A Tale of Two EdD Programs:
A Case Study of Intersectionality between Program Structure and Advising Model

Peggy F. Itschner

A dissertation

submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

University of Washington

2012

Reading Committee:

James S. Antony, Chair

Diane Gillespie

Margery Ginsberg

Thomas Halverson

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:

College of Education

University of Washington

Abstract

A Tale of Two EdD Programs:
A Case Study of Intersectionality between Program Structure and Advising Model

Peggy F. Itschner

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:
Associate Professor James Soto Antony
College of Education

The purpose of this study is to explore the intersectionality of program structure and advising models in Doctor of Education (EdD) programs. This study examines two EdD programs, one that is traditional in its structure and advising approach and one that has intentionally modified its design/structure and advising model, to be attuned to the practical and developmental needs of practitioners. This study takes a collective case study approach, examining the issue through the perspectives of faculty and students who are or have been involved in the two programs.

The researcher discusses themes that emerged from the perspectives of the participants through an exploration of faculty perceptions of the EdD, students' choices to pursue the EdD, key strategies for advising EdD students that faculty in each program identified, the general advising experiences of students in both programs, and how faculty and students believe their respective programs' structure and advising model influence and impact one another.

The findings reveal that a core faculty leadership structure is a key factor in the ultimate success of a program. The traditionally structured program lacks this core leadership, which has led to a consensus among students in the NEP that their EdD program is treated like a stepchild to the PhD and that the faculty recognizes the lack of differentiation between the PhD and EdD

in the NEP specializations, particularly in the dissertation or culminating project requirement. Because of this and other major program structure issues, students in the program have an overall neutral satisfaction level and many creative suggestions for how to improve the program structure and advising model. EP faculty have worked continually throughout the history of the program to improve the structure, understanding that this will impact the advising model. In turn, EP students appreciate the cohort model and built-in advising structures of the program and overall have a very high level of satisfaction. Recommendations are offered in the final chapter for best practices in both programs based on data from the faculty and students, the existing literature, and the researcher's insights.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Throughout my pursuit of this degree, many people have provided the delicate balance of challenge and support that has been critical to my ultimate success. I owe them a debt of gratitude and wish to express my sincere appreciation. Thank you to my friends, fellow students, faculty and staff in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies. Also, many thanks to my supervisory committee members, Dr. Diane Gillespie, Dr. Margery Ginsberg, and Dr. Tom Halverson. I am grateful to you for investing your valuable time and expertise in my success. Thank you for all that you do for students, colleagues and community members whose lives you touch every day. In particular, I am grateful for Dr. Ginsberg's guidance in providing access to one of the programs involved in this study. I also give special thanks to my committee chair, Dr. Jim Antony, for his unfailing and unconditional support through my very unorthodox path to the EdD. Dr. Antony exemplifies the type of advising that provides a pathway for his students, including me, to succeed, and I am truly grateful. I appreciate your professionalism, intellect and abundant patience and optimism throughout the years.

My partner for life, Jesse Sharp, has supported me throughout the journey. He has advocated for me and been my pillar of confidence and hope that I would finish. Particularly in the home stretch of completing the dissertation, he allowed and even encouraged my education to come first.

Finally, I am forever thankful to the faculty and staff who participated in this study. For giving of your time and sharing your experiences and wisdom, I am indebted to you. Thank you for being part of my journey and helping me to succeed.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Background

There are profound challenges currently facing doctoral education. Golde (2006) proposed "three vexing problems": graduates are ill-prepared for work in or out of academe, minorities and women continue to be underrepresented (in some fields more than others), and attrition in many programs is at or above 50% (Bowen & Rudenstein, 1992; Di Pierro, 2007).

With these issues in mind, doctoral programs have the goal of creating environments that foster success during the program. However, merely completing a program of study is not sufficient to the aim of graduate education. A second main goal of doctoral programs is graduating students who have also acquired the knowledge, skills, and abilities to contribute to the field as a member of the professional community, or creating "stewards of the discipline" (Golde, 2006).

The advising relationship is perhaps the most natural place where these goals can be met. According to Lovitts (2004), choosing an advisor is possibly the most important decision a graduate student makes. The choice of advisor can make the difference between completion and retention, the nature and quality of the student experience, and overall socialization. Researchers agree that effective advising is critical to the ultimate success of a doctoral student (Barnes and Austin, 2009; Golde, 2005) and can specifically contribute to improvement in the areas of challenge mentioned above.

Barnes and Austin (2009) suggest that doctoral advising is one of the main problems in doctoral education and assert, "The issue of advising in graduate education is particularly important because the nature of the relationship between doctoral students and their advisors has far-reaching implications and consequences for the advisee" (p. 298). However, despite its

recognized importance, there is also widespread concern for the way doctoral advising is actually practiced and its impact on student success or failure (Hinchey and Kimmel, 2000), making doctoral advising an area worthy of critical examination.

Compounding the concern regarding the practice of doctoral advising is the fact that all doctoral degrees are not the same. The research-oriented Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), offered in nearly every possible field of study, prepares students for careers in academe as college professors and researchers and is the doctoral degree most often researched and discussed in the literature. However, students pursuing practice, or professional, doctoral degrees such as the Doctor of Education (EdD) need the same degree of advising. While advising has a comparable impact on the success of practice-oriented doctoral students as PhD students, the purpose of such degrees is very different from the PhD and students need unique advising tailored to their academic and professional needs in order to truly become stewards of the discipline. This is particularly important given that faculty who advise EdD students often hold the PhD and have sought careers in the professoriate—few have adopted careers in educational administration or practice.

Much research has been done regarding doctoral advising; however, the literature focuses almost exclusively on students pursuing the PhD The professional doctoral student is pursuing a radically different career path (practice-oriented) than the PhD student (research-oriented) and therefore, needs advising pertinent specifically to the goals and purposes of a professional degree.

Importance of Study

This is an important area of research for a number of reasons, both personally to my future and globally to the world of higher education practice and the society it impacts. As a

student pursuing the EdD degree at a research intensive university where the majority of doctoral students in the College of Education are pursuing the PhD by a 3:1 ratio, I have felt that the EdD program is often overlooked and misunderstood, and little difference is acknowledged between the EdD and PhD For example, on the EdD course of study forms for my program, the dissertation requirement appears the same as that of the PhD program. During personal reading about qualitative research, I learned about alternative dissertation formats and inquired of my committee if I was required to complete a traditional dissertation format. My committee granted flexibility to conduct a more practical (i.e., not purely theoretical) dissertation suited for an EdD student pursuing an administrative career. However, this was a result of my initiation as a student to discover alternative dissertation formats rather than a component inherently built into the EdD program, such as a first-year seminar, to inform students of dissertation formats available to them and how to decide which might be best for them. This practical dissertation would hopefully provide a jumpstart to an administrative career, as a project I could use in my practice as a higher education administrator, just as the traditional dissertation aims to provide the first pieces of publishable research for the PhD student.

In the world of higher education practice, this research is desperately needed. As mentioned previously, there are enormous problems in doctoral education that need to be addressed. Doctoral advising practices that are attuned to the specific paths of students pursuing professional doctorates can begin to alleviate the issues of attrition, underrepresentation of minority populations, and inadequate preparation for the profession. Beyond improvement of doctoral education, the implications for improved advising of professional doctoral students are far-reaching. Graduates of EdD programs often become administrative leaders of higher education institutions, affecting the world of higher education in major ways. They affect

institutions of all types, from the community college to the research university. The doctoral experience of these leaders comes alive with pragmatic outcomes, from programming to policy, from student services to faculty research, and even from postsecondary institutions to greater society. It is critical that EdD students are able to maximize their doctoral education at the various junctures in the program as specific preparation for practice-oriented careers, and advisors are one of the primary keys to ensure this enhanced experience becomes reality. The advising needs of these students, in order to be prepared for such work, are evident and it is this issue which I aim to explore in the current study.

Purpose of the Study

Given the importance of advising in the successful experience of a doctoral student and the dearth of existing literature regarding advising of doctoral students pursuing practice degrees, it is critical that this area be explored and examined. As will be discussed in Chapter 2, the literature makes it clear that program design is a primary concern of those involved with the EdD degree and its improvement and that advising is affected by program design or structure. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to explore the intersectionality of program design/structure and advising models in EdD programs. This will be done by examining two types of EdD programs, one that is traditional in its design/structure and advising approach and one that has intentionally modified its design/structure and advising model, to be attuned to the practical and developmental needs of practitioners.

A premise of this study is the belief that advising that is intentional toward the purposes of the degree and academic/professional pursuits of the students (rather than treating all doctoral students the same) will result in more effective advising of EdD students. Also, this study is grounded in the belief that intentionality is likely impacted by the structure of the program,

because clarity on the part of both faculty and students regarding what the EdD is and who its students are increases the likelihood of effective advising, which results in student success both during and after the program.

Overview of the Study

This study uses a qualitative approach, case study method, to examine how the program structure of an EdD program impacts or interacts with the advising of the program's students. Case study method allows me, the researcher, to provide an in-depth understanding of each case, or EdD program. Specifically, in order to gain an understanding of how program structure and advising interact, I will use a collective case study approach, which allows me to examine two EdD programs at one institution. By studying two EdD programs at a single institution, one with a non-executive program structure and one with an executive program structure, I can hold constant the external institutional context and provide greater understanding of the interaction between the programs' structures and their advising models.

During a review of the literature regarding doctoral advising, I noticed that the scholarship on "doctoral advising" treated all doctoral students as PhD students. This caused me to question whether or not EdD advising has been studied, because as an EdD student I know that it is critical for advising to be practice-based, as EdD students are different from PhD students. For this reason, Chapter 2 addresses the research and scholarship of doctoral advising, writ large, as well as the literature about the EdD degree. From this research, I learned that EdD advising has not been explicitly studied (Olson & Clark, 2009). Chapter 2 also provides theoretical approaches that ground the research questions posed in this study, including the socialization of doctoral students and differences between mentoring and advising. These

approaches inform the direction of this study, as they point to important aspects of advising EdD students appropriately.

Based on findings in the literature, Chapter 3 sets forth the research questions that are explored in this study and identifies the collective case study approach as the method for examining this topic. I describe the procedures for this study according to the case study method, including boundaries of the case(s), data collection, case descriptions, and interpretation.

Chapter 4 introduces the two EdD programs which are the cases for this study, as well as the study participants. Chapter 5 presents the findings through key themes that emerge regarding faculty perceptions of the EdD, students' reasons for choosing an EdD, faculty key strategies for effective EdD advising, and students' general advising experiences. Chapter 7 provides a discussion, including a summary of findings that answer the research questions proposed in Chapter 3, implications and recommendations for the two EdD programs, limitations of the study, and directions for future research on this topic.

Chapter 2: Review of Research and Scholarship

As discussed previously, there are major differences between students preparing for research versus practice careers and pursuing research versus practice doctorates that necessitate advising experiences that pay attention to those differences. As Toma (2002) notes, "What matters in applied doctoral study…is utterly different than what is important in pure doctoral study" (p. 5).

To sufficiently examine the background for this study, a review of the literature will be explored on two major topics: advising doctoral students and what is known about the Doctor of Education (EdD) degree. Olson & Clark (2009, p. 218) acknowledge that, "There is no research literature that specifically addresses the organization of the mentor-advisee model in EdD programs and its effectiveness in supporting doctoral students in their learning and development." Therefore, in order to adequately assess advising of EdD students, examining doctoral advising broadly and what is known about the EdD degree is necessary.

Advising Doctoral Students

The literature regarding doctoral student advising involves four major topics: strategies for effective advising, socialization through advising, responsibility in the advising relationship, and advising structures. However, in order to understand the conversation around doctoral advising, it is necessary to begin with a discussion of student success at the doctoral level, which highlights the desired outcomes for doctoral students.

The Secret of Student Success

Student success can be a broadly and nebulously defined term that must be explored in more depth. Advisors and institutions know that they "got it right" when students succeed, but indicators of success must be delineated so that student success can be identified when it occurs.

An obvious indicator of student success is *completion* of the program. With an estimated retention rate of fifty percent (Bowen & Rudenstein, 1992; DiPierro, 2007), a measurable outcome of success is graduation!

Time-to-degree is another critical indicator of success. The reality is that time-to-degree has risen steadily (Bowen & Rudenstein, 1992). Programs have the goal of decreasing time-to-degree as students are supported through the program holistically: through financial support, effective advising, and developmental opportunities. Bowen & Rudenstein focused on this outcome as a key indicator of success in their seminal study of PhD programs.

A clear mark of progress and success for doctoral students is the *pursuit of a career in the field of study*. Students gain an understanding of the real aspects of the workplace they will enter, or are already working in. Most students in PhD programs strive to enter the professoriate, and for these students, the "reality" includes: changing approaches to teaching and learning, increasing diversity of students, new technologies, changing societal expectations of the academy (parents, employers, legislators, and community leaders have all changed the notion of scholarship), and demanding faculty lifestyles and changing conditions of the academic job market (Austin, 2002, 97-99). It is important to note that developing an understanding of the workplace during the doctoral experience for EdD students should look distinctly different from the faculty focus on PhD students. As an EdD student in higher education, I have consciously focused on understanding the nuances of leadership and management in a student services office because my goal is to move into that area of college administration. Clearly, this is not the same understanding of the workplace that PhD students in higher education would seek in order to become a professor at a university.

When students are successful, they typically are *active in the profession.* Participation may include publishing and presenting research. The student experiences a "sense of intellectual belonging" as evidenced by involvement in research groups, collaborative projects, peer support networks, and departmental/committee activity (Antony & Taylor, 2004). Again, being active in the profession ideally looks different for the EdD student, such as pursuing quality internship experiences or collaborating on initiatives at their local schools. In the beginning of my doctoral experience, I kept hearing my peers (who were mostly PhD students) discuss presenting their research at conferences and collaborating with faculty on research projects. However, I realized that I could be active in the profession in ways that were more appropriate to my goals as an EdD student so I collaborated with the Director of Student Services (someone working in a position I hoped to one day be in) to create an Advising Handbook for graduate students in the College of Education.

Other aspects of student success may be less conspicuous. *Mutual positive regard* with faculty, peers and the profession is extremely important and indicative of success. Antony & Taylor (2004) noted that evidence of this aspect occurs through successful role models and optimistic student-teacher relationships. *Student development* and growth also occur in the successful student, as they discover confidence and intellectual autonomy. As well, *stewardship* which combines competence (skills and knowledge) with integrity (a moral compass based on a set of principles) is evident in the successful doctoral student (Golde, 2006). While the outcomes of mutual positive regard, student development, and stewardship are also desired outcomes for EdD students, the way they become realized is likely through different experiences than that of PhD students. While PhD students might engage in collaborative research that they publish and present at a conference, EdD students working in the same local school district might engage the

community in practical ways, such as through helping to develop a new after-school mentoring program.

It is important to recognize that the doctoral student is joined by others in order to be successful. Others who take part in the journey experience success with the student. First, *advisors* reap the rewards of student success by advancing their own research and accomplishing set goals. An advisor in the social sciences remarked, "The ideal student will…be a source of stimulus to your own work" (Delamont, Atkinson, & Parry, 1997, p. 12). The *institution* and *department* or *program* also succeed as the reputation of programs improves and graduation and retention rates increase. These programs will also attract higher quality students and faculty as more students succeed in their educations and careers. Finally, the student's *profession or field* succeeds through new research directions and ideas, improved strategies, and best practices.

Strategies for Effective Advising

Aspects of effective advising must be examined as a starting point to employing strategies that provide advising to meet students' needs. Austin (2002) recognized the importance of the student's perspective in understanding how advising is most effective. In a qualitative study, Austin followed a sample of doctoral students aspiring to the professoriate over the course of four years. She focused on the voices of the students to reveal weaknesses in graduate student socialization. One of the major concerns students expressed was the minimal feedback and mentoring they received from faculty. The other two major concerns cited by students are directly related to the advising relationship, a lack of professional development opportunities and few opportunities for guided reflection.

Effective advising that meets students' needs can alleviate these concerns. For advising to be effective, it must be regular and focused, providing the guidance of a mentor. Hinchey and

Kimmel (2000) call "irresponsible and unprofessional faculty advising…one of the most scandalous elements of graduate education," (p. 12) and suggest that faculty meet with students consistently and provide departments with evidence of student progress. At the doctoral level, an advisor who merely addresses procedures and develops a course of study is insufficient. It is often assumed that the doctoral advisor will also serve as a mentor to the student; however, the literature often distinguishes between the two. An advisor attends to required paperwork and academic requirements, while a mentor more broadly pays attention to the student's professional development (Barnes and Austin, 2009), including relational development with peers and faculty and personal identity development (Gardner, 2008b).

Ideally, the advisor functions as a mentor but it seems that effective mentorships are rare. Hinchey and Kimmel (2000) posit that the rarity is due to the mutual chemistry that is required and that such mentorships must occur naturally. Despite the rarity and serendipitous nature of true mentorships, they are to be proactively sought by students because student success depends on it (Johnson & Huwe, 2003). Research on mentoring suggests that mentorships are most effective when they are chosen, not assigned, and Mullen (2006, p. 10) says, "The mentor match is one of the most crucial doorways of any graduate program." As an EdD student, I knew that I wanted to have mentors who were interested in my professional growth and had experience in the types of administration I wanted to pursue in my career. My faculty advisor has pursued a career as an administrator, becoming an associate dean, and his expertise has proven very helpful in developing my understanding of the bigger picture in higher education outside my work in academic advising. I have also developed relationships with the directors of student services in two colleges at my university, believing that they are not only involved in the types of work I

want to do but also that they do the work with the personal character and integrity I respect and admire.

A mentor also teaches the doctoral student the realities of faculty life, an area that many students complain advisors have ignored. However, according to Bieber and Worley's (2006) study regarding graduate students' conceptualizations of the faculty lifestyle, this may prove a difficult task for the advisor. In this study, the students' ideas of the faculty lifestyle were undeterred by contrary evidence. The students' continued to believe the reality of being faculty was the romantic idea they had developed as undergraduates of the autonomous professor who spends her time teaching and advising students. This notion seemed unchanged regardless of graduate student experiences. For example, most graduate students privileged teaching and mentoring over research, and believed they could overcome the academic environment that relies on a publishing record for tenure. So, while effective advising approaches the realities of faculty life, faculty mentors do well to realize that perceptions of faculty life may be difficult to break. While these studies, along with Austin's (2002) clearly address advising issues of PhD students seeking careers in the professoriate, none of these researchers mentioned that their studies were appropriate for PhD students and that further research of students seeking professional doctorates would be useful to determine what their advising needs might be.

Socialization through Advising

The aspects of effective advising discussed in the previous section, feedback and mentoring received from faculty, professional development opportunities, and opportunities for guided reflection, contribute to a student's socialization. Socialization is a hot topic gaining attention among educational leaders, and there are various definitions of socialization. Traditional socialization refers to the process through which students learn to adopt norms,

values, skills and attitudes needed for membership in a group (Gardner, 2008b). Modified versions of the traditional socialization model are gaining momentum, and are discussed in this section as socialization pertains to advising.

A significant finding of Austin (2002) related to the student who simultaneously wanted to "be true to one's own values while recognizing and adapting to the dominant values of the academy and being competitive in the academic job market" (p. 111). This sentiment concurs with Antony (2002), who asserts a modified framework of graduate student socialization. According to Antony, a traditional congruence and assimilation model like the one mentioned previously is insufficient in that it marginalizes students who may not fit a traditional mold. Gardner (2008a) cites the great impact that the pressure of "fitting the mold" has on the attrition of marginalized doctoral students.

Indeed, socialization has been successful primarily for students who fit into the prevailing Euro-centric, male culture of academe (Gardner, 2008a; Hinchey and Kimmel, 2000). Hinchey and Kimmel (p. 70) go so far as to call the academy "a bastion of male power and privilege." Nerad & Cerny (1999) claim that female graduate students are at a disadvantage regarding advancement and career opportunities due to informal mentoring inherent in a male-oriented system and exclusion from the "male locker room network" that privileges males. Based on an historical look at female graduate students, Nerad & Cerny determined that from 1905 to 1995, women were greeted by a "chilly academic climate" that was unsupportive and discriminatory. In a separate study, Nettles (1990) found that black and Hispanic doctoral students experienced more racial discrimination, and blacks have the fewest teaching and research assistantships, which have greatly impacted students' successes in a doctoral program. These issues raise questions about whether women and minority students would be more

effectively advised by someone of the same gender or similar racial/ethnic background. Mullen (2006, p. 59) cites the clear benefit of being advised by someone who shares a similar background; however, "having access to the long-established power structures that facilitate professional networking, employment, and success" can also be a major benefit. Antony (2002) submits that an alternate socialization model for graduate students can allow for intellectual freedom and individual development by encouraging the learning of a profession's norms and values without having to adopt those same norms and values.

The advising relationship that occurs between faculty and doctoral students is a prime place for such student development to occur. With the department as the primary "socialization agent" and the advisor as the primary connection between the student and department, advisors have a key role in a student's socialization, experience, and post-graduate options (Barnes and Austin, 2009). Advisors can teach the culture of the profession, while encouraging students on a regular basis to develop their own professional identity.

The Advising Relationship: Whose Responsibility?

Because it is widely recognized that effective advising for doctoral students is critical to their success in the program (Golde, 2005), it is imperative to examine the idea of responsibility in the advising relationship. Bowen & Rudenstein (1992, p. 284) assert, "Faculty must take the initiative in creating and managing this process or structure." Students who are experiencing uncertainty and self-doubt are more likely to withdraw from, rather than approach, the advisor. DiPierro (2007) and Barger and Mayo-Chamberlain (1983) agree that students may struggle silently, questioning their worthiness of being in the doctoral program and assuming that sharing struggles may make them appear weak or reveal inadequacies. Students may also endure a conflict between the need for guidance and support and the need to establish competence and

independence (Gardner, 2008b.) In such situations when students may feel inferior to faculty and peers, advisors who recognize how terrifying the new status of doctoral student can normalize these feelings (Delamont et al., 1997). In fact, building up the student's confidence is arguably one of the most important functions of the advisor. The advisor serves as a gate keeper (Hinchey and Kimmel, 2000), an "immediate and powerful figure holding many keys to a student's future," (Barger and Mayo-Chamberlain, 1983) and therefore must take responsibility in the advising relationship.

My experience as a doctoral student held true to the literature in this area. For the first two years of my program, I struggled with feeling confident and whether I was smart enough to be there. Initially, it was difficult to discuss this with my advisor because I feared that I would appear weak and would take up the time of a very busy administrator. Not only did I struggle with personal doubts, but also with direction in the program as I could not seem to find a research topic worthy of the next few years of my life. I ended up leaving the program, without a word to my advisor. After leaving, I felt free enough to contact him and explain my journey. He encouraged me that I was very capable and worked with me to establish a research topic and redirect my path in the program. Only a year later, I completed coursework and gained confidence in my research. My advisor was my gatekeeper, and once I expressed the need for support, he responded by upholding his end of the relationship's responsibility.

One qualitative study examined the perceptions of advisor roles and responsibilities through interviews with exemplary doctoral advisors who have graduated a large number of doctoral students (Barnes and Austin, 2009). At the macro level, these advisors expressed their primary responsibilities as helping students to be successful, develop as researchers, and become

professionals. These are played out through the functions of collaborating, mentoring, advocating, and chastising.

Delmont et al. (1997) point out basic tenets of responsibility for advisors: getting students started academically, negotiating a place to belong in the program, and learning what it means to be a doctoral student. Advisors may additionally take on the responsibility of locating funding for the student in the form of teaching or research assistantships, being involved in career planning, and networking. All of these will differ substantially for research versus practice doctoral students.

On a micro level, Wisker (2005) provides a set of reasonable expectations students might have of the advisor. These include regular and timely feedback, constructive criticism, availability, and knowledge of the research area. Students can also expect guidance regarding conferences, networking, reading resources, and post-graduate issues such as publishing and the job search. Bowen & Rudenstein (1992, p. 262) encourage faculty to view their role of advisor as "the most advanced level of teaching in our education system."

However, the doctoral student cannot, and should not, depend entirely on others for success. Advisees rely on the advisor throughout the program, and must proactively nurture the advising relationship. Barger and Mayo-Chamberlain (1983) offer several areas of responsibility for the student: openness, pro-active self-management, and establishing trust. In addition, the student works with the advisor on developmental goals, such as overcoming passivity and gaining intellectual autonomy. Mullen (2006) utilizes true case studies to describe attributes of successful doctoral students. She discusses the case of "Sam" and "Dr. Goya" to drive home the importance of students demonstrating eagerness, a professional attitude, and leadership potential. Sam was proactive in his approach with Dr. Goya, conducting preliminary research,

communicating his own needs, and forthrightly asking questions or for advice. While Barnes and Austin's (2009) study revealed that advisors have clear responsibilities in the advising relationship, they also noted that students are equally responsible for creating relationships that are productive and worthwhile. To create such a relationship, Delamont et al. (1997) suggest practical aspects to the student of showing up prepared, writing regularly, communicating, and doing the work that has been agreed upon.

Barger and Mayo-Chamberlain (1983) offer aspects of responsibility that rest with the advisor and other aspects that a student upholds, indicating their support for the idea of shared responsibility. Shared responsibility is needed, not only in theory or lofty rhetoric, but also in practice. When shared responsibility is in place, positive characteristics of the advising relationship come to fruition: friendly yet professional, collegial, supportive and caring, accessible, and honest (Barnes and Austin, 2009).

Advising Structures

Four primary types of advising can be identified in doctoral programs: one-on-one, committee, peer, and cohort. Students may experience one or more of these structures during the doctoral program. This study touches on each of these and the reality is that the advising structures overlap, so a brief discussion of each advising structure is presented here.

One-on-one advising

One-on-one advising is typically conducted between two individuals. Most often, the individuals are not of equal status in position/title, such as a faculty member and student. This relationship may be assigned or chosen, or begin as an assigned partnership that becomes a mutual fit that the participants choose to continue. The student may also receive one-on-one

advising from a faculty member other than the formal advisor. Another viable option for students is with a non-faculty mentor, such as a dean or internship supervisor.

Committee system

The committee system of advising has accelerated in popularity, mainly due to recognized deficiencies in the one-on-one model of advising and new program structures. The committee system has become a popular choice for EdD programs that are focusing on building communities of support within the academic program. Committee systems involve a student and more than one advisor in a group format. The dissertation phase of the doctoral program provides a natural environment for effective committee system advising, where a formal committee is already in place to support the student. According to Bowen & Rudenstein (1992), the committee system is gradually replacing the traditional apprenticeship model of advising during the dissertation phase as the notorious problems associated with the traditional model have come into the light. This is particularly important given that student progress during the dissertation is significantly impacted by the student's relationship with the advisor (Malmberg, 2000). The replacement of the apprenticeship model with the committee system may also be a solution to assuage the problem of absolute power in the hands of a single faculty advisor (Hinchey and Kimmel, 2000). Power structures that have been held firmly in place due to the unequal status of faculty and students, and horrendous tales of a student's future being negatively impacted by an advisor, can be alleviated by a committee system that distributes the power among several faculty.

Peer advising

Peer advising takes place between two or more students or peers in a program. The students may be at the same level or phase of the program; however, peer advising often involves

one student who is further along in the program and can provide guidance. Peer advising may exist in groups or one-on-one. Peer advising may be offered by the department as a formal program, or may be informally initiated by the students. In my program, students can sign up to participate in a peer mentoring program. My peer mentor was a wonderful source of support, encouragement and helpful information during my first year in the program. She was heavily involved in the academic community and was able to connect me to various people and activities. In groups, a faculty member may be present as a formal or informal advisor, particularly in the lab sciences, but the importance of peer advising and support in this setting is obvious as students conduct research collaboratively (Delamont et al., 1997).

According to Wisker (2005), peer advising can assist the advisor's workload. In addition, peers can assist in narrowing the skills gap that may exist between the new graduate student and faculty advisor and contribute to the new student's development of autonomy. A common approach for peer advising occurs when students form writing groups. Peers can attend to academic, social, and professional aspects. The peer advisor might review academic work, invite students to social gatherings, inform students of organizations and other student life opportunities, and inform of department or program "culture." The importance of peer advising should not be underestimated. As one student noted, half of her cohort would not have survived the doctoral experience without the support of peers (Mullen, 2006).

Cohort advising

A student experiences advising at a programmatic level based on the type of cohort structure implemented for a program. According to Malmberg (2000, p. 24), "Tinto (1987) demonstrated that the intensity of the interaction between students and the academic and social systems of the institutional program have a profound effect upon student success or failure." This

has been studied widely at the undergraduate level. However, interaction of a student with his or her program is critical in doctoral education as well. Student development is promoted by the program structure and design, as well as the advising relationship (Barger and Mayo-Chamberlain, 1983). Program structure and design as it pertains to EdD programs and advising will be discussed later in more detail. In particular, the structure or design of a student's cohort can greatly enhance this interaction between student and program, which in turn affects positive outcomes, such as decreased time to degree and increased likelihood of completion.

The concept of a cohort can be defined broadly and narrowly. Loosely or broadly viewed, a cohort can simply be a group of students entering a graduate program at the same time. Students in such programs pace themselves in the program, often do not know who else is in the program, and have much freedom in which classes they take and when. While assigned a faculty advisor, students are likely to be on their own to figure out the contours of doctoral education. They are likely to be responsible for their own funding, whether that means using personal resources or securing a fellowship or assistantship. In my program, the cohort follows this loose definition. I have taken courses with students across the college, in both masters and doctoral programs. I do not know other students in my program unless I meet them accidentally. My advisor has been very helpful throughout my experience, but it is ultimately my responsibility to navigate the processes and procedures of the college.

A more narrow perspective of a cohort consists of a group of students who are admitted to a program and take the same courses at the same time with the others in the cohort. All students experience the same courses with the same professors, and have an automatic sense of belonging to a group. It is difficult to get lost in the crowd with such a cohort structure, as they are typically small in size. The benefits of a cohort structure are numerous. According to Mullen

(2006, p. 14-15), in one education department who uses a cohort model, "the program of study is carefully designed to optimize opportunities for mentorship. Students are admitted as part of a cohort. All of the students' major field courses are completed with the cohort, and many individuals find it advantageous to take other required courses…with cohort members." Research suggests that smaller cohorts tend to have higher completion rates and lower time-to-degree than larger cohorts (Bowen & Rudenstein, 1992). These students are often granted funding for one or more years by the program. It is this narrow type of cohort that I believe has the greater chance for positive impact on a student's success in doctoral education. University administrators, faculty, and students cite numerous benefits of cohort-based programs, including increased interaction, involvement, and integration with their program and the academic community (Donaldson & Petersen, 2009). A recent trend of EdD programs involves utilizing a tight cohort structure (Archer, 2005; Caboni and Proper, 2009; Everson, 2006; Olson & Clark, 2009).

Through this review of the literature, I detected a noticeable gap that I have attempted to note at various points. The existing literature regarding doctoral student advising focuses exclusively on PhD students pursuing research/faculty careers. Studies that claim to be examining doctoral student advising clearly focus on areas pertinent to the PhD student, including research and teaching assistantships (Nettles, 1990), helping students develop as researchers (Barnes and Austin, 2009), publishing and presenting research (Wisker, 2005), faculty lifestyle (Austin, 2002; Bieber and Worley, 2006), the traditional dissertation (Delamont et al., 1997) and the academic job market (Austin, 2002), while not mentioning areas of great importance to doctoral students pursuing practice degrees such as internships and alternative dissertation formats. This necessitates examining what is known about practice doctorates, and specifically the EdD degree.

THE DOCTOR OF EDUCATION DEGREE

History

Teachers College of Columbia University offered the first PhD in education in 1893. In the field of education, the only doctorate available for the first 27 years was the PhD The Doctor of Education (EdD) made its first appearance at Harvard University in 1920 (Brown, 1990; Cremin, 1978; Shulman, Golde, Buescel, and Gorabedian, 2006), where it is still the only doctoral degree in education, for the purpose of offering a practice doctorate for students aspiring to be leaders of educational organizations rather than educational researchers (Cremin, 1978). The ideal difference between the two is that the EdD trains research professionals while the PhD trains professional researchers (Toma, 2002).

For a while, the EdD enjoyed popularity such that by 1941, the number of EdD degrees conferred equaled that of the PhD (Brown, 1990), even at Columbia where the first EdD was not offered until 1934 (Cremin, 1978). This trend stabilized in the 1950s and began declining in the 1960s. According to the "Dean's Network Study" in 1985, which surveyed students and alumni at 42 large research institutions, 74.1% of the alumni held the PhD and 81% of students were pursuing it. It was also clear that the more prestigious the school, the greater the proportion of students pursuing the PhD (Brown, 1990), which concurs with others who found that research universities became increasingly likely to move toward the PhD while comprehensive institutions moved toward the EdD (Osguthorpe and Wong, 1993; Toma, 2002). Thus, the first twenty years of the EdD's life were its best, in terms of popularity with institutions, faculty, and students.

Despite the original clear intentions of distinguishing the EdD from the PhD, it was only eleven years before Freeman made the first reference to problems differentiating between them

in 1931 (Brown, 1990; Shulman et al., 2006). Kolbert and Brendel (1997, p. 207) claim that, "Since its inception at Harvard in 1920, the formal doctor of education degree, or the EdD, has been the source of controversy, discussion, and confusion in higher education" (p. 207). In a discussion of the original requirements of the PhD at Columbia and the EdD at Harvard, Cremin (1978) notes that the two programs were not very different, other than the latitude given at Harvard for the thesis topic. This is in spite of the fact that Harvard initially established the EdD with the rationale that education needed its own degree separate from the arts and sciences PhD In reality any difference, Cremin states, "derived much more from the differing size and character of the two institutions than from any fundamental difference in the problematics they embodied" (p. 15).

Since then, researchers have focused their attention on the EdD around two major issues: which degree is "right" for the highest level of practitioner training in education, and what the design or structure of the EdD should be. Resolving these questions is not only important in principle, but also because of the sheer number of students pursuing each degree. Education awards 6500 doctorates each year, more than engineering or the physical sciences, and fewer only than the life sciences (Shulman et al., 2006). Despite the PhD being better known, schools of education often have just as many, if not more, students pursuing the EdD. At the University of Southern California, 200 students are enrolled in EdD programs, while 100 are pursuing the PhD. At Vanderbilt University, there are 44 PhD students and 56 EdD students (Caboni and Proper, 2009) and at St. Louis University, there are 28 PhD and 242 EdD students just in the Department of Educational Leadership and Higher Education, located in the College of Education and Public Service (Everson, 2009). One survey of higher education programs, sent to 68 institutions with faculty listed on the Association for the Study of Higher Education's

website, represented 26 PhD programs and 30 EdD programs, indicated that they had awarded 500 PhDs and 443 EdDs (Richardson & Walsh, 1978). Enrollments were almost equally split between PhD and EdD programs. With such numbers, it is clear that differentiation is needed.

The existing literature does not directly address advising in the context of these questions; however, I argue that advising EdD students appropriately provides one way of addressing the problems that plague the EdD and that in attempting to resolve the issues of which degree and what design, advising must be considered as an important part of the solution.

Which degree is "right"

Researchers have put forth many ideas about which terminal degree best serves training educators, but there has been no clear institutional movement toward one degree title or the other (Osguthorpe and Wong, 1993). Many advocate for retention of both the EdD and PhD but express the need for clearer distinctions between them (Archer, 2005; Caboni and Proper, 2009; Dill and Morrison, 1985; Everson, 2006; Toma, 2002). Many institutions, such as University of Missouri-Columbia, University of California at Los Angeles, University of Southern California, and Vanderbilt University, are responding in this way and have focused on restructuring their EdD programs. Another proposal is to eliminate the EdD and start from scratch with a new professional doctorate (Shulman et al., 2006), or even simply eliminate the EdD with no replacement (Deering, 1998). Arthur Levine, former president of Teacher's College at Columbia University, stated that the EdD should be eliminated because it is a watered down PhD and proposes that a master's degree is the appropriate terminal degree for education practitioners, similar to the MBA in business (Archer, 2005; Shulman et al., 2006). Brown (1990) does not suggest a fate for the EdD, only that the PhD should be retained.

Those who believe both degrees should be retained point to many varied reasons. According to Guthrie (2009), the twin realities of rigorous expectations for both research and practice provide a rationale for two distinct degrees that meet the needs of educational researchers and practitioners. To be effective, the degrees must be distinct in purpose, program standing, and pride. Guthrie asserts that a separation of degrees "is now imperative for professional pride, institutional regard, and individual student participant well-being" (p. 8). Shulman et al. (2006) note, "Problems [of the education doctorate] are chronic and crippling" (p. 25). There is a perception that they lack rigor and substance, and by trying to prepare high-level practitioners and scholars in education, neither is done well. Toma (2002) states that the importance of drawing real distinctions between the EdD and PhD is due to the common errors of higher education programs to either use the PhD to prepare administrators, or prepare them through inappropriate means by labeling EdD training as the PhD

Toma (2002) called for the retention of both degrees, but with stress toward the EdD, as most students pursue careers as practitioners rather than researchers. A major problem is that education worked hard to be "worthy" of offering the PhD but now suffers by subjecting itself to inappropriate standards and practices for a professional field because "what matters in applied doctoral study…is utterly different than what is important in pure doctoral study" (p. 5). He suggests that reinventing the EdD could legitimize the field of education and allow educational leaders to set their own standards, as with law, medicine, and business.

Focusing on higher education programs, Dill and Morrison (1985) claim the PhD and the EdD should be differentiated primarily through the research requirements of each program because of four "forces" at work. First, a surplus of doctoral graduates has caused a renewed effort on the part of various organizations to redefine and improve the PhD. Second, younger

faculty are coming in with more sophisticated and varied research skills. Third, the students enrolling are more often in school part-time and working full-time, and thus are more fully oriented toward practice. Therefore, programs, specifically EdD programs, might consider the changing clientele in distinguishing the structure of the two degrees. Finally, Dill and Morrison note the ethical problem of leaving the programs undifferentiated. The results of a previous study of higher education programs revealed that two-thirds of the participants were in administrative positions in postsecondary institutions and a mere 4% were teaching in higher education, or "had actually become scholars in the field of their doctorate" (p. 177). With so few pursuing the traditional research path of the PhD graduate, Dill and Morrison assert the need for differentiation.

Brown (1990) critiques Dill and Morrison's (1985) reasons for differentiating the two degrees. Based on a study he did five years earlier, Brown reviews the trends of the two degrees from the perspectives of faculty, alumni, students, and administrators. He argues that there are three major factors related to degree choice that interfere with the effort to eliminate the PhD and make the EdD the preferred degree. First, he claims the market is reopening for doctoral students in education due to the retirement of baby boom faculty. Second, the PhD enjoys the popularity of students and faculty that make eliminating the degree an unlikely option. Finally, as research capabilities continue to grow in an age of increasing technology, the knowledge base in education is expanding. These three trends indicate that no longer offering the PhD is not a viable or desirable option. Toma (2002) also suggests that eliminating the PhD is not realistic or even desirable due to the need for training of educational researchers. Brown does not make clear if he believes the EdD should be eliminated or if both degrees should remain, but he definitively states that the PhD should be retained.

Deering (1998) takes Brown (1990) a step further. Not only should the PhD not be eliminated, but Deering also asserts that the EdD should be. Deering examined the need for two terminal degrees in education. Based on a lack of existing differences between the programs involved in the study, faculty hiring patterns that suggest few differences, and alternative advanced courses of study, Deering concludes, "The EdD has no clear, distinct purpose" (p. 246). However, Deering's proposal to eliminate the EdD begs the question: If schools of education eliminate the EdD, how would this affect the advising of students preparing for educational practice careers who are now likely to be enrolled in PhD programs designed to train educational researchers? Also, if he believes that the EdD lacks a distinct purpose, why is the answer to eliminate the program rather than establish a clear purpose?

Countering Deering (1998), in their discussion of Vanderbilt's revised EdD program, Caboni and Proper (2009, p. 68) claim that the EdD is the most appropriate degree for educational practitioners and that "for administrative positions a well-conceived EdD may be more relevant than a PhD." Guthrie (2009, p. 3) agrees, "The EdD is now deserving of prominent billing as the degree of choice for education practitioners." Lee Shulman, former president of the Carnegie Foundation, succinctly advocates that both degrees have their place in education: "We need PhD preparation for scholarship and EdD preparation for practice. Both are rigorous" (Everson, 2006, p. 5).

Although Shuman et al., 2006 advocate for two degrees, they re-imagine the EdD, calling it the Professional Practice Doctorate (PPD), not a continuation of the present ones. The rationale for a new degree rather than redesigning the EdD is the need for a "zero-base" design due to the extent to which a new vision is needed. There are four main components of the P.P.D. First, professional assessments will replace the traditional dissertation. Second, signature pedagogies

will be utilized that demonstrate "what counts as knowledge in a field and how things become known" (Perry & Imig, 2008, p. 2). Third, faculty will be skilled practitioners, perhaps titled "clinical faculty" (Shulman et al., 2006). Last, students will already have some professional experience, and concurrently work while in the program.

Carpenter (1987), in contrast to Shulman et al. (2006), argues for the EdD as it is. He maintains that ambiguity should be embraced. In a critique of Dill and Morrison (1985), Carpenter recognizes that a primary point of needed differentiation between the EdD and PhD is the research requirements. Dill and Morrison suggest that utilizing management and decision sciences tools are most appropriate for EdD programs training educational managers and PhD programs should acquire research skills from other disciplines, such as sociology and anthropology. Carpenter counters that management techniques would only further separate practitioners from scholars who would no longer understand what is being written in their own field and that educational research would be taken over by "outsiders." Thus, Carpenter asserts that the case is strong for education to define its own standards for the EdD and PhD. He claims that higher education "is too young to concern itself with artificial distinctions between theory and practice problems" and is "well served by the current situation, despite its ambiguity" (p. 285). Carpenter feels there is enough variety "to be stimulating and challenging" and the best thing to do is nothing, largely due to student preference for the PhD (p. 285).

Osguthorpe and Wong (1993) offer four real options for moving forward. Institutions can continue to offer both the PhD and the EdD with the ambiguity intact, as Carpenter (1987) suggests. They may also continue to offer both degrees but with clear differentiation between them (Archer, 2005; Caboni and Proper, 2009; Dill and Morrison, 1985; Everson, 2006; Toma, 2002). Education could choose one or the other, clearly defining its expectations (Deering,

1998), or start fresh with a new degree (Shulman et al., 2006). Whatever the path, it is evident that the "calls for increased national dialogue to strengthen the education profession by reducing confusion between its two doctoral degree titles" (Osguthorpe and Wong, 1993, p. 47) must be answered. Yet, when answered, how such major decisions will impact the advising that is so critical to student success must be addressed.

A national effort to solve the problems of confusion about the two major existing doctoral degrees in education is the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED). The CPED is an offshoot of the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate (CID), which ran from 2001 to 2005, and involved 84 departments across six disciplines offering the PhD with the aim of improving doctoral programs (Perry & Imig, 2008; Shulman et al., 2006). The CID concluded that the confusion between the EdD and PhD needs to be resolved because currently the EdD is not adequately preparing educational practitioners so the field of education needs "more rigorous and relevant professional training" (Perry, & Imig, 2008, p. 1).

Launched in January 2007, the CPED has engaged two dozen institutions focused on improving preparation for educational practice (Perry & Imig, 2008). The CPED aims to produce institutional examples as models by commissioning a team of faculty at each institution that will implement a pilot program based on the deliberations of the CPED. Educational leaders participating in the CPED determined four design concepts that the pilot programs must have that exhibit the knowledge and skills that educational professionals should have. First, capstone projects are being used to assess student learning that are more suited to the EdD than the traditional dissertation. Second, each program has a signature pedagogy. Olson & Clark (2009) discuss a signature pedagogy used at Arizona State University, the learner-scholar community. Third, programs construct laboratories of practice where students learn "ways of doing" through

structured fieldwork experiences. Typically, the pilot programs do this by making students' workplaces their laboratories (Perry & Imig, 2008). Finally, programs develop a scholarship of teaching and learning.

A common issue shared by those involved in the CPED was getting faculty at home on board with the new changes. As little as advising is discussed regarding the work of the CPED, participants noted the difficulty of asking faculty to examine their perspectives of doctoral training, particularly the one-to-one model and the dissertation (Perry & Imig, 2008). These attitudes directly impact how advising is approached and the form of advising used, such as the traditional apprenticeship model or committee system.

Program Design or Structure

Not only have researchers debated which terminal degree should be the standard in education, but also once a degree is settled upon, what the degree should look like. To address this, much of the literature has examined the differences between the PhD and EdD and proposed program designs to offer a truly distinct practice doctorate in education. This is supported by a national conversation about the quality of educational leadership programs and increasing support for alternative approaches to doctoral education (Everson, 2009). The issue of program design is critical because, "without real clarification in terms of curriculum, career path, and outcome, the EdD will continue to face challenges and lack wide acceptance as the primary degree for practice-oriented individuals seeking a terminal degree in education" (Caboni and Proper, 2009, p. 63).

The general consensus is that there are minimal, if any, differences between the EdD and PhD and doctoral students in education go through very similar programs (Archer, 2005; Caboni and Proper, 2009; Carpenter, 1987; Cremin, 1978; Kolbert and Brendel, 1997; Osguthorpe and

Wong, 1993; Richardson & Walsh, 1978; Shulman et al., 2006; Toma, 2002). On a national scope, two surveys by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education in 1958 and 1969 confirmed the minimal difference between the PhD and EdD. Another large survey of faculty representing 26 PhD programs and 30 EdD programs in higher education concluded there is only one major difference, the administrative unit where the program is housed, but the degrees have converged over time (Richardson & Walsh, 1978). In theory, they were designed to serve very different purposes; however, in practice, those differences are largely a fiction across the U.S. (Brown, 1990; Toma, 2002). This is typically attributed to the EdD having become an imitation of the PhD (Archer, 2005), and not being qualitatively different than the PhD (Brown, 1990).

As mentioned previously, many institutions have opted to restructure their EdD programs. St. Louis University revised their program, which is now clearly focused more on practical skills required of educational leaders, by utilizing common strategies for restructuring. There is an emphasis on the application of theory to practice, forming cohesive cohorts, and dropping the dissertation requirement in favor of a practical project that is often team-based (Archer, 2005; Everson, 2009). Institutions that want to more clearly distinguish their education doctorate degrees often employ these strategies.

Such major changes must impact the advising EdD students receive, yet the literature rarely addresses this issue. Another institution that revised their EdD program and employed similar strategies is Vanderbilt University. Like SLU, Vanderbilt created a practitioner-oriented, cohort-based program with a capstone project instead of the traditional dissertation (Caboni and Proper, 2009).

The University of Pennsylvania's higher education program has worked diligently to distinguish the EdD degree through a number of changes (Toma, 2002). First, the EdD is now more common because that is the more common career path for students, and the PhD is rare, admitting only one or two students each year. Second, students are funded differently. EdD students do "mentorships" across campus involving sophisticated administrative work while PhD students do fellowships and research assistantships. Third, comprehensive exams and dissertations differ, although Toma admits that the dissertations differ more in theory than in practice. Fourth, the program has shifted the burden of completion from students to faculty, which reflects back to the notion of responsibility discussed in the previous section on doctoral advising. The program now offers an Executive EdD in Higher Education that is a 20-month program where students come to campus once a month. In addition to core Penn faculty, leaders from other institutions are involved in teaching and advising. In short, Penn offers "an EdD with real meaning—and it's proving to be a powerful experience for all involved" (p. 26).

Many researchers have found that not only are the differences between the EdD and PhD programs minimal, but that both programs lean toward the traditional PhD (Brown, 1990; Shulman et al., 2006; Toma, 2002). Brown's study of structural and contextual differences between the programs found that all programs had the tendency to emphasize aspects typical of the PhD such as research skills, qualifying examinations, and the dissertation, as did Osguthorpe and Wong's (1993) study. Dill and Morrison (1985) also noted the tendency of the two degrees to have similar research training, and propose this area as a prime opportunity for differentiation. Brown concluded that schools of education "are well within the tradition of doctoral programs throughout the university" and have a "definite bias toward producing scholars" (p. 15).

Concurring with this argument, Caboni and Proper (2009) note that universities, particularly research universities, tend to privilege the theoretical in instruction; yet writing research papers, taking traditional statistics courses, and writing a dissertation have little long-term utility for educational leaders. Not only is theory privileged over application, but the EdD itself "has consistently been regarded as being inferior in terms of prestige, and student preference for the PhD is well documented" (Kolbert and Brendel, 1997, p. 207). Richardson & Walsh (1978) also noted that the EdD has become inferior to the PhD while Toma (2002) explains that the prestigious reputation of the PhD causes many students clearly interested in administration to pursue the PhD. When USC decided to overhaul their EdD program, they had to deal with "implicit biases that treated the EdD as a "low-end PhD" (Shulman et al., 2006, p. 25) or "PhD-lite" (p. 27). Further, faculty at the 42 research institutions that were surveyed in Brown's (1990) study, regardless of the degree the individual held, felt that the goal of doctoral study is the production of university professors and did not see the compelling need for differentiated programs for students going into practice versus research careers. This is a truly stunning finding that impacts advising of practice-oriented students. In Kolbert and Brendel's (1997) study, faculty of counselor practitioner programs, which are nearly all housed in schools of education, favored the PhD over the EdD on all but one factor, which degree was more oriented to preparing counselor practitioners. This factor was only slightly favored. According to Toma (2002, p. 13), "Education faculty have increasingly internalized the norms and values of the arts and sciences." It is obvious how these attitudes held by faculty would directly impact how the faculty member approaches advising. In my experience, advisors in my program often approach their EdD advisees about switching to the PhD program, although I have yet to hear of a PhD student having this conversation with an advisor. This is interesting considering that that

the PhD is better known and it is less likely that a student interested in a research/faculty career would stumble into an EdD program and more likely that a student interested in educational administration might not know of or understand the EdD and stumble into the PhD program. Perhaps the conversation regarding which program is the better fit for a student is a good idea for advisors to have with all of their students, regardless of the program.

Cremin (1978) offers a solution for the "education of educators" by re-vamping the components originally envisioned by James Earl Russell at Columbia University in the late 19th century. Those components include: a liberal education that focuses on interdisciplinary knowledge, expertise in a teaching field, professional knowledge of policy studies, developmental studies, and pedagogical studies, and technical skill acquired through rotating internships. Cremin's doctorate replaces the traditional dissertation with opportunities for individual and group scholarship throughout the program in the form of one or two solid research papers, demonstration of teaching skill, and scholarly analysis of a practical problem in education. Similar to some medical programs such as the B.S.-M.D. at Northwestern University and Boston University, Cremin puts forth the idea of a six-year B.A.-EdD program. Again, such an overhaul in program design would have a profound impact on the advising of students, yet no mention is made of any adjustments to provide appropriate advising in light of such major changes.

Advising EdD Students

As with Archer (2005), Caboni and Proper (2009) do not mention how these major changes in program design impact the advising of Vanderbilt's EdD students. While Archer (2005) provides a general commentary about the recent effort of some EdD programs to more clearly distinguish themselves from PhD programs, Everson (2006), a faculty member directly

involved in the process of reforming SLU's EdD, discusses at length the role of personal partnerships that have been consciously created, including the advising relationship. With the revised program design came a revised role of the advisor. Advising is no longer one-on-one; it is team-based, where each team is assigned an advisor who acts as a facilitator and evaluator. A conscious effort is made to match advisors with teams based on shared interests and experiences. The advising relationship is strengthened through a one-credit course taught by the advisor to his or her advisees at the beginning of the second year. In the course, advisors focus on team topics, report progress, address issues, and assess the progress of teams and individual members. A useful tool that has aided faculty is an advising handbook that "supports students when they face the rigor, ambiguity, and complexity that is a part of all doctoral work" (Everson, 2009, p. 98). According to SLU faculty advisors, the redesign of the advising relationship in the EdD program required them to have a proactive approach and encourage collaboration in a more focused way (Everson, 2006).

Olson & Clark (2009) also discuss EdD advising in the context of Learning-Scholar Communities (LSCs), a signature pedagogy implemented in the redesigned EdD in Leadership and Innovation program at Arizona State University's College of Teacher Education and Leadership. The goal of the LSC is to "assist and support students to conduct applied research in local educational contexts" (p. 216). In the second year of the program, the initial cohort of 20-24 students forms smaller cohorts of 5-7 members. Joined by two collective faculty advisors, these smaller groups are LSCs and commit to working as a community throughout the remainder of the program.

LSCs provide a new approach to learning and advising, where learning is collaborative and built on an apprenticeship model where faculty and students co-construct knowledge.

Because of this, faculty noted the influence of working in a community of practice on their development as advisors and credited having to redefine their conceptions of what constitutes graduate work and research in order to assist students with action research in local settings. One faculty member acknowledged the difference between advising for the EdD and PhD stating, "I have to keep reminding myself that if this were a traditional PhD [program], I would be the subject expert" (Olson & Clark, 2009, p. 218). In fact, the advisors "had to redefine their understanding of being a faculty mentor for doctoral students" (p. 218).

A Note about Resources

With the exception of the LSC at Arizona State University, the programs discussed here are at private institutions. It is important to note that the implementation of major changes to EdD programs so that they are differentiated from PhD programs and more closely meet the vision and purposes originally intended of a terminal degree for educational practitioners depends heavily on the accessibility and availability of resources. Private institutions enjoy more freedom to use their funds as they wish, while public institutions must rely on state and federal resources. Clearly, this affects decisions regarding which programs are implemented and the design of programs. Making the types of drastic changes discussed above is heavily reliant on the funding available to institutions. Is it really possible to make these changes, which are increasingly agreed upon as necessary for a truly effective terminal degree for educational practitioners, at public institutions?

Beyond the general question of funding, there are issues such as shared courses between EdD and PhD programs, which is typically done as an efficiency and cost-saving measure. Would a truly differentiated program share courses like that? However, to not share courses circles back to the need for resources to create new, unique courses for the EdD. The practical

resources of differentiating involve hiring faculty, articulating across the curriculum, bringing in educational leaders as instructors or guest speakers, etc.

The intersection of resources and effective advising of EdD students is critical. How resources flow and are allocated matters. In turn, the way resources flow dictates how faculty design programs, and program design can inherently enforce and support an advising model appropriate to and profoundly effective for EdD students pursuing leadership and administrative careers, such as the examples discussed previously.

Conclusion

Considering the national focus concerning the EdD since 2005 (Olson & Clark, 2009) and the consensus on the importance of effective advising for doctoral students, adequate advising for EdD students is mentioned shockingly little. Olson & Clark acknowledge that, "There is no research literature that specifically addresses the organization of the mentor-advisee model in EdD programs and its effectiveness in supporting doctoral students in their learning and development" (p. 218). The national focus, as evidenced by such initiatives as the CID and CPED, is on program structure and design, creating a fitting professional doctorate in education. While this is obviously critical, I argue that even with an overhaul in program design that pays attention to the practitioner goals of EdD students, without effective advising specifically tailored to the needs of practice students, the problems that plague doctoral education will persist. Education programs have struggled to differentiate the programs and provide effective advising since the inception of the EdD nearly a century ago. If the leaders and administrators of programs continue to struggle, how can they advise appropriately? And, if advising is so crucial yet it can't be done effectively, what will become of EdD students?

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

This chapter focuses on the methodological approaches that will be used in this study. I include the specific research questions addressed in this study that I developed based upon the literature covered in Chapter Two. Additionally, I describe the methods used to answer these research questions and outlines the procedures I utilized according to case study methodology.

Research Purpose

Given the importance of advising in the successful experience of a doctoral student and the dearth of existing literature regarding advising of doctoral students pursuing practice-oriented doctoral degrees, it is critical that this area be explored and examined. The literature makes it clear that program design is a primary concern of those involved with the EdD degree and its improvement and that advising is affected by program design or structure. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to explore the intersection of program design/structure and advising models in EdD programs. This will be accomplished by examining two types of EdD programs, one that is traditional in its design and advising approach (a non-executive structure) and one that has intentionally modified its design and advising model (an executive structure). Based on the literature in Chapter 2, the two primary structures of EdD programs are executive and non-executive. Executive programs aim to meet the needs of students who also work full-time, such that classes are offered on a structured, mandated pace in a cohort of students who enter and progress through the program together. Because the students work while in the program, classes meet on weekends rather than during the week. In contrast, a non-executive program follows the more traditional design/structure of a PhD program, in which students are self-paced and progress through the program as individuals rather than as part of a cohort, and typically attend classes during the week.

Research Questions

Research Question 1

What are the advising experiences of EdD students in a traditional program structure and EdD students in a modified program structure? In what ways are the experiences of students in the two programs similar or different?

Research Question 2

How do faculty perceive the EdD degree? The literature suggests that educational leaders are struggling with whether the EdD degree is appropriate as the terminal degree for educational practitioners and if/how the degree should be differentiated from the PhD. Do these issues influence faculty as they advise EdD students? Do these differ between faculty at a traditional EdD program and a modified EdD program?

Research Question 3

Does the structure of an EdD program and its advising model interact? The literature suggests that a program's structure can affect the way advising is practiced by advisors and experienced by students. Does this study support this notion, and if so, in what ways?

Characteristics of Qualitative Research

To answer the research questions above, a qualitative approach will be utilized. Qualitative research is "characterized as inductive, emerging, and shaped by the researcher's experience in collecting and analyzing the data" (Creswell, 2007, p. 19). Qualitative research seeks to provide depth, detail, and individual meaning through a stance of openness that allows readers to understand the world as experienced by the participants. Another distinguishing mark of qualitative research is the researcher as instrument. This concept means that the skill,

competence and rigor possessed by the researcher have a great impact on the credibility of qualitative research (Patton, 2002).

According to Patton (2002), the design strategy in qualitative research is naturalistic, using real world settings that are minimally manipulated by the researcher, and emergent, with openness to the research process and adaptive as emergent findings are discovered. Data collection involves qualitative data from observations, interviews, or documents that yield detailed or "thick" description, direct contact with the participants and situation by the researchers from a stance of empathic neutrality, or understanding without judgment. Qualitative data analysis assumes the uniqueness of each case or individual and consists of inductive processes where the researcher is immersed in the data in order to discover patterns or themes. Analysis also maintains sensitivity to the social, historical, and temporal context of the study and does not aim to generalize findings to larger populations.

Case Study Method

Examining an issue through exploration of bounded systems constitutes case study research. Creswell (2007) views case study research as a methodology in which the researcher identifies a bounded system (case) or multiple bounded systems (cases) and studies an issue through multiple sources of data collection and development of a case description and case-based themes.

Creswell (2007) identifies three types of case studies. An intrinsic case study focuses on the case itself because it is unusual or unique. An instrumental case study focuses on an issue by selecting one bounded case that serves to illustrate the issue. A collective case study also selects an issue to explore, but does so through examination of multiple cases. In a collective case study, the researcher often selects cases that are different enough to provide varied perspectives of the

issue. This study will use a collective case study approach in order to demonstrate program structure and advising intersectionality by studying two EdD programs at one postsecondary institution in the hopes of discovering best practices for EdD advising at the institution being studied.

The Cases

According to Creswell (2007), researchers identify a case or cases by considering those that might be most useful. Stake (1995) supports this notion, suggesting that the primary concern when selecting cases is to maximize the opportunity to learn. A case can be an event, program, activity, or individual. For this study, I have chosen a highly ranked research-intensive public institution through purposeful sampling. By choosing one institution that has both an executive and non-executive EdD program, I believe the opportunity to learn is maximized as I explore in great depth the intersection of program structure and advising while the context remains the same. The institution is the flagship university of its state in the Pacific Northwest, henceforth called Northwest Flagship University, or NFU. The institution has a comprehensive school of education that offers an executive EdD program and a non-executive EdD program in educational leadership. The executive program, henceforth called the EP, is cohort-based and has a specific schedule of classes students adhere to, and the non-executive program, henceforth called the NEP, is not cohort-based and students take classes based on their individual goals and paths within a program structure similar to the PhD. It is important to note that I am a student at Northwest Flagship University in the NEP. After thorough research of EdD programs across the country and discussion with my doctoral committee, based on access, connections, and logistics, Northwest Flagship University has been selected to be the case for this study. In the Ethical

Considerations section below, I discuss how I intend to maintain objectivity and the integrity of the study.

Data Collection

In case study research, the researcher collects data from multiple sources of information, such as interviews and documents (Creswell, 2007). As I collected data, my aim was to "try hard to understand how the actors, the people being studied, see things. [The researcher] tries to preserve the *multiple realities*, the different and even contradictory views of what is happening" (Stake, 1995, p. 12).

In order to have triangulation of data sources, I utilized faculty and student interviews and document analysis. First, I interviewed three faculty from the NEP and three faculty from the EP, as well as one faculty member who has been involved in both programs. For the student perspective, I interviewed four individual students at various stages in each program, which provided for understanding of student advising experiences across varying phases of the program.

I reviewed documents to understand and describe a clear historical picture of each program's design and advising practices. The document review consisted only of public information. No private files were used in this study. The documents were already publicly released and available to the general public. Such documents include past and current materials the program uses to advertise itself, such as websites and brochures.

Data Analysis

In accordance with Creswell's (2007) outline of case study procedures, data analysis in this study involved the development of a detailed case description of each case through a holistic picture of the entire case. I established and analyzed key themes that emerged from the data

gathered through categorical aggregation and/or direct interpretation (Stake, 1995). As Stake suggests, because of the instrumental nature of this case study, I focused more on categorical data and measurements, concentrating on relationships identified in the research questions, and less on the complexities of the individual cases. For this study, the most sensible way to present the data is by category or theme, with findings for each case, followed by a cross-case analysis where themes are compared across cases. The final chapter provides an interpretation of the meaning learned about the issue, interaction and intersectionality of the EdD program structure and advising model, through the cases of the NEP and EP at Northwest Flagship University.

Ethical Concerns

Qualitative case study research is concerned with the trustworthiness of a study's conceptualization, as well as data collection, analysis, and interpretation (Merriam, 1988). Therefore, reliability and validity are crucial; however, these concepts carry a different meaning in qualitative research than in quantitative.

In order to ensure *internal validity*, which addresses how the findings match the reality, the "case study worker constantly attempts to capture and portray the world as it appears to the people in it" (Walker, 1980, p. 45 quoted by Merriam, 1988, p. 167). Merriam offers six strategies to ensure internal validity. For this study, triangulation was utilized, which is the process of confirming the emerging findings through multiple sources of data (interviews and documents). Member checking is another strategy I used, as I returned to the participants with the data collection, analysis, and interpretation to ensure that their views are presented as accurately as possible. Peer examination was undertaken by continually presenting the emerging research to my doctoral committee, who provided guidance and suggestions the study and report evolved. Finally, researcher bias was conscientiously considered. As mentioned previously, I am

currently pursuing the non-executive EdD degree at NFU. Obviously, I have had advising experiences as a student in one of the degree programs currently under exploration. Indeed, my experiences propelled my interest in this study. However, I made a conscious effort to identify and struggle with my own advising experiences as an EdD student so that I could separate them as much as possible to approach the study with the empathic neutrality of a qualitative researcher. These efforts included journaling about my experiences, as well as discussing my thoughts with my advisor and doctoral committee. I continually confronted my views and strove for the delicate balance of self-awareness and understanding of the participants throughout data collection and analysis. While conducting interviews, I did not disclose any personal opinions with the participants until after the interview was concluded so as to not influence the data. The strategies of member checking and peer examination also ensured that any personal biases I may have are held in check, and that participant views are appropriately represented. I interviewed students that I do not know and, where possible, faculty that I do not know so as to protect the integrity of the study. The names of all participants have been kept confidential between me and the participants so that the data collected will not lead to harmful or detrimental circumstances. A similar possibility concerned my hearing personal information about students or faculty I know through this research. My intent was to protect the integrity of the study by bringing any information revealed through the data collection back to the research questions and themes under study. As a qualitative researcher with a background in counseling, I also value the concept of subjective experiences and multiple realities. Because of this, I am able to separate a person's experiences from making definitive judgments about people or things so that when personal information was disclosed, I could recognize how such information contributes to the research without internalizing someone else's opinions or experiences as absolute truth.

Another ethical concern for case study research is *reliability*, which "refers to the extent to which one's findings can be replicated" (Merriam, 1988, p. 170). This can be problematic due to the assumption in qualitative research that there are multiple realities because reality is subjective, and therefore, the same results will not occur if a qualitative study is repeated. However, Merriam suggests viewing reliability as a form of dependability or consistency, or basically that the results make sense given the data. Just as with internal validity, there are various techniques that can ensure reliability. Triangulation will strengthen reliability. Another technique to ensure reliability is the use of an audit trail.

Finally, efforts were made to ensure a high ethical standard by concerted consideration of *external validity*. External validity is also commonly called generalizability, or how much results of a study can be generalized to another setting. Merriam (1988) suggests that providing a detailed description of the study's context so that others interested in transferring the study to another context know how to do so more appropriately enhances generalizability, noting the typicality of the case(s), and conducting cross-case analysis. Stake (1995) clarifies that case study research does not aim to make generalizations. Stake states, "Seldom is an entirely new understanding reached but refinement of understanding is" (p. 12). It is a refinement of understanding how EdD program structure and advising interact that I sought to explore in this study. I do not make broad generalizations; however, I do hope that the faculty and student experiences revealed could have potential influence on other EdD programs and student success.

CHAPTER 4: INTRODUCTION OF CASES AND PARTICIPANTS

The Cases

There are two EdD programs involved in this study, which each represent a case. The two programs are both offered through the College of Education at Northwest Flagship University (NFU), a major research-intensive university in the Northwest part of the United States. In the College of Education, there is an overall 3:1 ratio of PhD to EdD students.

The non-executive EdD program (NEP)

The NEP's website describes the degree program as a professional doctorate designed for those who seek careers as advanced administrative leaders in higher education institutions. The NEP is offered as a specialization under a larger area of educational leadership. This larger area's website indicates students can receive a MEd or PhD in the NEP specialization; it is only when one visits the specialization's website that the EdD is also listed as a degree option.

The NEP's website also describes a fairly structured degree program. According to the website, students engage "in a tightly-articulated program of study." The first year emphasizes coursework in leadership and foundational issues in higher education. Students focus on developing research skills and experiencing a professional administrative internship during the second year. Students are expected to complete a practice-focused dissertation, "which we call the culminating project". This dissertation is to be specifically focused on a practical dilemma in higher education.

As part of the course of study, students in the NEP are also encouraged to take courses in other schools at NFU, such as the Business School and Law School, in addition to courses in the College of Education.

The course of study form for the NEP outlines the major sections of the degree. I could not find a suggested sequence for students to follow regarding the NEP. Students must complete the following, a total of 102 credits, to earn the EdD in the NEP specialization:

- 24 credits of Educational Specialization, 9 of which are specified courses
- 24-42 credits of Related Fields (in and out of Education), no specified courses
- 9 credits of Leadership Training, all specified courses
- 9 credits of Internship, 6 of which can be waived by additional coursework if approved by the student's advisor
- 9 credits of Research Methods, none are specified courses
- 27 credits of Dissertation (no mention of it being a "culminating project")

From the NEP website, students can link to the NEP specialization's handbook. This 41-page document outlines the rules regulations, guidelines, course of study forms, and milestones for the MEd, EdD, and PhD degrees. It is here where students can find out about important steps in the progression of the degree, such as Prospective Candidacy, which can only be completed after a student has earned eighteen credits and completed at least one internship.

The NEP's website notes that most EdD students are working professionals and attend the program part-time. The program can be completed part-time in four years. A student self-paces through the program and has an individualized course of study that is negotiated between him and his advisor. Courses are typically offered on weekday evenings and meet once per week.

Graduation rates for the NEP have only been tracked since 2008, and therefore have very little to report at the time of this writing. The director of the NEP referred me to a staff member in the College of Education at NFU who tracks such statistics. This person told me that the most

reliable data on graduation rates involve the entire larger area, which includes both NEP and EP, and therefore do not provide actual graduation statistics for the NEP program.

When I visited the NEP office to acquire more information on how the program markets itself, I found a program brochure on the counter for the graduate program in the NEP specialization entitled "Leadership in Research and Practice." The brochure provides a general overview of the NEP specialization as a graduate program, stating that a student can earn a Masters or Doctorate degree through a "curriculum of rigorous coursework and professional development." The brochure highlights the program's faculty and their research interests, as well as describing recent faculty research projects.

The executive EdD program (EP)

Like the NEP, the EP is also offered under the larger area of educational leadership in the College of Education at NFU. Unlike the NEP, students in the EP can only earn an EdD and may choose to also earn a certificate for superintendent certification. There is no MEd or PhD option in the EP. According to the EP's website, the program is "designed for educators who exercise leadership in K-12 districts". The EP allows students to "develop both the practical skills and conceptual knowledge needed for effective systems leadership". According to the website, students leave the EP equipped with the skills to use and generate knowledge in school leadership.

The EP is a three-year, cohort-based program with a prescribed curriculum, where all students attend the same courses (called "modules") and move through the program as a cohort. During the first and second year, students engage in the modular coursework, experience professional internships, and have annual portfolio reviews. The final year of the program involves the development of a capstone portfolio. Students demonstrate written work from each

year, examples of their work in a context, and evidence of leadership skills from their work in the field.

The EP consists of four components, which are outlined on the homepage of the EP website. Completion of the four components totals 102 credits, and leads to the EdD degree. The four components are as follows:

- Core—30 credit sequence of coursework leading to the state superintendent certification, which can be tailored to the interests of those not interested in the certificate. The Core includes interdisciplinary modules, internship experiences, analysis of problems of practice, reflective seminars, and a focus on using data and making decisions.
- Advanced Leadership Experience—30 credit sequence focused on advanced understanding and skills in creating solutions to problems of practice through modules, internships, reflective seminars, and relationships with mentors in each student's area of interest
- Elective Credits—12 credits taken in the first year of the EP that align with interest groups established during the first year based on students' interests and foci
- Capstone Project—30 credit culminating project that synthesizes coursework and field-based study into a comprehensive product

Students attend class one weekend per month and a week long summer session, as is typical of an executive format program. The current cohort is the program's fourth cohort, and includes approximately 30 students. In four cohorts, there has only been one full-time student; all other students are working professionals.

The EP boasts graduation rates that are much higher than the national average of 50%. When I inquired about graduation statistics from the director of the program, she referred me to the EP program assistant, who reported that cohort 1 graduated 80% with 10% still continuing (possible 90% completion), cohort 2 graduated 84% with 8% continuing (possible 92% completion), and cohort 3 graduated 65% with 16.5% continuing (possible 80% completion). At the time of this writing, 88% of the current cohort are on track to graduate on time.

When I visited the EP's office, the program assistant greeted me and asked how she could help. I requested information about the EP and she gave me a handout and packet of material describing the program.

The packet provides a detailed description of a student's timeline in the program, breakdown of how each weekend session will be spent, previous capstone topics, a rubric of how the capstone portfolio is assessed, current job placements of current EP students, application checklist, program costs, updates on previous EP students, and awards and publications of EP faculty and students.

The Participants

Faculty and students from each program were interviewed in order to gain a deep understanding of perceptions of the EdD, advising experiences of students, advising strategies of faculty, and how the structure of the EP or NEP program impacts the advising experiences of students. The length of each interview ranged from thirty to sixty minutes, and the majority were held at the participant's professional office. All interviews were audio recorded and transcribed.

From the NEP

I interviewed four faculty who have taught and advised in the program from five to eleven years. All of the faculty have advised students in the NEP Masters, EdD and PhD

programs. Each faculty member currently advises from two to six EdD students. Two of the faculty are full-time professors, one is a former full professor who now holds an advanced administrative position at NFU, and one is part-time. Two are female and two are male. The participants represent African-American, Latino, and European descents. One of the faculty has also taught and advised in the EP program, and was therefore able to speak to experiences in both programs.

Four students from the NEP were interviewed. All four students are currently enrolled in the NEP. Three of the four students work full-time, two at institutions of higher education, and attend school part-time. The fourth student attends school full-time, and does not work. Two of the students have completed coursework and are writing the dissertation. One has nearly completed coursework, and will be taking the comprehensive exam soon. The fourth is beginning the second year of the program. Two are female and two are male. One is African American, one is Asian American, and two are Caucasian.

From the EP

I interviewed three faculty, all of whom have taught and advised in the EP from the program's conception in 2002. When including the faculty member mentioned previously who has taught and advised in both programs, I actually gained perspectives on EP from four faculty members. All four faculty have also taught and advised in other programs besides EP. Three are full-time professors, and one is a former full-time professor who is now an advanced administrator. Two of the faculty are female and two are male. They have all advised students in Masters, EdD, and PhD programs. Of the four faculty, three are Caucasian and one is African American.

Four students from the EP were interviewed. Two of the students graduated with a previous cohort, and two students are currently in the EP and will graduate this year with the cohort. All four students worked full-time throughout the program. Two of the students are male and two are female. Three are Caucasian, and one is Asian American.

Conclusion of case and participant introductions

By learning more about how each program markets itself, I wanted to know if the faculty and students in each program confirmed what I found on their respective websites and marketing materials. Do students in the NEP experience a "tightly-articulated course of study"? Do the NEP faculty encourage and expect students' dissertations to be practical, a culminating project? Do EP students feel they have the opportunity to develop practical skills and conceptual knowledge they need to be effective professionally? These are questions that I wanted to find answers to by speaking directly with faculty and students in each program.

To find such answers, I asked faculty questions regarding their perceptions of the EdD degree in general and the EdD in their respective programs, NEP or EP, and how those perceptions influence the way they advise students. I also asked faculty about key strategies they utilize to effectively advise EdD students, how they believe the structure of their EdD program impacts or influences the advising experiences of students in the program.

It is interesting to note that recruiting faculty to participate for the EP program was relatively simple. I acquired potential faculty names from the director and she introduced the study and me to the faculty. Once I asked faculty to participate via email, they each responded within two days, agreeing to participate, and interviews were scheduled shortly thereafter. In order to recruit faculty for the NEP program, I acquired potential faculty names from my faculty advisor, who has had close ties with the program for many years. I contacted the faculty, and two

responded fairly quickly, agreeing to participate in the study. I emailed the other two several times, yielding no response. Eventually, I was able to acquire consent to participate from one by contacting his administrative assistant a couple of times. In order to acquire consent from the other, my advisor sent an email on my behalf asking her to consider participating. She responded, agreeing to participate.

To discover answers to the questions above from a student perspective, I asked the student participants questions about why they chose to pursue an EdD (versus a PhD) and why the specific EdD program, NEP or EP. I also asked the student participants about their advising experiences in the program, and specifically about major themes from the literature on doctoral advising, such as satisfaction, professional development, and advisor traits. I also asked the students how they believe the structure of their program has impacted or influenced the advising experiences of students, and asked them what recommendations they might give faculty or administrators developing the structure of the program in order to improve the advising experiences of students.

As it was with the faculty, recruiting students for the EP program was relatively simple. The director introduced my study and me to potential student participants. The director was able to tell me which cohort the students were in and who their advisor was, so I could ascertain a diverse pool before contacting anyone, allowing my process to move more quickly than with the NEP recruitment. When I contacted the students directly, they responded quickly and agreeably about participation. Recruiting participants for the NEP student perspective required obtaining a list of names from the COE Office of Student Services. I then contacted several potential participants by email to introduce the study and myself, and ask if they would be interested in participating. I did not know what stage of the program students were in or who their advisors

were based on the list I was given, so this was also part of determining who the participants would be, along with their own willingness to volunteer. Enough students to create a diverse pool from NEP responded, and I was able to move forward with the study after one round of email contact.

This chapter has introduced the two EdD programs involved and provided a brief summary of the faculty and student participants. I have also described how the participants were recruited to participate. As previously mentioned, I hoped to find answers to the questions I have outlined above regarding how structure and advising impact one another by interviewing faculty and students in each program. Chapter Five will next outline the findings from these interviews, detailing faculty and student perspectives on the EdD degree, effective key strategies faculty use when advising EdD students, advising experiences of students in each program, and how both faculty and students believe the structure of their EdD program impacts or influences the advising experiences of students.

CHAPTER 5: Perceptions, Choices, Strategies and Experiences

To provide a foundation for the purpose of this study, exploring how a program's structure impacts or influences the advising practices in a program and advising experiences of the students, this chapter explores four key areas: how faculty perceive the EdD degree, how students choose to pursue an EdD and their particular program, strategies faculty employ to advise EdD students, and students' advising experiences in their programs. Faculty and students participated in one hour interviews and were asked questions directly related to these areas. Appendix X provides the interview guides for both faculty and students.

Perceptions and Choices

In order to begin to understand how faculty advise EdD students and the advising needs and experiences of EdD students, it is critical to first explore how faculty perceive the EdD in general as a degree and the specific EdD program in which they teach and advise. It is also important to understand why students choose to pursue and EdD program, versus a PhD, and why the particular EdD program they are in.

Faculty perceptions

NEP faculty perceptions of EdD degree

The NEP faculty generally agree that the EdD degree is generally designed for students wanting to focus on practice or administration within the field of education. While one faculty member recognized that there is a debate on a national level about the purpose of the degree and that there are "serious questions" about colleges of education and the EdD, the general NEP faculty consensus rests with the perception that the EdD degree is practice-oriented and designed for people looking to do advanced study in the integration of research and practice. Students are usually interested in professional programs and a professional career, often working in or

aspiring to work with organizations dealing with educational institutions or at educational institutions in a practitioner-oriented way, in contrast to those who seek a PhD who generally focus on developing skills in research methodology and aspire to a career in research and the professoriate.

While the NEP faculty agreed upon this general distinction between the EdD and PhD, one NEP faculty member acknowledged that this is theoretically the case, but the difference may not always be so black and white and while it can be said that one is applied and the other is original research, it may not always be so easy to separate. Another agreed, noting that many of her EdD students are interested in professional careers, but some will also pursue the faculty route. In a similar vein, she said that the perception that EdD students just want to be practitioners and not contribute to the academy is no longer the case. For this reason, she encourages many of her EdD advisees to publish in practitioner journals and engage in other traditional "PhD behavior" that helps them stand out in an increasingly competitive job market. Issues with possessing an EdD rather than PhD when a student is in the job market were mentioned by another NEP faculty member, but she noted, "When Harvard only offers the EdD, it's difficult."

One faculty member also offered another way to distinguish the EdD from the PhD Rather than focus solely on the career path of the student, the type of overall work a student does in the program may indicate whether the EdD or PhD is the appropriate degree choice for the student. For her, if a student does original research involving a new survey, new interviews, develops a conceptual framework, they may as well be a PhD student. An EdD would use existing sources to form something practical. She gave the example of one of her EdD students

who created a manual for community college administrators for dealing with crises as her dissertation.

Another observation regarding the difference between the EdD and PhD is that institutional context matters. According to one NEP faculty member, the credibility of the EdD greatly depends upon the type of institution. At community colleges, the EdD has tremendous credibility, and some liberal arts colleges place a high value on the EdD, made evident when their own graduates establish careers there. However, at a research university, such as NFU, the PhD reigns. People understand it and there is often not as much clarity about the role of the EdD at a research university. Another NEP faculty agreed, suggesting that different institutions treat the EdD differently. Some universities, such as Harvard, offer only the EdD and claim that they prepare students for faculty careers through their EdD program.

NEP faculty perceptions of the NEP EdD degree

When I asked NEP faculty for their perceptions of the NEP EdD degree, a consistent message did not emerge. Three of the four faculty continued to discuss general perceptions of the EdD degree, and those findings are outlined above. The only observation made by one of these three came from the director, who stated that the NEP generally draws students already working in administrative positions, as opposed to many EdD programs which serve as a pathway for students aspiring to administrative positions.

Only one NEP faculty member, the one who has taught and advised in both programs, delineated specific perceptions of the NEP EdD. His perceptions largely came in the form of concerns about the program and its impact on student experiences, and appeared to have as a point of contrast his experience working with the EP. In general, he feels that the NEP does not have as much clarity about purpose and preparation of EdD students. His major concern about

the NEP EdD is the way the program is actually administered due to a lack of faculty buy-in, including a lack of clear system for advising, lack of work to create a cohort, lack of articulated curriculum for methodology, and lack of bounded time to degree (such as the expected three years for completion of the EP). He worries that these factors result in NEP students being "left to drift" through the program, that students are without a community and may lose focus on their purpose in the program.

In short, this NEP faculty member expressed concerns about the role and administration of the NEP EdD that are a direct result of the type of leadership and structure of the program. As the data were collected and results discovered, it became clear that leadership and structure are the overarching themes throughout this study. Other sub-themes throughout the remainder of the exploration of results in this chapter can be easily categorized under either leadership or structure, including the advising experiences of students

EP faculty perceptions of EdD degree

As with the NEP faculty, faculty in the EP generally agreed that that the EdD is a practice-based degree with a different focus and purpose than the PhD EdD students seek advanced training and preparation for educational leadership practice, and is distinguished from preparation for scholarly, analytic, or academic work which is historically the providence of the PhD Students typically have different career aspirations associated with why they would choose the EdD program as opposed to a PhD

Two EP faculty addressed the concept of rigor and equality of the EdD to the PhD One stated that the EdD is "equally, but differently, rigorous" and requires students to be clear on what's going on in complex organizational setting and how dynamics unfold in time in that setting. Another asserted that the EP faculty "summarily reject the concept of the EdD as a PhD-

lite, and do not see one as easier than the other. The EP faculty used terms such as "practitioner-scholar" and "problems of practice" to describe the EdD student and the types of work they pursue within a practice doctoral degree program. The EP faculty use these terms to understand the EdD degree, such that "scholarship is in the service of practice as opposed to in the service of generating theory".

EP faculty perceptions of the EP EdD degree

When I asked the NEP faculty for their perceptions on the NEP EdD specifically, they continued to speak in general terms about the EdD degree. When I asked the EP faculty about the EP EdD specifically, they distinguished the degree from their general perceptions of the EdD Additionally, the perceptions were descriptive in nature, rather than the evaluative concerns expressed by the one NEP faculty member who did distinguish his perceptions of the NEP EdD from the EdD in general. Again, that one faculty member is the person who has taught and advised in both programs, so it interesting to note the difference in how he perceives the two programs.

One EP faculty stated that the EP is designed for students who want their research and inquiry to drive what they are doing professionally. Another asserted that students in the EP have diverse career goals but all have to be involved or interested in wanting to learn about systems level leadership issues, something that goes beyond a single unit like a school, particular kind of classroom, particular kind of content area. EP students represent their learning by using research to inform their practice, through a portfolio, heavy internship component, and cohort-based experiences. Several of the EP faculty mentioned that the EP EdD is specifically focused on K-12 education and students preparing for educational leadership practice in K-12 systems.

The faculty member who has taught and advised in both programs and expressed concerns outlined above regarding the NEP acknowledged that the EP focuses on K-12 education, which may be an advantage because they EdD is perceived positively and is understood and reputable in K-12 education, which can be a benefit for those wanting to move up in K-12 administration.

Summary of faculty perceptions

It is clear from the perceptions of the NEP and EP faculty that they agree on many of the general perceptions of the EdD degree. They all believe its main purpose is to prepare students for careers as educational practitioners. For the NEP faculty, there was little to distinguish general perceptions of the EdD from the NEP EdD, other than several concerns expressed by a faculty member who has been involved in both programs about the way that the NEP is administered, which link directly to issues of leadership and structure. The EP faculty described how they perceive the EP EdD separately from their general perceptions of the EdD degree. These perceptions were descriptive in nature, rather than evaluative.

Student Choices

Why NEP students chose to pursue the EdD

Reasons why students chose the EdD rather than the PhD for both the NEP and EP programs can be categorized into academic/professional and non-academic/non-professional reasons. Three out of four of the NEP students chose to pursue an EdD program for purely academic reasons. They all currently work full-time in educational administration and wanted to stay on an administrative career pathway. All three of them considered the PhD but determined that the EdD was the most relevant to their professional goals. These three students also mentioned having role models and mentors in administrative positions who they discussed the

decision with and ultimately decided that the EdD was a better fit academically and professionally. One student even thought the PhD might be held against her, because she might be seen as research-focused rather than student-centered. One student said it was fairly clear to him from the NEP website, where there is a PhD and EdD option in NEP. The website stated that the EdD is targeted to practitioners, and he comes from a practitioner standpoint so he didn't think too long about which degree was more appropriate for him.

There is a student from the NEP who will be called the Outlier throughout the remainder of this study. The Outlier is an EdD student in the NEP, but he is quite different from the typical EdD student and from the other three NEP students in this study. The Outlier is a full-time student and does not work. He teaches a class with his advisor for his internship requirement, as opposed to meeting his internship requirement through an administrative role as most EdD students do. When asked why he chose to pursue the EdD, he responded that he is interested in both research and practice and wanted opportunities to pursue both. The Outlier was the only NEP student to provide non-academic or non-professional reasons for choosing an EdD versus PhD He stated that the EdD would be cheaper and quicker than a PhD, due to the fact that the EdD requires fewer credits than the PhD

Why NEP students chose to pursue the NEP EdD at NFU

Again, the reasons NEP students gave for choosing the NEP EdD at NFU over other programs fall into academic/professional and non-academic/non-professional categories. However, unlike the reasons for choosing an EdD over PhD, which were largely academic, the more common reasons for choosing the NEP at NFU were non-academic.

One academic reason provided by two of the students was that they had taken classes in the program before being formally admitted. One took classes as a non-matriculated student; the

other completed her Master's degree in the COE at NFU and because of the fact that graduate classes in the COE are open to all graduate students, for the most part, she had taken similar courses and knew people in the NEP EdD program. Both of these students concluded the NEP EdD would be a good fit based on their interests, the faculty they met, and the fact that they already knew people in the program. The other academic reason provided for choosing this program was the reputation of NFU over neighboring universities. NFU is a highly ranked institution, as is the COE, and two of the students mentioned the reputation of the university as a factor in choosing the NEP EdD, particularly over a similar program at a nearby university.

The majority of the reasons for NEP students choosing the NEP EdD at NFU were non-academic or non-professional. These included location, cost, and other circumstances. Regarding location, students described NFU as close to family. Three of the four NEP students have spouses with children, which makes them place-bound in terms of graduate study. These three also need to stay in the area because of current employment.

Cost was another common factor for choosing this program. One NEP student works at NFU, which makes attending the program cost-effective (there is a tuition waiver for employees) and convenient. Another mentioned the lower cost of NFU, a public institution, compared to the nearby similar program which is offered at a private institution and therefore, costs significantly more. Even when attracted to the mission of the private institution, for one student the financial cost won out and he chose NFU.

Other circumstances, or reasons for choosing the NEP at NFU that were non-academic included it being "easy" because of already taking classes there and already knowing people in the program.

The Outlier mentioned wanting to be close to parents and extended family, as well as loving the geographic region of the country.

Why EP students chose to pursue the EdD

As with the NEP students, the reasons why EP students chose an EdD rather than a PhD are purely academic (keeping in mind that the only NEP student to cite a non-academic reason for choosing the EdD was the Outlier). Also similar to the NEP students, the reasons largely stemmed from their perception of the EdD as a degree for practitioners, focused on applied work in education rather than research and pure scholarship. The EP students uniformly expressed their desire to be in a program that was based on their daily professional work and would enhance their existing careers as administrators, rather than bring them into new careers as researchers. One student expressed this idea well:

> I feel attached to the idea that I'm a practitioner more than anything else. My first love is actually working in the K-12 system, so a professional degree really appealed to me, [with the] idea that I would become a scholar basically of practice and implementation.

Finally, one of the EP students said that she worked with the EP director professionally, and it was the director who drew her attention to the fact that the work she was doing was doctoral work.

Why EP students chose to pursue the EP EdD at NFU

Whereas the NEP students named several non-academic reasons for choosing the program at NFU over other EdD programs, the vast majority of reasons cited by the EP students for choosing the EP EdD at NFU were academic.

The students discussed the concept of program fit in their decision to pursue the EP at NFU. One student commented on the program's focus on social justice issues as an attractive characteristic of the program. He also felt the applied nature of the program to his daily work would suit his learning style. Three of the students were attracted to the cohort model, because of their desire to learn with a community and team.

Students also cited the importance of having connections to others involved in the EP program. One student, as mentioned earlier, had worked with the EP director and therefore had familiarity with the focus of the program and a relationship with one EP faculty member coming into the program. Another student knew people in previous cohorts who highly recommended the program to her.

As with the NEP students, one EP student also cited the reputation of NFU as part of his decision to pursue the EP EdD at NFU.

Location, the only non-academic reason cited by an EP student for choosing NFU was given by one student, the convenience of living close to the campus.

Summary of student choices

Whether a student in the NEP or EP, it is clear that the nearly uniform reasons given for choosing an EdD over PhD are related to academic or professional desires and goals. Only one student, the Outlier in the NEP, noted a non-academic reason for choosing the EdD However, there is more differentiation in the reasons noted between NEP and EP students for choosing their particular program. NEP students cited far more non-academic or non-professional reasons, while only one EP student provided one reason for choosing the EP at NFU.

Conclusion of Perceptions and Choices

Before exploring how NEP and EP faculty advise EdD students and how students in these programs experience advising, I believe an understanding of how faculty perceive both the EdD degree in general and the particular program in which they teach and advise is crucial, as is understanding why students in each program chose to pursue the EdD degree and their particular program at NFU.

Now that faculty perceptions and student choices have been delineated, these perspectives can be kept in mind as a discussion follows focused on advising in the NEP and EP programs. I asked faculty in each program about key effective strategies they use for advising EdD students and students were asked to provide their thoughts on their advising experience as a whole in the program.

Advising Experiences: Faculty & Student Perspectives

Faculty perspective: Key strategies for advising EdD students

During each interview with the faculty in both programs, I asked them what key strategies they have used to effectively advise EdD students. Faculty from both programs discussed the importance of treating each advisee as an individual, regardless of whether he or she is enrolled in a PhD or EdD program. Nearly all of the faculty mentioned that they first get to know a student and his or her academic and professional goals. One NEP faculty member commented, "There is not one way to advise EdD versus PhD students." Another said, "I ask them what they want. More student services, more budget? And then I work with them. I would do the same for the PhD" A member of the EP faculty asserted that whether he is working with a PhD or EdD student, it is critical for him to understand where a student is, what they know, what they want to know, and to help students understand themselves—what their abilities are, areas of

growth, and what they have a passion for. Across both programs, the faculty focus on asking students what they want to get out of the program to help them understand a student's advising needs.

However, the faculty in NEP and EP differed in many regards when it came to their key strategies for advising EdD students. All of these strategies can be categorized as mainly related to either leadership or structure, though many strategies relate to both because, as it will be discovered throughout this study, the leadership and structure of a program intertwine intricately to affect the advising experiences of students. To clarify, leadership refers to a program's leadership team, or core group of faculty who provide leadership to the program. Structure refers to elements that are built-in to provide a framework for the program. Chart 5.1 provides a summary of the key strategies for NEP and EP faculty based on the categories of leadership and structure.

Chart 5.1 Key strategies for advising EdD students

	Leadership	Structure
NEP	• Create supports for adult learners • Partner w/community leaders • Understand professional well	• Create cohort within a cohort • Part-time student disadvantage • Advise for milestones • Logistics of advising
EP	• Faculty checking • Regular feedback • Listen to what students need • Career-based advice	• Regular contact (each session) • Advise for milestones • Peer group advising • Practice-oriented

NEP faculty strategies for advising EdD students

The NEP faculty outlined the key strategies that have helped them advise EdD students, and interestingly, all of these related to the idea of creating structures for effective advising. The only exception came from the faculty member who has taught and advised in both programs. He spoke to the importance of structural pieces in the program, but was the only NEP faculty member to also address issues primarily related to leadership.

First, he noted the dire need EdD students have, and his responsibility to create, supports so they will complete the program because they are typically adult learners balancing family and work challenges while being in school. Unlike the typical PhD student, school isn't necessarily the EdD student's main focus.

A second issue related to program leadership he has noticed is that EdD advising requires "a different kind of mentorship." Rather than the individual apprenticeship advising model of the PhD EdD students benefit from partnering students with leaders in the professional community. Due to the current structure of the NEP, he primarily does this through his own personal network and connections. However, he suggested that the program could create partnerships more easily if there existed a core leadership team, or greater "faculty buy-in" for the program to create such partnerships.

This faculty member also raised a third issue directly related to leadership in his discussion of key strategies for advising EdD students. He acknowledged the need for him to understand the profession well himself, which assumes a certain knowledge base. One other NEP faculty mentioned this as well, noting that she discusses current trends in the student's area of interest. To do this, she must be aware of those trends and able to advise a student or connect a student to appropriate networks and resources.

All of the other key strategies mentioned by faculty related to structural elements. This is interesting given that the NEP as a program does not have these structures, despite all of the NEP faculty stating how important these structures they create are to the advising process. It is also interesting to note that the structural strategies of the NEP faculty are created by them individually. The structural strategies discussed by the EP faculty later are part of the program's structure, and they discuss how they use these existing structures as part of their advising strategies.

Three of the four NEP faculty have created cohorts within their advisees in order to more efficiently and effectively advise their EdD students. Two of the faculty have created a formal setting for this, a doctoral seminar. These are courses offered to each faculty's advisees and students earn credit through the course. One faculty meets with the seminar once per month, and the seminar consists of both her PhD and EdD advisees. The topics are based on the needs of the students. The other faculty meets with her seminar bi-weekly with all of her advisees, including masters and doctoral students. She developed the seminar to build in her own structure because she "couldn't wait until the College has a meeting on how to go to conferences". She develops the list of topics with her students. Topics offered in the two seminars have included time management, writing skills, staying motivated, Human Subjects, professional competencies, presenting at conferences, and intercultural skills. Another NEP faculty developed a cohort of his advises in a more informal way. He met with his students for dinner or gathered them in more social settings on a regular basis. The faculty developed these advisee cohorts for several reasons. The cohorts develop a community of students to encourage one another through the program. Faculty also want to encourage peer learning because "you learn, to a large degree, from your peers…it is important to organize the learning environment where there is enough

interaction between peers." And quite simply, the faculty find it to be an easier way of tracking multiple students' progress, since students are on an individualized pathway through the NEP.

Three of the four NEP faculty also discussed the disadvantage that seems to hold true for part-time students in the program, and their need to have strategies for working specifically with such students. I have categorized this as a structural issue because the NEP seems to be more structurally designed for a full-time student, rather than a student who works full-time and attend school part-time. The EP faculty did not discuss part-time versus full-time students because all of their students (and very few in the past) are part-time, and the program is designed for such students. In the NEP, the faculty worry that part-time students are disconnected from the campus and program because they are typically working and may even live outside the area. This concern is even larger as a student completes coursework, and is working alone on his or her dissertation with no reason to come to campus for class. Many of the NEP students already hold high-level administrative positions, which can also increase their likelihood of being disconnected. Another disadvantage of part-time students in the NEP that faculty pointed out is the increased probability that it will take them longer to complete, often resulting in them leaving the program. To counter this, one faculty member noted that she works hard to create solid educational plans for her advisees to keep them focused on a specific goal. A third disadvantage for NEP's part-time students is that they seem to have less access to faculty. Part-time students are generally less involved in a faculty member's research projects, and therefore spend less with their advisors. One faculty commented that he sees his PhD students who are involved in his research once per week while he sees his EdD students only once each quarter. Another echoed this, saying that she sees students involved in her research every week. She offers the students in

her doctoral seminar opportunities to contribute to her books or articles, but those who work full-time can do this.

Other faculty also indicated the importance of specific plans as a strategy for advising EdD students. They do this by advising for the milestones and requirements of the NEP, such as prospective candidacy, internship, general exams, and dissertation. One advisor's main strategy for advising relates to helping students stay focused on the next milestone because he has noticed that his EdD students work well with having a specific goal due to the fact that they are balancing multiple responsibilities outside of graduate study. He mentioned the priorities of assisting students select courses based on their interests, or identifying "cognates" (a term only used on the PhD course of study). He advises students, using the course of study as a roadmap and contract between him and the advisee. Two NEP faculty discussed preparing students for the internship requirement. One encourages students to consider the internship as "leverage for the professional environment" by seeking an internship outside of their normal job responsibilities. Another works with her students together to find an internship, set clear goals, and utilize the experiences gained towards the dissertation project. NEP faculty indicated that there was not much difference in how they advise their EdD versus PhD advisees regarding the general exams and dissertation requirement, other than less focus on designing original research.

The NEP faculty also discussed the logistics of advising EdD students, which is the final strategy related to structure. As noted earlier, the faculty tend to meet with their EdD advisees less than their PhD advisees, due largely to the fact that most EdD students are part-time and not directly involved in their research projects. The two full-time NEP faculty meet with their EdD advisees individually once per quarter approximately. One of these also sees her advisees who are enrolled in the doctoral seminar once per month. The other NEP faculty, who is part-time,

checks in with her advisees once per month, and also sees advisees in her seminar on a bi-weekly basis.

In summary, the bottom line for NEP faculty is that they are creating individual strategies, largely of structure, because these do not exist at the program level. This stands in stark contrast to the EP, where faculty report a nearly equal number of strategies related to leadership as structure, and those structural strategies utilize existing programmatic structures rather than being individually created structures as in the NEP.

EP faculty strategies for advising EdD students

When the EP faculty discussed the key strategies they practice for effectively advising EdD students, they equally addressed strategies of leadership and structure.

Related to leadership, a primary strategy is faculty "checking". The EP faculty discuss this as a context for the faculty to provide each other routinely with how they are working with students, how students in their modules are doing, and assess the advising practices of the faculty. As a group, they meet together to help each other improve as advisors and instructors, and to alert one another to how students are progressing in the program.

Another strategy related to leadership is that of regular feedback. This happens in two ways, and both are tied to the concept of the EP faculty as a core leadership team. The EP faculty place a high priority on giving students "supported and specific feedback" and may do this by providing feedback directly to students or to a student's formal advisor. During the faculty checking mentioned above, if a faculty notices a student struggling in a module she is teaching, she may discuss this with the student's advisor, who can then address with this with the advisee.

The EP faculty also employ the key strategy of listening to what students say they need. This requires being mentally present with students and rooting every conversation in where they

are and who they are. Active listening allows one advisor to engage in collaborative problem-solving with the student, ranging from the most abstract and theoretical to the concrete and practical. Another advisor takes seriously what her students say works effectively for them when it comes to advising: "The important thing for me is that they know that I'm going to listen to what they say works, and then I'm going to make changes and I think that's what I do best as an advisor." Listening may also involve just being a sympathetic, listening ear and an integral part of advising reaches beyond the academic life of an advisee to "personal trouble-shooting" in order to help students succeed: "People have lives and they don't all revolve around doctoral study; that's all part of the equation, part of what I have to do [as an advisor]."

The fourth and final strategy that EP faculty employ from a leadership perspective is career-based advice. This relates to the strategies mentioned by the faculty member earlier who has been involved in both NEP and EP, who expressed the responsibility he feels to connect his EdD advisees to leaders in the professional community, as well as his responsibility to understand the profession well himself so that he can advise and refer students appropriately. He mentioned the difference between how he carried this out in the two programs. In NEP, he primarily used his own network to connect students, whereas in the EP, he was able to leverage the expertise of other EP faculty and their expertise. If a student needed connections in a particular area, he knew which EP faculty was the appropriate person to mentor the student in that area. Another EP faculty member agreed: "I connect [my EdD students] to others, trying to plug them into other people and idea sources, and see that as part of what advising is about." The other EP faculty noted that many EP students transition professional positions while in the program, and it is imperative as advisors that they assist students with thinking critically about

their professional trajectories. One acknowledged how such advising looks different for an EdD student than PhD student:

> I help students with the sequence of next steps, helping them think creatively about it, connect them with the right people, anticipate pitfalls and issues that may arise. This is different than for a student wanting to pursue an academic or research career.

Other career-based advice EP faculty focus on includes encouraging students to share their work with professional audiences, and one advisor regularly has her EdD advisees co-author current research.

Several strategies the EP faculty discussed for advising EdD students directly relate to elements of structure, which refers to the built-in pathways the program's structure has for effective advising. One such strategy is regular communication and contact with students, which is eased by the monthly weekend sessions of the EP. One noted the difference she sees regarding communication and contact between her PhD advisees and those in the EP:

> With a PhD student, I might wait until they reach a certain milestone and set up an appointment, with EP we see them every month and during the interim, we email and phone so there's a much more regular and predictable cycle of involvement with their projects.

Other EP faculty acknowledged that they prioritize being available to students via multiple forms of communication because the students work full-time and often cannot come to campus. One said that he believes in the importance of regular communication, and may give a "stern nudge" to help his advisees stay on track. The EP faculty felt that they could easily see their students once a month during the weekend sessions, leveraging when students are already on campus, but

all of them mentioned that they also regularly communicate with their students between sessions as well.

A second structural strategy is also a strategy that NEP faculty utilize to advise EdD students, advising for program milestones. However, the reason for this strategy differs between the two programs. Whereas NEP faculty suggested this is a way of keeping a student "focused on a task" and to keep them from "becoming overwhelmed" by the balance of graduate study with non-academic responsibilities, the EP refer to the cohort structure as one major reason to focus on program milestones.

> Due to the nature of the cohort structure, it is very obvious if a student isn't keeping up. Advising for milestones helps them to stay on track by developing a specific plan. We move along a trajectory and visualize getting to the next point.

Another EP faculty explained how being a professional for many years in the field helps her to advise EdD students to stay on track in the program:

> I was a practitioner so I'm really comfortable in the cycle of the school year. It's very much in my blood, so I know how you have to get things done by a certain time.

All of the EP faculty agreed that peer or group advising within the cohort is a key strategy, which is built into the EP's structure as a cohort-based program. The faculty meet with their advisees in group settings during the monthly weekend sessions, and each students discusses his or her progress and concerns or questions. They receive feedback from their advisor as well as their peers, which has often resulted in a redirection of the student's work. The EP uniformly stated that they conduct more group advising with their EdD advisees than with

PhD and they enjoy being able to take advantage of the students already being together at the monthly weekend sessions.

The fourth and final strategy that EP faculty employ when advising EdD students is making advising practice-oriented. As a professional degree with a clear mission, EP students are all working professionals seeking administrative careers in educational leadership. Therefore, the EP faculty focus on helping students to connect learning activities and goals in the program to the specific leadership work they do or aspire to do. One EP faculty stated this point:

> Advising is an attempt to help students connect curriculum to what they're doing professionally; spend a lot of time talking about their work, their actual daily work and the challenges they're facing, and then looking inside that conversation for ways to see potential applications for something they just did in a module.

Another EP faculty member agreed that she highlights the integration of ideas, tying conceptual work to experiences and articulating a course of action.

> I integrate a problem they are working on and use it as fuel for a course assignment. With my PhD advisees, we construct theories and I have them do guided readings or annotated bibliographies. It's very different.

Conclusion of faculty key strategies for advising EdD students

The NEP and EP faculty highlighted the strategies they employ for advising EdD students. Areas of similarity across both programs include the concept of meeting students where they are and treating them as individuals, regardless of whether they are enrolled in a PhD or EdD program. The strategies faculty discussed could be categorized as either leadership or structural in nature. Whereas NEP focused almost exclusively on structural elements, the EP

faculty focus equally on strategies of leadership and structure. The NEP's structural strategies involve faculty creating individual structures to increase the effectiveness of their advising, while the EP faculty leverage the existing program structures to improve advising.

But, the question remains: do these strategies work? Are NEP and EP students experiencing effective advising that meets their needs? The next section explores the responses from students in each program regarding their advising experiences in their respective programs.

Student perspective: Advising experiences throughout the program

During each interview with the students, I asked them about their general advising experiences in their EdD program. Then, I followed up by asking questions focused on key themes from the literature on doctoral student advising: satisfaction, professional development, advisor traits, and responsibility in the advising relationship. Most of the themes that emerged from both the NEP and EP students can be categorized under the concepts of leadership and structure, as the key strategies that faculty expressed were. For the NEP students, a third category was needed: strategies for improving the advising experience.

Students in both programs spoke highly of their advisors and programs, specifically in terms of respect for them, their reputation in the field, and the quality of education they received or are receiving. Some common themes emerged from students in both programs, such as availability of the advisor and who initiates contact, but the content provided by the student responses within these themes is quite different, as will be explained in the next sections.

NEP student advising experiences

While the themes from the NEP students regarding their advising experiences can be categorized as primarily leadership-related or structure-related, there exists some overlap in many cases. For example, the consensus from the NEP students is that the advising experience

depends on a student's advisor, rather than any built-in program structures, as can be seen and will be discussed later in the EP program. The Outlier student states that his outstanding advising experience is "largely due to having an amazing advisor." Another NEP student noted that every advisor has a different kind of approach.

Chart 5.2 Advising experiences of EdD students

	Leadership	Structure
NEP	• Experience depends on advisor • Availability/access to advisor • Feel "on their own" • Students initiate contact • Feel supported by advisor	• Doctoral seminar • Disadvantage as part-time student
EP	• Same advising experience • Someone cares • Faculty initatie contact • Advising from all faculty • Advisors are administrators • Availability/access to advisor • Deeper reflection • Meets students' needs	• Regular contact • Peer/group advising • Advisor match based on interests

A theme that both NEP and EP students mentioned that relates to leadership in the program was availability of and access to their advisors; however, the experiences of students

were generally different between the two programs. In the NEP, students perceived that the availability of their advisor depended on the advisor's professional status, which affects their time and priorities. The Outlier and one other student highlighted that their advisors were generally easy to reach and available for advising. In their cases, the Outlier's advisor already has tenure and the other student's advisor is an Assistant Professor and fairly new to NFU. For the same reason of professional status, two of the NEP students perceive their advisors to be more available than the other two students. The other two share the same advisor, who has been an Assistant Professor seeking tenure. Both students stated that it is difficult to meet with the advisor, and they both offered possible reasons for this that relate to the advisor's professional status: the advisor has been seeking tenure and advising seems to be a low priority, the advisor's time was bought out by grants one quarter and the advisor was rarely on campus so her time was very restricted. They expressed that they may meet with her individually once per quarter at best, and those meetings are sometimes on the phone rather than in person. The circumstances under which they meet are sometimes less than ideal:

> Sometimes she is on her way to a meeting in [name of town} and we talk on the phone. Or maybe I send her an email with three questions, and she only responds to one. If I get an email from her, I drop everything and respond right then because I know she is on email and I can have an email conversation with her at that time.

From the student perspective, meeting one-on-one with this advisor is challenging, but she has created the doctoral seminar, discussed in the previous section, as a strategy to effectively advise students.

Related to the concept of professional status of the different faculty, the NEP student who is advised by the Assistant Professor who she finds to be easily available initially applied to the NEP and was denied. She was told to re-apply to program and request a different advisor, and that she was denied simply because of advisor time and caseload.

NFU is a research-intensive university, and this institutional context has not gone unnoticed by the NEP students. They perceive that PhD students generally have more access to the faculty because they work with them on research projects and the fact that an R-1 institution's primary focus is research. One student said that through informal conversations she has had with other students, many students feel that faculty care more about research and gaining tenure than students. She declared, "Yes, it's R-1 but you should still care about students."

Another theme among the NEP students related to leadership is the idea that they are on their own in the program to "navigate the system and figure things out." Two of the students used the term "self-guided" and "wandering" to express this part of their advising experience. The students read through the student handbook and spent "tons of time" on the program website and "pouring" over the policy manual to find out about policies, procedures, and next steps in the program. One said, "I figured out most of it myself by reading or asking people who have gone through the program." Another asserted, "I've had to do a lot of work to understand just about every question or decision and how to navigate a particular stage in the process," such as how to use credits from a previous degree, course selection, how to select committee members, and requirements to submit a dissertation proposal. One student hasn't been able to meet with his advisor, so he has been researching the website and student handbook. He said, "I had imagined you sit down with your advisor and they say, 'This is what you do.'"

Along the similar lines of students navigating the NEP on their own, the theme of student initiating contact with their advisors, rather than the advisor initiating, emerged.
The students stated emphatically that they initiate all contact with their advisors. One said, "It's up to the student to initiate a lot of things."

A positive theme related to leadership among the NEP students is that they have all felt very supported by their advisors. They felt supported for a variety of reasons. One student explained that her advisor supported her research and interests enthusiastically in an area that some advisor might have discouraged her from pursuing. Another noted that his advisor has made sure he stays on the timeline for degree completion he set as a goal. Another found that, as a student of color, having an advisor who is also of color has been very inspiring and added to her feeling supported. And of course, the Outlier has felt supported by his advisor, who he suggests has given him "life advising" in addition to academic advising, been available anytime he had a need, and has opened up any option or possibility he has wanted to pursue.

Two major themes emerged that are primarily related to program structure. Two of the students have experienced the doctoral seminar discussed in the faculty key strategies section, and found the seminar to be a very positive part of the advising experience, mainly because of the peer relationship established and developed there. One student said he was able to fill in some of the gaps of his advising experience from his peers in the seminar that he would have expected from his advisor. Students formed their writing groups in the seminar, and one found a committee member through a guest speaker in the seminar. As the faculty stated earlier, practical topics were explored in the seminar, including applying for scholarships or grants, turning presentations into articles, defining conceptual frameworks, and preparing for exams. However, for students whose advisors do not offer the seminar, there seems to be trouble understanding

why the seminar is only available to some students. One wondered, “How come we’re not getting anything special from our advisor? Should our advisor be having this seminar?”

The NEP faculty expressed that part-time students may be at a disadvantage in the program, and this theme also emerged through the students’ advising experiences. One of the major challenges of being a student in the NEP is relates to the structure, which appears to inherently build in disadvantages for part-time students. As part-time students who work full-time, students have had a hard time finding writing groups. They have to do more to seek out mentoring from and committee members who have had relevant professional experiences as educational administrators. They perceive that full-time students, and more specifically PhD students, seem to have more access to faculty and more opportunities, such as co-publishing and presenting at conferences. One asked:

> Do I need to go ask my advisor for those opportunities, or is that just something as a working person in an EdD program, that’s going part-time, that they just don’t look at you in that same way?

Beyond the themes related to leadership and structure, the NEP students also mentioned strategies they have learned to incorporate in order to improve their own advising experiences. One such strategy involves connecting with other students, particularly those who are ahead of them in the program. They did this to get what they needed and figure things out, and acknowledged how helpful it is to have “a network of students who have done it successfully.” One noted that she received professional development through these peer relationships. Another noted that in the doctoral seminar, peers engaged in a lot of information sharing which helped them navigate the program. A second strategy mentioned by multiple students was utilizing the

student services office located in the COE. The staff had helped them to navigate the steps in the program, as well as policies and procedures.

Beyond these themes that emerged from the students' general advising experiences, I also explored with them key themes from the literature on doctoral advising: satisfaction, professional development, advisor traits, and responsibility in the advising relationship.

Satisfaction, overall, is neutral among these NEP students. They seem more satisfied with the program in general than with their advising experience. Of course, the Outlier student presented a different sentiment than the other three students. He said he would rate his experience a 10…or 10,000. The reasons for his satisfaction are that his advisor has given him options, opened doors, and given him opportunities to teach, and develop a class and summer program. It is important to reiterate that the Outlier is a full-time student who is teaching a class with his advisor. The other three students reported a different level of satisfaction from the Outlier, but a similar sentiment to each other. They all reported a more neutral level of satisfaction, citing a few reasons. One student said her advisor answers questions when needed. Another said she would rate her experience a five or six, but if she considered the other faculty from whom she received advising though they were not her formal advisor, she would rate her satisfaction at a seven. Another student summarized his satisfaction:

> I wish I had more access to my advisor and she was more engaged in my process. I would be much less satisfied without the doctoral seminar, and I credit that to my advisor, setting that up. But I do think it's filling gaps that I think I would have expected from my advisor herself.

Despite these sentiments, the NEP students did acknowledge positive aspects of their advising experience. As a part-time student, one has been impressed that her advisor likes to move

students through the program efficiently. Another found her advisor very affirming of her desire to do research on her own [racial/ethnic] community. A third student commented that, as a person of color, having an advisor who is also of color has been very motivating.

According to the NEP students in this study, professional development, a key theme from the literature on doctoral student advising, is generally not something they feel they receive from their advisor. Again, the Outlier provided a response that stands in contrast to the other three students. The Outlier's advisor has mentored him, teaching skills in how to better represent himself, how to build resume/CV, how to interview, and how to become better researcher. For the other three students, they have not generally not experienced professional development through the advising relationship. Two students noted again that the institutional context, as a research-intensive university, may be a factor. One said that coming in to the program, she knew the kind of professional development she could expect from advisor, which is "not likely", has held true. The opportunities she has seen for professional development are geared towards faculty rather than administrative advancement, which she expected at an R-1 institution. Another student commented that professional development from his advisor has not really happened for him; however, he has seen it for those wanting to be researchers:

> [There are] amazing professional development for PhD students in the [doctoral] seminar, but professional development related to the work I'm doing and why I'm getting the EdD? None.

As they do for general advising, when NEP students do not receive professional development from their advisors, they create their own sources and strategies for developing professionally. They expressed receiving professional development from other students, through the doctoral seminar and other classes. They also mentioned seeking professional development

from their professional networks and supervisors, serving on committees in their professional positions, and reading articles rather than seeking professional development from their advisors. One student gave the example of being in a class with many PhD students who had presented and published their research, and she felt that something was wrong. She said,

> It was my supervisor, not advisor, who gave me a big "Aha" moment. An EdD is very different from a PhD and what you want to do and how you're groomed for X, Y, Z. Practitioners are not groomed to do conferences and research and be steeped in quantitative studies. You're more about how do I effectively serve students, and so you need to recognize that when you bump up in classes against maybe people whose vocabulary or level of understanding on certain subject matter look like this compared to your own experience...It's not that something is wrong with you. It's that these two tracks [EdD and PhD] are very much alive and well, and nobody has really addressed them.

Another key theme from the literature on doctoral student advising, advisor traits, was explored with the NEP students. Traits that students feel are important related to the advising relationship are: strong interpersonal and communication skills, ability to keep students focused and motivated, common background, friendliness and approachability, and being mentally, as well as physically, present. Regarding keeping students motivated, one commented, "There are times I've walked out of a half-hour meeting with her totally invigorated and ready to go, because she's asked me a question in a way that I hadn't thought of it, and that's important!" Three students, all except the Outlier, mentioned that availability and accessibility are one of the most important traits of a good advisor. The final trait students mentioned is related to content

expertise, and one student noted that because her advisor does not have expertise in her area, she has found others in her professional community for this.

The final theme from the literature on doctoral student advising that I explored with the NEP students is responsibility in the advising relationship. The faculty in the program seem to have mixed feelings about this. The faculty member who has taught and advised in both programs shared his worry that, in the NEP, too much is left up to the student and as a result they are left to run adrift because the onus is on them. Another faculty said that at the beginning of the program, he lets students know that, "This is their program and they need to take ownership of it." Basically, he gets a sense of when the student wants to graduate, and if he hasn't heard from a student in a while, he will follow-up. The NEP students note the importance of shared responsibility. One knows that she needs to communicate with her advisor, particularly when something important happens, such as change of research interest. Another commented that students must take responsibility for their education, but she feels that it should be a shared responsibility. Right now, she feels the NEP is "all student-driven" and "not a reciprocated [relationship]".

Overall, NEP students indicated that their advising was not an in-depth experience. It is clear that the students feel there is no set advising experience in the NEP; therefore, advising experiences vary widely by individual advisor. In practice, this leads to variation in the types of advising, professional development, level of satisfaction, and the appearance of unequal opportunities (as in the case of only some advisees having access to a doctoral seminar, which is clearly a very positive experience for those who experience it). It appears that a faculty member's professional status impacts the advising experiences of students. In the case of the student who was denied and told to re-apply, modifying only the advisor she requested due to

restricted advisor time and caseload, how does this impact the concept of importance of program fit and finding an advisor the student feels they can work with? As with the faculty, the students in the NEP seem to also feel that being a part-time student in this program is a distinct disadvantage. So, is it fair to admit students who are only part-time knowing this? Is it fair to continue with a structure or practices that disadvantage part-time students? When NEP students could not get access to their advisors, they created their own strategies to navigate the program, including connecting with other students, utilizing the student services office, and getting professional development from their professional networks rather than academic advisors. It is important to note that due to lack of built-in program structures, both faculty and students are creating their own strategies and structures for success. Is it efficient, or best practice, for individuals to create these strategies versus a program-wide strategy through a collaborative core leadership of faculty and cohort of students?

EP student advising experiences

When I asked EP students about their general advising experiences in the program, they articulated very positive responses overall. The themes that emerged can also be primarily categorized as related to leadership or structure, with the majority relating to leadership.

A theme related to leadership that is also impacted by the program's structure is that students seem to have the same, equitable advising experience, across the program, regardless of the formally assigned advisor. One student commented, "I get the sense from colleagues that have other advisors in the program that they feel the same way…I think they're getting the same experience."

Another theme that reflects the leadership of the EP is the sentiment that someone [the advisor] genuinely cares about and takes an interest in them. Several students expressed this:

> [There is a] strong sense of reassurance, knowing that when times get tough or when the fear gets you, when life gets in the way and your work has been put on the back burner, there's someone there that cares and there's someone coaching you through it; you're not out there by yourself.

Another declared, "EP faculty would not let you fail; if you're determined to complete, they are going to be there to make sure you do; that was true of every EP faculty I interacted with." A third student said, "The advising is personal and geared to us as individuals b/c the faculty know us so well."

The idea that faculty initiate contact with their advisees also emerged as a strong theme from the EP students. Students could expect a check-in once a month at the weekend session, but they uniformly stated that they also received phone calls or emails from their advisors between sessions. One students acknowledged the importance of such contacts:

> [My advisor] initiated contact. She checked in via email, and before meetings, she would email me, "I know next week, you're going to have this chapter to me." I don't believe I ever would have had it done without that kind of support.

Another student discussed how his advisor visited his internship site to observe and have conversations about his internship experience.

Perhaps the theme that reflects leadership most directly, is the idea that students receive advising in the EP from all of the faculty, regardless of formally assigned advisor. The students highlighted how connected the faculty of the program are to one another, that they all attend every weekend session regardless of who is teaching the modules, and that they are always approachable, accessible, and willing to help. One student said, "I had six people who knew me

really well, my job and what I did day-to-day; they knew my goals and where I wanted to go; they had different perspectives about next steps for me." Students felt the EP faculty worked together fluidly and they could get help from any of them.

Another theme from the EP students related to leadership in their advising experience is that all EP advisors are experience, veteran administrators. They all have expertise in different content areas, but because of the collaborative nature of the core leadership team, students knew who to approach for help with different areas. One student noted the positive impact on his advising experience that the faculty have been out in the field themselves as educational administrators.

As it had with the NEP students, the theme of availability and accessibility was popular with the EP students. The unanimous consensus among the EP students was that availability is not an issue. They used terms such as "open door policy" and "always available". One said his advisor had "strong beliefs" about accessibility. Students also commented on how accommodating faculty advisors are to their schedules as part-time students who work full-time. Advisors were willing to meet off campus if that worked best for students, giving their time and inviting students to their homes.

All students in the EP appreciated that their advisors challenged them to deeper reflection throughout the program. As the faculty advised on coursework and projects, they caused students to have deeper reflection than they would have on their own. The students noted that the faculty did not give answers or tell them what to do; rather they helped the students think things through and deepen their understanding by listening and asking critical questions. One student concisely summarized this idea, "The EP faculty see advising as teaching, with effective questioning rather than telling you what to do."

Finally, related to leadership, students acknowledged the EP faculty as advisor for meeting their needs. They did this by helping them to achieve their goals for time to completion, and making sure students had the experiences and opportunities to meet their professional goals.

Three major themes related primarily to program structure emerged through exploration of the EP students' advising experiences. The first of these was regular contact. Unanimously, the students reported that they had regular contact with their advisors, due in large part to the routine of the weekend monthly sessions. This regular contact also motivated the students, as one said, "My advisor meets with her advisees on a monthly basis, which forced us to move; if we didn't have anything to say at monthly meeting, very obvious."

Another theme from the EP students was peer or group advising. While this was also mentioned by the NEP students, it is expanded in a different way. The NEP students connected with other students for peer advising out of necessity or as a strategy to get what they needed when they could not access their advisors or the advisor did not have the content expertise required to meet the student's need. The EP students experienced peer or group advising as part of the EP's structure as a cohort model. Students learned that knowledge could spread easily because of their proximity in the cohort as they shared various challenges and then heard about insight that an advisor had given someone. Another highlighted an improved learning experience through peer advising: "We meet in advising groups, and another level of learning is involved. Maybe I'll learn from something going on in my colleague's experiences and they learn from me." Students also gained extra support through the peer advising of the cohort model. One said, "When others in advisee group finished a year before her, they became her biggest supporters for finishing, calling to ask how they could help." Another laughed as he shared, "We talk about the fact that we [students in the cohort] dragged each other across the finish line."

A final theme related directly to the EP structure is the advisor assignment based on internship and future goals and interests. The EP has different internship advisors depending on the kind of internship a student desires. All students wanting the option certification offered by the EP are assigned to an advisor who holds that certification and has worked professionally in that area for many years. Another student explained that her advisor helped her find an internship within the school system she wanted because he knew she was starting a new job in that area. In the EP, internship and permanent advisors are assigned after the first year of the program, once relationships have been established between faculty and students and students have developed goals for the internship and program.

As with the NEP students, I explored the key themes of satisfaction, professional development, advisor traits, and responsibility in the advising relationship with the EP students.

Satisfaction among the EP students is overall very high. Students appreciate that all of the faculty attend every monthly sessions. They felt very supported, knowing "someone is there to see you through". Another student said her "satisfaction was deep because I wasn't going to be allowed to fail." One student completed his degree ahead of schedule and credited that to the "meticulous advising" he had. Another student said she was particularly satisfied with the cohort model and the way the program is structured.

EP students also felt very positive about the professional development they gained through the program. Students felt the faculty took at an interest in their careers, both in the past and the future. Professional development took on various forms for the students. Faculty helped students develop professionally by facilitating conversations with students about leadership, who they are as leaders, and who they want to be when they leave the program. Faculty also provided students with practical opportunities for professional development, giving advice on events and

conferences to attend or discussing current or recent events in the field during course modules. Professional development also came in the form of mentoring and guiding, and encouraging student to connect their learning in the program to their professional work. In contrast to the NEP students, who felt they had to seek professional development from their peers or professional networks, EP students stated, "Professional development…I would say that's what our advising was all about" and, "The advisorship itself is really professional development." Another student said that every monthly weekend session was an opportunity for professional development for him.

The theme that NEP and EP students provided the most similar responses to was advisor traits. EP students named similar characteristics such as strong communication skills, approachable, available, and content expertise or knowledge of the field. Additionally, EP students noted the importance of thoughtfulness, genuine interest in their students, humility, listening, collaborative with students, and determination to see students through the program.

Finally, EP students commented on the importance of shared responsibility in the advising relationship. The EP faculty supported this notion, as one stated, "I have a deep and strong sense of responsibility for every student," and another clarified, "They are in charge of their education, and I'm here to be an active guide." The students seemed to concur with this. One acknowledged the need or "give-and-take" with the advisor, and another commented, "Someone is seeing you through, not holding your hand, but seeing you through the different experiences and modules, and delving into your career."

One EP student summarized her feelings about the advising she experienced in the program: "The advising was critical in my program; very transparent and very much a big part of the program…they were very intentional." Overall, students in the program expressed very

positive experiences with their advisors. Core themes emerged regarding leadership and structure within the program as their experiences were explored. They are highly satisfied and believe they developed professionally.

Conclusion of student advising experiences

Through an exploration of general advising experiences and key themes from the literature on advising doctoral students, it is clear to see that there are sharp differences between students in the NEP and EP. In both programs, the themes that emerged reflected on the leadership and structure of the two programs. NEP students, other than the Outlier, expressed neutral satisfaction and often had to create or find alternative ways to navigate the program besides their advisors. EP students, on the other hand, responded with high levels of satisfaction and believe the advising in their program meets their needs. The results discussed here will be further examined for implications and recommendations in the Chapter 7. However, before those can be explored most fully, it is important to return to the direct purpose of this study: how does a program's structure and advising model interact? With the understanding of how faculty perceive the EdD, how students choose the EdD and their specific program, key strategies for effective faculty advising of EdD students, and the advising experiences of EdD students, the next chapter will explore how faculty and students in the NEP and EP believe their program's structure impacts or influences the advising practices of the program and experiences of the students.

CHAPTER 6: Program Structure's Impact and Influence on Advising

With an understanding of how faculty perceive the EdD, students choose an EdD program, faculty key strategies for advising EdD students, and advising experiences of students in each program, this chapter focuses on the main purpose of this study. As stated previously, the purpose of this study is to explore the intersectionality of program design/structure and advising models in EdD programs by examining two EdD programs. This has been alluded to in chapter 5, as faculty and students both addressed structural elements as they explored their own perceptions and experiences with advising in their respective EdD programs. During each interview with a faculty member or student, I directly asked how they believe the structure of their programs interact with or influence the advising experiences of students. Their responses are discussed throughout the rest of this chapter.

NEP Faculty Beliefs on Structure and Advising Interaction and Influence

Three major themes emerged from the responses of the NEP faculty regarding their beliefs on how the structure of the NEP interacts with and influences the advising experiences of NEP students: lack of clear faculty leadership structure and core faculty commitment, lack of clarity about what constitutes the dissertation or final project, and the current structure seems to make advising harder for faculty.

Three of the four NEP faculty commented on the lack of clear faculty leadership in the program. One noted the lack of a "solid cadre" of NEP faculty and another recognized the lack of faculty presence in the program. Faculty acknowledged that advisors are often not on campus, may have administrative positions and responsibilities, and there is much turnover. Basically, "everything is in flux." The result of this lack of leadership structure among the faculty is clear, and was mentioned several times by the NEP students. As one faculty member said, advising is

currently negotiated between each individual student and the advisor at their own pace, doing their own thing. He stated, "We're not moving a collective thought [as a cohort would]." Another faculty member suggested a lack of cohesive advising structure by the faculty, that "every faculty does what they believe is important." The faculty member who has taught and advised in both NEP and EP summarized this theme:

> What is needed is someone truly stewarding all aspects of the program. There is a lack of faculty community, and we need College of Education buy-in such that faculty commit to the program. Otherwise, the onus ends up on student and this lack of buy-in may leave the program and students vulnerable because the mission, vision, and support of program need to be anchored in mission and vision of College [of Education].

The second major theme from the NEP faculty regards the lack of clarity about what constitutes a dissertation or final project in the program. This clarity may be either compounded by, or in part due to, an observation made by one faculty member, that the NEP may not prepare students methodologically or encourage students to take more methods courses. As noted in chapter 4, the NEP requires only three courses of research methods and the three courses are not specified. Another possible factor is the range of expectations not only by students, but also by the faculty themselves. One faculty member said, "I've found myself having to explain and remind the [doctoral] committee this was an EdD dissertation." Regarding the dissertation requirement, which appears on the course of study form, exactly as it does on the PhD course of study form for the NEP specialization, faculty have observed that many EdD students in the NEP do a "full-on dissertation, a study, because we don't have a solid guide for what the culminating dissertation project is so most of our students err on the cautious side and end up doing a PhD

dissertation." This faculty admitted the need for a clearer distinction so that EdD students know they can do a project with a practical approach. Another acknowledged, "If we had a clearly laid-out program like [EP], we might see different results." The newest NEP faculty member, who has yet to graduate his own EdD student but has served on a few EdD doctoral committees has noticed,

> We [NEP] haven't made clear distinctions about what a dissertation should look like between a PhD versus an EdD in this program. For the EdD dissertations I have served on, it's looked similar to a dissertation for the PhD It's the culture of the program.

The idea that advising seems harder on NEP faculty because of the current structure is the third major theme that emerged. One stated that parts of the current structure could be improved to make advising easier. Currently, the program caters to the schedules of students. The structure is quite open, which leads to challenges for the faculty, who are managing individuals all on different timelines. Additionally, the structure does not build in the social cohesion that an executive, cohort based program would, where peers help to support advising inherently. As noted in the section on key strategies NEP faculty utilize for advising EdD students, they are creating cohorts within their own advisees because the program does not include a formal cohort. This not only creates perceived inequality in advising experiences by the students, as noted in the section on student advising experiences in the NEP, but also means that the work involved in creating cohorts is being done by multiple faculty as an individual effort, rather than a collaborative and cohesive whole.

It is interesting to note that one faculty member, the director of the program, discussed the forward movement of NEP towards a cohort model. She outlined, quite specifically, the

concept of a three year program with a "highly regimented course pattern with a really clear pathway" during the first two years. Students would complete the internship during the second year, more guidelines would be provided for a capstone project, and a specified research methods sequence. She highlighted the importance of creating community and accountability through the cohort model, and that advising would continue to be individualized but course offerings would be more specific and on a timeline to assist with a smoother advising process and less confusion from students. No other NEP faculty member mentioned this throughout the discussion of program structure and their ideal program; however, the director said that this concept has been discussed and agreed upon by the faculty. At the time of this writing, the revised NEP program structure has yet to be presented to anyone other than the NEP faculty themselves.

Overall, the NEP faculty believe the structure of the NEP is lacking a clear leadership structure and core faculty commitment. They also believe there needs to be more distinction between what constitutes a PhD dissertation versus an EdD dissertation or culminating project. Finally, they agree that the current structure seems to make advising harder on the faculty than it could be. What all of this means for the NEP will be discussed in the final chapter, including implications and recommendations for the program, based primarily on the perspectives of the faculty and students themselves.

NEP Student Beliefs on Structure and Advising Interaction and Influence

Student beliefs regarding the interaction and mutual influences of program structure and advising are critical to consider in developing an understanding of how this dynamic exists in the NEP. The students' responses can be categorized as positive experiences with the structure, negative experiences with the structure, and strategies for dealing with the structure.

Three of the four students, the Outlier and two others, provided positive comments regarding the structure of the NEP; however, the Outlier provided much more positive feedback than the others. The main positive experience is related to the flexibility of the program. The Outlier appreciates the individualized attention he receives, which is helping him to find his niche. He is the only student to indicate that would not want a program based on a cohort model because he feels that he "might be forced to work in a certain way". While two other students found positive experiences in the current NEP program structure, they both also indicated (along with the fourth NEP student who did not provide positive feedback about the current NEP structure) that a cohort model might be preferred for reasons other than flexibility. Interestingly, while peer learning is often strongly associated with a cohort experience, the Outlier feels that he is able to learn from a wider variety of peers because he is not in a cohort program, where he would only work with a specific group of peers. Another NEP student also acknowledged that she has been able to meet with colleagues from outside the COE, which gives new energy rather than working with the same people all the time. Two other reasons the students appreciate about the program's flexibility is that it allows them to take classes outside the COE and they can take classes when it works for them. One commented, "I was on leave for two quarters and didn't lose pace with a cohort."

Within the negative experiences noted by NEP students, there are four themes: desire for a cohort, the EdD as stepchild, structure is a bottom-up approach, and lack of structure for moving through the curriculum.

Three of the four NEP students expressed interest or desire in a cohort-based program. One said she has envied students in cohort programs because she sees the benefit of being in a group of peers who understand the program and having built-in study groups. Another

recognized the benefit of a fixed timeline, saying his friend started a cohort-based program in the NEP specialization at another institution two years after him and now they are in approximately the same phase of their programs. One NEP student acknowledged the lack of community in the current program structure, saying, "Everyone is spread out all over the place and we never really have the opportunity to come together. There is a lack of cohesiveness." Another explained that he has no idea who else is in the NEP unless he meets them randomly in class, and that students are at a wide range of levels. He also lamented,

> The structure leaves students to figure things out on their own. I feel this way and have had new students express this to me. Whereas, a cohort creates an easy space to share common experiences, questions, and advice.

The second theme that arose from the NEP students' negative experiences in the program is the concept of the EdD as stepchild. Three of the four NEP students, everyone except the Outlier, referred to the idea that the EdD appears inferior to the PhD, at least in the COE at NFU and in particular, the NEP specialization. One student likened it to taking a college freshman student program, not changing anything, and calling it a transfer student program. She noted the importance of actually designing a program for transfer students that meets their needs, and said, "It's the same thing with the PhD ad EdD It feels like I'm basically doing a PhD with just a couple of tweaks but no built-in structures like research assistantships." Another agreed, "You're in here with PhD students going through the same program." A third student also concluded, "The EdD feels like an add-on. It feels like you're in a PhD program, kind of doing something a little different on your own. Everything seems really oriented for the PhD track." Other than the Outlier, all of the NEP students expressed feeling like the EdD program is a low priority. This seems to relate in part to the institutional context, as a research-intensive university. One student

stated, “This program is all about research. In this environment, it feels like these are people preparing researchers, and EdD’s are kind of like the stepchild. It’s not whiny, it’s just the reality.” A student concisely asserted the bottom line: “We get no love as EdD students.”

From the students’ negative experiences, the theme of student initiation arose. One student called it a “bottom-up approach” where the students have to initiate and figure out the program’s milestones and requirements rather than her advisor contacting her about deadlines and explaining next steps in the program. Students said the structure is very loosely defined and advising is also loosely defined, lacking a clear schedule. Students simply initiate contact with their advisors when needed. Even the Outlier agreed, “It’s important for students to have frequent contact with their advisors, and maybe the structure of the program should foster an environment where students can do this.”

The final thought regarding students’ negative experiences with the NEP program structure on their advising is the lack of structure for moving through the curriculum. One student asserted,

> There is no structure for how to move through curriculum, which we would never do in K-12. Why would we do that in higher education or graduate school? It’s curricular incoherence. For example, right now we do classes that likely have nothing to do with our internships.

At a very practical level, students agreed that there is no clear sense or plan for the order to take courses, or which courses to take in the NEP.

Because of these negative experiences with the program’s structure and its impact and influence on their advising experiences, NEP students have created strategies for dealing with the structure and improving their own experiences. One strategy involves creating their own cohorts

within the doctoral seminar. Students in the seminar are at different points in the program, which serves as an advantage to learn from others who have been through the next step. Of course, this strategy is only available to students whose advisors provide a doctoral seminar. Another strategy students employ is to learn, over time, how to manage the advising relationship. One student said, "I've learned how to communicate and what works. If I catch [my advisor] on email, I will drop everything to have a virtual conversation." Another strategy for NEP students is to utilize the Office of Student Services in the COE on a regular basis. The OSS has assisted students with making sure they cover their degree requirements, navigating courses, and understanding policies and procedures. One student noted, "I've spent almost as much time with [the director of OSS] as I have with my advisor!"

Two of the four NEP students involved in this study are in the dissertation phase, and both of them made comments related to the program's structure and the dissertation requirement. One observed that most students in the doctoral seminar she attends are doing "PhD-type dissertations." The other commented,

> I've had to figure out what the difference is between an EdD project and PhD dissertation. My advisor said I don't have to do original research, that it can be an application of existing research, but that's the extent of the explanation. I've had a hard time understanding my real options because everything about dissertations that I see if PhD…here's chapter one, two, three.

In summary, the NEP students discussed positive and negative experiences related to the NEP's structure, as well as strategies for dealing with the structure. The main positive aspect, according to the students, is the flexibility of the loosely defined structure. Students cited several negative experiences, including desire for a cohort, the EdD as stepchild, structure is a bottom-up

approach, and lack of structure for moving through the curriculum. Because of these negative experiences, students developed strategies for success within this structure, including creating their own cohorts, learning how to manage the advising relationship, and utilizing the Office of Student Services in the COE. With an understanding of how NEP faculty and students believe their program's structure impacts and influences advising, the perspectives of faculty and students in the EP will be explored.

EP Faculty Beliefs on Structure and Advising Interaction and Influence

When asked how they believe the structure of the EP interacts with and influences the advising of students in the program, the EP faculty shared six major themes: the previous structure of the program, how and why the new structure developed, the core group of faculty, advising groups, advising of each student by multiple faculty, and the integrated nature of the program.

All of the EP faculty discussed the previous structure that existed for the EP, when the program was actually under a different title. The previous structure provided little distinction between the EdD and PhD; the two programs had the same courses, exams, and dissertation. One faculty member stated, "It was a watered-down PhD program lacking purpose for those seeking it." Students mainly worked full-time, and it became obvious that scheduling courses was challenging and students were taking too long to complete the degree. The faculty realized that by students trying to fit the courses into their lives as busy working professionals, everyone struggled and the program overall was unsuccessful. Students were in a "loosely constructed cohort" where they did not take courses at the same time and were not required to be on campus at the same time. In addition, the advising required "a lot of scrambling with each student."

The second theme involved continuing the story of the EP by discussing how and why the program's structure was revised. The faculty met with students and asked, "What are you looking for? What features do you want?" and "then we tried to provide that." Trying to get it right, the program went through several redesigns that were increasingly integrated and cohort-based. The core group of faculty developed the structure together over time, listening to students' responses to the questions above, looking at the literature on what works, and reviewing current certification standards and curriculum design. The faculty listen to the students because, as one advisor said, "all of the things I've come to understand work is because students have said they work. My way of working in the world is to realize that it's not for me that we're doing these things, it's for students." The faculty key in on the importance of the literature because the experts have indicated clearly the positive impact of a cohort and the importance of social interaction and connecting with others in a learning environment. Thus, "we have incorporated group advising, group reflection, and peer review into the [EP] structure." The changes in the EP structure intentionally have made the advising experience equitable for all students, which the faculty consider critical. Advising is also more supported because of the structures the faculty have built into the EP.

The third major theme that emerged from the EP faculty interviews was the impact on program structure and advising of having a core group of faculty committed to the EP. The faculty feel there is a "very distributed leadership model in this core team" and "defined leadership committed to the program with expertise in various areas." One faculty member conveyed his sense of being part of a community. Faculty know who has expertise in what area and refer students accordingly as appropriate. Through regular meetings during each monthly weekend session and once in between, the faculty have ongoing conversations about the

program. One result of this was the shift from a capstone project to the current culminating project, which is a portfolio. One faculty member pointed out that this change occurred because the faculty "were talking and paying attention." Another said, "There are clear ideas and collective agreements of what constitutes a final product." Regular meetings and communication within a core group provide a venue for the faculty to share common expectations as advisers, as one faculty member indicated, "Specifically talk about advising strategies and share those strategies, so I think I have a pretty good handle on how each us advises the students in this program." Another commented,

> It's a structural and cultural thing, that we meet regularly, once or twice a month, talking with each other all the time about advising issues. We are much more in touch with each other about what we are doing or should be doing, could be doing.

An important theme mentioned by all of the EP faculty connected to how the structure of the program impacts advising is advising groups. In the EP, students are assigned to an advising group, and all students in that group have the same advisor. The groups are largely formed based on internship and career interests and goals. The advising groups meet during the monthly sessions, and are set up as a "social structure" that provides peer and advisor feedback. Advising groups engage in advising activities within the cohort, and discuss each student's progress in the program on a regular basis. The groups provide support, such that "the advisor isn't the singular touch-point as is common with the PhD." This makes sense given that "with this captive cohort and prescribed core curriculum, you're all on the same journey in one sense."

The EP faculty recognized that a key feature of the EP's structure that impacts the advising experiences of students is the fact that students are advised by multiple faculty, another

major theme that emerged. Because all of the faculty attend every monthly session and engage with the cohort, their advisees, and advising groups even if they are not teaching a course module, the faculty are visible and become familiar with all students in the cohort. One faculty member conveyed a shared responsibility for advising among the faculty, "The faculty share responsibility for the success of all the students and co-develop plans or assistance for individual students." Students are able to interact in substantive ways with several faculty over longer periods of time than they would with traditional coursework.

Finally, the EP faculty highlighted the unique integrated nature of the program, which directly impacts the structure and advising of EP students. In the curriculum, the faculty co-plan instruction and emphasize making connections across different modules so students see and understand how applied the course content is to their professional work. This integration is important to the faculty, as one stated,

> I feel responsible as a faculty member, as an organizing group, to find common threads and make them accessible [to students] and to create conditions where students can integrate. Some faculty in other programs hold doctoral seminars but not all do, and then it's "Good luck! I hope you integrate!'

The cohort model and core faculty leadership structure connects teaching and advising, so that when instructors teach a course module, they have their own advisees as well as the other faculty's advisees. One faculty member indicated the impact of this, "So, you have a different knowledge base about how students are responding and performing in the program, than in the PhD program where you may not know how they are doing in other courses." The integrated nature of the program weaves throughout as,

> Each module is taught and then advising groups discuss the integrating, organizing questions. Faculty discuss integrating the internship with the curriculum, integrating the modules with each other, and using the Community of Scholars as an integrating center for everything. The portfolio requires integration of what is learned in the modules, and finally, there is integration of what students are learning in the program to problems of practice in their work settings.

Other faculty also mentioned how the portfolio requirement of the EP requires integration, as they advise from the beginning of the program about choices for inclusion in the portfolio. EP students have five common learning standards established at the beginning of the program, which inform and drive portfolio development. Therefore, students integrate everything they learn in light of the learning standards as they develop their portfolios.

Six major themes emerged from the EP faculty regarding how the program's structure impacts the advising experiences of the students. Faculty spoke of the previous structure of the EP, and how and why a new structure developed. They also highlighted the core faculty leadership, advising groups, advising of each student by multiple faculty, and the integrated nature of the program. One of the faculty summarized the overall sense of how structure and advising intertwine in this program:

> This is a cohort program, in the most fullest, deepest sense. And the cohort, as a whole entity, as a whole community of people, has gotten to know itself well, has been encouraged through numerous ways of knowing itself and learning from itself and shaping itself and interacting with us in various combinations, And this full set of interactions and occasions for this group to be together and to shape its thinking, is, in the broadest sense, a mentoring function and a kind of advising

function, which goes way beyond the individual faculty member.

EP Student Beliefs on Structure and Advising Interaction and Influence

When asked about their general advising experiences in the program, the EP students highlighted a few themes that related directly to the program's structure. Regular contact, peer or group advising, and advisor match based on interest were all features they attributed as positive to their advising experiences and these are part of the program's structure. When asked more directly about how structure impacts and influences advising in the EP, the students mentioned the importance of faculty attending and participating at every monthly session, built-in advising at every session, and the structure being fit for the program's clientele.

The most frequently mentioned idea around program structure and advising from the students is that the all of the faculty attend and participate at every session. This created opportunities for both formal and informal advising. Faculty know the students well because they attend every month, and students have noticed this allows the faculty to see their needs and challenge and support the students accordingly. One student commented,

> The way the program is set up, you interact quite a bit with the different professors. Because they spend so much time with us, I think a lot of students, including me, would also interact with them in such a way that they probably fulfilled some of the duties of an advisor.

For the EP students, structure and advising also connect in the program through built-in advising opportunities at every monthly weekend session. Students can schedule formal advising meetings during the session, and many advisors are available before or after the session as well. Advising opportunities also take place informally, through feedback and ongoing conversations

about students' professional lives and how their learning in the program applies to their professional work.

Students in the EP have also noticed that the faculty have created a program structure that "knows its clientele" and the characteristics and working conditions of students in the program. The structure keeps students moving. For one student,

> [The structure] took someone who was working many hours a day and allowed me to find my way through. I don't know if doing it on my own, if I would have finished. The fact that it was structured with clear deadlines, timelines, and expectations saw me through the program.

The advisors followed this structure for the program when they worked with students, setting expectations, deadlines, and timelines through their advising. Students noticed that the advisors understand and know how to work effectively with students who are working while pursuing graduate study.

Conclusion

This chapter has explored themes that emerged from the faculty and students in the NEP and EP programs regarding beliefs about how each program's structure impacts or influences the advising experiences of students.

NEP students highlighted one major positive factor, the flexibility of the structure. They believe their program allows them the flexibility needed as students who work while in graduate school. It is interesting to note that students in the EP program, an extremely structured program, did not mention the EP's schedule as being rigid or a barrier to their success in the program. In fact, EP students appreciate the structure of the program, which they believe is designed specifically for working students and supports their success.

NEP students commented on several aspects of the interaction between program structure and advising that they feel are negative, including desiring a cohort, feeling the EdD is treated as stepchild, the structure as a bottom-up approach where students must initiate, and a lack of structure for moving through the curriculum. EP students appreciate having a cohort support system facilitated through advising groups, built-in advising opportunities at the monthly sessions, and a structure that is suited to students who are working professionals. This last theme stands in particular contrast to the NEP program, in which NEP students (and faculty, too) have observed that being a working professional, which leads to part-time students status, seems to be a distinct disadvantage from full-time student (and PhD) status in the NEP. The EdD as stepchild was perhaps the most commonly mentioned theme from the NEP students; this term was not heard from any EP students. One EP faculty communicated how detrimental it can be when students feel that they or their program are treated as inferior, particularly at a research university:

> It's easy, in our setting, for EdD training to become the poor stepchild of the institution, which mainly wants to do the high-prestige, high-classy research scholarly thing…That isn't the way I've experienced things…because I think a lot of us take this EP training very seriously, and we find it intellectually exciting in different ways than our other work is.

Another observation from the faculty responses indicates that the NEP faculty realize that the structure of the NEP leads to advising experiences for students that are completely dependent on the individual advisor. Thus, NEP students experience widely varying advising practices and structures, such as the doctoral seminar which is only available to advisees whose advisors offer the seminar. The EP faculty, in comparison, intentionally developed the EP structure to provide

an equitable advising experience for all students. The built-in structures for advising in the EP support advising, while the NEP faculty commented that the current program structure actually makes advising harder on the faculty, particularly tracking individual student's progress in the program.

Finally, a major theme mentioned both groups of faculty is the leadership of a core group of faculty. For the NEP faculty, this is a critical piece that they acknowledged as missing in the current program. The result is potential vulnerability of the program and students "left to wander adrift." The EP faculty discussed the importance of the core group, explaining they benefits of having a core leadership team that meets regularly to improve the curriculum and share advising strategies.

This chapter and the previous chapter have brought an understanding of faculty and student perspectives in two EdD programs that are very different in program structure. It is evident that there are major differences in how faculty and students experience advising and how the program's structure impacts advising experiences and practices in both programs. The final chapter will provide implications and best practices for global design of EdD programs, largely based on the ideas and recommendations of the faculty and students involved in this study.

CHAPTER 7: Summary, Recommendations, and Future Directions

The final chapter will begin with a summary of findings that answer the research questions proposed in Chapter 3. I will also present implications and recommendations for each of the EdD programs in this study regarding structure that provides for effective advising of EdD students. I will discuss limitations of this study, and provide future directions for further research on the topic of the interaction between program structure and advising model in EdD programs.

Summary of Findings to Research Questions

Before presenting implications and recommendations, this section summarizes the findings from interviews with faculty and students in two EdD programs at NFU, the NEP and EP.

Research Question 1

How do the advising experiences of EdD students in a traditional program structure compare to EdD students in a modified program structure?

In Chapter 5, I outlined the key themes that emerged from students in both the NEP and EP. Students' advising experiences for both programs could be categorized broadly as related to either leadership or structure; however, there were major differences in the specific themes students discussed. Chart 5.1 highlighted the key themes for each program. Even when the same theme was mentioned, such as availability of and access to the advisor, experiences between the two programs were different. Generally, students in the NEP had more difficulty accessing their advisors, and attributed this primarily to the professional title and status of the advisor. A major difference existed between the two programs concerning the overall advising experience in the program; students in the NEP noted the experience depends heavily on the advisor, whereas in the EP, students felt that everyone had the same advising experiences. Students in the NEP felt as

though the advising is largely student-initiated and they were on their own to navigate the program's requirements, while EP students described the ways they felt that the advisors genuinely cared about their success and often initiated contact. All of these themes primarily related to the leadership structure of the faculty in the program.

Other themes related more to structural elements of each program. In the NEP, a key theme involved the doctoral seminar that some NEP faculty offer to their advisees. This was a positive experience for students whose advisors offer the seminar; however, it can also be perceived as an extra benefit that leaves students whose advisor does not offer the seminar wondering if they are missing an important advising experience in the program. The EP organizes students into advising groups, where a set of students is assigned to one advisor and those groups meet during the monthly sessions. EP students highlighted the positive impact that this opportunity for peer learning provided. The other theme expressed by NEP students was the perceived disadvantage of being a part-time student in this program. Part-time students feel they have less access to faculty and fewer opportunities for professional development and interaction with their advisors. It is important to note that the NEP faculty also mentioned the disadvantage part-time students have in the program. In the EP, all students are part-time and the program is designed specifically for students who are working professionals.

I also asked students directly about their experiences with three key themes from the literature on doctoral advising: satisfaction, professional development, and responsibility in the advising relationship. There were sharp contrasts in students' experiences between the two programs regarding these themes. NEP students, other than the Outlier, expressed neutral satisfaction and often had to create or find alternative ways to navigate the program besides their advisors. EP students, on the other hand, responded with high levels of satisfaction and believe

the advising in their program meets their needs. NEP students indicated very little professional development, particularly in the advising relationship, while EP students spoke very highly of the professional development opportunities afforded them in the program, and one stated that the advising relationship itself is professional development. In both programs, students felt that responsibility in the advising relationship should be shared, but only EP students felt that it actually was, while NEP students indicated feeling that advising is student-driven.

It is important to highlight that one student in the NEP, called The Outlier throughout this study, differed greatly from the other NEP students. The Outlier differed in his perceptions of the advising experience and structure, expressing a much more positive experience overall than the others. The Outlier differed not only in his perceptions, but in his general characteristics as a participant in this study and EdD student. He is a full-time student, does not work outside of his graduate study, and is teaching a class with his advisor. After data collection, I learned that The Outlier has actually changed his program, and is now pursuing the PhD in the NEP specialization. This makes sense of some of the major ways in which he stood out from the other NEP students, and seemed to fit more of a PhD student profile.

Research Question 2

How do faculty perceive the EdD degree? What factors do they believe are critical in order to advise EdD students effectively and for the ultimate success of EdD students? Do these differ between faculty at a traditional EdD program and a modified EdD program?

At the beginning of Chapter 5, I presented the findings on how the faculty in both programs perceive the EdD degree. NEP and EP faculty agree on many of the general perceptions of the EdD degree. They all believe its main purpose is to prepare students for careers as educational practitioners. For the NEP faculty, there was little to distinguish general

perceptions of the EdD from the NEP EdD, other than several concerns expressed by a faculty member who has been involved in both programs about the way that the NEP is administered, which link directly to issues of leadership and structure. The EP faculty described how they perceive the EP EdD separately from their general perceptions of the EdD degree. These perceptions were descriptive in nature, rather than evaluative.

In Chapter 5, I provided key strategies, or factors, that faculty in each program believe are critical for effective advising of EdD students. Chart 5.1 outlined the specific strategies, and just as with students' advising experiences, the key strategies could be broadly categorized as related primarily to leadership or structure. Areas of similarity across both programs include the concept of meeting students where they are and treating them as individuals, regardless of whether they are enrolled in a PhD or EdD program. The strategies faculty discussed could be categorized as either leadership or structural in nature. Whereas NEP focused almost exclusively on structural elements, the EP faculty focus equally on strategies of leadership and structure. One NEP faculty member, who has taught and advised in both programs, highlighted the only themes from NEP faculty related to leadership. He mentioned the importance of connecting EdD students to community leaders and partnering with community leaders in the field. He also mentioned the importance of knowing and understanding the professional field well.

The NEP faculty create their own cohorts of advisees through doctoral seminars in order to better manage individual students' progress and provide an opportunity for peer interaction and advising. An important theme for the EP faculty was mentioned by all of the EP faculty, the idea of faculty checking. The EP faculty meet regularly to discuss advising strategies and students' progress. EP faculty also discussed the importance of regular feedback, which is made easier with the monthly sessions built into the program's structure. Overall, the NEP's faculty are

creating individual structures to increase the effectiveness of their advising, while the EP faculty leverage the existing program structures to improve advising.

Research Question 3

In what ways do the structure of an EdD program and its advising model interact?

I explored this question with both faculty and students in each program and provided the findings in Chapter 6. There are definite differences in how these two programs' structures and advising models interact.

The NEP faculty believe the structure of the NEP is lacking a clear leadership structure and core faculty commitment. They also believe there needs to be more distinction between what constitutes a PhD dissertation versus an EdD dissertation or culminating project. Finally, they agree that the current structure seems to make advising harder on the faculty than it could be.

The NEP students discussed positive and negative experiences related to the NEP's structure, as well as strategies for dealing with the structure. The main positive aspect, according to the students, is the flexibility of the loosely defined structure. Students cited several negative experiences, including desire for a cohort, the EdD as stepchild, structure is a bottom-up approach, and lack of structure for moving through the curriculum. Because of these negative experiences, students developed strategies for success within this structure, including creating their own cohorts, learning how to manage the advising relationship, and utilizing the Office of Student Services in the COE.

Six major themes emerged from the EP faculty regarding how the program's structure impacts the advising experiences of the students. Faculty spoke of the previous structure of the EP, and how and why a new structure developed. They also highlighted the core faculty

leadership, advising groups, advising of each student by multiple faculty, and the integrated nature of the program.

Overall, the EP students described several key themes related to how they observed and experienced the EP structure and advising interact. Regular contact, peer or group advising, and advisor match based on interest were all features they attributed as positive to their advising experiences and these are part of the program's structure. When asked more directly about how structure impacts and influences advising in the EP, the students mentioned the importance of faculty attending and participating at every monthly session, built-in advising at every session, and the structure being fit for the program's clientele.

Thus, the research questions proposed in Chapter 3 were clearly answered in Chapters 5 and 6. Additionally, I have summarized the findings in this chapter to provide sufficient data in order to offer possible implications and recommendations to each program with the goal of implementing best practices in EdD program structure and effective advising.

Implications: If Something Doesn't Change…

Based on the findings discovered from the faculty and student perspectives presented in this study, I believe there are potential implications for each program. One of the major findings from this study regarding how program structure and advising in a program interact is through the faculty leadership. Faculty and students in both programs discussed at length the importance of a core faculty leadership or conversely, the detrimental impact on a program, and thus the success of students in the program, when there is a lack of core faculty leadership. As I considered the recommendations suggested by the faculty and students, it became clear that any forward movement in either program hinges largely on the faculty leadership structure.

Therefore, I begin with a discussion of the faculty leadership in each program, followed by recommendations for each program.

NEP faculty leadership structure: Implications and recommendations

In the case of the NEP, the faculty commented on the fact that advising in the program operates at the individual advisor level. In Chapter 6, the themes highlighted by the NEP faculty directly address the detrimental consequences that a lack of core faculty leadership has on the program and its' students. One specific example is the continued confusion among students as to what distinguishes a PhD dissertation from an EdD dissertation or "culminating project" because the faculty have not collectively made a distinction and communicated it widely. Another example, mentioned in Chapter 5, came from the faculty member who has taught and advised in both the NEP and EP who suggested that the NEP could create partnerships with community leaders more easily if there existed a core leadership team, or greater "faculty buy-in" for the program to create such partnerships. A direct result of the lack of core faculty leadership is the lack of any forward movement in developing a more effective overall program structure. Currently, faculty in the NEP create their own structures individually, by advising students individually along the student's particular timeline, or through establishing a doctoral seminar in which their advisees can take a credit-bearing course that addresses common advising topics. Due to the lack of faculty buy-in to the program mentioned by the faculty member above, the program remains vulnerable to abolition because no one is "minding the ship" as this faculty member stated.

Of course, this also leaves students in the program vulnerable, and they have noticed this. NEP students also noticed that the faculty practice advising in very different ways, which leaves a student's advising experience heavily dependent on the individual advisor. The students

observed the lack of built-in structures for advising, which results in the appearance of unequal opportunities, and in the case of the part-time student, blatant disadvantages which was acknowledged by both NEP faculty and students.

Essentially, if nothing changes, the NEP could, at best, continue as is with students experiencing neutral levels of satisfaction and little professional development and at worst, be held on hiatus or possibly be eliminated altogether. Since I concluded the interviews, the M.Ed. in the NEP specialization is no longer admitting new students and there is quiet conversation that the EdD is likely to be next. Why? Because the program's director has accepted a new position at another institution and another faculty member will be on a one-year sabbatical. The program fell vulnerable to individual faculty trajectories, as the faculty member who has been involved in both programs, predicted it might.

The faculty and students, in the course of discussing their experiences and perceptions, proposed several recommendations for the NEP in order to provide a program structure that improves advising experiences of students. Some of these recommendations involve solidifying a core faculty leadership. First, there must be substantive faculty buy-in to the program, as expressed by one faculty member who said, "[The NEP faculty] need to be able to say together that we are all committed. It has to start with our [NEP] faculty, then it's got to spread out to the rest of the COE faculty, and that has to be robust." One of the NEP students also spoke to a related point, suggesting a restructure of the faculty, because they "have different kinds of expertise; all your students aren't PhDs wanting to be researchers and I'm not sure right now if [the program is] doing anything to address these students." One faculty and one student also proposed increasing faculty support through regular faculty meetings specifically to address

advising issues. The NEP student suggested that newer faculty might be mentored by current faculty on effective advising practices.

The faculty and students proposed several other recommendations, all of which depend first on having a core faculty leadership structure in place. First, curricular coherence would greatly improve a student's experience in the program. One student suggested having more theoretical courses early in the program, followed by more applied coursework that teaches tangible skill sets such as leadership development, budget management, and grant writing, that practice-oriented students need. Students also recommended a logical method for selecting courses rather than a "free for all". This curricular coherence could provide a natural venue for another recommendation, more and better partnering with community leaders, which was proposed by a faculty member. Community leaders could be involved in building curriculum and teaching classes, as well as developing a network of established partners for student internships. One faculty member noted that such community leaders could be alumni from the NEP, who know the program and are likely to be invested in its improvement. Collaborating with alumni at this level would require better tracking after graduation, another recommendation.

Based on increased relationships and connections with community leaders and alumni, a coherent internship program could be established, which was suggested by one faculty member and two students. This could impact two major areas of the internship requirement of the program. First, an internship database could be created based on previous internship sites and opportunities that would allow students to connect to the types of internships they seek more easily. Another student suggested a second way the internship experience could be improved upon, through advisors providing more guidance on how to set up an internship and what kinds of experiences to seek. A coherent internship program connected to community leaders and

alumni that is more directly guided by faculty advisors could provide more meaningful internship experiences for students who say that they are currently on their own to locate internships which often do not give them the professional development experience they had hoped it might.

The doctoral seminar emerged as the most positive aspect of the advising experience for NEP students who have the opportunity to be in one. For the student who did not have this opportunity, she perceived that she was missing an important experience and noted that, "If only a few students have access to these seminars, you are leaving the rest out." The faculty who offer the seminar acknowledged its importance in helping them to advise more effectively. Thus, it is proposed as a recommendation that within the current structure, the doctoral seminar might be a requirement; however, one faculty member who offers the seminar noted the difficulty of creating such a requirement due to political ramifications within the COE and NEP program because the doctoral seminar is not accepted college-wide as a credit-bearing course. Still, I believe that based on its positive impact on faculty and students alike, it is recommended to make the doctoral seminar available to as many students as possible. One student emphasized how important the seminar was in her experience: "The seminar should be a recognized and valued part of the program. It was more useful to me than the internship."

A final recommendation to the NEP is that those administering the program seriously consider creating a cohort model. Every NEP faculty and student in this study, except the Outlier, remarked on the positive impacts of a cohort and their desire to establish a cohort program, in some way. For some, the cohort could be the first two years of the program and then students complete their dissertation or culminating project in an individualized pathway. Others acknowledged the importance of building community and an environment for peer learning and

advising through a cohort and having the support of others who understand the experience of the program.

Clearly, faculty and students agree that establishing a core faculty leadership structure is essential to improving the advising experiences of students in the program. All of the recommendations discussed in this section hinge on faculty leadership who have bought into the program and committed to its' improvement and development. With the impending departure of the program director, who was the only NEP faculty to mention the proposed cohort model, the future of the EdD in the NEP specialization remains to be seen.

EP faculty leadership structure: Implications and recommendations

The EP clearly has an established core faculty leadership structure, which has impacted the overall program structure and advising experiences of students. Generally, the perspectives that faculty and students gave were positive. The faculty discussed how they meet together regularly and exchange advising strategies. The only recommendation regarding the faculty leadership came from a student. As mentioned in Chapter 6, the program has undergone several revisions, precisely because the faculty are meeting together and continually seeking ways to improve the program. However, the numerous changes can potentially create confusion, as noted by two students in the current cohort. While seen as positive and appreciated that the faculty convene and work hard to continually improve, one student stated that a recent change "made it confusing for those who started [the EP] and at the end of the first year and found out it would be three more years [instead of two]. [We needed to know] about expectations and what the end would look like."

Similar to the NEP, the recommendations suggested for the EP depend greatly on the faculty leadership structure in place. One student, from a previous cohort, expressed concern for

having the appropriate number of faculty involved in the program to ensure that students have the advising experiences they need. He stated this concern stems from knowing that faculty who were in the program when he was a student have moved on and not been replaced. The other major recommendation was more intentional time for advising during weekend sessions. According to one student, there is time for quick check-ins, but suggested the possibility of increasing the time available for advising, perhaps by alternating networking/community building with advising at alternate weekend sessions.

Basically, having a strong core faculty leadership structure is overall positive, but it is critical when considering changes to the program, to assess the impact on students and clearly communicate such changes. Students also desire ample time with their advisors, which requires having a sufficient number of faculty advisors available in the program.

Recommendation for both programs

One common recommendation arose from students in both programs. They strongly desire more clarification of the advisor role and advising relationship. Students expressed the desire for delineation of the responsibilities of the student and advisor so that expectations are clear. Students noted that expectations should be program-wide so that the advising experience is uniform. Specifically, one student thought it was important to know how often students can expect to meet with their advisors, saying she desires, "formally stated expectations so I don't feel like I'm imposing on my advisor if I want a one hour meeting once a month." Another student highlighted confusion about knowing which questions she should ask her advisor and which she might ask someone else, such as the student services office. In the same vein as responsibility in the advising relationship, one student remarked that it should be clarified in writing at the beginning of the program what students and faculty advisors rights and

responsibilities are in the advising relationship. One student remarked, “I don’t know what my advisor is accountable to do!” Another student suggested that such clarification should occur as students begin the program, and then as reminders and reiterations throughout the program. He also noted that it need not be completely formal, but there might be clearly stated guidelines or a rubric that brings structure to advising, “so it’s not just ‘How are you doing?’”

In summary, students in each program brought recommendations to the table for consideration. In the NEP, faculty also made suggestions to improve the program. In both programs, the recommendations and future improvements hinge largely on a clearly established core faculty leadership structure. While recommendations were quite different between the two, students in both programs expressed the need for greater clarification of the expectations and responsibilities involved in the advising relationship.

Limitations of the Study

While I believe that this study provides rich information based on faculty and student perspectives, the topic of program structure and advising models in EdD programs is a broad topic. Because I was very interested in these two programs based on my experience, I chose to study them. However, this provides a limitation of the study in that the context was narrow. I examined two programs at one institution in a research-intensive context. The perceptions gleaned here cannot and should not be generalized to faculty and student perspectives of the EdD in general. One faculty member in this study noted that his experience of an EdD program at a previous institution, which was a small, private college, was very different from his experience at NFU. Even at other research-intensive universities, another faculty member acknowledged that each program has its own conditions, circumstances, and culture.

Another limitation of this study involves those who participated. Faculty and students volunteered to participate and therefore, may provide a view quite different from others who did not volunteer. If sampling had been truly random, different themes may have emerged.

Finally, this study only included a small number of students from each program. While seven faculty is a fairly large sample from these two programs, eight students total is small. Therefore, while consistent themes emerged in the data through this sample, the small proportion of students represented in the study should be kept in mind when arriving at any conclusions or proposing recommendations.

Future Considerations

Because of the importance of advising in doctoral programs for the ultimate success of students, I believe this is a topic that should continue to be explored. This study examined two EdD programs at one institution, a large, public research university. Based on this study, there are several directions for future research on the topic of interaction between program structure and advising model in EdD programs.

Initially, I planned to include another research-intensive university comparable to NFU that also offers a traditional EdD and modified EdD in specializations similar to the NEP and EP. Due to limited access and resources, my committee and I determined to include only NFU in the current study. However, I believe that studying similar programs at another R-1 institution would be valuable to see if the results are similar to what was found at NFU. It would also be worthwhile to explore similar programs in a different institutional context, such as a smaller, private liberal arts institution. Because of the difference in institutional mission and the ways in which resources are acquired and allocated, as well as the types of faculty and students who have

chosen to teach and learn at that type of institution, studying a different institutional context might yield different findings.

This study utilized interviews as the sole method of examining this issue, other than basic marketing materials for each program. Conducting surveys across a larger sampling of students would likely provide additional data that could further enhance the findings and implications of the study. By surveying a greater number of students, more themes might emerge or the themes from this study might continue to be confirmed by more students. Other means of data collection, such as classroom observations and more in-depth document review, would also provide additional rich data.

In Chapter 1, at the beginning of this study, I claimed that this is an important topic that must be explored because of the importance of advising in the successful experience of a doctoral student and the dearth of existing literature regarding advising of doctoral students pursuing practice degrees. Through a review of the literature, Chapter 2 made it clear that program design is a primary concern of national researchers and experts involved with the EdD degree and its improvement and that advising is affected by program design or structure. The purpose of this study was to explore the intersectionality of program design/structure and advising models in EdD programs. I did this by examining two types of EdD programs, one that is traditional in its design/structure and advising approach and one that has intentionally modified its design/structure and advising model, to be attuned to the practical and developmental needs of practitioners.

In Chapter 1, I stated that a premise of this study is the belief that advising that is intentional toward the purposes of the degree and academic/professional pursuits of the students (rather than treating all doctoral students the same) will result in more effective advising of EdD

students. I also clarified that this study is grounded in the belief that intentionality is likely impacted by the structure of the program, because clarity on the part of both faculty and students regarding what the EdD is and who its students are increases the likelihood of effective advising, which results in student success both during and after the program.

I believe that Chapters 5 and 6, which delineate the findings from interviewing faculty and students in each program, confirm these statements. It is clear that students in the NEP feel that their EdD program is treated like a stepchild to the PhD and that the faculty recognize the lack of differentiation between the PhD and EdD in the NEP specializations, particularly in the dissertation or culminating project requirement. Because of this and other major program structure issues, students in the program have an overall neutral satisfaction level and many creative suggestions for how to improve the program structure and advising model. EP faculty have worked continually throughout the history of the program to improve the structure, understanding that this will impact the advising model. In turn, EP students appreciate the cohort model and built-in advising structures of the program and overall have a very high level of satisfaction.

Chapter 7 has provided a summary of findings that answer the research questions proposed in Chapter 3, as well has outlining specific recommendations for both programs based largely on responses given directly by the participants of the study. My hope is that this study might propel positive movement in each program which, I believe and hope this study demonstrates, is led by a core faculty leadership structure, to continually examine and improve their program structures and intentionally seek to understand how decisions about program structure will impact the advising experiences of students. And if Barnes and Austin (2009) are correct that “the nature of the relationship between doctoral students and their advisors has far-

reaching implications and consequences for the advisee," it is imperative that the NEP and EP faculty strive for excellence in building a core leadership faculty structure that prioritizes program development and advising for continued success.

References

Antony, J. S. (2002). Reexamining doctoral student socialization and professional development: Moving beyond the congruence and assimilation orientation. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research Vol. XVII* (349-380). New York: Agathon Press.

Antony, J. S. & Taylor, E. (2004). Theories and strategies of academic career socialization: Improving paths to the professoriate for black graduate students. In D. H. Wulff, A. E. Austin, & Associates (Eds.), *Paths to the Professoriate: Strategies for Enriching the Preparation of Future Faculty* (92-114). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Archer, J. (2005). Some EdD Programs Adopting Practical Approach. *Education Week, 25*(15), 8. Retrieved from MasterFILE Premier database.

Austin, A. E. (2002). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the academic career. *Journal of Higher Education, 73*(1), 94-122.

Barger, R. R. & Mayo-Chamberlain, J. (1983). Advisor and advisee issues in doctoral education. *Journal of Higher Education, 54*(4), 407-432.

Barnes, B. J. & Austin, A. E. (2009). The role of doctoral advisors: A look at advising from the advisor's perspective. *Innovative Higher Education, 33*(5), 297-315.

Bieber, J. P. & Worley, L. K. (2006). Conceptualizing the academic life: Graduate students' perspectives. *Journal of Higher Education, 77*(6), 1009-1035.

Bowen, & Rudenstein. (1992). In pursuit of the PhD Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Brown, L. D. (1990). *A perspective on the PhD-EdD discussion in schools of education.* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Caboni, T., & Proper, E. (2009). Re-envisioning the Professional Doctorate for Educational Leadership and Higher Education Leadership: Vanderbilt University's Peabody College EdD Program. Peabody Journal of Education, 84(1), 61-68. Retrieved from Education Full Text database.

Carpenter, D. S. (1987). On-going dialogue: Degrees of difference? *The Review of Higher Education, 10,* 281-287.

Cremin, L. A. (1978). *The education of the educating professions.* Charles W. Hunt Lecture presented at the meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, Chicago, IL. (ERIC document EJ181489)

Creswell, J. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Deering, T. E. (1998). Eliminating the doctor of education degree: It's the right thing to do. *The Educational Forum, 62*(3), 243-248. Retrieved from Education Full Text database.

Delamont, S., Atkinson, P. & Parry, O. (1997). Supervising the PhD: A guide to success. Buckingham, England: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.

Di Pierro, M. (2007). Excellence in doctoral education: Defining best practices. *College Student Journal, 41*(2), 368-375.

Dill, D. D., & Morrison, J. L. (1985). EdD and PhD research training in the field of higher education: A survey and proposal. *The Review of Higher Education, 8,*169-186.

Donaldson, J. & Petersen, G. J. Cohort Doctoral Preparation Programs: Neo-Institutional Perspectives. From http://cnx.org/content/m14518/latest/ August 9, 2009.

Everson, S. T. (2006). The role of partnerships in the professional doctorate in education: A

program application in educational leadership. *Educational Considerations, 33*(2), 5-9. Retrieved from Education Full Text database.

Everson, S. T. (2009). A professional doctorate in educational leadership: Saint Louis University's EdD program. *Peabody Journal of Education, 84*(1), 86-99. Mahwah, NJ: Taylor & Francis, LTD.

Gardner, S. K. (2008a). Fitting the mold of graduate school: A qualitative study of socialization in doctoral education. *Innovative Higher Education, 33*(2), 125-138.

Gardner, S. K. (2008b). "What's too much and what's too little?": The process of becoming an independent researcher in doctoral education. *The Journal of Higher Education, 79*(3), 326-350.

Golde, C. M. (2005). The role of the department and discipline in doctoral student attrition: Lessons from four departments. *Journal of Higher Education, 76*(6), 669-700.

Golde, C. M. (2006). Preparing stewards of the discipline. In C. M. Golde, G. E. Walker, & Associates (Eds.), *Envisioning the Future of Doctoral Education* (3-20). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Guthrie, J. (2009). The Case for a Modern Doctor of Education Degree (EdD): Multipurpose Education Doctorates No Longer Appropriate. Peabody Journal of Education, 84(1), 3-8. Mahwah, NJ: Taylor & Francis, LTD.

Hinchey, P. & Kimmel, I. (2000). The graduate grind: A critical look at graduate education. New York: Falmer Press.

Johnson, W. B. & Huwe, J. M. (2003). Getting mentored in graduate school. Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association.

Kolbert, J., & Brendel, J. (1997). Current perceptions of the doctor of philosophy and doctor of

education degrees in counselor preparation. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, *36*(3), 207. Retrieved from MasterFILE Premier database.

Lovitts, B. E. (2004). Research on the structure and process of graduate education. In D. H. Wulff, A. E. Austin, & Associates (Eds.), *Paths to the Professoriate: Strategies for Enriching the Preparation of Future Faculty* (115-136). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Malmberg, E. D. (2000). Retention and attrition of doctoral candidates in higher education. Dissertation for UNT.

Merriam, S. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mullen, C. A. (2006). *A graduate student guide: Making the most of mentoring.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Nerad, M. & Cerny, J. (1999). Widening the circle: another look at women graduate students. *Communicator, 32*(6), 1-7.

Nettles, M. T. (1990). Success in doctoral programs: Experiences of minority and white students. *American Journal of Education, 98*(4), 494-522.

Olson, K. & Clark, C. M. (2009). A signature pedagogy in doctoral education: The leader-scholar community. *Educational Researcher, 38*(3), 216-221.

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

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods (3rd ed.).* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Perry, J. A. & Imig, D.G. (2008). A stewardship of practice in education. *Change Magazine, 40*(6), 42-48.

Richardson, R.C., Jr., & Walsh, R. T. (1978). *Differences and similarities in the practices of institutions offering the PhD and EdD programs in higher education.* Arizona State University-Tempe, AZ. (ERIC document ED198748)

Shulman, L. S., Golde, C. M., Buescel, A. C., & Gorabedian, K. J. (2006). Reclaiming education's doctorate: A critique and a proposal. *Educational Researcher, 35*(2), 28-31.

Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Toma, J. D. (2002). *Legitimacy, differentiation, and the promise of the EdD in higher education.* Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Sacramento, CA.

Wisker, G. (2005). The good supervisor: Supervising postgraduate and undergraduate research for doctoral theses and dissertations. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Appendix A

Faculty Interview Guide

1. How long have you been teaching/advising in this program?
2. How many students have you advised? How many do you currently advise?
3. How do you perceive the EdD degree?
4. How does this perception influence the way you advise EdD students?
5. What are the effective key strategies for advising EdD students?
6. As a faculty advisor, how do you believe or experience the structure of this EdD program [executive or non-executive] interacts with or influences the advising experiences of students?
7. What did you think I might cover in this interview? (If this hasn't been covered yet in the interview, do so now.)
8. Since your interview has covered a lot of territory, not all of it can be included in my report. What would you be disappointed to see left out?

Appendix B

Student Interview Guide

1. Why did you choose an EdD rather than PhD program for your graduate education? Why this particular EdD program?
2. I'm interested in learning about the advising experiences of EdD students in an executive and non-executive format, as we discussed. I would like to hear about your experiences in the [executive or non-executive] program at NWU.
3. Based on their response to number one, ask follow-up questions on key themes from the literature review such as *satisfaction*, *professional development*, or *advisor traits*.
4. How, if at all, do you feel that the structure of your Ed.D program (executive or non-executive) impacts the advising experiences of students in the program?
5. What would you tell faculty or administrators developing the structure of this program in order to improve advising experiences of EdD students in this program?
6. What did you think I might cover in this interview? (If this hasn't been covered yet in the interview, do so now.)
7. Since your interview has covered a lot of territory, not all of it can be included in my report. What would you be disappointed to see left out?

VITA

Peggy Itschner was born in Dallas, Texas. She lived in West Africa for two years and Texas for several years before moving to Seattle, which she currently resides. Peggy earned her Bachelor of Arts in Psychology from Ouachita Baptist University and her Master of Education in Higher Education at Dallas Baptist University. In 2012, she earned her Doctor of Education in Higher Education at the University of Washington and currently serves as the Interim Director of Advising and Success Services at North Seattle Community College.