culture committed to ethics and social justice issues that impact children and their families.
School Improvement	Cognizant of and sensitive to addressing school improvement while meeting the needs of individual candidates, their families and the community	● Learn to incorporate best practices in hiring, staff professional development, and faculty evaluation that will lead to school improvement ● Be knowledgeable of and be able to apply contemporary instructional leadership theories, school-wide Multiple Systems of Support (MTSS), data-driven decision making leading to school improvement ● Be able to utilize candidate data and cultivate excellence in faculty instruction when choosing curricula to enhance candidate and school improvement ● Be knowledgeable of and be able to apply the law in ensuring a safe and healthy learning environment for all candidates ● Learn to build and maintain collaborative relationships amongst faculty, candidates, families, communities, and professional networks to foster an environment that incorporates diverse voices leading to school improvement ● Use technology to build and sustain accountability systems that assist in gathering communicating, analyzing and making decisions concerning school improvement ● Learn to nurture successful school-wide practices that provide a collaborative culture while avoiding fragmentation between departments and divisions that can undermine school improvement.

Table 2. Continued

Focus of the Work	The Transformative Leader Is	The Transformative Leader Will
Diversity	Cognizant of and sensitive to issues of diversity in a reflective and responsive manner to promote student achievement for all students.	● Participate in field and practicum experiences in multiple diverse settings representing varied SES, religious, racial, non-traditional, public and private school populations ● Be afforded the opportunity to develop global perspectives through international study abroad experiences ● Develop the sensitivity to and the consideration for the varied identities of candidates, parents, and community members relating to SES, religious, racial, gender, sexual orientation, class, and ability within their role as educational leaders ● Develop the habits of mind to understand oneself vis-à-vis personal inclinations, passions and biases as they make one's own internal operations more discerning ● Engage in diverse learning settings including face-to-face dialogue, collaborative research and reflection, on-line instruction and multiple field and practicum research placements.
Data-Driven Decision Making	Cognizant of and sensitive to the power of data in effective leadership decision making that affects the school, individual candidates, families and the community.	● Be knowledgeable of how to collect, display, analyze and make decisions based upon various and multiple data sources ● Learn to utilize data to address equitable resources, faculty placement and performance, and candidate academic and behavioral outcomes ● Be able to use data to communicate a cohesive vision and mission to school boards, faculty, families, candidates and community ● Develop ethical discernment in the consideration and use of data to shed light on the major problems facing schools in order to provide wisdom and insight for possible solutions
Contemporary theories, research, law and policy	Continually updating his/her knowledge and skills of contemporary theories, research, law and policy that impact schools.	● Understand contemporary theories, research, law and policy as they impact educational leadership for excellence ● Develop deep knowledge about the teaching and learning process in order to become an effective instructional leader ● Become a reflective consumer of contemporary theories, research, law and policy as they impact institutional practices within diverse buildings and school districts ● Build upon existing knowledge and generate new knowledge through the application of contemporary theories, research, law and policy within diverse building and school districts ● Build and maintain ongoing and reflective leadership practices in light of emerging research, law and policy, that advances the school's vision, mission and goals ● Generate and transform the use of professional knowledge and practice to improve the school community. (Authors, 2009.)