

# **Educational Effectiveness Review Report**

---

## **The Broad Center for the Management of School Systems**

### **The Broad Residency in Urban Education**

October 15-17, 2014

#### **WSCUC Team Roster**

**Thomas McFadden, Chair; President Emeritus, Marymount College  
Lynn Beck, Assistant Chair; Dean and Professor, School of Education,  
University of the Pacific**

**Mark Bookman, Member; Team Member, Professor and Chair of the  
Business Department, American Jewish University**

**Halyna Kornuta, Member, Team Member; Associate Vice President for  
Academic Affairs, The Chicago School of Professional Psychology**

**Richard Osborn, WSCUC Liaison**

The team evaluated the institution under the WSCUC Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective judgment for consideration and action by the institution and by the WSCUC Senior College and University Commission. The formal action concerning the institution's status is taken by the Commission and is described in a letter from the Commission to the institution. If the institution is granted candidacy or initial accreditation by the Commission, this report and the Commission action letter will be made available to the public by publication on the WSCUC website.

## Table of Contents

Introduction: Description of the Institution and Overview of the Visit.....	2
Responses to Recommendations.....	5
Report on The Broad Residency Program .....	10
Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives.....	10
Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions .....	16
Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability.....	24
Standard 4 : Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement.....	29
Commendations .....	33
Recommendations.....	33
Appendices.....	35
Credit Hour Review	
Marketing and Recruitment Review	
Student Complaints Review	
Transfer Credit Review	

## **Introduction: Description of the Institution and Overview of the Visit**

Funded by the Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation (TBF), The Broad Center for the Management of School Systems (TBC) is focused on raising student achievement by recruiting, training, and supporting leadership talent from across the United States to transform urban school systems. TBC operates two programs in support of this mission: The Broad Residency Program in Urban Education (TBR) and The Broad Superintendents' Academy (TBA). The Broad Residency program is seeking WSCUC accreditation and was the subject of a Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) visit for Candidacy in 2012. The CPR team recommended to the Commission that TBR be allowed to bypass two more required visits and move directly to the Educational Effectiveness Review for Initial Accreditation which is the subject of this team report. The Broad Residency Program has been in existence since 2003 and recently launched its 12<sup>th</sup> cohort of residents. Its administrative offices are located in the Fox Plaza in Los Angeles. Each cohort participates in a distinctive two-year program with quarterly three- to four-day instructional sessions taught by four full-time, internal faculty and a larger group of part-time, external faculty. The eight instructional sessions are mandatory and are conducted in various major U.S. cities as determined by program criteria. Prior to each instructional session, Residents are assigned an extensive set of readings and are expected to complete a number of assignments including one "Applied Learning Project" (ALP) per session. The ALPs are one part of a larger assessment system that includes 360 degree evaluations, a capstone assignment, and various other assessments designed to occur at specific times during the program. Residents also hold full-time positions in K-12 public education organizations under the supervision of a mentor/ staff supervisor. These organizations include administrative offices in urban districts, state and federal departments of education, and charter management organizations. Reviews by staff supervisors are a part of the assessment system.

The selection process for residents is extensive, and qualifications are rigorous. To be considered, a prospective Resident must have, at a minimum, a master's degree or equivalent and four years of full-time work experience. The program attracts a robust number of applicants and, ultimately, admits only 2% of those who apply. The admissions process includes not only reviewing and vetting by TBR staff and alumni, but also by potential partners and supervisors who ultimately make the decision to hire the applicants chosen to participate in the program.

The actual program offers an educational experience for Residents that “differs from that of a traditional graduate school” (Institutional Report, 2014, p. 2). Differences are structural in that the program is not campus-based and is built around a combination of “in person instructional sessions without a campus,” “full time jobs in central offices of school systems,” and “high-touch support for application of learning” (WSCUC Poster, 2014). Differences also extend to the organization of the faculty, to the funding structure for TBR, and more.

Because the structure of TBR is different from that of a traditional graduate program, the WSCUC Review team spent considerable time carefully examining this innovative program. At the CPR visit in 2012, attention was spent on board composition and function, clarification of the commitment of Eli and Edythe Broad (through the Board Foundation for which they are the sole board members) for continued funding of TBR, the relationships between TBR and TBC, and ways in which TBR understood scholarship expectations for faculty and Residents. The review team also recommended that TBR continue to build relationships with traditional higher education programs and that it continue to document compliance with accreditation requirements. Further, because TBR was not a traditional institution of higher education, the CPR team also offered several suggestions that, in the view of team members, would help to position TBR for accreditation at some point in the future.

All members of the CPR team were able to continue as members of the EER team. They included Thomas McFadden (chair), Lynn Beck (.assistant chair), Mark Bookman, and Halyna Kornuta. Richard Osborn also continued as WSCUC liaison. The WSCUC team received EER documents electronically beginning in July 2014, held a preliminary meeting via telephone conference in late August 2014, and conducted the on-site review in Los Angeles and Long Beach, California, October 14-17, 2014. At that time, team members had a rigorous schedule of events and interviews, including meetings with TBR Residents, staff, alumni, and faculty; meetings with administrators in TBR/TBC; a meeting with the TBC Board of Directors, and observations of board meetings and instructional sessions.

The team focused on a number of issues during the site visit. The team was interested in verifying evidence presented in the 2014 Institutional Report including the ways in which TBR had addressed the recommendations from the 2012 CPR Report. It also, though, spent considerable time reviewing the assessment system and the data it generated with special attention to the degree to which the system was capturing the extent to which TBR is effective in meeting its stated goals of “find[ing] managers, primarily from outside education, who want mission-driven work in education and teach[ing] them about K-12 education while simultaneously placing them in the central operations of school systems where they can pave the way to improved student achievement” (Institutional Report, 2014, p.2). The team also focused on assessing and ensuring that TBR curriculum and assignments were appropriately rigorous continued to reflect on the scholarly expectations for faculty and Residents.

This report presents the results of the Educational Effectiveness Review. It is organized as follows. Following this introduction and overview is a brief discussion of TBR responses to the recommendations from the CPR report. This is followed by a discussion of the four standards with attention to ways TBR is meeting various criteria for review. The report concludes with commendations and recommendations.

## **Responses to Recommendations**

In 2012, the WSCUC Review team made ten recommendations in its CPR report. The team was impressed with the ways in which TBC/TBR received, acted upon, and documented their responses to these recommendations. Each response is briefly described below. Longer discussions of responses are included in other parts of this report.

### ***Recommendation 1: Consider ways to engage more deeply with the larger higher education community.***

The Broad Residency Program in Urban Education (TBR) has taken multiple steps to respond to this recommendation. Important actions include internal faculty joining the American Educational Research Association and the Association for the Study of Higher Education, faculty and staff members presenting at the WSCUC ARC 2014 conference poster session, identifying and implementing a range of knowledge-sharing practices, and forming a partnership with Harvard Graduate School of Education's Strategic Data Project. Further, two in particular of the four internal faculty worked with Harvard Graduate School of Education and other institutions of higher education to compare the curriculum, assignments, and assessments of the Residency program with those of more traditional master's and doctoral degree programs. TBR also engaged in a Program Review in 2013 and sought as reviewers three respected educational leaders who represented both traditional and somewhat less traditional institutions of higher education.

### ***Recommendation 2: At the level of the TBC Board, review WSCUC's Independent Governing Board Policy with particular attention to the appropriate structure of standing committees, its quorum requirement, and the composition and responsibilities of its executive committee.***

At the time of the 2012 CPR review, the team was concerned about the relationship between TBC and TBF. As mentioned above, TBF is the sole funding source for TBC and several members of TBF Board of Governors also served on the TBC board. Review by WSCUC's legal counsel, as well as several steps taken by TBC board, have led the team to conclude that TBC is in compliance with the Commission's Independent Governing Board Policy.

As reviewed by WSCUC's legal counsel and shared in the Institutional Report:

The TBF Board of Governors is not the legal governing body for TBF, as the team had assumed; it is an advisory board to Eli Broad and his wife Edythe, who are the sole governing authority for TBF, which is a trust. From a legal perspective, TBC board members who are also on TBF's board of governors have a fiduciary duty to TBC but do not have an equivalent or conflicting fiduciary duty or responsibility to TBC or the authority to act or vote on TBF business. (p. 8)

While this removes any possible technical violation of policy, it is important to note that TBC went beyond this policy requirement to identify which of its board members met the definition of an independent director under the law and is taking steps to expand its independent board membership (i.e., TBC board members who are not also members of TBF's Board of Governors), thereby diluting the possible impact of TBF advisory board members voting as a block. TBC board minutes from May 2014 document that one independent board member was to be added in October 2014<sup>1</sup> with plans to add additional members in the coming 6 to 12 months. TBC has also amended its bylaws (see Article III, Section 9) to increase its quorum requirement to "a majority of the Independent Directors in office," a marked increase from the prior quorum requirement of one-third of the independent members.

***Recommendation 3: At the level of the TBC Board, work with TBF to revise the wording in those sections of the grant agreement addressing the termination of the CEO, the outcome of accepting funding from entities other than TBF, and budget adjustments. The revised wording should clarify the independence of TBC's Board in decision-making while preserving the valid interests of TBF in TBC operations.***

As the essentially sole source funder, TBF revised certain sections of the grant agreement with TBC. This revised, comprehensive 2-year grant agreement includes conditions on gaining funding from other sources, making post-award adjustments to the use of funds, and the right to terminate funding if TBC's CEO is not acceptable to the Foundation. The revised grant terms also strive to clarify TBF's right to "reclaim a pro-rated share of unused Grant

---

<sup>1</sup> The WSCUC team confirmed that an additional member had, indeed, joined the TBC Board and ~~that she~~ was in attendance at the October 2014 Board meeting.

Funds and/or suspend the disbursement of any remaining grant payments” when TBF lacks confidence in the ability of the person proposed to be TBC’s Executive Director (CEO) to fulfill the mandate for which funds were granted. The draft wording adds the process by which TBC would propose who would next assume this position and that, if TBF found this person wanting, it would provide a written explanation as to why and would allow TBC to then propose a different candidate.

***Recommendation 4: Document the rationale for overlapping Board membership with TBF, and the nature of the involvement of the observer appointed by TBF.***

In response to this recommendation and, as noted above, the EER Institutional Report clarified that the TBF Board of Governors is not the legal governing body for TBF, as the team had assumed; it is an advisory board to Eli Broad and his wife Edythe, who are the sole governing authority for TBF. From a legal perspective, TBC board members who are also on TBF’s Board of Governors have a fiduciary duty to TBC but do not have an equivalent or conflicting fiduciary duty or responsibility to TBF since their TBF role is entirely advisory. According to this interpretation, all of TBC’s 13 board members are independent. Further, in order to increase board diversity and expertise as well as the number of TBC board members who do not also serve on TBF board, TBC board expanded its membership with one additional member added in October 2014 and a possible two to three new members joining within the next one to two years.

As will be discussed in relationship to Standard 3, a designated board observer from the Broad Foundation has not yet been appointed. However, the involvement that a potential observer from TBF would have in the grant agreement is in the process of being documented. In addition, an updated Certificate of Related Entity has been signed by the President of TBF, which demonstrates TBC’s ability to maintain autonomy over its operations and education program.

***Recommendation 5: Verify that the proposed endowment for TBC has created a commitment meeting what the Commission determines is sufficient to meet at least the minimum level of funding continuity.***

Section I.2 of the revised grant agreement provides “...that TBF will continue to provide those payments necessary to enable current students who have already undertaken a course of study to complete the course of study.” In discussion with the TBR financial team, as well as

discussion with TBF president, the team was assured this guarantee of teach-out funding applies to the entire agreement.

Also worthy of note is the fact that Eli Broad has provided a letter indicating his intent to create a substantial endowment to support the work of TBR. The dollar amount of this committed endowment represented an increase from the pledge given during the CPR visit. The committed endowment will provide sufficient funding to maintain the current annual operating budget level in perpetuity, as outlined in the long-term funding plan submitted by TBF.

***Recommendation 6: Continue to develop a cycle of inquiry that links learning activities with Resident outcomes and program revision/improvement as part of the educational effectiveness effort.***

The Broad Residency Program has made significant progress in the development of a robust and useful assessment system. It has also embraced the program review process and completed the first review in 2013. There are several important next steps for this organization as it builds on what it has already done. These include extending the assessment processes to evaluate the impact of TBR on long-term outcomes within the local schools, districts, or charter management organizations where residents are employed, and to continue to build capacity to engage in scholarship and research, thereby expanding TBR's sphere of influence within the research community.

***Recommendation 7: Continue to increase the academic qualifications and professional development of the instructional Team.***

At the time of the CPR visit, TBR had just employed the first internal faculty with a graduate degree in education. In the team's view, the addition of a "traditional educator" helps to provide an important context to the work that TBR is promoting. TBR continues to work with faculty members who, in many instances, have different qualifications from faculty within traditional graduate programs in education. After much discussion and careful consideration of the quality and rigor of the instructional program, the team has concluded that internal and external faculty have adequate qualifications and that the program is, indeed, of high quality. Further, the team was pleased with the ways in which TBR is pursuing professional development of its faculty. It is clear that internal and external faculty are functioning as members of learning communities as

they evaluate data and make informed decisions about the program.

***Recommendation 8. Review the level of scholarly expectation for the faculty and Residents, as appropriate to TBR's mission.***

The Broad Residency Program has established and clearly documented a policy on expectations for faculty related to “Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity” and has made progress in an arena described by the organization as “knowledge sharing.” Internal and external employees have presented at conferences and produced several non-refereed publications in the forms of books and a white paper. TBR also restructured the capstone course to increase and clarify the level of scholarly expectations for residents. As alluded to above, the WSCUC Review team acknowledges progress in this area and recommends continuing efforts to expand TBR’s capacity for scholarship and research and its influence within research communities.

***Recommendation 9: Continue diversity recruitment efforts, especially the recruitment of Latino Residents.***

Recruiting a diverse candidate pool has been priority for TBR. The organization continues to enroll a high percentage of non-white residents and has made impressive gains in the percentage of Latino Residents. TBR leadership has set a goal of at least 10% Latino residents in future cohorts and has taken multiple steps to reach this goal. The WSCUC team commends TBR for its work in this area and recommends continued attention to diversity, especially in regard to Latino candidates and residents.

***Recommendation 10: Continue to document accreditation requirements as described in the Compliance Audit Checklist.***

The Compliance Audit Checklist with links to documentation has been reviewed by the WSCUC staff liaison with TBR found to be in compliance with all items.

## **Report on The Broad Residency Program**

The WSCUC Review team devoted considerable time and attention to reviewing evidence presented in the Educational Effective Review Institutional Report and appendices. Prior to the site visit, several questions were identified that, in the view of team members, required clarification, verification, or additional evidence. During the visit, the team was able to address each of these questions and to verify other information included in the appendix. This section discusses the results of this review. It is organized, first, by the sub-headings within the WSCUC standards and then by the headings from the Institutional Report. As appropriate, associated CFRs are identified.

### **Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives**

#### **Institutional Purposes (CFR 1.1, 1.2, 1.3)**

The Broad Center for Management of School Systems has a laudable educational purpose, appropriate for an institution providing a single graduate degree. Its purposes are expressed specifically (albeit briefly) in its board-approved mission statement: “to raise [K-12] student achievement by recruiting, training and supporting leadership talent from across America to transform urban school systems.” This single mission statement encompasses the purposes of both The Broad Academy and The Broad Residency program. It is widely disseminated in institutional catalogs, handbooks and marketing materials, and is well-understood by all institutional stakeholders (CFR 1.1).

The Broad Residency Program has a well-articulated set of educational objectives for the eight teaching sessions conducted during the two-year program as well as the student residencies themselves. Learning outcomes cover educational/leadership theory as well as the skills necessary to effect change in a public urban education system. The Dimensions of Leadership (DoL) matrix is a central component in assessing the types of learning and practice that will be necessary for TBR graduates to be effective. The DoL are clearly defined and relate coherently to TBR goals. Each resident’s progression is extensively tracked throughout the program with input from both internal and external faculty as well as the mentors/supervisors with whom the resident works during -residency. The task of monitoring the progress of each individual resident

and comparing the achievements of any cohort with preceding cohorts is accomplished through a customized tool that assists in the measurement of resident's academic work and residency experience. This Performance Assessment and Support System (PASS) has been in place over the past three academic years, has undergone several improvements, and has contributed significantly to the ability of the faculty and leadership to gauge the achievement of the institution's educational objectives (CFR 1.2).

Data on residents' career progression, as well as graduation and retention rates disaggregated by gender and race, are made available to program applicants and the public through the institution's website and printed materials. The material on residents' career progression is more extensive than was available during the CPR visit and demonstrates a commitment to use appropriate data analysis to review program effectiveness. Although this analysis has not led to dramatic program changes since the 2012 CPR visit, every indication is that TBR is painstaking and comprehensive in its assessments of its programs, residents' learning and satisfaction during the residency period, and throughout the residents' career progression (CFR 1.2).

It is important to note that TBC board and leadership are not satisfied in assessing program effectiveness only by tracking its graduates' career continuation and advancement. TBC has the vision of spearheading a movement of leaders "dedicated to creating and transforming local, state, and national education systems" (see "TBC Strategies, Goals & Metrics," May 2012). The desired outcome is to help develop an identifiable group of urban school systems with dramatically improved student results whose reforms could be replicated across the United States. This is obviously an extraordinarily wide and ambitious undertaking (CFR 1.2). TBR's success in developing strategies to realize this vision will be discussed further in the team's report on Standard 2.

The same level of commitment attached to assessing program effectiveness and student success is also evident in developing and assessing the institution's leadership. TBC has a robust performance and development process. Formal reviews are conducted annually and development plans are formulated as appropriate. Opportunities for internal and external professional development are available. During the team visit, faculty and staff expressed

satisfaction with these development opportunities, with the evaluation system, and with an institutional culture of support and commitment to excellence. The TBC Board conducts an annual review of the CEO (CFR 1.3).

### **Integrity (CFR 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9)**

#### ***Academic Freedom***

The Broad Residency Program uses the statement on academic freedom formulated by the Association of American Colleges and Universities, and publishes this statement in its Faculty Handbook and Residency Handbook. The policy supports academic freedom for faculty and Residents. The procedure to be followed in case there is a grievance is also published in the Residency Handbook. There have not been any complaints made regarding violations of academic freedom (CFR 1.4).

#### ***Diversity***

The Broad Residency Program has a clear diversity statement, based upon an explicitly formulated value system, published in appropriate handbooks and websites. In addition, part of one teaching session for residents is devoted to the issue of race and identity. The institution has conducted an extensive diversity survey, covering 2010-2014, for its staff. The survey identifies gender and race, as well as economic, cultural and educational diversity. TBC has achieved a strong record for its staff with 19 percent African-American, 21 percent Latino, and 18 percent Asian-American.

Diversity among TBR residents is slightly more problematic. Gender diversity is not the issue. Indeed, for the 2013 entering cohort, 61 percent of the residents were female. African-Americans constituted 29 percent of residents in 2012 and 27 percent in 2013. But Latinos constituted only 2 percent of residents in 2012 and 9 percent in 2013. Given the institution's focus on urban education, there is a strong desire on the part of TBR leaders to increase the percentage of Latino residents. Several steps have been taken to address this issue. Two Latinos serve on the four-person recruiting team. Recruitment will be expanded to include tier-two business schools where the percentage of Hispanic students may be higher. Outreach to minority organizations such as the National Society of Hispanic MBAs and Management for

Tomorrow (a career development organization for minorities) will be enhanced. The team supports continued monitoring of the impact of TBR's Latino recruitment efforts. The institutional goal of increasing such residents from 9 percent in 2013 to 10 percent over the next two years, while realistic, may be overly modest (CFR 1.5).

### *Autonomy*

Although TBC was founded in 2003 by The Broad Foundation, TBC receives its major funding from TBF, and four of TBC's board members also serve on the TBF board, the institution has not experienced any interference in its substantive decision-making or educational functioning. TBF and TBC have taken several steps to ensure and clarify TBC's autonomy. For example, TBF's president has signed the Certificate of Related Entity as stipulated by the WSCUC Senior College and University Commission. The quorum requirements for TBC's board have been changed so that a majority of the independent board members<sup>2</sup> now constitute a quorum. TBC board has been organized into three standing committees (executive, program and audit). The Grant Agreement between TBF and TBC has been revised to condition the power that TBF has to withdraw funding from TBC in the eventuality of an unacceptable change in the CEO position at TBC. According to the terms of the Grant Agreement, TBF has the right to be notified of any material changes in the employment of TBC's CEO, to review the curriculum vita of the proposed CEO replacement, and to determine if that replacement is "reasonably acceptable." If an acceptable replacement cannot be found, TBF has the right to terminate its Grant Agreement and suspend all payments. However, a stipulation has been added to the Grant Agreement that, in the unlikely event that TBF would cut off future funding, sufficient support would continue so that any current student would be able to complete the program of study.

The changes described above are quite positive and the demonstrable fact is that TBC has enjoyed appropriate autonomy throughout its 12 year history. Yet some concerns remain. The Broad Center executive and audit committees are small (only three members) and coextensive, i.e., the same three board members serve on each committee. Of the 13 TBC board members, at the time of the visit only five were serving ~~serve~~ on any of the three standing committees. WSCUC Standards do not stipulate the number or composition of board committees, but the

---

<sup>2</sup> TBC board members who are not also on the TBF board are considered "independent."

review team suggests that TBC consider increasing the number of board members on its committees and thereby involve more board members in its important committee functions (CFR 1.6). At TBC board meeting during the team visit, steps were taken both to increase board membership and establish the functions and membership of the board's program committee.

TBC is exceptionally transparent in its selection process for residents with clear data about the program of study, its demands, its length, and its financing. Residents are also made aware of the career path that is available to them upon completing the program. Information about ~~prior~~ graduates is published and shared with program candidates. The recruitment process is rigorous, and prospective residents are given all the information necessary for them to make an informed decision about entering the program. In addition, candidates are provided the opportunity to discuss the program with alumni. Since all this information about the program is published in the institutional website and/or made available in recruitment brochures, TBR is transparent in presenting itself also to the larger public (CFR 1.6, 1.7).

The Residency Handbook provides clear information about the eight teaching sessions and the full-time work that Residents will be doing in a public education organization. Although the usual assessment practice of assigning students a letter grade is not followed, the criteria and methods for the faculty assessment of residents' work is made explicit in the Residency Handbook. Residents are evaluated not only for their work in the teaching sessions but also for their workplace performance. The Broad Residency Program is beginning to assess the correlation (if any) between these evaluations of the residents' performance during the two-year program and residents' career progression after graduation (CFR 1.6). In all of these processes, the institution follows an appropriate policy to ensure residents' privacy in accordance with the Family Education and Privacy Act.

A grievance policy has been established and provisions for filing complaints are made available. There has been no record of complaints by Residents, faculty or staff. Student transcripts are carefully maintained (CFR 1.7). The Broad Center has no history of complaints regarding its operations. Employee surveys indicate broad satisfaction with compensation, equitable treatment, and the workplace culture. The institution's finances are audited annually by

PriceWaterhouseCoopers, and are reviewed by the Board's audit committee (CFR 1.8). Finally, TBR has consistently exhibited honest and open communication with the Accrediting Commission (CFR 1.9).

## **Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions**

### **Teaching and Learning (CFR 2.1, 2.2, 2.2b, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7)**

#### ***Program Design and Approach***

The content of the TBR program is geared to accomplish the goal of preparing motivated professionals for careers in leadership in “high-level managerial positions in school districts, charter management organizations and federal/state departments of education”

(<http://www.broadcenter.org/residency/>). The content is appropriate to the learners and the mission. External reviewers in the 2013 Program Review stated, “The general quality of their program, as evidenced in their written materials, appears to be good. There appear to be no gaps in the way in which they [TBR faculty] have designed their program” (2013 External Review, p. 5). The topics such as Foundation in Urban Education, Strategic Transformation of School Systems, and Organizational Change and Leadership include management, strategy, navigation, and connection skills and encompass the same broad areas as other “top educational leadership graduate degree programs” (Institutional Report, p. 17). A review of evidence such as a curriculum map, an assessment map, TBR’s website, syllabi, and other items along with comments provided by numerous faculty and residents demonstrate that learning outcomes have been developed; that assessments are aligned to these outcomes; that assessments have been developed; and that faculty are continuing to benchmark work and refine rubrics (CFR 2.1, 2.3, 2.4).

The Broad Residency program offers a master degree, an appropriate degree level for ~~the~~ its content and requirements. (CFR 2.1, 2.2). The faculty for the program differs, in some ways dramatically, from faculty in most graduate programs. Faculty biographies indicate that many are currently practitioners-with significant practical experience ~~and~~ but relatively little to no experience in traditional higher education systems or in conducting research.- Nevertheless, faculty appear to be qualified as expert practitioners and meet the institutional standards. The faculty category definitions do not specify degree levels. Information about current faculty indicate some do not have terminal degrees (CFR 3.1, 3.2).

### ***Informed Stakeholders***

Advanced degrees are required of applicants, a fact that is clearly stated in multiple settings including-TBR website <http://www.broadcenter.org/residency/>, the Residency Handbook, and other advising materials. Student learning outcomes (SLOs) and other expectations for student learning are stated in the form of “program-level outcomes and course outcomes” (Institutional Report, p. 19), and are included in syllabi, general policies and expectations. They can be found in a variety of locations, including the Broad Residency website, the Residency Handbook, syllabi, and assessment guidelines; as well as the curriculum map and various marketing publications (CFR 2.3).

### ***Program Goals and Outcomes***

Both the website and the Handbook (2014) offer clear evidence of alignment between programs, policies, and advising practices and SLOs. A clear example of this alignment is found on pages 18-22 of the Handbook. The table devoted to “Milestones” (p. 18) identifies foci for both Residents and advisors/supervisors and explains expectations for both at various points in the program. These milestones and explanations are aligned with SLOs in this table (CFR 2.4).

### ***Assessment of Learning***

The assessment system used in the residency program has improved greatly since the 2012 CPR visit. The current system is clear and thorough and includes Applied Learning Projects (ALPs), Capstones, 360 Feedback, and Grant Term Reports. These assessments are administered by various faculty. Data are reviewed to “determine which students need extra support” (Institutional Report, p. 19), as well as the efficacy of the program in supporting all students in achieving the program’s outcomes. The Institutional Report (pp. 20, 21) contained several examples of changes in the programs as a result of data review. Faculty also gather regularly for grading calibration meetings to “increase accuracy and fairness in scoring” (Institutional Report, p. 19, and team interviews). Faculty statements, team interviews, and meeting minutes demonstrate that faculty and staff supervisors contribute to the assessment process and, further, that they all engage in the review of assessments and benchmarks. Faculty are strongly engaged in the pursuit of Resident achievement (CFR 2.4).

A wide array of evidence suggests that TBR Residents are actively involved in learning, are challenged, and are succeeding academically and professionally. Student feedback is systematically collected at the end of each teaching session, at other times throughout the year, at program completion, and, more recently, through “impact surveys” administered to all graduates. These, among other things, consistently reveal that the program is challenging and meaningful, as submitted through the visit’s confidential email account, and as echoed among TBR residents, graduates, and faculty during interviews:

I can say with confidence that the level of rigor equals and in many cases surpasses my traditional coursework undertaken for my MBA. ...

The assignments each quarter, similar to my MBA experience, use case studies and other related reading along with project-based application and live discussion during the session. I have found that, unlike my MBA program where I could scrape by in class without thoroughly completing the reading, the Residency demands and expects a high level of preparation for everyone and for every session. (communication via WSCUC confidential email account)

Resident scores on the array of assessments, captured in a variety of data bases, charts, and graphs, demonstrate learning at a generally high (at times very high) level. Because assessment data are generated from various sources and reflect the views of different evaluators, they represent reasonably varied measures of learning. The impressive employment records of graduates<sup>3</sup> and testimonies of current students and alumni also bear witness to a high level of challenge and learning (CFR 2.5, 2.6).

### ***Assessment Collection and Communication***

The Broad Residency Program uses Salesforce to manage data. Within Salesforce, the Performance Assessment Support System (PASS) tracks student data in three categories: Work, Assignments/projects, and Engagements and Supports. PASS also is the repository for staff advisor scores, data that might not be captured through more traditional scoring mechanisms.

---

<sup>3</sup> Ninety percent of graduates from TBR have remained in education with 22 % working in cabinet level (or higher) positions.

Residents have access to their scored assignments and scores via PASS (CFR 2.5, 1.10, 2.12).

In addition to enabling residents and faculty to view individual, disaggregated data (CFR 2.10), the PASS System allows for aggregation and display of data in a variety of formats. These data, when viewed in the aggregate, suggest that residents achieve stated levels of attainment.

Numerous examples of evidence supporting this assertion could be cited. Some examples include:

- “90% of Residents from Cohort 2011-12 received scores at moderate to high levels of proficiency (3.0 or higher) on the year 2 Capstone” (Institutional Report, p. 20)
- “In cohort 2011-13, 100% of Residents received an average of 3.0 or higher on skills measured in the 360 Degree Feedback” (Institutional Report , p.21)
- “In cohort 2011-2013 ... 100% received an average score of 3.0 or higher on GTR#2” (Institutional Report, p.21 )(CFR 2.6).

A review of rubrics reveals that SLOs are, indeed, central to all assessment mechanisms and used by faculty in evaluating residents’ work (CFR 2.6). An ongoing review of levels of proficiency has resulted in increasing the minimum proficiency level for some assignments.

### ***Program Review***

In 2013, TBR completed a program review. The process was built around a “Results Framework” that focused on the degree to which TBR accomplished identified goals (Program Review Institutional Report; Institutional Report, p. 22). The program review involved a Institutional Report, an internal review, and an external review. The three external reviewers were recognized experts in education from prestigious graduate schools. Data reviewed included graduation and retention data and a wide range of evidence on program effectiveness. The reviewers concluded that TBR was, indeed, engaged in a high quality and “innovative approach to educating K-12 administrative leaders” (Program Review External Report, 2013, p. 6). The reviewers offered a number of accolades to TBR and provided a range of suggestions for expanded influence and program improvement. Conversations and interviews with Broad leaders, both faculty and staff, revealed that TBR is taking the results of the program review to heart and is engaged in ongoing inquiry, data analysis, and continuous improvement (CFR 2.7).

### **Scholarship and Creative Activity (CFR 2.8, 2.9)**

Two of the recommendations (Recommendations 1 and 8) from the CPR review had implications for the capacity of TBR to specifically address “scholarship.” The Broad Residency Program is taking these recommendations seriously and is making strides in defining and producing scholarship, engaging in and supporting creative activity, and taking a leading role in the development of instructional innovation. Evidence of attention to scholarship and creative activity for faculty, for instance, is evident in the Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA) section of the Faculty Handbook (CFR 2.8); and, for the program, in the design or redesign of several assignments including the requirement for a literature review in the Capstone (CFR 2.9).

According to the RSCA section of the Faculty Handbook, the following are expectations for faculty:

All internal faculty are expected to take part in the following RSCA activities:

- Present new knowledge to partner organizations, higher education organizations, or other support organizations working to improve public education,
- Conduct and publicly share research based on data and insight we collect through our website, newsletters and publications to be identified,
- Partner with other higher education organizations to co-create curriculum,
- Share insight and knowledge on reputable public education blogs, and
- Consistently meet with other organizations for the purpose of sharing our lessons learned and best practices. (p. XXX)

It is worth noting that TBR’s definitions of “research and scholarly activity” are quite different from those used by more traditional institutions. For example, in most traditional institutions graduate programs in education, a literature review is a typical step in the completion of scholarly research where one reviews, synthesizes, and learns from the research of others, both supporting and dissenting research.- Further, in most institutions, knowledge-sharing includes

the formats identified in the RSCA Policy and at least some “peer reviewed” sources. The WSCUC review team recognizes and applauds the fact that TBR is intentionally different from most traditional graduate programs. The team also joins the program review’s external team in hoping that TBR will “foster fundamental educational improvements beyond those directly associated with TBR” (Program Review External Report, 2013, p. 6). One way to foster such improvements would be to document successes and lessons learned through research that meets the criteria that would be recognized in traditional academic settings. The WSCUC team recommends that TBR develop its understanding using best research practices and that it continue to seek ways to expand capacity and sphere of influence within the research community.

### **Support for Student Learning and Success (CFR 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13)**

#### ***Characteristics of Incoming Residents***

As discussed earlier, TBR has a well-developed data collection/student tracking system. Using Salesforce, TBR leaders begin the process of identifying applicants’ characteristics, skills, preferences for placement, fit with program goals, and more as soon as a candidate indicates interest in a residency by submitting a resume. As the application process intensifies, candidates’ strengths and needs in relationship to the Dimensions of Leadership (DOLs) are identified, recorded, and maintained in Salesforce databases. Once admitted, TBR staff responsible for recruitment and admission uses these data as they work with program faculty and staff advisers and formally “hand off” (Institutional Report, p. 26), newly admitted residents to individuals who will support them in the program (CFR 2.10, 2.12). Resident data (both academic and non-academic) continue to be maintained in Salesforce within the Performance Assessment Support System (PASS) system. An example of the type of data that guides TBR in identifying and supporting needs of students is a rubric-guided scorecard provided by staff advisers each quarter. These and other data are used to determine “how well a resident is doing and whether or not she or he needs support” (Institutional Report, p. 21) (CFR 2.10).

#### ***Student Satisfaction and Program Climate***

As noted, PASS provides a mechanism for tracking both aggregated and disaggregated resident achievement. TBR faculty and staff review and use these data to guide and support individual

students and to make changes, if warranted, in the program (see “Analysis of Graduation Data”; “TBR Assessment Analysis”). Among the data collected are surveys from residents tracking their satisfaction-at the end of a course, at mid- and program completion, and as alumni (see “Summary of Mid- Program and End of Program Surveys”). Graduation data (see “Analysis of Graduation Data”) attest both to residents’ timely progress through the program and to TBR’s attention to this phenomenon (CFR 2.10). Worthy of note are two additional facts. The first is that residents are generally very positive about their experiences within the program. For example, on End of Program (EOP) surveys, an average 91% of Residents report being “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the program. The second important fact is that lower reports of satisfaction (e.g. a decline in satisfaction with advising on the same EOP survey in the 2011-2013 cohort) were reviewed by TBR staff and provided impetus for changes in approaches to student support. In addition, TBR has hired a very robust staff of four fulltime employees to work with the four hundred alumni of TBR and to continue to provide additional support beyond completion of the program which may represent a best practice for alumni development.

### ***Resident Supports***

Because TBR is not a traditional graduate program, its co-curricular programs are defined as focusing on supporting Residents’ development as educational leaders. These supports, as identified in “Resident Development Support” documents, include:

- Advisory Teams
- Alumni Advisors
- Staff Advisors
- 360 Feedback
- Resident Development Plans
- Supervisor Engagement
- Executive Leadership Coaching
- Activate Ed Exchange including a Residency Alumni network.

The effectiveness of these supports is measured in part by assessing the ways in which residents are making progress toward Student Learning Outcomes. More specifically, though, the various supports and the individuals who provide them are evaluated through a variety of surveys

including end of session, mid- and program completion surveys. TBR faculty, staff advisors, and others review feedback data and make changes as needed. For example, after a decline in satisfaction with staff advisors was registered by the 2011-2013 cohort, TBR “improved Staff Advisors’ training and more consistently executed best practices” (Institutional Report, p. 27). Subsequent survey data registered improvements in satisfaction (CFR 2.10, 2.11, 2.13. 4.4).

The Broad Residency Program provides complete and useful program information in a variety of venues including the Broad Residency Website, the Residency Handbook, and various other publications. Advising is the responsibility of a variety of individuals but is the primary responsibility of staff advisors, “member[s] of the TBC Team whose purpose is to provide advice (project-based, career, and general) and resources to Residents and alumni. TBR also provides executive coaches and workplace supervisors to complement and supplement staff advisors. In addition to the formal advisers noted above, each Resident is placed on an “Advisory Team or A-Team.” These teams meet at a minimum one time each quarter either face to face or electronically and provide peer to peer support for residents. Residents are also provided the opportunity to work with TBC and TBR alumni who provide support and counseling as needed (CFR 2.12, 2.13).

## **Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability**

### **Faculty and Staff** (CFR 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4)

#### ***Faculty Model***

Since the CPR visit, TBR has made staffing modifications to support its unique instructional approaches and to more comprehensively analyze the significant data it collects. As requested, TBR has worked to more fully and clearly explain key terms and the roles/expectation of the tiers of faculty and staff it utilizes. Of particular value are: Faculty Categories Definition, Faculty Duties Unbundled, and the Faculty Handbook. (CFR 3.3, 3.4). These materials are greatly enhanced by the “Faculty Model” discussion and “Support for Student Learning” essay, along with the TBR Residency Handbook and material on “Information Resources” in the Institutional Report. (CFR 2.13). As noted in the discussion of Standard 3, TBR faculty differ in several ways from faculty in most “traditional” institutions. They, however, seem to meet and exceed the expectations for practitioner expertise that the organization has adopted. Further, the faculty and the instructional and supervisory approaches they are implementing are, by all accounts, rigorous and contributing to – if not responsible for – much of the Residents’ success. Thus, the team has concluded that the faculty model is adequate and that faculty appear to meet both institutional and WSCUC standards for quality.

#### ***Qualifications***

The Broad Residency Program is very purposeful in its selection of ~~the~~ instructional and support staff in order

to leverage the very best instructors and K-12 management experts from across the country and to engage them as needed for our program. Further, as knowledge and best practices evolve, we are nimble in adapting our faculty to provide the best learning experience possible for our students.” (Institutional Report, p. xx)

In TBR's case, the on-going evaluation of on-site program components, information from workplace supervisors, and data from the other members of the support team provides the "knowledge" which has empowered its senior management to make on-going incremental changes in multiple facets of the program. (CFR 3.1, 3.2)

The Institutional Report provides faculty and staff biographies, as well as a "Faculty Highlights" document. A question the team addressed is whether the absence of normative terminal degrees for many instructors, coaches, et al., is of concern. We concluded that the depth of experience directly related to the single academic program under review more than counter-balanced this. For example, the Report noted, "Our faculty members have on average 20 years' work experience, and have spent on average 10 years working in school operating organizations" (p.32).

That TBR's model is right for them is perhaps best demonstrated by the exceptionally high rates of graduation, satisfaction, and alumni success in K-12 education. For example, the program has a "93% average graduation rate , and 91% of End of Program (EOP) survey respondents reported they were 'satisfied' or 'very satisfied'" with their overall experience in the residency program " (Institutional Report, p.34). In addition, 90% of graduates from the program's twelve years of operation continue working in education

### ***Faculty Policies and Practices***

The Institutional Report also shared information on an array of practices and policies which demonstrate TBR's attention to faculty and staff development. A few examples noted in their materials are a document on (Staff) "Performance and Development Process," multiple components of the Faculty Handbook including "Faculty Evaluation," "Faculty Development and Related Policies," and other policies (CFR 3.3, 3.4) .

Faculty and staff roles, responsibilities, and practices appear to be driven by analysis of data about Residents and their needs. The Institutional Report notes, "A large majority of Residents transition from professional careers outside of K-12 education, so they need a Team that understands the similarities and differences among sectors and can coach them through

challenges that might arise as they transition ” (p.31). Recognizing this, TBR has developed an educational staffing structure which includes not only instructors for their multi-day on-site coursework, but a network of staff advisors, executive coaches, workplace supervisors, advisory teams, career counseling and technological resources which enable focused interaction and support of each Resident. (CFR 3.1, 3.2)

The Review team appreciated TBR’s thoughtful analysis of the second suggestion 2 from the CPR report. This suggestion stated, “That key administrators are also directly involved as faculty is, in some ways, an asset in terms of achieving program quality and is attainable with monitoring in a setting like TBC and TBR, which have a limited scope of programs (CFR 3.2). This situation also presents a potential challenge, though, in that TBC/TBR personnel may experience burnout as they seek to navigate multiple roles and manage a wide and diffuse range of responsibilities.” The Broad Residency determined, “the primary driver of potential burnout in TBC’s work is the amount of travel that our model requires, both for recruitment and sessions” (Institutional Report, p.10). They have taken a number of steps to reduce travel time for both of these components. This approach has also allowed TBR to keep their leadership team engaged in the totality of the program. Personnel in these positions indicated during interviews that this was an asset in terms of their ability to engage in program review and planning, as well as to maintain their individual excitement with their positions.

### **Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources (CFR 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.10)**

#### ***Financial Resources and Management***

TBR appears to be financially stable and viable for the foreseeable future. As noted in the section on “Responses to Recommendations,” a revised grant agreement provides assurances of adequate funding on an annual basis to ensure successful operation of the residency program. Further, as noted, Eli Broad has provided a document committing to an estate gift sufficient to endow TBR for the near and distant future. It is important to note also that TBC has never over spent its budget, has a perfect record of clean audits, and has no accumulated debt CFR 3.5). While it does not have the traditional CFO position, as described in the CFO Duties Unbundled document the combination of TBC’s Executive Director, TBC’s Deputy Director of Talent and Operations, the Senior Finance Director at Family Office Financial Services (FOFS), the FOFS Tax Director,

and the FOFS investment team provide the knowledge base and time needed to address the full range of needed financial services (CFR 3.10). The Institutional Report also demonstrates how TBR uses its on-going strategic planning process “to align resources and budget”(p.34) (CFR 3.5, 3.10).

### ***Information Resources/Information Technology***

In examining information resources and technology, TBC demonstrated through the Institutional Report and attachments (see “Library Resources for Residents”; “Information Resources for Staff”) that it has appropriate resources for the nature of its program (CFR 3.6 and 3.7). The team observed and worked with TBR’s information technology and these experiences corroborated the evidence provided.

### ***Facilities***

The Broad Residency Program does not operate from a traditional campus. TBC, TBF, and TBR offices are currently housed in an impressive location on the 30<sup>th</sup> floor of the Fox Plaza in Los Angeles. The eight instructional sessions are held in high end hotel facilities around the United States in cities where TBR is active or, at least, has a presence and has been determined by investigation to be a center from where Residents will learn from and engage with educators making a difference based on Program criteria (e.g., Los Angeles, Houston, Nashville, Chicago, etc.). Facilities at each site are more than adequate to meet the instructional and other needs of faculty and residents.

### **Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes** (CFR 3.8, 3.9, 3.10, 3.11)

The Broad Center for Management of School Systems is a relatively small organization. Recognizing this and the need for many staff members to have multiple roles, TBC states “Our goal is not to create an overly hierarchical organization, rather to make management and reporting relationships clear to ensure effective decision-making, implementation, feedback, and development of Team members” (Institutional Report, p.36). TBC has intentionally created a highly collaborative daily activity and decision-making process. Yet through their organizational structure chart and information, position descriptions and evaluation process (see “Performance and Development Plan 2014”). Policies, documents, and organizational charts also provide

clarity as to who has responsibility and accountability (CFR 3.8). Interviews with faculty and staff reveal that roles, structures, and the decision-making processes are understood and appreciated by the various stakeholders.

Recognizing the importance of external faculty, TBR has taken steps, since the CPR visit, to more fully engage this critical resource. This includes “increase(ing) the amount of time given to having external faculty members plan curriculum jointly with internal faculty or create curriculum under the guidance of internal faculty”( Self –Study, p.36; see “Minutes from a Meeting with Both Internal and External Faculty”). The increasing involvement of external faculty in curriculum development was underscored during interviews with team members, as well as internal and external faculty during the site visit (CFR 3.11).

## **Standard 4 : Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement**

### **Strategic Thinking and Planning (CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.3)**

#### *Data*

Efforts have clearly been made to embed purposeful assessment throughout the residency program. From the beginning, the recruitment experience is assessed as data are gathered about the number of résumé submissions and completed applications. Candidates are screened using the DoL as criteria. Contributing to the reliability of data collection, interviewers participate in bias training and questions are reviewed on an annual basis. Following an individual interview by telephone, candidates participate in small and large group exercises onsite and are rated on their responses. Tracking of the number of individuals who completed the stages of this process contributes to informing the Recruitment and Selection team's strategic planning process and generates questions about what to study the following year from lessons learned. Similarly, the Partnerships team identifies, based on predetermined TBR criteria, appropriate placements for residents and tracks skill requirements, national locations, and organizational cultures (CFR 4.1, 4.3).

Three academic program goals are defined by 12 program-level learning outcomes (PLOs); the curriculum map aligns multiple measures and evaluation methods to the PLOs. Data collection is systematic, includes reflection, and informs planning which is aligned with the mission. Multiple program data include five direct and three indirect assessments. Data from each assessment are used for various purposes as indicators of student learning, student satisfaction, partner organization satisfaction, and student success. A demonstration of how assessment data are imported into Salesforce revealed data profiles of each assessment by Residents. Residents' comparison with others in the cohort (presented in aggregate) were also provided. Internal faculty and advisors are able to monitor each Resident's growth as well as identify any concerns should assignments not be completed. An external agency was contracted to design more robust assessment measures as well as to create and administer surveys. External faculty spoke of the detailed immediate feedback they received from students, both through numeric scores and

written comments from students. External faculty also stated that the feedback informed change, particularly in the composition and delivery of the curriculum (CFR 4.3, 4.5).

### ***Annual Strategic Planning***

Strategic plans are owned by three teams: Recruitment and Selection, Partnerships, and Program. Each team creates an annual plan to accomplish tasks that, while focused, also incorporate interdependencies. A consistent member on all teams is the managing director. Following data analysis, teams write the strategic plan. The WSCUC team heard of the value of this process and how outcomes were transparent and communicated at multiple venues. Commitment to use of data is evidenced in the new position of assistant director of data and analysis. Continued collection of data provided opportunities for trend analysis. The process of data collection, analysis, communication of results, and implementation of informed change provides an excellent example of how assessment informs action for residents (CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.5) .

### ***Five-year Program Review***

The young age of TBR has contributed to only one program review within their five-year program review cycle. The review completed in 2013 was guided by four key questions and focused on the analysis of evidence about program quality and viability. External reviewers provided feedback noting the currency of the curriculum content and practices, which was also verified by the 2014 review team through interviews with faculty, residents, and alumni. TBR's Educational Effectiveness Institutional Report was described by internal faculty as an experience that "shifted our thinking, incorporated self-reflection and had impact on the organization to move forward, [permeating] from the Board to the order in which classes are taught" (CFR 2.7, 4.1).

### ***Stakeholder Engagement***

Stakeholders are identified as candidates, residents, faculty, alumni, and representatives from partner organizations. Evidence was provided that each stakeholder group played a role in the program improvement process and that multiple strategies for engagement are used. Candidates provide feedback on the interview process, internal and external faculty are provided with

opportunities to inform the curriculum, and alumni serve as application reviewers, interviewers, and as coaches for Residents. A newly formed alumni advisory board was created with a charter and meetings have begun. The outcome of engagement strategies, particularly evident during conversations with alumni, indicated a commitment to the residency model and support for ongoing engagement. Alumni expressed how the residency was leaving an “imprint” -in the educational community, which was reaching out to potential future residents. The WSCUC team discovered that many of the current residents were referred to the program by alumni. The team also heard responses from supervisors who described their oversight of Residents as “not burdensome.” The recent distribution of module readings and assignments contributed to a “much more connected” experience for supervisors, who described their engagement as contributing to “becoming a better supervisor” (CFR 4.8).

### ***Implementation***

The Broad Residency is an action oriented program led by teams who use plans to guide action on a daily basis. Further, the teams use the results of actions to inform and revise plans as needed. This is most obviously seen in the responses to data suggesting either strengths or weakness in the curriculum or Resident support structures (e.g., changing the order of some modules based on resident data; improving the advising system as a result of resident survey data). It is further evident in the inclusion of a wider variety of stakeholders, such as alumni, staff advisers, and supervisors, in assessments and evaluations of both residents and the program (CFR 4.8). It is also evident in changes ~~within changes~~ within organizational structures such as the addition of a full- time data analysis position to support data-driven decision making (CFR 3.2, 4.3, 4.7). Finally, the commitment to use both plans and data to guide action is evident in the positive attitude of top level leadership. Indeed, the embracing of opportunities to improve by the TBC Board and Executive Director set a tone that appears to have permeated and shaped a supportive, caring, “continuous improvement” culture (CFR 4.6).

### **Commitment to Learning and Improvement (CFR 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8)**

Commitment to learning and improvement is evidenced in multiple ways. Evidence was provided illustrating ongoing data analysis, annual strategic planning, and the five-year program review process. There is a symbiotic connectedness between various TBR program components

and implementation teams, all guided by the mission. The program team continues to be committed to reflection on practice following sessions with residents, and what they learn leads to plans for improvement. Residents also engage in reflection multiple times during the eight course sessions and they also complete surveys to provide feedback (CFR 4.5, 4.6).

Alumni spoke of the rigor embedded in the program that fostered a learning environment comparable or exceeding ~~experiences of~~ the “traditional” master’s programs. Changes to the capstone assignment demonstrated a commitment to support the research rigor of the program. Writing is being developed through ongoing journal entries that culminate in reflection papers at the end of years one and two. Residents are required to provide a literature review for the **capstone** course and internal faculty are considering the role research will contribute to the capstone experience. The scoring rubric was also enhanced with more detail, and papers were scored at calibration sessions for faculty, also resulting in improving the language of the rubrics. Both alumni and residents commended the delivery of the program using adult learning pedagogy, as well as the constant application of theoretical materials, an indication of commitment to their learning (CFR 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7).

External faculty described an improvement in the delivery of the curriculum with a greater attention to program continuity throughout the modules. These faculty described more involvement in the teaching and learning process, an improvement from a more disengaged model in the past. An appreciation was expressed for supervisors’ connections with residents. Special mention was made of the importance of faculty and staff supervisors, to the extent they are able, to be present when residents’ leadership stories are shared. An organizational culture survey (bi-annual employee engagement survey) was conducted with results providing evidence of a high level of commitment to continuous improvement (CFR 4.6, 4.7, 4.8).

The commitment to learning and improvement embraces the residency experience as an “authentic” networking system, whereby alumni are engaged in regional gatherings designed to “refresh and energize”. Resources available to residents and extended to alumni include The Exchange (an online tool) that creates an internal data base, access to the 360 degree feedback tool, and consultation with effective coaches (CFR 4.4, 4.6, 4.7).

## **Commendations and Recommendations**

### **Commendations**

The WSCUC Review Team commends:

1. TBR for its careful analysis of each of the CPR Team report recommendations as well as the exceptional quality of the entire EER Institutional Report. (CFR 1.9)
2. TBR for its thorough and transparent processes to inform prospective residents about the program and to reach its decisions about whom to select for each cohort. (CFR 1.7, 1.8)
3. TBR for its commitment to increase the number of Latino residents, and to have increased the percentage of Latino residents from two percent in the 2012-13 cohort to nine percent in 2013-14 cohort. (CFR 1.5)
4. TBR for substantial progress in the development of an evolving and robust assessment system. (CFR 2.6, 2.10, 2.11, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5)
5. TBR for its ongoing revision of the program reflecting a pervasive spirit of inquiry and a commitment continuous improvement. (CFR 2.6, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5)
6. The thoughtful and complete engagement by TBC leaders and staff as they addressed their unique governance and financial relationship issues with TBF. (CFR 3.8, 3.9)
7. TBR's ongoing efforts to evaluate and realign the support system for residents, supervisors, faculty, and alumni. (CFR 3.4)
8. TBC for its spirit of graciousness, optimism, professionalism, and humility. (CFR 4.1, 4.6)

### **Recommendations**

The WSCUC Review Team recommends that:

1. TBR continue its outreach to Latino residents with a goal of maintaining momentum in this area. (CFR 1.5)

2. TBR build on the strong assessment system and continue research efforts to evaluate impact as defined by TBR's mission. (CFR 1.3, 2.6, 2.10, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5)
3. TBR carefully consider approaches to purposeful data collection to adequately inform decisions and data analysis that are aligned with best research practices and continue to seek ways to expand their capacity and sphere of influence within the research community. (CFR 2.8, 2.9)
4. TBC continue its efforts to develop the Board's Program Committee, to diversity its Board, and to more fully document Board member engagement. (CFR 3.8, 3.9)
5. TBR utilize its assessment system to explicitly document that it has not only the needed fiscal, physical, and informational resources, but also that it has fully deployed internal and external faculty in the on-going improvement of the academic program. (CFR 3.1, 3.10, 3.11)
6. TBC clarify whether or not the "designated observer" position mentioned in the grant agreement, when filled, is a TBC board member. If this individual is not a board member, then the team recommends that the grant agreement specify the obligations this person has to maintain confidentiality and other obligations to TBC. (CRF 3.8)

## Appendix: Compliance Checklist

### CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW CHECKLIST

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)																								
Policy on credit hour	<p>Is this policy easily accessible?  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES</p> <p>Internally, it is located on The Broad Center's online document management system (Simon) and in the Residents Handbook, Appendix B: Syllabi.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Courses range from 5 to 10 credits.</li> <li>• Process for designating credit Hours (CA.1.7.6.6) provided. 1 CH – 15 clock hours. Practicum: 120 hours = 1 CH (1200 worked = 10 CH)</li> <li>• Program = 44 CH. From 2014 Residency Handbook:</li> </ul> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Courses</th> <th style="text-align: left;"></th> <th style="text-align: left;">Academic Credits</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>101A/B</td> <td>Foundations of urban education</td> <td>5 credits</td> </tr> <tr> <td>201 A/B</td> <td>Leadership development</td> <td>5 credits</td> </tr> <tr> <td>301 A/B</td> <td>Organizational change</td> <td>5 credits</td> </tr> <tr> <td>401A/B</td> <td>Strategic transformation of educational systems</td> <td>5 credits</td> </tr> <tr> <td>501 A/B</td> <td>First year practicum</td> <td>10 credits</td> </tr> <tr> <td>601 A/B</td> <td>Second year practicum</td> <td>10 credits</td> </tr> <tr> <td>701 A/B</td> <td>Master's thesis/ Capstone</td> <td>4 credits</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO The Policy is not available to an outside audience; details about credits are provided in the Residency Handbook..</p> <p>The phrase "credit hour" does not appear on the Achievement and Accreditation webpage <a href="http://www.broadcenter.org/residency/about/resident-achievement-and-accreditation-status-data-and-statistics#AccreditationStatus">http://www.broadcenter.org/residency/about/resident-achievement-and-accreditation-status-data-and-statistics#AccreditationStatus</a>, nor does it link to information on the general search of the website.</p> <p>Where is the policy located? As noted above.</p> <p>Comments: As noted above.</p>	Courses		Academic Credits	101A/B	Foundations of urban education	5 credits	201 A/B	Leadership development	5 credits	301 A/B	Organizational change	5 credits	401A/B	Strategic transformation of educational systems	5 credits	501 A/B	First year practicum	10 credits	601 A/B	Second year practicum	10 credits	701 A/B	Master's thesis/ Capstone	4 credits
Courses		Academic Credits																							
101A/B	Foundations of urban education	5 credits																							
201 A/B	Leadership development	5 credits																							
301 A/B	Organizational change	5 credits																							
401A/B	Strategic transformation of educational systems	5 credits																							
501 A/B	First year practicum	10 credits																							
601 A/B	Second year practicum	10 credits																							
701 A/B	Master's thesis/ Capstone	4 credits																							
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	<p>Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Every 5 years</li> </ul> <p>Does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explicit calculations are available illustrating use of the credit hour in course work, practicum, and the capstone.</li> </ul> <p>Comments:</p>																								
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	<p>Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours?  <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2014 Residency Handbook, p. 7, lists session dates for 2 years and locations; number of hours not indicated.</li> <li>• Courses 501 and 601 indicate 1200 hours in practicum each</li> <li>• Courses 101 through 701 are available and in the Residency Handbook.</li> <li>• "Course-level outcomes are articulated in <a href="#">syllabi</a>, instructional materials, assignments, and assessment rubrics for all courses." P. 20 EER Institutional Report</li> <li>• Gaps of information are missing in the syllabi including CH, rubrics</li> <li>• Syllabi provided are excerpts from the Residency Handbook. Information includes Course description, CLOs, requirements for a "pass" grade, and assignment schedule.</li> <li>• Syllabi do not include the # CH, descriptions of assignments nor descriptions of assessment criteria and how these are aligned with the CLOs.</li> </ul>																								
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	<p>How many syllabi were reviewed?  <b>N/A.</b> No online courses.</p> <p>What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)?</p> <p>What degree level(s)?</p> <p>What discipline(s)?</p> <p>Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments:</p>																								

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
<p>Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated)  <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i></p>	<p>How many syllabi were reviewed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Courses 101 through 701 are available and in the Residency Handbook. All 7 were reviewed.</li> <li>• Courses 501 and 601 indicate 1200 hours in practicum each</li> </ul>
	<p>What kinds of courses? "Regular" courses; Practicum courses; Master's Thesis/Capstone course</p>
	<p>What degree level(s)? Master's degree</p>
	<p>What discipline(s)? Educational Leadership</p>
	<p>Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO in combination with material available in Schoology provided to Residents.</p>
	<p>Comments:</p>
<p>Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)</p>	<p>How many programs were reviewed? One. Only one program available.</p>
	<p>What kinds of programs were reviewed? Educational Leadership</p>
	<p>What degree level(s)? MA</p>
	<p>What discipline(s)? Education</p>
	<p>Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>
	<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The time span of the program is two years</li> <li>• Details of the residents in session and between sessions is articulated in other places, is structured, and monitored.</li> </ul>

Review Completed By: Halyna Kornuta  
Date: October 17, 2014

**2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW CHECKLIST**

Under federal regulation\*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s recruiting and admissions practices.

<b>Material Reviewed</b>	<b>Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.</b>	<b>Verified Yes/No</b>
**Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students?  Comments:	Yes
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide accurate information about the typical length of time to degree? <a href="http://www.broadcenter.org/residency/about/curriculum">http://www.broadcenter.org/residency/about/curriculum</a> Two years. <a href="http://www.broadcenter.org/residency/about/faq">http://www.broadcenter.org/residency/about/faq</a> Two years. 2014 Residency Handbook <i>At the conclusion of the two-year program</i> (p. 6).	Yes
	Does the institution provide accurate information about the overall cost of the degree? 2014 Residency Handbook, p. 46. Note: Tablets required with partial subsidy; the website indicates: Residents are required to provide their own tablet computer (i.e. iPad, Android, etc.). - See more at: <a href="http://www.broadcenter.org/residency/about/curriculum#sthash.bMeBHyni.dpuf">http://www.broadcenter.org/residency/about/curriculum#sthash.bMeBHyni.dpuf</a>	Yes
	Comments:	
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide accurate information about the <b>kinds of jobs</b> for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? Alumni work positions listed <a href="http://www.broadcenter.org/residency/about/support-after-the-residency">http://www.broadcenter.org/residency/about/support-after-the-residency</a>	Yes
	Does the institution provide accurate information about the <b>employment of its graduates</b> , as applicable? Alumni work positions listed <a href="http://www.broadcenter.org/residency/about/support-after-the-residency">http://www.broadcenter.org/residency/about/support-after-the-residency</a> Resident Roles <a href="http://www.broadcenter.org/residency/about/resident-roles">http://www.broadcenter.org/residency/about/resident-roles</a>	Yes
	Comments:  Additional clarity to students in marketing materials that indicates that “Faculty” are guest, lecturers, and/or speakers. <a href="http://www.broadcenter.org/residency/about/curriculum">http://www.broadcenter.org/residency/about/curriculum</a> The search engine is not useful – error message appears consistently.	

\*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)

\*\*Section 487 (a)(20) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) prohibits Title IV eligible institutions from providing incentive compensation to employees or third party entities for their success in securing student enrollments. Incentive compensation includes commissions, bonus payments, merit salary adjustments, and promotion decisions based solely on success in enrolling students. These regulations do not apply to the recruitment of international students residing in foreign countries who are not eligible to receive Federal financial aid.

Review Completed By: Halyna Kornuta  
Date: October 17, 2014

**3 - STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW CHECKLIST**

Under federal regulation\*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s student complaints policies, procedures, and records.

<b>Material Reviewed</b>	<b>Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)</b>	<b>Verified Yes/No</b>
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints?	Yes
	Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where?  The Policy is found in the 2014 Residency Handbook (p. 58): Grievance Policy and Procedure. The Residency Handbook is provided to students and also available in Schoology. Information is also provided about FERPA in the 2014 Residency Handbook.	Yes
	Comments:	
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? Please describe briefly:  Residents (students) are first requested to resolve problems between student and faculty or staff member informally; if problem can't be resolved informally, the Resident communicates informally with the supervisor. If unresolved, the Resident submits a letter to the Associate Director of Resident Training. If still unresolved, a three member Grievance Board is formed. If this does not solve the problem, student may appeal in writing to the Executive Director of The Broad Center.	Yes
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure? Institution reported "Yes".  The institution has not had any student complaints to date.	Yes
	Comments:	
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? Where?  All documents of this type are archived in the internal shared drive, Simon.	Yes
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? Please describe briefly:  The institution has not had any student complaints to date, but if complaints were made, electronic files would be saved in a protected folder on the online document management system.	Yes
	Comments:	

\*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)

See also WSCUC Senior College and University Commission’s Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.

Review Completed By: Halyna Kornuta

Date: October 17, 2014

**4 - TRANSFER CREDIT REVIEW CHECKLIST**

Under federal regulations\*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices accordingly.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)	Verified Yes/No
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit?  The institution reported "yes." In the 2014 Residency Handbook, p. 59, the statement concerns the transferability of units for the purposes of Residents who may be interested in receiving credit for their Resident experience at another institution.	N/A
	Is the policy publically available? If so, where?  2014 Residency Handbook  Upon review, TBC is considering the addition of a statement that indicates that incoming transfer credits are not accepted. The Resident must complete all of courses at TBC.	Yes
	Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education?	N/A
	Comments:	

\*§602.24(e): Transfer of credit policies. The accrediting agency must confirm, as part of its review for renewal of accreditation, that the institution has transfer of credit policies that--

(1) Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and

(2) Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

See also WSCUC Senior College and University Commission's Transfer of Credit Policy.

Review Completed By: Halyna Kornuta

Date: October 17, 2014

