

Examining Faculty Member Changes in an Innovative Educational Doctorate Program

Ray R. Buss · Debby Zambo · Suzanne R. Painter · David W. Moore

Published online: 3 June 2012
© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2012

Abstract Recent criticisms of the Educational Doctorate (Ed.D.) have challenged faculty members to create or reform such programs. In response to these concerns, faculty members at a particular institution designed and implemented a new Ed.D. program focused on leadership and innovation. We conducted this action research study in order to examine the changes faculty members experienced as they implemented the program along with the factors to which they attributed these changes. Data were gathered with an online survey; and results indicated changes had occurred in perceptions of research, teaching, and students as well as professional identities. Participants attributed these changes to collaborative teaching, a community of practice, and strong leadership. Findings will guide program leaders and faculty members in the coming years and may provide insights to leaders of similar programs and to those guiding innovative efforts.

Ray R. Buss Ph.D., University of Wisconsin-Madison, is Associate Professor in the Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College at Arizona State University. His research interests include doctoral student development, doctoral program delivery, and teacher efficacy.

Debby Zambo Ph.D., Arizona State University, is Associate Professor in the Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College at Arizona State University. Her research interests include newly designed Ed.D. programs and the application of educational psychology and neuroscience to educational practice.

Suzanne R. Painter Ph.D., University of Oregon, is a Division Director in the Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College at Arizona State University. Her research interests include preparation of educational leaders and implementation of change in doctoral education.

David W. Moore Ph.D., University of Georgia, is an Emeritus Professor in the Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College at Arizona State University. For thirty years, his research interests centered about adolescent literacy. His interests recently shifted to the professional doctorate in education when he served as coordinator of the Ed.D. in Leadership and Innovation program at ASU.

R. R. Buss (✉) · D. Zambo · S. R. Painter · D. W. Moore
Division of Educational Leadership and Innovation, Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College,
Arizona State University, P.O. Box 37100, Phoenix, AZ 85069-7100, USA
e-mail: ray.buss@asu.edu

Keywords Change · Faculty members · Innovative doctorate program · Community of practice

In the United States, the Educational Doctorate (Ed.D.) has come under intense scrutiny and withering criticism (e.g., Levine 2005), and various proposals have emerged for reform (e.g., Grogan and Andrews 2002; Shulman et al. 2006). In response to these or similar though less severe criticisms and governmental directives to provide additional highly qualified technology, business, and education personnel, second generation doctoral programs have emerged in large numbers and flourished in the United Kingdom, Australia, and the United States (Carboni and Proper 2009; Lester 2004; Neumann 2007; Scott et al. 2004). First generation doctoral degrees included a heavy load of course work with a culminating dissertation and were dominated by academe (Maxwell 2003). By comparison, second generation doctoral programs are situated at the intersection of the profession, the workplace, and the university (Lee et al. 2000). These programs highlight interdisciplinary and applied knowledge, emphasize research in the workplace setting, focus on the connections between theory and practice, foster critical and reflective thinking about practice, and reflect the perspectives of practitioners (Bourner et al. 2001; Lester 2004; Maxwell 2003; Rolfe and Davies 2009; Servage 2009). They have become popular because they offer flexible delivery and peer support (Boud and Lee 2005; Scott et al. 2004).

Nevertheless, the changes required of faculty members in accepting second generation doctorates and their attendant program requirements may not be easy. The changes necessary to adopt such programs require substantial alterations in roles and belief systems (Fullan 2001; Lester 2004). Faculty members asked to innovate may find themselves needing to abandon practices they have used for years and to risk failure as they embark in new directions. Creating programs and changing the views and behaviors of faculty members requires a new mindset, collaborative work, and strong leadership to insure that faculty members remain positive and that students have a comprehensive educational experience (Boud and Tennant 2006; Fullan 2008; Scott et al. 2004).

In this article we report an action research study in which we investigated the effects of change on faculty members who implemented an innovative Ed.D. program with features including inquiry-based, co-taught courses; students learning from repeated cycles of action research in their workplaces; and small groups of students and faculty members forming Leader-Scholar Communities (LSCs) designed to support students' research in local contexts. The purpose of this study was to determine the changes faculty members identified in themselves and the factors to which they attributed these changes as they worked to implement a new Ed.D. The results of this study will guide faculty members in the coming years and may provide insights to other program leaders as they work to secure faculty members' support for innovation in Educational Doctorate programs.

Theoretical Framework

Two strands of research guided this study: the research on change in educational organizations (Fullan 2001, 2007, 2008; Hall and Hord 2006; Hargreaves 1992, 1994) and the research on communities of practice (Lave and Wenger 1991; Wenger 1998; Wenger et al. 2002). The first framework informing this study is the work of Hall and Hord (2006) that

investigated implementation of change and discovered that individuals asked to enact innovations move through somewhat predictable stages of concern. Initially, as innovators gain awareness they begin to seek information and then ask questions about how the change will affect them personally. After these concerns are addressed (at least in part), they move on to concerns about managing the details of implementation, examining the consequences of the change, collaborating with others to make improvements, and refocusing on adapting the innovation to achieve better results.

In their work, Hall and Hord (2006) determined that leadership was the key to helping innovators move through the stages. Change facilitators help individuals enact change when they develop and articulate a vision, plan and provide resources, provide training, check on progress, provide continuous assistance, and create a context supportive of change. As these steps are taken, those asked to implement change begin to make sense of the innovation; become engaged in the process; create shared understanding that may, or may not, match the original plan; and gain a sense of efficacy from their work (Fullan 2001, 2007, 2008).

Similar ideas of change and leadership are offered in Hargreaves' (1992, 1994) moving mosaic metaphor. Change, according to Hargreaves, is more likely to occur when leaders understand and become a part of the culture in which it exists. Hargreaves argued that change occurs when leaders collaborate and build on the talents of stakeholders, encouraging them to make shared decisions, cross boundaries, and contribute in substantive ways.

The second framework that informed this study is the Communities of Practice work described by Wenger and his colleagues (Lave and Wenger 1991; Wenger 1998; Wenger et al. 2002). Communities of practice are groups of people engaging in common work and learning from and with each other as they solve problems and strive to attain common goals. In communities, individuals make meaning and find identity. Wenger's (1998) concept of identity is ontogenetic and focuses on a constant becoming based on experience:

Identity is not some primordial core of personality that already exists. Even though issues of identity as a focus of overt concern may become more salient at certain times than at others, one's identity is something constantly renegotiated during the course of our lives. (p. 153)

Taken together, the findings from the literature on change in educational organizations and the research on communities of practice led us to several compelling questions worthy of investigation. First, *did the culture the leaders built encourage faculty members' participation, create opportunities for them to grow, and address concerns?* In the context of this study, we examined whether the leadership created such a culture and nurtured the faculty members through the changes they were expected to enact. In sum, we examined how faculty members perceived program leaders' articulation of a vision; provision of resources, training, and assistance; and provision of a supportive context and opportunities to share new understanding as they experienced the changes being implemented in the new Ed.D. program.

Second, *did experiences within the new program change professors' professional identities, especially when they were immersed in communities of practice that focused on understanding and implementing innovations?* This question warrants scrutiny because these scholars were called upon to re-invent processes and artifacts that marked them as members of a particular vocation (the professoriate) and at the same time demanded that they develop and implement new actions that threatened their identity as scholars and experts in particular disciplines. Innovations challenged the faculty members to re-examine their identity, competence, and place in the organization (the personal stage of concern according to Hall and Hord); and in doing so they

turned to the community of practice that was being built to renegotiate the meaning of professional concepts and the roles they were asked to play.

During the implementation of the program, the theoretical constructs offered by Hall and Hord, Hargreaves, and Wenger and colleagues would predict that the negotiation of meaning of faculty members' roles and program artifacts (what constitutes the dissertation, the proposal defense, the dissertation committee, a class offered in the program) would emerge from the extensive discussions held by those participating in the community of practice. For this study, the data we collected from surveys were analyzed to determine the changes faculty members reported in their identity as they negotiated meaning with students and each other, the concerns they felt along the way, and the factors to which they attributed change.

Context of the Innovative Educational Doctorate

The Educational Doctorate program in this study was the first doctoral program approved for the College; and as planned, it had two innovative features when it began: Leader-Scholar Communities, which are small groups of five students and two faculty members, and a hybrid course format that includes classes meeting face-to-face for 2/3 of the semester and online for 1/3. These innovations are consistent with components of second generation doctoral programs including strong peer support networks (Boud and Lee 2005; Scott et al. 2004) and flexible delivery of programs (Scott et al. 2004; Wikeley and Muschamp 2004). Classes began in fall 2006; and, although certain ideals were enacted, the program quickly floundered, and students' protests sounded much like Levine's (2005) criticisms of the Ed.D. Students felt the program consisted of traditional lecture-based courses, lacked innovation, and did little to increase their capacity to become leaders and scholars. As a result, the dean made a change in program leadership toward the end of the first semester when a director with previous experience in leading a more traditional Ed.D. program was replaced by an interim director. The new director, who had had experience leading change at several other universities, assumed control of the next semester's classes and asked four faculty members to join him in delivering a team-taught, inquiry-oriented and field-based course that blended two courses into one and focused on mixed-method action research projects. A few weeks into the semester, a full-time faculty member, well versed in leadership and change, agreed to direct the program with assistance from the interim director. Thus, the leaders of the program were the full-time faculty member who became director of the program and the "interim" director who became assistant director. These two began to formulate a new vision as they modeled collaboration and included faculty members in shared decision-making. Within a few months, regular meetings were scheduled so faculty members could provide input, and at the same time four respected faculty members were recruited to serve as dissertation chairs for five students. Thus, the program began to be shaped by a team of faculty members, who subsequently met every two to three weeks to discuss the program, make decisions, and share information to help students. Gradually the following elements became the cornerstone of the program:

- Outcome—The intended outcome was determined to be a more thoughtful, reflective practicing leader-researcher confident in his or her ability to implement and evaluate the results of educational innovations (Lester 2004; Scott et al. 2004).
- Action research—Repeated cycles of action research would be required prior to the dissertation action research study (Lewin 1945/2005; Stringer 2007). The dissertation

would report on the last cycle of research related to an innovation implemented by the student in the student's own educational organization (Boud and Tennant 2006; Lester 2004; Maxwell 2003).

- Pedagogy—Core three-credit courses would be co-taught in teams of two to four as blended pairs (two courses forming one six-hour course). Courses would be based on students conducting action research and learning the literature and mixed methods simultaneously (Greene 2007; Stringer 2007).
- Dissertation committees—The dissertation committee would consist of pairs of faculty members who would advise five to seven students, with each student nominating a third member of his or her committee from outside the college (Maxwell 2003). The group of two faculty members and five to seven students would be termed a 'Leader-Scholar Community.' They would meet regularly over the two-year period preceding graduation to support each other during the action research dissertation process (Boud and Lee 2005; Wenger et al. 2002) that leads to a separate dissertation, which is carried out by each student.
- Support—Through coursework and the Leader-Scholar Community meetings, students would be encouraged to assume individual and collective responsibility (Boud and Lee 2005; Wenger et al. 2002).

These elements are consistent with other second generation doctoral programs as noted in the citations above. Finally, enactment of this vision with the new leadership began in spring 2007 and has continued. The first cohort of 20 students all graduated in May 2009.

Method of the Study

Participants

For this action research study (Lewin 1945/2005; Stringer 2007) we gathered data via an online survey from eight faculty members who had participated in shaping and delivering the program to the first cohort of students. Four of these faculty members had previously held positions at other institutions where they had participated in more traditional Ph.D. and Ed.D. programs. The faculty members represented various roles: course instructor, Leader-Scholar Community chair, Leader-Scholar Community second member, or a combination of these roles. Three of the four authors of this paper were among those who provided data upon which the results are based; the fourth served as the new director of the program. Prior to conducting the study, the Institutional Review Board had approved the protocol for work with human subjects.

Instrument

The online survey consisted of five questions. Responses to question number one provided information about the faculty member's role; and the remainder of the responses provided information about their perceptions of the program, themselves as change agents, and the factors that helped or hindered the changes they described. The questions asked were:

1. What has been your role?
2. How are you a different person as a consequence of participating in the Ed.D. program? Please tell about how and when you think this came about.

3. Tell a story about a memorable and influential learning experience, (positive, negative or both) you have had in the Ed.D. program.
4. What work arrangements, routines, leadership or other organizational features have aided or hindered implementation of the program?
5. If you were advising colleagues at another institution who sought to implement a similarly innovative program, what counsel would you give to increase the likelihood that faculty members would collaborate in implementing innovation?

Procedure

The eight faculty members responded to an e-mail invitation asking them to complete an online survey. Responses were then automatically transferred into a spreadsheet, and the data were analyzed using the methods described in the next section.

Data Analysis

Prior to describing the analysis procedures, information about the nature and quantity of responses is provided. Responses to the first question about one's role in the program were brief, typically consisting of 2-6 words such as course instructor, Leader-Scholar Community chair, or combinations of these roles. By comparison, responses to the other four questions were fairly lengthy and provided good detail. For example, total word counts for written responses to questions 2-5 were 745, 794, 504, and 543 words, respectively. This results in a mean response rate of 93.12, 99.25, 63.00, and 67.88 words per respondent for each of the questions.

A team of four faculty members analyzed the qualitative data. To build an explanatory framework, analysis progressed inductively with a constant comparative method that allowed the researchers to move between data, codes, larger categories, themes, and assertions (Glaser and Strauss 1967; Strauss and Corbin 1998). To ensure credibility each phase of the process is explained below.

Level 1: Un-packaging the Data

All researchers read and reread the data independently. At this stage, initial labels, key words, and codes were established. Thus, key words or short phrases constituted the initial codes. Examples related to students' needs and instruction include "Students' needs," "students ... drive my instruction," "more aware of individual student needs," and "just in time' support" are phrases illustrative of coding at this level.

Next, one researcher linked data to these codes question by question in a partially ordered matrix checklist (Miles and Huberman 1994). The matrix utilized a spreadsheet format. It contained the raw data in the left column and emerging codes on the right. The researcher's choice to link codes to questions at this phase was careful and inductive. Data were sorted systematically and examined for confirming and disconfirming ideas. These nascent codes were brought to the other researchers, discussed, clarified, and refined.

Level 2: Re-packaging and Aggregating Data

The goals in this phase of analysis were to uncover how data and codes fit together. The researchers met and discussed which codes were prominent, how they were ordered, and how they fit into themes. To achieve transparency, preconceived beliefs were discussed and

ideas were continually compared to participants' perspectives and words (Lincoln and Guba 1985). Through analysis and comparison, beliefs mentioned less often were rethought, reclassified, or eliminated. Thus, at this stage, one of the important processes provided for initial codes to be collected into larger categories. Using our previous example codes, "Students' needs," "students ... drive my instruction," "more aware of individual student needs," and "'just in time' support" were all collapsed into a larger category we called, "student-centered needs and instruction." This process of creating larger categories was conducted for all the data. For example, a larger category called "emerging instructional principles" resulted when initial codes such as "instruction on a case-by-case basis," "teaching with constructivist ways," and "constructivist teaching principles" were gathered into a larger category.

Next, larger categories were examined for relationships and the writing of analytical memos began. We moved inductively from the data set to the larger categories and developed connections among the categories that led to themes based on the data (Erikson 1986; Strauss and Corbin 1998). We then broke apart the matrix and created a conceptual map. Themes were fit together to show relationships and hierarchies. Salient, repeated findings allowed us to formulate nascent assertions. Thus, we collected a number of larger categories together that resulted in emerging assertions. For example, we gathered the previously illustrated categories about "student needs and instruction," "emerging instructional principles," and other related larger categories into a nascent assertion we labeled, "views of teaching changed."

Level 3: Solidifying Assertions and Creating an Emergent Framework

We next used the conceptual map and nodes to solidify emerging assertions. Assertions were made in narrative form and supported with participants' words (Erikson 1986). (Assertions along with supporting quotes are provided in the [Results](#) section.) As assertions were articulated, we consistently checked whether or not the effects of collection methods and current analysis of our findings agreed with the original data set. We met regularly, reviewed the analysis, and went back to the original corpus of data to make certain findings were inclusive, trustworthy, and credible.

We provided the assertions to all faculty members who had completed the survey for a member check following our analyses. With a few minor exceptions, the interpretations of responses were consistent with participants' intentions. We incorporated input from the member check into the final set of assertions.

As a result of carefully applying the previous analytical procedures, we believe that our efforts demonstrate process validity. We performed the entire process in an analytical, dependable, and competent manner. Additionally, we assert that the processes are credible because we engaged in reflective efforts, followed detailed procedures, developed a clear and comprehensive audit trail, and employed member checks. Finally, consistent with qualitative interpretive methods, we do not claim nor should the reader infer that our representations are the only way to interpret the data.

Results

We first present the results relative to question 2 (faculty members' perceived changes because of their participation) and question 3 (their story). Taken together, faculty members' responses to these questions explain "what they thought changed." We recorded changes in

four important areas: (a) research, (b) teaching, (c) students, and (d) perception of professional identity.

To clarify the results, each of the areas is represented first as an assertion, then explained and illustrated with selected quotes. Moreover, for each of the assertions disconfirming, contradictory statements are presented if they were provided. These statements help portray the complexities associated with the assertions and the care we took to consider both sides.

What changed?

Assertion 1—Faculty Members' Views of Research Expanded Participating in this program changed faculty members' views of legitimate types of research, turning their focus from a traditional perspective to one that recognized the value and power of teachers and school leaders performing action research in K-12 schools and other educational settings. Prior to working in the program, most faculty members held rather traditional views about research based on their experiences. They had been trained in traditional Ph.D. programs and worked in traditional university settings. However, when changes became necessary, they were able to move beyond their concerns and embrace and implement new ideas. The need to lead students through an action research dissertation broadened their view of research. Over the course of participation in this program, all eight faculty members came to recognize the value of school-based action research. As one participant put it, "I am more aware of the power of action research." Another said, "Action research is a great way to involve practitioners in...research. If faculty...would like to involve themselves in the real world outside of academia, this is truly a great program." A third stated, "I realize that traditional research has no place in the day-to-day events of schools. School-based research and local impact is more important than statistical significance, etc." Such statements suggest that faculty members broadened their perspectives and came to view action research as a way to turn theory into practice and to involve university scholars, like themselves, in school-based research. Action research came to be viewed as a way to connect researchers to practical, use-inspired research.

Although, in general, faculty members' perspectives about research and action research changed in positive ways, concerns surfaced because of publication expectations for tenure and annual reviews. They had to divide their time between students' research and their own, and they were typically working with students conducting research in fields very different from their own. This was difficult for some because of the amount of work demanded. Working with students doing research beyond faculty members' areas of expertise competed with their ability to conduct their own studies and publish their own work. As one participant noted:

I have had to work with people who are doing research in fields completely unlike my own. So, while I do not have expertise in my doctoral students' fields, I have had to help them become excellent researchers and academic writers. It is difficult to work at this level on projects unrelated to my area of expertise. [This work is] [v]aluable and interesting for sure, but difficult. More importantly, working with doctoral students who are not in my field caused me to not be able to spend the time I need in my own area.

Taken together these comments suggest a new perspective and respect for action research along with concerns. Faculty members gained new research perspectives and moved through a somewhat predictable stage of concern about what this meant for their own work.

Assertion 2—Faculty Members' Views of Teaching Changed Prior to implementation of the program, faculty members tended to hold more traditional perspectives on teaching,

focusing on the didactic delivery of information. As a result of participating in the new program, views of teaching changed and became more student-centered and constructivist in nature. The new view also included a strong collaborative component that had not previously been evident. Finally, students' learning and individual needs increasingly directed the faculty members' actions and thoughts. One faculty member offered the following comment:

I had forgotten how important those aspects [student learning] are when teaching in higher education. I forgot my beliefs and what grounded me as an educator and reverted to the norm of traditional teaching in higher education, which is teacher-centered, didactic, and hierarchical. What was important to me was following the syllabus and having the students do what [I] had planned for them. After team teaching ... I found my way back to what is really important and focused again on student-centered, constructivist teaching principles.

Another echoed these sentiments and added that student needs played a larger role in shaping instruction:

Students' needs play a much larger role in my approaches to instruction. I allow students to drive my instruction to a much greater extent than prior to my involvement in the program ... I am much more aware of individual student needs and providing "just in time" support, which became very necessary as students worked on their dissertations.

In summary, the comments suggest that with respect to teaching faculty members (a) became more flexible, (b) provided feedback and just in time instruction, and (c) became more sensitive to students' learning and learning needs.

Assertion 3—Faculty Members' Views of Students Changed Gradually, faculty members engaged more deeply with students; and the bonds formed became progressively more evident. Working closely with students in Leader-Scholar Communities caused faculty members to develop a sense of pride as their students demonstrated increasing independence and leadership. One faculty member explained as follows:

The most influential learning experiences occurred when students demonstrated increasing independence and knowledge as they progressed on their dissertation work. It was wonderful to observe them as they became more deeply engaged in their research and took greater control over their work. The growth of students in this area was substantial and a testament to their commitment, professionalism, and personal capabilities.

Another maintained:

The most memorable learning experiences have come from my relationships with my doctoral students. They have become almost like my own children in that I have seen them mature into researchers and leaders before my eyes. I am very proud of them and even a little protective.

Faculty members changed their perceptions of students over time, viewing them increasingly as maturing researchers and educational leaders, as these comments suggest.

However, working with students was not without challenges and concerns. One faculty member noted:

One student felt she did not have enough exposure to stats and traditional methods of inquiry to evaluate her programs, [She] wanted a more traditional program I assured her that I taught myself everything about [data analysis] via the dissertation process. Like a traditional program you get the very, very basics but you must be in charge of your own learning to apply what you've learned, become an expert in an area, and live the difficult decisions you must make to conduct the best dissertation study you can.

In sum, bonds were formed as faculty members and students worked together in communities to solve problems and ensure students' success. Pride and respect dominated relationships; but tensions arose, especially when students wanted structured directions and questioned core principles of the program.

Assertion 4—Faculty Members' Identity Changed The Ed.D. was new to this College, and this caused faculty members to feel intellectually stimulated because they were working with promising new scholar leaders who had practical insights. This feeling rejuvenated a number of the faculty members and increased their sense of efficacy. One faculty member said, "Actually, responding to individual student needs has been professionally rewarding, broadened my experience, and been intellectually stimulating." A second allowed, "There were BUMPS and yes, I did struggle, but I came out stronger and learned to handle difficult situations. When I started ... I never thought I could have much to contribute, but now I see I do"

These remarks show that faculty members were indeed rejuvenated and that their identity changed as their efficacy increased. Even with bumps and setbacks faculty members believed they made contributions that changed developing scholars' lives.

What helped or hindered these changes?

We now present the results related to questions 4 (aids and hindrances) and 5 (advice). Together faculty members' responses to these questions are used to explain "to what faculty members attributed these changes." They suggested four areas as being primarily responsible: (a) Leader-Scholar Communities, (b) collaborative teaching, (c) collaboration on the program's development and functioning, and (d) program leadership.

Assertion 1—Faculty Members Valued the Leader-Scholar Communities as a Means to Facilitate Change in Students In the Leader-Scholar Communities (LSC), students came together as a community of practice with their peers and faculty members to solve problems, gain insight, and advance toward completing their dissertations. One faculty member noted the value of the LSC in fostering support for students:

... perhaps the greatest strength of the program is the use of the LSC. This component of the program was utilized to provide superb levels of support to students. Students in the LSCs benefitted from their peers and from the faculty members.... The LSCs augmented the cohort connections that had been established earlier. The key point was providing support so students could attain the goals set forth in the program.

A second also affirmed this idea:

The use of the cohort structure and especially the implementation of the LSC have been essential to program success. Students have drawn upon LSC members for support and critique of their efforts. Additionally, providing students with individual support through their chairs and second person on the LSC has been critical to the success of students.

Statements like these indicate the extraordinary value faculty members placed on the Leader-Scholar Communities for students. All of the faculty members indicated the community support and collaborative atmosphere provided students with networks of peer and professional support, and this support was a key piece to developing leader scholars. No concerns were noted.

Assertion 2—Faculty Members Attributed Their Change to Collaborative Teaching Faculty members indicated they changed because they engaged in co-planning, co-teaching, and debriefing as a team. They believed that this collaborative effort brought their teaching to a whole new level and that their teaching became more connected to the program goals, created a consistent scope and sequence of coursework, and focused on students' needs. When faculty members worked together, their teaching became more transparent. As one said,

... I have a much greater appreciation for collaborative teaching as a result of my participation. Being able to capitalize on the expertise of colleagues during the teaching of classes was very powerful. Two factors supported this transformation—collaborative planning of course content and delivery and the dynamic effects of classroom instruction with colleagues were the primary factors.

A second offered a similar statement of how collaborative teaching influenced change:

The ability to co-plan, co-teach, and debrief with someone has brought my teaching to a whole new level—more visible to my peers, more thoughtful in terms of addressing course content, more connected to the goals of the program, and more aligned with the scope and sequence of other courses. ...it [co-teaching] is time well spent. Finding the right folks who work with you, respect you, and help are important. The person I work with and I are a balance.... It's about communication and being able to find the humor in situations.

Despite the benefits collaborative teaching brought, concerns were also expressed. Collaborative teaching was not always easy because of the time, effort, and work involved. Time was a serious concern because credit was given for one course in the program despite the fact that two classes were integrated into one six-hour course. Longer class time and blended courses meant more planning and in-class time and more content to cover. One faculty member suggested, "... the realities and commitments - it's a lot of hard work and takes time."

These statements indicate faculty members thought co-teaching facilitated change in their instruction but took a lot of work. Collaborative teaching created opportunities to share ideas, solve problems, and become better connected to course and program goals. Despite these benefits it demanded time, effort, and hard work; and this caused some concern.

Assertion 3—Faculty Members Became Committed to Collaboration on Program Development and Functioning Faculty members who participated in the program adopted a

community of practice ethic. They solved problems together and created a shared vision of their efforts and the innovation as it evolved. Hierarchies were dissolved, and expertise was shared as they made decisions relative to the program. This group worked as a community to address concerns students felt about the program and concerns others had about the Ed.D. They reminded each other of the program purposes, the difficulty and messiness of the work, and the need to stay focused on action oriented local interventions. They believed it was important to meet regularly and appreciated the fact that these meetings were based on their needs and concerns. This group supported each other through various situations and decisions that needed to be made, and this was especially salient in one faculty member's words: "Sometimes we are in tough positions and need to make difficult decisions, but I know my colleagues will back me up OR honestly tell me what they think. It's [having] someone to share trials and tribulations with." Collaboration was especially appreciated through difficult times and became motivating because it brought personal and professional rewards. One faculty member explained:

I see myself as part of something bigger—an Ed.D program as well as a movement in academia – that values collaboration and mutual problem solving.... I see myself as a participant sharing expertise with others and sharing in decision-making relative to the overall program as well as doctoral candidates' programs of study.

A second suggested working together was critical in fostering change, "The support comes from the faculty working together. The good thing is that the faculty... is really dedicated to making this program innovative and making it work...."

Finally, another faculty member tendered a compelling statement about the importance of collaboration in the program:

Regular meetings where we remind each other (faculty) of the purposes of our program, the difficulty and messiness of the work, and the need to stay focused on action oriented local interventions as opposed to national surveys or purely theoretical work. We have to keep supporting each other, or we could lose the focus of the program.

Such comments attest to the importance faculty members placed on their roles in developing and implementing the program. The sense of being a part of something bigger... that valued collaboration and mutual problem solving captures the essence of the comments of faculty members' responses in this area. Coming together as a community and collaborating on all aspects of the program was a hallmark achievement.

Despite these positive views of collaboration there were several concerns. As noted above, collaborative efforts frequently dealt with "messy problems." So there were concerns from time to time about arriving at "solutions." Finally, one faculty member expressed a concern about collaborative efforts and the highly developed (tightly knit) community of practice that had formed. His concern focused on faculty members who were not involved in the program saying they may feel excluded: "Attention is needed on maintaining positive relations with faculty who are not participating directly in the program. We need to be inclusive while maintaining a core that pushes the program forward and maintains the program's core features."

Faculty members also recognized that there were challenges to collaboration on program development and functioning. The challenges included dealing with messy problems, time demands, and a tightly knit community, which may be perceived as exclusive.

Assertion 4—Faculty Members Believed Leadership Facilitated Change The faculty members believed leadership was a *key* factor in the success of the program. Further, their

comments indicated leaders made a *difference* in program implementation. Responses indicated faculty members thought that the leaders of the program (the new director and associate director) were committed to a vision, possessed a pioneering attitude, had background in implementing it, and retained the capacity to take action on it while managing all the details. To them the leadership understood and became a part of the culture. They encouraged vigorous and dynamic alliances, crossed boundaries, and redefined roles. To state it more succinctly, the leaders explicitly and implicitly talked the talk and walked the walk of those they wished to change.

Additionally, faculty members suggested that the leaders demonstrated expertise, faith, and enduring optimism. They exhibited the capacity and wisdom to construct a dream collectively and convinced the appropriate faculty members that the dream was attainable. Building and fostering this type of atmosphere encouraged faculty members' participation and contributions to the program. Notably, leaders enabled and provided faculty members with time to converse and reflect. As one faculty member observed, "[The leaders] promoted a community of practice ethic that contributed substantially to the implementation of the program. This promotion was done explicitly and implicitly, talking the talk and walking the walk." In an incisive comment, another faculty member wrote:

The leadership for this program makes such a difference....The leadership has helped to set standards for the program and establish procedures that arise from a community of learners orientation for faculty as well as for students with faculty. Now the leadership provides clear expectations for faculty participation and following the procedures. But there is also an eye on addressing issues, making thoughtful changes, and listening to each other. It works.

Finally, another advised:

I think that the program takes strong leader[s], one [sic] who can dream big and convince others that the dream is doable. [Their] wisdom, expertise, experience and recognition really helped to convince the appropriate people to listen and implement an untraditional [sic] Ed. D. program. It took faith from the faculty to believe and believe in themselves.

Others felt that the dean's leadership was a compelling component in making the program work. For instance, one faculty member noted, "... the buy-in and faith of the Dean, I believe, has really helped in providing the [leadership] backing needed to support and persuade the faculty." A second suggested:

The college administration must recognize the substantial commitment required of faculty members who are working with the students and construct a reward system that is appropriate. Going even farther, the Standards of Academe [the college's standards for evaluation] and their annual review procedures at an institution must be established to encourage faculty members' participation and reward it.

In sum, these comments were compelling especially in regard to the role of leadership in fostering change in this Educational Doctorate program. Faculty members advised that division and program leaders as well as the dean provided critical leadership. Respondents indicated these leaders developed a strong vision of the program and aided the faculty members in adopting the vision and facilitating faculty members' work to attain it.

Consistent with the parameters of action research, the results reported here will inform decisions for those working and leading this particular program in the coming years. These results may also offer ideas to other program leaders and faculty members, in a very general way.

Discussion

Our purpose in conducting this study was to determine the changes faculty members identified in themselves and the factors to which they attributed these changes. For instance, the faculty members' changes relative to action research, constructivist teaching, student development, and self-efficacy can encourage faculty members and their leaders to work toward enhancing these factors in the years to come. Participating faculty members can strive to articulate and define these factors even more intentionally, celebrating them as core program ideals.

Reporting changes in professional identity through action research like this helps leaders see the benefit of collecting data on faculty members' views and concerns. As faculty members work on this Educational Doctorate, they articulate and share challenges, begin deliberating and analyzing what they can do, and make meaningful modifications. Faculty members can assess change critically, determining what is appropriate; and they can decide how to forge their professional identities. For instance, the concern about supporting students' individual action research and advancing their own research agendas deserves attention. Is it possible and desirable to craft a professional research agenda that consists of advancing the efforts of others? How do annual reviews fit into the process? Does such an agenda depend on one's tenure status?

Wenger (1998) cogently argued that building an identity involves the negotiation of meaning based on experiences in social communities. Thus, participation in the various communities is integral to defining and redefining one's identity during the implementation of this new program. It promotes faculty members' thoughtful reflection on their work as researchers and teachers, their relationships with students, and their individual efficacy in terms of their professional identity.

Determining the sources that help and hinder this process helps plot the program's future course. Realizing that faculty members ascribe growth in their professional identities to the Leader-Scholar Communities, collaborative teaching, collaborative operation of the program, and the leadership offered can direct program leaders and faculty member participants to focus attention on these features in the future. For example, Leader-Scholar Communities, collaborative teaching, and collaborative participation in the conduct of the program all contribute to the development of an intricately woven community of practice. In these situations, faculty members participate in multiple opportunities to make sense of the program by talking with others and developing shared understandings. Lave and Wenger (1991) acknowledged the importance of talk in a community of practice. Moreover, for Lave and Wenger, talk consists of two components: the language used in a community of practice and the stories told. Notably, in these stories, knowledge is shared and learning takes place.

Faculty members also attributed change to program leaders who provide various types of support to the faculty members. They specifically indicated that vision and provision of support and assistance are valuable. Moreover, faculty members especially attributed change to the establishment of supportive contexts such as team teaching and regular meetings for consideration of all kinds of issues related to the program. These findings are consistent with Hall and Hord's (2006) outcomes with respect to change facilitators who are able to: (a)

articulate a vision, (b) plan and provide resources, (c) provide continuous assistance, and (d) create a context supportive of change.

Specifying changes in doctoral faculty members' professional identities and the sources of the changes is complicated. The categories of identity changes reported here are informative, but they can also be misleading. Categorizing the ways faculty members believe they have changed no doubt offers only a partial view and neglects the dynamic nature of the changes. Inviting faculty members to think about who they are becoming as doctoral-level educators also might imply a critique of their past, and such critiques can be menacing. Moreover, attributing changes to particular sources is equally slippery. In this initial study, the complexities of the situation are reported with disconfirming data, checking interpretations with group members, and shaping assertions accordingly; but a full accounting of the intricacies of this project awaits future research.

Concluding Remarks

With any action research, extreme caution must be exercised both by the researchers who write about their efforts as well as by the readers who seek to glean insights from reading about the work conducted by others. As a result we, offer several questions for consideration by those who wish to develop and implement innovative educational programs that might fall outside of normal higher education conventions and practices. Some questions for consideration are:

- Is the administration supportive of the innovative educational program(s)?
- Will the administration support faculty members who participate in the innovative educational program(s)?
- Are there early adopters who can lead implementation of the innovative educational program(s)? That is to say, are there champions for the innovation?
- Are the norms and behaviors (including reward structures) that currently apply in your educational setting sufficiently adaptable to allow for implementation of the innovative educational program(s)?
- Are colleagues willing and able to spend the time required to engage in collaborative efforts to develop, implement, and monitor the innovative educational program(s)?

These are only a few examples of questions that may be worthy to consider as readers reflect on how information from our study may be useful as they contemplate developing and implementing their own innovative program(s).

References

- Boud, D., & Lee, A. (2005). "Peer learning" as pedagogic discourse for research education. *Studies in Higher Education, 30*(5), 501–516.
- Boud, D., & Tennant, M. (2006). Putting doctoral education to work: Challenges to academic practice. *Higher Education Research and Development, 25*(3), 293–306.
- Bourner, T., Bowden, R., & Laing, S. (2001). Professional doctorates in England. *Studies in Higher Education, 26*(1), 65–83.
- Carboni, T. C., & Proper, E. (2009). Re-envisioning the professional doctorate for education leadership and higher education leadership: Vanderbilt University's Peabody College Ed.D. program. *Peabody Journal of Education, 84*(1), 61–68.
- Erikson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 119–161). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Fullan, M. (2008). *The six secrets of change: What the best leaders do to help their organizations survive and thrive*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *Discovery of grounded theory*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine De Gruyter.
- Greene, J. C. (2007). *Mixed methods in social inquiry*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Grogan, M., & Andrews, R. (2002). Defining preparation and professional development for the future. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(2), 233–256.
- Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. M. (2006). *Implementing change: Patterns, principles, and potholes* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Hargreaves, A. (1992). Time and teachers' work: An analysis of the intensification thesis. *Teachers College Record*, 94(1), 87–108.
- Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, A., Green, G., & Brennan, M. (2000). Organisational knowledge, professional practice and the professional doctorate at work. In I. Garrick & C. Rhodes (Eds.), *Research and knowledge at work: Perspectives, case studies and innovative strategies* (pp. 117–136). London, UK: Routledge.
- Lester, S. (2004). Conceptualizing the practitioner doctorate. *Studies in Higher Education*, 29(6), 757–770.
- Levine, A. (2005). *Educating school leaders*. Princeton, NJ: The Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation.
- Lewin, K. (1945/2005). Action research and minority problems. In B. Cooke & J. F. Cox (Eds.), *Fundamentals of action research*, Vol. 1 (pp. 19–31). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Original work published 1945.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Maxwell, T. (2003). From first to second generation professional doctorate. *Studies in Higher Education*, 28(3), 279–291.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Neumann, R. (2007). Policy and practice in doctoral education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 32(4), 459–473.
- Rolfe, G., & Davies, R. (2009). Second generation professional doctorates in nursing. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 46(9), 1265–1273.
- Scott, D., Brown, A., Lunt, I., & Thorne, L. (2004). *Professional doctorates: Integrating professional and academic knowledge*. Maidenhead, UK: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Servage, L. (2009). Alternative and professional doctorate programs: What is driving the demand? *Studies in Higher Education*, 34(7), 765–779.
- Shulman, L. S., Golde, C. M., Bueschel, A. C., & Garabedian, K. J. (2006). Reclaiming education's doctorates: A critique and a proposal. *Educational Researcher*, 35(3), 25–32.
- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. M. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stringer, E. T. (2007). *Action research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Wenger, E., McDermott, R., & Snyder, W. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Wikeley, F., & Muschamp, Y. (2004). Pedagogical implications of working with doctoral students at a distance. *Distance Education*, 25(1), 125–142.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.