

# Using the CPED Rubrics for Program Self-Study: Confirmation and Challenge

**Sarah A. Capello**   
Radford University  
[scapello@radford.edu](mailto:scapello@radford.edu)

**Maxwell M. Yurkofsky**   
Radford University  
[myurkofsky@radford.edu](mailto:myurkofsky@radford.edu)

## ABSTRACT

This essay details the process, results, and implications of a self-study project that the Education Doctorate (EdD) program faculty at Radford University undertook as part of their engagement in the Carnegie Project of the Education Doctorate (CPED) Principles Implementation & Framework© Impact Self-Study Project. Radford University is a regional comprehensive institution located in the Southeast that has a relatively new EdD program. We believed that embarking in a formalized self-study project could serve as a useful benchmark check-in for us to assess our program progress, alignment to our core goals, vision, and mission, and serve our aim of engaging in continuous program improvement. For the self-study, we reviewed program documents and student artifacts and conducted focus groups with faculty and students. We coded the data according to the CPED framework principles and scored our program according to the CPED rubrics. The results confirmed that we were making desired progress but also illuminated growth areas.

## KEYWORDS

*CPED, EdD, education doctorate, self-study*

Radford University is one of the seven Carnegie Project of the Education Doctorate (CPED) member institutions that volunteered to participate in the CPED Principles Implementation & Framework© Impact Self-Study Project. We did so, in part, because we had participated in an earlier CPED Guiding Principles Rubric Pilot Project where we tested out a rubric prototype, identified gaps in our implementation of two CPED principles, and made intentional revisions to our program design to rectify those gaps as well as engage in broader program revisions. We believed the second rubric self-study project would be a timely opportunity to assess our growth (if any) in our implementation of those two principles. Secondly, as a newer program that had made significant programmatic revisions, we also wanted to check for alignment between the CPED Framework© and our program's core goals, vision, and mission and implementation. The CPED Principles Implementation & Framework© Impact Self-Study Project provided a systemic and rigorous method for meeting those goals.

In this paper, we share our experiences in both the CPED Guiding Principles Rubric Pilot Project and the CPED Principles Implementation & Framework© Impact Self-Study Project, our self-study process and program ratings across both rubric projects, and the ways in which we used the findings from both self-studies to spur continuous program improvement. Engagement in the CPED Principles Implementation & Framework© Impact Self-Study Project confirmed that we were maintaining the original program mission but also challenged us to reflect more deeply on faculty initiation to the program and how we could engage students and alumni more in the self-study process.

## PROGRAM BACKGROUND

Radford University is a regional comprehensive institution located in the Southeast with a strong history in teacher education and educational leadership preparation. Our Education Doctorate (EdD) program is a three-year, online synchronous program designed to prepare PK-12 leaders for executive leadership roles within their school districts. Our program was designed using CPED guiding principles for program design and the principles and process of improvement science (Bryk et al., 2015; Hinnant-Crawford, 2025). Our students complete a Dissertation in Practice (DiP) focused on a Problem of Practice (PoP), which is broken into three sections and follows the improvement science process. First, students identify and inquire into a PoP in their local school settings. Next, they develop a theory of improvement and change idea to address the PoP. Finally, they implement iterative Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycles and evaluate the effects of their change ideas for improvement. To support this work, we ask students to invite a practitioner within their educational organization who is familiar with or involved in their PoP to serve as an outside committee member.

We use a cohort model and enroll 20-25 students each year, the majority of which are central office administrators, building-level administrators, and teachers. Currently, three core EdD faculty teach in the program and chair the majority of students' DiPs but are supported by other departmental faculty as well as adjuncts with PK-12 administrative experience.



New articles in this journal are licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 United States License.



This journal is published by Pitt Open Library Publishing.



**impacting.ed.pitt.edu**  
Vol.11 No.4 (2026)

This journal is supported by the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate: A Knowledge Forum on the EdD (CPED) [cpedinitiative.org](http://cpedinitiative.org)

ISSN 2472-5889 (online)  
DOI 10.5195/ie.2026.639

## INITIAL CPED RUBRICS PROJECT

In Fall 2022, the core EdD faculty, a group of three newly hired faculty (including Sarah and Max, the authors of this article) and the current program coordinator, volunteered to participate in a CPED Guiding Principles Rubric Pilot Project. At the time, CPED had developed a prototype of the CPED Guiding Principles Rubric to assist EdD programs in assessing their progress toward implementing the six CPED principles in their program design or redesign process. The goal of the pilot study project was for a small number of CPED member institutions to self-assess their programs using the rubric prototype and to provide feedback on the usefulness and viability of the draft rubric so that CPED could subsequently revise and share it broadly with the CPED community as a tool for program assessment and continuous improvement. At the time, Radford University's EdD program had enrolled its third cohort of students, and the core EdD faculty were deep in the process of program development. We had been working together for about a year on redesigning research methodology courses, revising social justice courses, and restructuring dissertation research credits to align our program coursework and DiP with the CPED Framework© and the principles and process of improvement science. We were a

new program that made significant changes to the original program design as we learned from students' and faculty's initial experiences in the program, and we were eager to pilot the draft rubric and learn how our new program revisions and implementation were aligned with the CPED principles (or not) and to identify areas for improvement.

To inform the rubric pilot project and our self-assessment of our newly redesigned program, we spent about a year collecting data on students' experiences in the program and their perceptions of our alignment with the CPED principles through a student satisfaction survey and student interviews. We also revisited, reflected on, and collaboratively discussed our program's developing mission and vision statements, our course offerings and sequencing, student feedback from our course evaluations, our experiences chairing and serving on DiP committees, and our students' DiP products.

The CPED Guiding Principles Rubric prototype asked institutions to rate themselves on their implementation of the six CPED principles on a scale of Emerging, Designing & Developing, Implementing, Experienced, and Benchmark. We rated ourselves as follows:

**Table 1. Radford EdD Program Ratings on CPED Guiding Principles Rubric Prototype Fall 2023**

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

As Table 1 demonstrates, we rated our program as "Experienced" in four of the CPED principles and believed that we were on track to reaching that designation for the other two. Since we had only implemented the program revisions with our newest cohort, which was just beginning the program, no students had yet experienced the full program revisions, and we had not had the opportunity to assess their progress on Principles 1 and 3. The expectations were embedded in the program that students would meet those principles; we simply needed more time and additional students to come through the program to be able to reach the "Experienced" rubric designation. Furthermore, the "Benchmark" rating required programs to regularly assess each principle for continuous improvement, which we could not do given the age of our program and recent program revisions.

## Programmatic Revisions Stemming from Initial Self-Study

After reviewing some student data, reflecting on our program redesign work at that point, and rating ourselves on the CPED Guiding Principles Rubric Prototype, we were excited by our alignment with the CPED Framework© and that we were able to identify and document that alignment in both student and faculty data. Our program redesign included significant changes to our research methodology courses including moving from traditional quantitative and qualitative research methodology distinctions to practitioner inquiry courses centered on and sequenced around the improvement science process. Furthermore, in response to feedback from our first graduating cohort, we also redistributed dissertation research credits so that students received one credit each semester rather than nine credits in the last year. This provided students with DiP support throughout the program, not just in the final year (See Capello et al. (2023)) for additional details on our research



methodology coursework redesign). After engaging in the initial CPED self-study project, we felt confident about our revisions to the research methodology coursework and sequencing and did not make additional programmatic revisions at that point. However, we did continue to meet bi-weekly, administer annual student satisfaction surveys, and talk with faculty and graduates of the program to learn how our redesigned coursework was being implemented and to ensure that it remained aligned with the CPED principles and our programmatic vision and mission.

However, as Table 1 shows, we did have some work to do following the initial self-study related to CPED Framework© Principle 1. With the research methodology courses revised and implemented, we turned toward examining how we were preparing equitable and justice-oriented PK-12 school leaders and how those lenses impacted students' framing of their PoPs. We wanted students to see the system contributing to the problem (Bryk et al., 2015) rather than place blame on students and communities. Students in the first cohorts had coursework in diversity, equity, and inclusion and critical social theories, which, we learned, students and faculty both felt were disconnected from the work of PK-12 education leaders and not explicitly connected to their DiP research. Subsequently, we developed a social justice course sequence that included coursework that explicitly connected social justice and equity to educational leadership. We also identified places in other coursework, such as our practitioner inquiry courses, where we could help students think about and identify system-wide influences on their PoPs.

## A SECOND CPED RUBRICS PROJECT

Two years later, Radford's EdD program again partnered with CPED and other member institutions on a second project, the CPED Principles Implementation & Framework© Impact Self-Study Project. This project was intended to validate a new set of rubrics, the CPED Framework© Implementation and Impact rubrics, which were developed, in part, from the findings the 2022-2023 initial principles rubric work. Unlike the first self-study project we participated in, the second CPED Principles Implementation & Framework© Impact Self-Study Project was designed to be a more formalized self-study process. It included guiding instructions for participating institutions to conduct their self-study, specific data to be collected, processes for reporting data, and several whole-group meetings among representatives from other participating CPED member institutions. Now that we had a few years' experience implementing the programmatic changes we made early on and had implemented a new social justice course sequence, we believed that engaging in this second project could serve as a useful benchmark check-in for us to: 1). assess our progress since the 2022-2023 report for all CPED principles with specific attention on Principles 1 and 3, 2). reassess the alignment between the CPED Framework© and our program's core goals, vision, and mission, and 3). engage in continuous program improvement through systematic and rigorous inquiry. At this point, one of the core EdD faculty members who participated in the first CPED rubric project had retired and a second had taken a position at another institution, so we (Sarah and Max) collaborated as co-researchers in the self-study data collection, analysis, and rating work.

## Self-Study Methods

Beginning in Summer 2024, participating CPED institutions began meeting periodically with Dr. Jill Perry, Executive Director of CPED, and Dr. Stephen Pape, the CPED Principles Implementation & Framework© Impact Self-Study Project lead. These meetings were helpful in clarifying the goals of the project and data collection and analysis procedures. They also brought to light ideas and questions other institutions had that were helpful in shaping our own self-study. Through these meetings and discussions among Radford's EdD faculty, we began to carve out a pathway for completing our self-study.

### Data Collection

Throughout summer and fall of 2024, we collected data according to the CPED Principles Implementation & Framework© Impact Self-Study Project guidelines from the following sources: 1). program documents (e.g., mission and vision statements, student handbook, dissertation rubrics), 2). syllabi from nearly all required courses, 3). student and faculty focus groups, 4). 10 randomly-selected DiPs, and 5). survey data from past student success surveys and program innovation surveys. The program documents, syllabi, and survey data were all accessed from our shared department files or were publicly available on our university website (such as the program's mission and vision statement).

In addition to retrieving existing programmatic data, we also had to collect focus group data from faculty, students, and alumni, which required more coordination. First, we invited faculty who had taught in the program and those who had chaired and served on DiP committees to participate. Eight faculty members agreed to participate, including department faculty, an adjunct who teaches in the program, and our department chair, who has taught in the program and serves on DiP committees. As co-researchers, we each facilitated a focus group on Zoom using the suggested protocol. The faculty focus groups lasted approximately an hour each.

Student focus groups were more challenging. Because all our students are full-time practitioners, we had to conduct the focus groups in the evening. Knowing that students already had evening classes and wanting to respect their time, we decided to make space during class for participation in an optional student focus group. This class was comprised of students in the third year of the program who had nearly all finished their DiPs and were weeks away from graduating. We chose this cohort because they were the first to experience the revised curriculum and programmatic changes we made between 2021-2022, and they were the furthest along in the program of any of the cohorts. We anticipated that this group would provide a more holistic overview of how the EdD program implemented the CPED principles (or not) than cohorts who had not experienced the full program and DiP experiences. Students interested in participating in the focus groups were divided into two breakout rooms on Zoom and provided with the CPED student focus group protocol and a copy of the CPED Framework© for program design. We asked students to discuss the focus group questions and to share a written, de-identified summary of their responses to each question when they finished. We did not record the student focus groups, and the course instructor did not join either focus group to allow students to discuss their responses freely and anonymously.

Finally, we attempted to conduct an alumni focus group, but multiple email attempts to garner interest did not result in enough alumni for the focus group.

## Data Analysis

As instructed by the self-study project guidelines, we took a deductive approach to our data analysis and used the six guiding principles of the CPED framework as our *a priori* codes (See Table 1). We also used the CPED design-concepts as *a priori* codes: Scholarly Practitioner, Signature Pedagogy, Inquiry as Practice, Laboratories of Practice, Dissertation in Practice, Problem of Practice, and Mentoring and Advising.

We reviewed each data source for: 1). the presence (or not) of each code, 2). how the Framework© element was integrated in the program (if at all), and 3). evidence of application of the Framework© element in the field (if at all). We used an Excel spreadsheet to record and analyze the data.

## FINDINGS OF THE SELF-STUDY

After analyzing the data, we rated our program on the two rubrics according to the criteria listed. Both rubrics used a scale of: Emerging, Progressing, Full Integration, and Exemplar. However, one of the challenges we encountered when rating our program according to the Guiding Principles Implementation Rubric was that there was some overlap of the criteria within the rubric categories on the Guiding Principles Implementation Rubric. For example, the rubric listed a demonstration of evidence of each principle in 50-75%

of relevant documents as a criterion of the Progressing rating. However, it also listed a demonstration of evidence of each principle in 50-70% of program assessments as a criterion of the Full Integration rating. Because we wanted to assess our implementation of the CPED principles authentically, we subsequently rated our program in both the Progressing and Full Integration categories for each Framework© principle, reflecting the fact that our assessments consistently fell across those two levels. This overlap made it challenging to assess exactly where our program fell on the rubric continuum and to determine what progress we had made since the first rubric project. Table 2 presents our ratings for each principle. Following Table 2, we provide a brief overview of our evidence for each principle with examples from the data we collected.

## Principle 1

We found evidence of Principle 1 primarily in our program documents, coursework, and student dissertations. For example, our program vision statement reads, in part, that our program “will prepare practitioner-scholars who are prepared to address issues of equity and social justice in order to ensure that the needs of every student are met.” Furthermore, as described above, our program redesign included a social justice course sequence, and six out of 10 randomly selected student DiPs were explicitly focused on equity and justice-oriented PoPs. Encouragingly, the majority of students strongly agreed on our most recent student satisfaction survey that the program helped them feel prepared to center equity and justice in how they define, investigate, and address their PoPs.

**Table 2. Radford EdD Program Ratings on Guiding Principles Implementation Rubric Spring 2025**

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

## Principle 2

We found evidence of Principle 2 primarily in our practitioner inquiry course sequence, our dissertation research courses, and in all students’ DiPs. Since our program uses a DiP model whereby we require students to identify, inquire into, and address a PoP using the improvement science process, our dissertation process naturally prompts students to construct and apply knowledge to improve the lives of their staff, students, and communities. Our program documents provided additional evidence for Principle 2 through

mission and vision statements that portray our commitment to prepare students who can “address complex problems of practice within their educational ecosystems and communities.”

## Principle 3

We found evidence of Principle 3 primarily in our program documents, coursework, and student dissertations. Our mission is, in part, to “practitioner-scholars to lead collaborative continuous improvement work, alongside diverse communities.” Furthermore, our program requires students to convene a DiP improvement team



that includes organizational members and community members knowledgeable of or impacted by the PoP who assist them in the PoP inquiry, development of a theory of improvement, and PDSA cycles. Students receive support for this work in their practitioner inquiry and dissertation research courses.

## Principle 4

We found evidence of Principle 4 primarily in our student dissertations and coursework. Again, because our students complete a DiP focused on a PoP, their dissertation research is entirely field-based and PoP-centered. Our practitioner inquiry and dissertation research coursework supports students' inquiry work and implementation of their PDSA cycles. Faculty and student focus group participants noted the value they felt these field-based opportunities provide for leadership preparation.

## Principle 5

We found evidence of Principle 5 primarily in our program documents, coursework, and student dissertations. Our program vision statement reads, in part, that our program prepares students who "are prepared as practitioner-scholars to employ Improvement Science processes and research-based approaches to improve schools, school districts, and other educational organizations." DiPs in our program require students to use the improvement science process, which includes developing a theory of improvement that blends practitioner knowledge and experience with knowledge from the scholarly literature. Following suit, the DiP rubrics assess how students blend their own practitioner knowledge with the research literature and empirical inquiry to inform their research. Students receive support for this work during practitioner inquiry and dissertation research coursework.

## Principle 6

We found evidence of Principle 6 primarily in our student dissertations and coursework. As mentioned already, the DiP requires students to draw on their professional knowledge and practice to identify, inquire into, and develop and test out solutions to localized PoPs. Our program also requires students to include a section in their DiP where they reflect on the implications of their DiP work for their leadership. Moreover, students are challenged to examine and transform their leadership via our leadership course sequence.

## Evidence of Program Improvement

When compared to our program ratings on the CPED Impact and Principles Rubric Pilot Project from Spring 2023, we see some growth. Notably, in Spring 2023, we rated our progress toward Principle 1 as Designing & Developing, but in Spring 2025, we rated it as Progressing – Full Implementation. We also found similar growth in Principle 3. In Spring 2023, we rated our program as Implementing and moved to Progressing – Full Implementation in Spring 2025. While it is important to note that the Spring 2023 rubric is different from the Spring 2025 rubric and the overlap in the Implementation Rubric categories made it difficult to land on one rating, we still feel that there was enough evidence from the self-study data analysis to feel confident that we had grown in these two principles. We rated the other four principles (Principles 2, 4-6) as Experienced in Spring 2023 and Progressing – Full Implementation

in Spring 2025. Again, although it is hard to compare across the different rubric scales, we felt that meeting some of the Full Implementation criteria for each principle on the Spring 2025 rubric was evidence that we had maintained momentum and have been implementing the principles adequately.

The second rubric, the CPED Framework® Impact Rubric, was intended to gauge the impact of the Framework® on four groups: students, faculty, the EdD program, and the profession and field. As Table 3 demonstrates below, we rated our impact across the four groups as Full Integration to Exemplar. Our data demonstrated Exemplar impact on students and the professional field / practice, Full Integration – Exemplar impact on the program, and Full Integration impact on faculty. Similarly to the Guiding Principles Implementation Rubric, we rated our program in the Full Integration and Exemplar categories on the Impact rubric due to meeting criteria in both.

**Table 3. Radford EdD Program Ratings on the CPED Framework® Impact Rubric Spring 2025**

| CPED Framework Impact on...   | Rating                      |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Students                      | Exemplar                    |
| Faculty                       | Full Integration            |
| Program                       | Full Integration - Exemplar |
| Professional Field / Practice | Exemplar                    |

## IMPLICATIONS FOR CONTINUED PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

Engaging in the self-study project led to several implications that are important for our program viability. First, we saw evidence of the importance of core-EdD faculty communication and collaboration for program improvement. Since we began our major program redesign work in Fall 2021, our core EdD team has met frequently to check in on student progress, reflect on courses and advising, reexamine our course offerings and sequencing, discuss our DiP process and products, collect and review student and faculty data such as our annual student success survey, and use that data for continuous program improvement. Our constant communication and collaboration around course sequencing, the DiP process and outcomes, and student and faculty experiences have led to several positive outcomes including: tightly scaffolded courses, student progress monitoring and individualized support, shared norms around the DiP process and evaluation, and improvement in faculty instruction and advising. We believe that the collaborative spirit and subsequent programmatic revisions, in part, led to our high ratings on the Spring 2025 rubrics and the growth in Principles 1 and 3 from Spring 2023 to Spring 2025.

Second, the lower faculty rating on the Impact Rubric highlighted a need to initiate new EdD faculty, departmental faculty new to the EdD program, adjuncts, and outside of Radford University DiP committee members into the CPED Framework® and the program's mission and vision. As our core EdD faculty group grows and changes, our program has been intentional about orienting new faculty into the CPED Framework® and how it impacts our coursework and DiPs. Many of our department faculty who teach and advise in the EdD program were former PK-12 practitioners prior to becoming university faculty and completed traditional PhD dissertations. Similarly, many of our adjuncts and outside committee members are current practitioners and completed traditional PhD or

EdD dissertations. Both groups are typically unfamiliar with the CPED Framework®, improvement science as a methodology, and our DiP process and product when they begin teaching courses or serving on DiP committees. These faculty often bring experiences and expectations associated with their own PhD or EdD programs to the courses they teach or the DiP committees they sit on. Therefore, we have found that it is important to orient our adjuncts and outside DiP members into the CPED Framework® and our program mission and vision so that all instructors and committee members have shared understandings of program goals and provide cohesive guidance for students. As more students graduate from our program, we have begun to curate a pool of exceptional graduates as potential adjuncts and outside committee members to teach and serve on DiP committees when their experience, role, PoP, and school district align with programmatic and student needs. After some initial discussions, sharing examples, and clarifying goals and processes, most faculty demonstrate strong buy-in to the CPED Framework® and the DiP process and product and offer strong support for students' DiP work. There are a few faculty, however, who retain concerns about the program, especially the DiP, and we continue to have ongoing discussions among faculty related to the methodological rigor of the research, the literature review, the IRB process, and writing expectations.

Finally, while our self-study revealed that faculty were largely familiar with the CPED Framework®, our students were less so, although they indicated that the CPED principles embedded throughout their program experience have a very strong impact on their work as Scholarly Practitioners. This finding led our core EdD faculty to grapple with: 1). What we want our students to know about the CPED Framework® and 2). How we can increase their engagement in future self-studies.

## KEY LEARNING FROM SELF-STUDY

We engaged in the CPED Principles Implementation & Framework® Impact Self-Study Project as a benchmark assessment of sorts to learn: 1) if and, if so, how we had retained our grounding in the CPED Framework® since our program initiation in Spring 2020 and 2) if we had grown, maintained, or regressed our implementation of the CPED principles since participating in the original pilot study. The results from the self-study are encouraging: we are maintaining our original mission, we have improved in our implementation of two of the six principles, and our program is having a strong impact on educators, students, and their communities, as evidenced by our students' DiP outcomes.

As we reflect on the process of engaging in the self-study, several affordances and challenges come to mind. First, data collection went smoothly for the most part. All documents we needed to review were easily accessible, and we already collected program improvement data such as the prior pilot study work and ongoing student success surveys that informed the self-study. Faculty were very interested and willing to participate in the focus groups. Second, our program was designed, in part, around the CPED Framework®, so there were many intentional instances of the principles embedded throughout the program. Concurrently, our EdD team, which includes core EdD faculty, department faculty who teach and advise in the program, adjuncts, and our department chair, is very familiar with the CPED Framework®, so we did not spend a lot of time sharing or

discussing the principles during the focus groups. Some department faculty also made connections to CPED principles in their course syllabi. Therefore, when we were analyzing the data, it was easy for us to identify and note instances of the CPED principles and design features.

On the other hand, the self-study process was time and labor-intensive, which was exacerbated by only having two faculty collect and analyze data. Further, as noted prior, we had difficulty engaging students and alumni in the process, and we did not recruit enough alumni to run a focus group. Unfortunately, the student focus groups did not produce the data we expected. While we believe that not recording or attending the student focus group was the more appropriate action ethically, the lack of a knowledgeable facilitator to guide the focus groups resulted in student responses that were somewhat unclear and unrelated to the prompts. In hindsight, we do not believe that students fully understood the questions being asked, and we needed to be more intentional about the timing and design of the student focus groups in the future.

Overall, we found the self-study process to be fruitful and generative. It confirmed that we were making progress, maintaining progress, and provided new challenges for us to focus on as we work toward continuous improvement. It also gave us data and evidence to share with our department director and dean of our college to demonstrate our program viability and impact across a range of institutional roles. While we do not currently have the capacity to engage in a self-study of this rigor on an annual basis, we appreciate the process and rubrics that we gained through completing the study and will continue to use them on a recurring basis. Lastly, as with all CPED opportunities, the ability to connect with, question, discuss, and learn from faculty in other CPED member institutions through their own self-study processes was an expected and delightful benefit for our program's continuous improvement.

## REFERENCES

- Bryk, A. S., Gomez, L. M., Grunow, A., & LeMahieu, P. G. (2015). *Learning to improve: How American's schools can get better at getting better*. Harvard Education Press.
- Capello, S. A., Bonney, E. N., & Yurkofsky, M. (2023). The practitioner inquiry course sequence: Centering improvement science in the design of an EdD program. In C. Benedetti & A. Covarrubias (Eds.), *Teaching critical inquiry and applied research in Ed.D. programs: Moving beyond traditional methods* (pp. 121-134). Myers Education Press.
- Hinnant-Crawford, B. N. (2025). *Improvement science in education: A primer* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Myers Education Press.