The team evaluated the institution under the WASC Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities. 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. This report and the Commission letter are made available to the public by publication on the WASC website.
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SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Visit

The High Tech High Graduate School of Education (HTHGSE or GSE) opened in September 2007. Located in San Diego, the GSE is closely connected physically and pedagogically to High Tech High, a public charter school management organization. The mission of the GSE is to develop reflective practitioner leaders who work effectively with colleagues and communities to create and sustain innovative, authentic, and rigorous learning environments for all students.

The GSE is committed to providing its students with learning experiences that are personalized, authentic, and relevant. This commitment is derived from the theoretical approach to teaching and learning that guides High Tech High K-12 schools, which centers students in the adult world of work and learning through integrated curriculum and heterogeneous grouping practices. Innovative curriculum, a culture of collaboration, and a total-immersion learning communities serve as hallmarks for the High Tech High pedagogy that is rooted in authentic experiences.

The HTH GSE offers two Master’s of Education (M.Ed.) programs: School Leadership and Teacher Leadership. In 2007, the HTH GSE opened with a cohort of nine HTH teachers enrolled in the Teacher Leadership M.Ed. program. In 2008, the School Leadership program welcomed its first cohort of 6 candidates and the Teacher Leadership program expanded to include external candidates, bringing in a new cohort of 16. Candidates from these original cohorts graduated in 2009 and 2010. Currently, there are
14 candidates in the School Leadership program and 21 candidates in the Teacher Leadership program.

HTH GSE’s accreditation history dates back to 2007 when the institution was granted eligibility. The CPR Candidacy visit was scheduled for spring 2009 and the EER candidacy visit was scheduled for spring 2010. A CPR visit for candidacy took place in March 2009. Following the review of the CPR visit, the EER visit for candidacy was moved to spring 2011. The EER visit took place in February 2011. In June 2011, the Commission received the EER report and deferred action on candidacy for one year in order for the institution to demonstrate that it meets the WASC Standards and CFR’s at the level required for candidacy. A Special Visit was scheduled for spring 2012 to review progress on the issues cited by the commission.

The Special Visit focused on the following four issues as identified by the Commission Action Letter of July 2011, and each topic below includes the related directives from the end of that Commission Action Letter:

Leadership and Governance: “The Commission expects GSE to develop and document an organizational structure that clearly defines administrative positions and explicitly delineates lines of responsibility and to establish and implement a system of performance evaluation.” The School is also advised “to finalize organizational and board-related policies and procedures and processes for decision-making.” The Commission directed the team to also examine the “GSE’s development as an educational institution offering programs at the graduate level, which are evaluated through a regular system of program review.” (CFRs 1.3, 3.1, 3.3, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10)
Organizational Structure and Decision-Making Processes: There exists an ongoing concern about the dual roles of many of the School’s administrators, faculty and staff. The shared personnel arrangements between the GSE and HTH needs to be formalized through shared service agreements or contracts. As well the Commission urged GSE “to identify and provide for the human resources needs of the graduate programs and to clarify the responsibilities of those individuals who have dual roles”. The Commission noted the Special Visit team should review progress on “a stable and effective administrative and governance structure with clear decision-making processes and roles.” (CFRs 3.1, 3.2, 3.8)

Educational Effectiveness: The Commission noted a need “to fully develop and align institutional learning outcomes, program learning outcomes and course-level learning outcomes.” The Commission states that it also expects “GSE to shift from reliance on indirect evidence of student learning to direct evidence and to be able to demonstrate what students are learning and how results from assessment are used for improvement.” The Commission instructed the team to examine progress on “student learning outcomes and systematic processes to assess student learning and use [of] the results for improvement,” as well as on the development of “a regular system of program review.” (CFRs 1.2, 2.3, 2.10, 4.4, 4.5)

Graduate Culture: The Commission letter states the creation of a graduate culture is a matter of institutional identity as well as a curricular and pedagogical focus. This means GSE must develop a clearly identified graduate school faculty, and support for research, scholarship and creative activity by faculty and students that “moves beyond local practice,” extending to peers outside of the GSE. The Commission recommends “looking
to good practice in peer institutions of graduate education for model policies and practices in areas such as admissions, thesis requirements, information resources, and faculty workload and scholarship.” The Commission requested review of progress on “the creation of policies and practices that reflect institutional support for scholarship and creative activity,” including a public, agreed-upon definition of scholarship..and promotion of externally validated research activities. (CFRs 2.1, 2.2b, 2.8, 2.9, 3.3, 3.4, 3.6)

The Special Visit did not include review of any off-campus sites or distance education programs. No substantive change issues were included as part of this Special Visit. A compliance audit was not conducted.

B. Quality of the Special Visit Report and Supporting Evidence

Upon receiving the 2011 Commission Action Letter, the GSE formed a Report Committee and contracted the services of an external Assessment Consultant recommended by WASC. The Report Committee was comprised of the GSE Administrative Dean/WASC ALO, the President and the two Program Directors. Over a five-month period, this Committee worked together to document, draft, review and finalize the Special Visit Report. The GSE’s Board of Directors received the report in December 2011 with an opportunity to provide feedback. In addition, the Dean and Chief Academic Officer were integral to decisions made in response to WASC Action Letter recommendations and provided feedback on the report.

Program faculty members were integral to the development and alignment of institutional learning outcomes, program learning outcomes and course-level learning outcomes. Faculty participated in all aspects of refining signature assignments and
evaluation processes, developing the program review process and criteria, and assessing fidelity of all these process with the GSE mission.

The GSE report is presented in an order different from the order of the topics in the Commission Action Letter as summarized above. The GSE report is organized around four key issues taken from those topics in the following order: program review, scholarship and creative activity, administration and governance, and learning outcomes and assessment. It addresses related issues from the Commission Action Letter and the EER team as appropriate. This team report has followed the organization of the GSE report, noting the issue identified by the Commission in parentheses after the section title, and incorporating the issues highlighted in the Commission Action Letter within each section.

The institution carefully reflected on each issue and engaged in serious, extensive discussion and action. The GSE utilized appropriate methodology to respond to each issue that frames the Special Visit report. This methodology includes delineation of the issue, a description of the steps taken in response, identification of appropriate evidence to assess steps taken, a report of findings and next steps, and finally, a reflective assessment on the effectiveness of the changes. This methodology provides a complete circle of assessment that effectively informs the institution’s progress toward meeting institutional goals and expectations.

The GSE’s Special Visit report includes evidence that directly responds to the issues described in the report. The evidence clearly reports on actions and steps the institution has taken in order to show effective and sustainable action around each issue. The GSE analyzed their existing evidence, identified gaps and took action to produce
evidence in such a way that fostered growth and movement toward meeting WASC standards. The GSE draws reasonable conclusions based on the evidence produced. The actions steps were reasonable and effective to bring GSE to the point that it is at the time of the Special Visit.

C. Description of the Team Review Process

Each team member engaged in an independent review of the High Tech High GSE Special Visit Report and all materials provided by WASC regarding previous High Tech High visits including the 2011 Commission letter. The team Chair assigned areas of focus to each team member based on his or her areas of expertise. Team members filled out a Team Worksheet for the Special Visit Review Conference Call that the Assistant Chair compiled into a single Worksheet prior to the conference call. During the conference call the team reviewed the four issues and discussed the GSE report response in detail. The team identified areas of strength, remaining questions and additional evidence needed.

The Assistant Chair contacted the GSE ALO and requested additional evidence. The team reviewed the additional evidence prior to the visit.

The team met the first evening of the visit to review the evidence and develop appropriate lines of inquiry based on the evidence. Team members composed interview questions appropriate to the individuals and groups to be interviewed that probed into identified lines of inquiry. During the visit the team carefully reviewed evidence provided in the team room and conducted interviews with a variety of individuals and groups.
across the campus. The team debriefed regularly to triangulate interview evidence and to refine interview questions.

During the visit, the team reviewed the GSE’s report, all evidence submitted with the report, and supplemental materials provided in the team room. Additionally, the team conducted interviews with the President, the President’s Cabinet, Program Directors, Administrative Dean, Dean, Chief Academic Officer, Program Directors, Program Adjunct Faculty, students, alumni, the Board of Trustees and others to provide additional evidence and verification of the materials reviewed.

SECTION II – TEAM ANALYSIS OF THE ISSUES

Program Review (Graduate Culture)

Specifically, the team looked at the issues identified by the July 2011 Commission letter of a) developing appropriate policies and procedures for a graduate-level institution, b) developing program review and aligning learning outcomes, and c) cultivating leadership for, and a culture of, assessment. In responding to this issue, the review team evaluated the HTH GSE Special Visit Report, Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) Aligned With ISSLC Professional Standards for School Leaders, Institutional Review Plan and related appendices, Functional Area Plan (FAP) Evaluation, Annual Program Assessment Reports, Enrollment Functional Area Plan, Benchmarking Against Peers, and course syllabi. In addition, the team met with members of the President’s Cabinet, as a whole and individually, as well as in various groupings to discuss questions in detail. The team also met with current students and alumni.

The GSE planning documents are well thought out and well designed. Now, they need to move to implementation. It will be difficult to know how well their plans have
been implemented without further review of their progress at a later date. (CFR 1.2, 2.3, 2.10, 4.4, 4.5)

In their 2010-11 enrollment, 65% of their teacher leadership graduate students are external to HTH and 25% of their school leadership candidates are external to HTH. A mix of students from outside of HTH employment will increase diversity of perspectives and challenge ideas in a manner that is most conducive to graduate education. Students reported they believe they are challenged to think outside of their own practices and experiences and to consider theories and pedagogies arising from multiple perspectives about teaching, learning, schooling, equity and social justice to name a few topics. (CFR 2.2)

In review of 15 of the GSE 17 course syllabi, the courses appear to be designed for the graduate level. The GSE clearly align its course syllabi with its program outcomes, articulate criteria for evaluation of their assignments, and engage their students in levels of self-inquiry and inquiry into their students’ work or other related course projects. While the courses are offered as pass-fail, the criteria for what constitutes a passing grade are clearly articulated. The team appreciates the GSE’s refinement of its inquiry courses to include qualitative methodology in addition to action research. Such inclusion expands options for emerging school and teacher leaders to be better equipped for what they may encounter in their own practice. (CFR 2.2b)

The inclusion of development and implementation of advisory boards in coaching faculty on further development of the curriculum and its evaluation is wise. The institution might also consider continuing current efforts to further network with other professionals doing similar scholarly work. The team applauds the GSE for enrolling the
Administrative Dean in the WASC Assessment Leadership Academy and encourages the GSE to involve faculty as well. (CFRs 2.1, 2.2b, 2.8, 2.9, 3.3, 3.4)

**Scholarship and Creative Activity (Graduate Culture)**

Specifically, the team looked at the issues of developing appropriate polices and procedures for a graduate-level institution and supporting faculty scholarship. In responding to this issue, the review team evaluated the HTH GSE Special Visit Report, the Un-Boxed Journal, current faculty research agendas, the Faculty/Staff Handbook, proposal and capstone rubrics, seventeen course syllabi, faculty profiles, GSE Mid-year survey results, the Human Subjects Review Process, and additional evidence in the team room. In addition, the team met with members of the President’s Cabinet, as a whole and individually, as well as in various groupings to discuss questions in detail. The team also met with current students and alumni.

The journal articles in Unboxed: a Journal of Adult Learning in Schools, share creative reflections, which are thought provoking. However, the inquiry paradigm used to evaluate the ideas or research the effectiveness of their creative approaches is unclear. The team was pleased to learn from the president and the dean that the future journal of UnBoxed is being peer-reviewed. It will be helpful to the GSE’s development of graduate culture to clearly articulate the journal submission guidelines and peer review process for the journal as the GSE develops its notion of publication of GSE scholarship. (CFRs 2.2b, 2.8, 2.9)

Upon examining seven graduate student research artifacts, it is evident that students practice a high level of self-inquiry and critical reflection of their students’ work while encouraging their students to do the same. This aligns well with the GSE’s
curriculum values and PSLOs. It is also evident that students are referencing differing bodies of literature as they conduct their research. However, the depth of theoretical alignment with their findings and integration of published research and findings with their own interpretation of those findings has room for improvement. What is less evident is the extent that other modalities of inquiry are incorporated into the graduate curriculum and into the graduate students’ work. (CFRs 2.2b, 2.8, 2.9)

The idea of implementing a Research Institute in order to formalize an academic convening of HTH GSE curriculum and scholarship generation is an exciting one. The notion of including professionals within San Diego and outside of San Diego will further advance various perspectives of inquiry and scholarship processes that currently exist at HTH GSE. The program coordinators and Dean self-report a strong commitment to academic freedom which would allow individual faculty to research their own agendas even though the Dean is focused very specifically on his. (CFRs 2.8, 2.9, 3.2, 3.3)

The program coordinators and the Dean know they need to develop processes where they will support each other in their inquiry work and publishing, and they know they need to include perspectives that reside outside of HTH GSE in their development of their research agendas. They are considering hiring another FT GSE faculty member who is an accomplished scholar and a skilled research mentor. Such a hire would be helpful to their development. (CFRs 2.8, 2.9, 3.2, 3.3)

With regard to faculty work-load, the two program coordinators report a workload that seems to be in alignment with the faculty handbook and the evidence of the workload with which we were provided. Again, the growth indicated in the meeting with the Dean’s cabinet highlights the need to add full-time faculty in order to support expected
scholarly productivity and well as mentoring of student scholarship. (CFRs 2.8, 2.9, 3.2, 
3.3)

The team’s analysis of the aforementioned evidence concluded that faculty are 
being mentored in the design and implementation of their research/scholarship/inquiry 
agendas by faculty who reside outside of HTH GSE. The current structure of outside 
mentorship seems to be working well as reported by program coordinators, but the team 
is unclear as to whether it will be sustainable over the long run should those mentors be 
unable to support them. The team encourages HTH GSE to design a systematic structure 
that supports the mentoring of graduate scholarship. In tandem with this concern is that 
there are varying definitions of what scholarship is among the program faculty. The team 
recognizes that the commitment to scholarship is new to HTH GSE and thus, this is not 
atypical. HTH GSE faculty and administrators would benefit from more conversation on 
what scholarship means to them and how they identify it. (CFRs 2.2b, 2.8, 2.9, 3.2, 3.3)

In addition, the team made the following observations and encourages the 
organizational leadership to specifically a) clarify work load percentages for all faculty 
with regard to their current assignments and percentages of time dedicated to teaching, 
scholarship, and service, b) identify resources that are provided to support faculty 
member’s engagement in their research/inquiry agenda (aka., data gathering support, 
dissemination support) c) explain in detail how training for and the administration of the 
IRB process (in order to protect human subjects’ rights) for faculty and student research 
and inquiry has been implemented in a manner that upholds the federal regulations and 
protects conflict of interest. It is also unclear how conflict of interest as a researcher is
addressed by the IRB committee members (whose membership is the same as those who advise the students or faculty in their research), as it appears that graduate students and faculty are engaged in research within their own classrooms and d) how teaching, scholarship, and service are specifically evaluated during annual reviews (6.1 in faculty handbook). There are no specific criteria in Appendix 1 of the faculty handbook for performance review. In other words, how does the GSE define the quality of the work under review? In addition, with reference to the sabbatical policy on p.10 of the faculty handbook, it is unclear as to whether there is an application for sabbatical, criteria for review of sabbaticals, or clarification on how long the Dean may defer a sabbatical application. (CFRs 2.8, 2.9, 3.2, 3.3)

**Administration and Governance (Leadership and Governance; Organizational Structure and Decision Making)**

The GSE took steps to meet WASC standards regarding leadership role identification, job descriptions, clear organizational reporting relationships and a sustainable review process for all administrators. The GSE provided evidence to describe the relationship between the GSE and other entities related to High Tech High as well as the Board of Director functions and responsibilities. The evidence included a description of the clear roles and decision-making processes, clear position descriptions, a shared services agreement, a revised organizational chart, a faculty & staff handbook, and a comprehensive institutional review plan. The team obtained additional evidence through interviews with the President, President’s Cabinet, Dean, Administrative Dean, Program Directors, Board of Directors, GSE staff, students, and alumni.

The last team report describes GSE leadership as fluid and calls for position descriptions of the roles of those in the president’s cabinet, which were provided to the
current team. (CFRs 1.3, 2.1, 3.1, 3.8, 3.10) The Special Visit Team feels that there remains a need for title alignment with actual functional responsibilities that parallel best practices and recognized nomenclature in higher education.

This issue was addressed with both the GSE management and board, and seemed to be both understood and well received. One specific observation made by the team is while that the GSE currently has both an incumbent CAO and Dean by title, neither is operating functionally in these roles as they would be understood in peer institutions. Further, the team’s assessment of current GSE personnel and their areas of expertise is that there is both a void in the functional role of CAO in the GSE at the moment, and a strong need now and going forward for a seasoned and effective CAO. The team recommends that the GSE conduct a search for a senior, experienced CAO with experience at the graduate level outside of the HTH network and with strong resonance with the mission and values of the GSE.

WASC standards anticipate that governing boards be responsible for “appropriate oversight over institutional integrity, policies, and ongoing operations, including hiring and evaluating the chief executive officer.” (CFR 3.9)

In terms of the relationship of the GSE to the other HTH legal entities, as it pertains to governance of the GSE, HTH Learning (the parent) was described both as “the landlord” and “the real estate holding entity,” the HTH Foundation as the holder of gifts, and the HTH Board as the governing board for the K-12 schools. In meeting with four members of the GSE Board of Directors, plus the chair in a separate meeting, it is clear that the board understands the oversight and fiduciary expectations as a board that WASC standards call for (CFR 3.9), as well as the responsibility to evaluate the president (CFR
They are, to a person, passionate and dedicated to values and mission of the GSE. At the same time, the chair of the GSE board chairs all four HTH boards and other members serve on 2 or more HTH boards, as noted by the prior team.

The GSE is resourced by a matrix of (1) its tuition revenue, (2) gifts from donors, (3) services provided by HTH, for which the GSE pays a (minimal) management fee and (4) services provided by personnel who are shared via the shared services agreement with the HTH, for which the GSE pays a set amount by person.

Given these complexities of interaction and interdependence with the other units of the organization, the team wonders about the implications going forward for clarity of purpose and function in relation to the other HTH entities as the GSE board continues to serve as an independent board overseeing a developing and maturing GSE. The team recommends that the GSE board invest in its own development to become fully engaged in its rightful oversight and fiduciary role as an independent board of a graduate institution seeking regional accreditation.

WASC standards call for “personnel sufficient in number and professional qualifications to maintain its operations and support its academic programs, consistent with its institutional and educational objectives” (CFR 3.1).

The last team cited the existence of dual roles played by some GSE employees. Though a formalized shared services agreement (CFRs 3.1, 3.2, 3.8) was provided to the team, the team finds that there is still the need to clarify the responsibilities of those with dual roles. The team was provided with written job descriptions and verbal percentages of time (which seem variable rather than fixed) dedicated by key personnel to both the GSE and other HTH entities. It appears that while the president and the two program chairs are
clearly dedicated 100% time to the GSE, they are the only full time employees. There is also a half time Registrar and Project Manager. The Dean, Administrative Dean, and CAO all continue to have considerable responsibilities – with varying amounts of time dedicated outside the GSE – to other HTH units. The titular CAO, for example, supervises all eleven of the HTH school directors while having no direct reports in the GSE itself.

**Learning Outcomes and Assessment (Educational Effectiveness)**

The Special Visit Report described a comprehensive and intensive effort to establish a viable Institutional Review process in response to the EER team report and the Commission Action Letter. The GSE provided substantial evidence to describe the steps taken towards examination and reflection of how all areas (academic and functional) of the GSE contribute to student learning. The team understands the GSE has worked to define, delimit, measure and review student learning outcomes. The evidence included a description of the Program Review process including tools such as report templates and rubrics, curriculum maps, clear definitions and descriptions of institutional learning outcomes, program learning outcomes and student learning outcomes, course syllabi, examples of completed program reviews, annual assessment reports and a timeline for future program reviews. The evidence also describes a parallel, evidence driven review process for functional areas of the institution such as informational technology, facilities, development, professional development programs, human resources, information resources, enrollment and academics. The team obtained additional evidence through interviews with the President, President’s Cabinet, Dean, Administrative Dean, Program Directors, Board of Directors, GSE staff, students and alumni.
The GSE revised their strategic academic priorities so they are realistic and measureable. The GSE designed benchmarking processes to ensure that the GSE’s learning outcomes at all levels are reasonable, measurable and on par with similar institutions. A particular strength of the system is that cohorts will be compared to each other over time thus providing data on program improvement and curriculum development efforts on a regular systematic basis. (CFRs 1.2, 2.3, 2.10, 4.4, 4.5)

The GSE has made significant strides in establishing the infrastructure systems and processes to support the educational effectiveness of their graduate programs. Since receipt of the July Action Letter, the GSE established senior leadership in assessment, naming an Administrative Dean oversight responsibility and authority, reviewed and refined the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO) so that they are clearly defined and measureable, and aligned to professional standards, and revised curriculum maps to support advanced treatment of learning outcomes. Associated Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) are measured through the direct evidence of Signature Assignments in each graduate program of study. The results of the PLO Assessments are synthesized to create an Annual Institutional Assessment Report, which examines the degree to which the two programs at GSE are meeting the ILOs. In addition, indirect evidence sources in the form of an annual student survey, an annual alumni survey and an annual Faculty Student Retreat, are analyzed in relation to the ILO designated for review in any given year. (CFRs 1.2, 2.3, 4.4, 4.5)

The GSE curriculum map illustrates infusion of PLOs throughout coursework in each M.Ed. program. Course syllabi reflect associated PLOs as well as course-based
student learning outcomes. Signature assignments are clearly described and evaluative assessment expectations are detailed. (CFRs 1.2, 2.3)

The GSE developed systematic processes for annual assessments connected to program and institutional review. Annual program assessments serve as the data sources for cyclical Program Review that occurs every four years. The GSE is currently in its second year of baseline data collection; in 10/11 the GSE faculty examined the capstone projects from each program as direct evidence of the related PLOs for inquiry and reflection. In 11/12 the ILOs associated with the “design of equitable learning environments” and “engagement in leadership for school change” are under examination. Thus, every ILO is examined on a two-year cycle leading up to a formal Program Review every four years. The program review process includes a self-study, an external review and a program review report. (CFRs 4.4, 4.5)

A particularly notable practice in the GSE’s program review process is an event and process called Looking at Student Work. The collaborative discussion of student learning through capstone projects supports refinement of the program’s assessment and rubrics as well as discussion regarding student learning. The collaborative discussions inform the Annual Program Assessment Reports which include proposed actions and a timetable for reassessment thus closing the reflective assessment loop. (CFR 4.4)

Interviews indicated that considerable learning in the area of assessment has occurred since July 2011. The institution carefully considers data collection for multiple purposes within the lens of direct and indirect evidence. Administrators and faculty reported personal transformations in their work and thinking about student satisfaction surveys, course assignments and Signature Assignments. For example, one faculty
member reported that the new understanding of evidence has lead to a refinement of class assignments so that the product is a more valid reflection of the PLOs. (CFR 4.4)

The GSE’s institutional review process is comprehensive and rigorous. The process for program review and functional area plan evaluation is a solid infrastructure that can provide critical feedback to the GSE regarding student performance and learning. It will be critical for the GSE to implement the Institutional Review Process through a complete cycle and beyond. Other WASC review teams will expect to see systematic, in-depth direct and indirect evidence of the Institutional Review system with particular regard to assessment of student learning.

SECTION III – FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings

(1) The GSE has taken to heart the input and consultation of WASC staff and visiting teams in their dedication to becoming a learning organization and an accredited member of the WASC community.

(2) The GSE community as a whole has demonstrated palpable passion and commitment to the assessment of student learning outcomes in the service of their students’ learning and success.

(3) The GSE, birthed from the K-12 culture of the parent HTH, has demonstrated impressive discernment in beginning to differentiate the requisite ingredients of graduate culture and its essential characteristics while maintaining the shared values and vision of the HTH family.
Recommendations

(1) That nomenclature in internal and external communication – including alignment in title and function - be consistent with that found in peer institutions in graduate education. (CFR 3.8)

(2) That the overall corporate structure be refined and balanced in such a way that the needs of the GSE for a governing board and operational freedom sufficiently independent of the parent and other entities to satisfy WASC standards be supported and maintained. (CFR 3.8, 3.9)

(3) That the GSE board invest in its own development to become fully engaged in its rightful oversight and fiduciary role as an independent board of a graduate institution seeking regional accreditation. (3.8, 3.9)

(4) That a national search for an senior chief academic officer experienced at the graduate level and external to the HTH network be launched as soon as possible. (CFR 3.8, 3.11)

(5) That the GSE engage expert consultation in the area of human subjects rights and review in order to best ethically and legally prepare graduate students and support their faculty and minimize risk for the institution. (CFR 1.8)

(6) That the GSE identify resources and establish criteria for how teaching, scholarship, and service are supported for all faculty, evaluated during annual reviews, and established as work load percentages. (CFR 2.8, 3.3, 3.4)

(7) That the GSE develop and maintain data systems that protect sensitive and confidential student and human subjects information. (CFR 1.8, 3.6, 3.7)