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SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Accreditation History

In 2001, the Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation initiated and funded The Broad Center and one of its two core programs, The Broad Academy. The second core program, The Broad Residency in Urban Education, was initiated in 2003. The Broad Academy prepares current and aspiring superintendents for the challenges in leading large, diverse, urban school systems. The Broad Academy does not grant degrees and is not part of this accreditation visit; The Broad Residency graduate program is the focus of this reaccreditation visit. The most recent cohort includes 69 residents who, upon successful completion of the program, will be granted a master's degree in Educational Leadership. The Broad Center is located at 2121 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 3000, Los Angeles. The Center does not have off-campus or distance education programs.

The Broad Residency (TBR) program prepares individuals for the challenges of central office leadership in large, diverse, urban public district, charter school networks, and state education agencies. The program's mission is to transform American public education into an engine of excellence and equity by identifying, preparing and supporting leaders in urban school systems. The program is a two-year intensive, hybrid program of coursework with eight quarterly face-to-face sessions in different cities across the U.S. Residents are placed in a central office position at a host K-12 public urban school district, charter organization, or state education agency. Potential students (residents) are drawn from careers both inside and outside the field of education with a majority of candidates coming from successful careers in other fields. The master's degree in Educational Leadership is the residency program's sole degree. The Broad Residency program and graduate degree were initially accredited by WSCUC in 2015. This is their first reaccreditation visit.

B. Description of Team's Review Process

The WSCUC visiting team first came together for the peer evaluation training on January 10, 2019 in Oakland. On April 16, 2019 the team held a Conference Call, section assignments were discussed and confirmed, and first impressions of the Institution’s Report were shared. The Off-Site Review was conducted May 20-21, 2019 at the WSCUC office. All team members were present. Two Lines of Inquiry and two document requests were developed as well as draft commendations. A Conference Call with The Broad Center leadership team was held at the conclusion of the Off-Site Review to hear an update to their Institutional Report and to share with them our two Lines of Inquiry, two document requests, and commendations.

Between the Off-Site Review and the visit in October 2019, the visiting team wrote draft sections of the preliminary report and held a conference call on September 20, 2019 to finalize plans for the upcoming visit and to review the draft preliminary report.

The team visit to The Broad Center in Los Angeles commenced on October 15, 2019. During the visit, the visiting team conducted 15 interviews with members of The Broad Center leadership, internal and external faculty, Broad Foundation Board and staff members, students, alumni, and members of The Broad Center Board. The team’s visit coincided with the second meeting of a cohort group in Los Angeles during which time the team witnessed a class session and spoke with students. The team also reviewed documents related to budget and finance, evidence of student work, student capstone projects, Board minutes, and program review and assessment documents. There were no messages for the visiting team through the confidential email account.
conclusion of the visit, the visiting team finalized the report and reached consensus on the commendations and recommendations. These were reported at the exit meeting.

C. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence

The visiting team appreciated the overall high quality, organization and completeness of the Institution’s Report. We found it to be well written, comprehensive and an accurate reflection of the institution. We were impressed with the institution’s data collection, many types of assessments and the use of the collected data to drive strategic institutional decisions. While the Institution’s Report was largely developed by The Broad Center staff, there was review and input from Board members, faculty, students and alumni. The Broad Center leadership team has fully embraced theWSCUC process for continuous improvement. We saw evidence of the rigorous inquiry, searching questions, appropriate methodology and effective use of data described in their Institutional Report. The Institution’s update was helpful and brought the team up to date on strategic decisions that were contemplated in their Institutional Report.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions

The WASC Commission on February 20, 2015 in granting Initial Accreditation endorsed the recommendations presented in the 2014 Seeking Accreditation team report:

1. To increase The Broad Center’s impact on a broader national scale;
2. To make the Governing Board more independent and more diverse;
3. To continue academic improvement and formal program review; and
4. To enroll a more diverse group of residents into each cohort as it relates to racial-demographic identity, gender, prior education and work experience.

Each of the four areas have been actively addressed with significant progress made in each area. The institution’s progress in the areas of resident and staff diversity and governing board independence/diversity are particularly noteworthy.

Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and compliance with federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

The Broad Center (TBC) conducted a self-review under each of the four WSCUC Standards in a reflective and analytic way. The self-review was comprehensive with participation from Board members, senior leadership, faculty, and staff. The inclusion of a range of TBC stakeholders provided a solid approach to reviewing and responding to WSCUC Standards and feedback was offered on how to proceed in preparation for the Reaffirmation visit. Following the self-review, responses were summarized and reviewed by a steering committee. The review findings included areas of strength, areas of improvement, prioritization of areas for attention, and the beginnings of plans to address improvement areas.
In review of Standard 1, TBC clearly articulates its mission, vision, and core beliefs. Throughout interviews with faculty, current students, and alumni, it was revealed that TBC strives to live out their mission “to transform American public education into an engine of excellence and equity by identifying, preparing, and supporting leaders in urban school systems”. The self-review indicated that 95 percent of institutional responses found this an area of strength. (CFR 1.1) TBC's strong commitment to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) was also clear in its mission and approach to supporting students, alumni, and K-12 partners. Current students shared through interviews that the strong focus on DEI enhanced their learning experience and provided them with tools to be successful in their placement sites.

TBC's self-review revealed a need to address clarity of educational objectives and more public evidence of student learning. (CFR 1.2) The steering committee identified potential next steps for addressing concerns by increasing visibility of student learning through the website, white papers, and webinars for prospective students. Through interviews with Senior Leadership, it was noted that TBC has engaged multiple experts to provide more specific data on how TBC is impacting the urban public education landscape. The team noted that while it is challenging to draw a direct correlation between TBR's student learning outcomes and improvements in K-12 schools, TBC should continue their research and increase efforts to communicate impact to the field. In addressing criteria for integrity and transparency, TBC's self-review identified this to be an area of strength. Respondent ratings cited TBC's commitment to diversity and educational objectives (CFRs 1.4, 1.5) as clearly defined. The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine compliance with Standard 1.

In review of Standard 2, TBC’s self-review identified the Teaching and Learning CFRs (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, and 2.7) to be an area of strength with 100% of respondents. For CFRs 2.4 and 2.6, the WSCUC steering committee provided a plan for clearer articulation of student learning outcomes and strengthening the collection and use of data to address concerns from the self-review responses. TBC's commitment to publish includes 60 reports, articles and presentations over the past five years. (CRF 2.8) The steering committee identified several strategies for increasing information dissemination through sharing toolkits, resources, and further promoting alumni achievements. The team noted Capstone Projects as valuable examples for sharing achievements more broadly. The self-review responses indicated that a variety of direct and indirect assessment measures are implemented. A system of supports for residents is established through peer-advisory teams, Broad advisors, executive coaching, and 360-degree feedback. (CFRs 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13) The team’s finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine compliance with Standard 2.

In review of Standard 3, TBC has a small number of faculty and staff. Respondents from the self-review rated the qualifications and diversity of the faculty as a strength. (CFR 3.1) The self-review revealed that almost 30% of respondents identified faculty development for external faculty as an area for improvement. The steering committee identified faculty onboarding and professional development as an area to address. (CFRs 3.2, 3.3) Through interviews with external faculty, the team discovered external faculty are not involved in assessment or had full ownership of the curriculum. While TBC operates with a focus on praxis, the institution may consider developing and defining the levels of faculty, duties, and roles to further articulate faculty expectations. Also, TBC should consider developing clear faculty expectations for teaching, service, and scholarship to fully articulate a normative workload for the determined faculty roles (i.e. program faculty, internal faculty, external faculty, and guest speakers).
TBC currently receives funding from The Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation and operates with financial stability and clean audits. (CFR 3.4) The self-review revealed this to be a strength for the institution. TBC has developed an online learning management system with 100% of respondents describing technology resources as a strength. (CFR 3.5) TBC does not have a full-time CFO; financial activities are monitored and managed by Family Office Financial Services (FOFS). (CFR 3.8) The self-review respondents referenced as a strength, the increase in diversity of the governing board members. (CFR 3.9) The team’s finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine compliance with Standard 3.

In review of Standard 4, quality assurance, review and evaluation were rated as a strength by 100% of respondents in the self-review. (CFR 4.1, 4.2) The newly formed Data, Research and Evaluation (DRE) team supports data collection and analysis across the institution and has increased the institution’s capacity to prioritize this work. TBC demonstrates a commitment to continuous improvement as a core value of the institution. (CFR 4.3) Through the self-study report, TBC identified the need to put more emphasis on direct measures of student learning and planned to explore the arc of student learning for areas of success to expand these measures. (CFR 4.4) The self-review respondents revealed the inclusion of stakeholders in assessment of institutional effectiveness and strategic planning as an area of improvement for the institution. (CFRs 4.5, 4.6, and 4.7) The team reviewed a working draft of the 2020-2023 Strategic Plan as part of the visit. The senior leadership team used the self-study process to inform the direction of the strategic planning efforts. While the strategic plan is in the draft stage, TBC plans to share out more broadly with internal faculty and the Board through continued dialogue and collaboration. The team’s finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine compliance with Standard 4.

TBC completed the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators to provide assurance that there is a system of assessing, tracking, and improving learning for students through the single degree program, M.Ed. in Educational Leadership. TBC has developed formal learning outcomes at the program level aligned with student learning and course learning outcomes. The learning outcomes are published in Resident and Faculty Handbooks, rubrics, and the TBC website. TBC does not use GPA and evaluates degree outcomes through applied learning projects, capstone projects, 360-degree feedback surveys, and network member impact surveys. Internal faculty interpret evidence of student learning once per quarter and assessment data is used for annual strategic planning.

In review of the federal compliance forms, TBC submitted the Credit Hour and Program Length Review Form. TBC provided a detailed description of the session schedule with credit allocation to each reading, assignment, and course session. TBC uses a clock hour conversion method for a total of 44 credits for the degree program. Credit hours for practicum courses are calculated based on the recognition that 120 hours worked is equivalent to one credit hour. Other course credits are calculated on the recognition that 15 clock hours of engagement in session activities and application of learning projects, or 60 clock hours of reading course-related materials is the equivalent of one credit hour. TBC uses a clock hour conversion method for a total of 44 credits for the degree program. Attendance is tracked through session modules with a required 90% session attendance requirement for residents. Attendance records are maintained in Salesforce and program faculty monitor periodically during each of the eight sessions to confirm residents are present. While practicum attendance is not tracked to the same degree, program faculty are in dialogue with resident supervisors to ensure residents are at their employment site and meeting the 1200 hours of practicum experience throughout the two-year program. TBC met criteria under the Credit Hour and Program Length Review.
TBC completed the Marketing and Recruitment Review Form which met federal requirements. TBC follows federal requirements on student recruitment and publishes details regarding program length and employment of graduates in the student handbook and on the website. Interviews with the recruitment and selection team revealed much of the recruitment happens through the vast alumni network and through strategic attendance at conferences such as Management Leadership for Tomorrow.

In review of the Student Complaints form, TBC described the formal grievance policy and procedure. The policy is detailed in the Resident Handbook. There have been no grievances filed to date. Faculty should consider reviewing the grievance policy more explicitly with students at the onset of the program. TBC met criteria under the Student Complaints review.

TBC met criteria under the Transfer of Policy Review. TBR does not accept credits from other institutions.

Final determination of compliance with the Standards rests with the Commission

Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality and integrity of the degrees

The Broad Center (TBC) staff and faculty have expended considerable effort to determine and define the meaning of their graduate degree. The residency program is designed with rigor and application such that each resident will obtain and refine knowledge, skill, will, and mindset in three program learning outcomes (core program-level goals):

1. Residents will have a strong command of critical issues in K-12 urban education that are rooted in theories of change;
2. Residents will demonstrate leadership and management skills that are critical for executing high-impact change and growth in K-12 urban public school systems; and
3. Residents actively learn from their experiences in the K-12 workplace.

These program learning outcomes also serve as the institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) and are readily observable in student learning outcomes (SLOs) as evidenced in course syllabi. In addition, assessments of resident learning are focused upon measuring attainment of skills. (CFRs 1.1 and 1.2) Residents are required to complete a capstone project which has the equivalency to a master’s thesis.

Further, TBC has also created and conducted rigorous program reviews that assess ILOs and SLOs through internal and external examination. It appears that TBC is deeply committed to clearly stating outcomes, collecting data to demonstrate that its residents are attaining the desired outcomes, and that the program is fulfilling the institutional mission.

To provide evidence that their processes and outcomes are achieved at a high level, TBC conducted a benchmarking study in 2015. From the evidence provided in this study, it appears that TBC is indeed charting a significantly distinctive course of study that favorably compares with, and in some instances exceeds, programs from institutions such as Harvard, Stanford, and the University of Pennsylvania.
TBC has also completed assessments of residents and graduates in the workplace. Surveys of supervisors and other relevant stakeholders have been conducted. The data gathered and analyzed support suggested levels of excellence of TBC graduates on numerous scales of performance. (CFR 2.6) The Broad Center staff provides quality data analyses, clearly observable in the studies and surveys. There is a desire to continuously improve based upon the significant collection and review of data. The addition of key staff members to the Data, Research and Evaluation (DRE) team has allowed TBC to determine the nuances of which data should be gathered and how those data are to be presented for decision-making. The WSCUC team is convinced that the meaning, integrity, and quality of the graduate degree offered by TBC is achieving its goals at an exemplary level.

The Broad Center has taken great efforts to ensure that the integrity of their graduate degree is measured according to the highest standards. This is evidenced in their very clear “School System Excellence and Equity Framework.” Careful and thoughtful attention has been given to determining five system-level priorities: Deliver high-quality learning opportunities; attract, develop and retain exceptional talent; commit to a culture of inclusivity and continuous growth and results; execute strong operations to support schools and staff; and empower and engage the community. Each area is further supported with well documented goals that are then linked to student learning outcomes and assessments. (CFR 2.1, 2.3, 26)

Structural integrity of the master’s degree is further supported through analysis of the multiple locations where courses are to be held. The locations are routinely altered to focus attention on school systems that are achieving great gains in urban education, thus offering excellent on-site learning opportunities for residents. For example, certain locations have demonstrated achievement in technology, so TBC will hold its quarterly course offering in that particular place, gleaning the most from the advances gained by local systems. This method indicates a nimbleness that allows for residents to engage with leaders who are making great strides. (CFR 2.10 and 4.1) Finally, TBC is also very particular and thoughtful about selecting the collaborative partner systems for resident placement. These sites are carefully considered for their ability to engage and assist the residents in their educational journey. But the sites are also strategic to provide benefits for the residents as TBC desires to positively impact urban education for students who attend. It is impressive to observe the many ways that residents and collaborative partner organizations are bringing about significant change that will improve the education of its students. In that endeavor, it is also important for TBC to continue to link resident and graduate impact upon the systems that they serve. This will further create a culture of evidence that supports the TBC mission and vision while also potentially leading to positive change for urban education settings.

Component 4: Educational Quality: Student learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation

The Broad Center has identified three program learning outcomes (core program-level goals) that are appropriate to their institutional mission, address student characteristics, and support the needs of constituents and partners. (CFRs 1.1 and 2.2b) The program learning outcomes (Component 3) are further established through five core competencies, sequencing topics of K-12 education, leadership development, and diversity, equity, and inclusion curriculum.

The program learning outcomes map to the student learning outcomes (enduring understandings) and are measured through multiple assessment methods to provide evidence of learning throughout the program. (CFRs 2,6, 2.3, 2.4, and 4.1) Assessments are designed to measure and provide data sequentially throughout the program to support evidence of improvement with
participation of all constituents. (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 2.5, 2.6, and 2.7) Indirect and direct assessment methods of student learning and thus the achievement of core competencies are used. The comprehensive map/crosswalk of the Dimensions of Leadership with the WSCUC CFRs and the Lumina DQPs illustrates a thorough understanding of when the assessment occurs, how data are collected, and the use of data to demonstrate key student learning as well as to support educational and program decisions. (CFRs 2.1, 2.2b, 2.4, and 4.2) A regular review of data from these measures are utilized to “close the loop” by informing curricular adjustments, identifying gaps in resident learning, as well as informing programmatic strategic planning and attending to operational issues. (CFRs 2.3, 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4) Changes are made in content and curriculum when assessments and surveys identify achievement gaps. The change process includes input from internal faculty and administrators, who then work with staff responsible for instructional design.

The institution has sufficiently exhibited that the program content and rigor is appropriate to the master’s level. (CFRs 2.2b, and 4.1) The focus on the leadership dimensions and competencies of their school system central office staff sets The Broad Center program apart from other programs. They measure the impact that their graduates have in their districts and in public education which is to be commended.

Residents self-report perceived value of their progress, as measured through the student learning outcomes, the applied learning projects, and other emerging trends in K-12 and leadership development. (CFR 2.5) Analyses of the slight decline in the students’ perceived value may provide additional insight into the curriculum and/or design and delivery of content. (CFRs 2.6, 4.4, and 4.7) Communicating how and why the program review data informs the planning for the future should inform and engage members of the Board of Directors program committee. (CFRs 4.3, 4.3, 4.5, and 4.6)

The objective of measuring the impact that TBR program as defined by TBC’s mission of improving K-12 student performance is as commendable as it is difficult to execute. The aspirational goal serves to inform and inspire. (CFR 1.2) There is significant anecdotal evidence from current residents and alumni of achievements of impacting students. There is great power in these stories of qualitative results. The residents’ capstone projects illustrate these stories effectively. Providing opportunities to broaden the audiences who hear these stories, would advance their impact. TBC would be advised to continue to refine and focus on the diversity, equity, and inclusion arc, toward measurement of impact.

Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation

The Broad Residency (TBR) described its aim to “graduate Residents with the knowledge, skill, will, and mindset to contribute meaningfully to K-12 public education systems” (TBC Institutional Report for Reaccreditation, 2019, p. 41). TBR defined eight indicators of student success including completing programmatic requirements within three years of program entry, maintaining full-time employment within a K-12 public school system throughout the program, and producing high-quality work within school systems to maximize impact and produce improved results for all K-12 students. TBR aligned their core competencies with WSCUC competencies defining a high level of rigor and standards of performance required for all residents.

Retention and completion rates are key indicators of student success for TBR. Since the program began, TBR has graduated 14 cohorts with an average graduation rate of just under 90 percent (CFRs 2.6 and 2.10). With an aspirational goal for every student to graduate and pursue a career in public education, TBR identified a need in retention and developed better data monitoring of its
Resident Retention Intervention (RRI) support in 2017. Through the creation of this system, TBR tracks, identifies, and proactively mitigates cases of potential program departure. The 2017-19 cohort included 18 cases of intervention with 28 percent of residents continuing in the program and 39 percent continuing in retention support efforts. Through interviews with the partner strategy team, the cases of residents potentially withdrawing from the program were due to family obligations or incompatible employer site placement. Using robust student supports and an advising structure, TBR internal faculty are in consistent dialogue with residents and partner sites to proactively address concerns or issues as they arise.

On average, associate residents (those having more exposure to working in a public education system prior to the program) graduate at a higher rate than matched residents (not working in a school system prior to the program, thus “matched” with their employer) within a cohort. TBR indicated a focus on revising program survey questions to better understand these data. The team commends the work that has begun to address potential bias in the selection and recruitment process through revising systems and screening questions. The team recommends adding specific gender and ethnicity questions to existing surveys and exit interviews to better understand the student experience. Through discussions and interviews, the team recognized a culture of continuous improvement that is demonstrated by all levels of faculty and staff. TBR is committed to analyzing evidence of student achievement as the institution strives to increase impact in urban public school systems.

TBR indicated an important measure of student success as following residents who remain in the public education sector post-program completion. Within one year of graduation, 91 percent of alumni are still in K-12 roles and within three years of graduation, 86 percent of alumni are still in K-12 roles. Alumni report a high level of impact of TBR program in influencing their work in K-12 public education. Through alumni surveys, 55 percent of alumni rated the impact of TBC as “extremely influential” or “transformational” in their professional growth. Through interviews with alumni, the team heard positive, confirming statements about the key take-aways of the program. Alumni shared about building empathy, leading with vulnerability, and harnessing the collective genius of other cohort members. Whether alumni are five years out of the program or recent graduates, TBC has designed valuable ways for former residents to connect through the annual alumni forums, systems leader convenings and emerging practices exchanges.

To continue to foster current resident success, TBR provides a range of support services. Peer-advisory teams, Broad advising, executive coaching, and formative evaluation tools combine to support student learning and success. Residents and alumni evaluate the effectiveness of the support services and feedback is reviewed in order to fine-tune the support structure. In response to low ratings for advisory team support, faculty revised team groupings by role type, which led to improved ratings. The 360-degree feedback process is the most highly rated student support with an average of 88% rating for valuable or extremely valuable.

During interviews with current residents, the culture of TBR became clearer. While TBC does not have a formalized statement on graduate culture, residents described the graduate culture as being built through focusing on action, thoughtful collaboration, and the establishment of a community of practice. Residents described the level of rigor and scholarly work to be consistent with a praxis-oriented program where clear expectations are in place and assessments are tied to learning outcomes. Several residents remarked that while they have been working in the field of education for several years, the level of depth and opportunities for critical thinking in TBR sessions was greater than what they received in previous master’s and credentialing programs.
Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program review, assessment, use of data and evidence

The Broad Center’s quality assurance is driven by CFRs, past WSCUC team and Commission feedback, and TBC’s overall commitment to improvement. Program reviews of TBR program occur every five years in three phases. Program reviews completed in 2013 and 2018 assessed effectiveness of reaching program goals and data were used to inform planning and budgets. The outcome of the 2013 review included the annual alumni survey and actions which increased diversity. A major goal in 2013 was to increase growth in cohort size and the 2018 comprehensive program review revisited that decision and its impacts, both internally and with external reviewers. TBC recognized capacity issues and decisions were made to pause enrollment growth, focusing on depth versus breadth, and to strengthen data practices. (CFRs 2.7, 4.1, 4.4, and 4.6) These initiatives are also documented in the draft strategic plan. Overall, the 2018 program review identified program strengths, areas for improvement, key indicators of program success and viability, and actions from an internal and external review perspective. The Bellwether Education Partners landscape assessment included multiple experts who provided different ways of measuring the impact of residents on school systems and the students they serve.

Frameworks and benchmarking have been developed. A benchmarking study in 2015 compared TBR with other institutions. Numerous internal learning review processes occur throughout the year, as evidenced with the use of their Dimensions of Leadership as the framework for curriculum, quality self-reports (assessing residents’ learning outcomes pre/post); and questions about the impact of intensive learning sessions.

Indirect assessment occurs via comprehensive data collection from residents, faculty, and supervisors, and is comparative over time, and changes noted upon review. (CFR 4.5) There is a noted shift of focus to direct assessments, thus presenting less emphasis on student satisfaction and more on student learning. Portfolios are used, seven summative applied learning projects (under revision), capstone papers, and a final capstone project. Faculty, mainly internal faculty, assess using rubrics; assessment practices have been enhanced with calibration exercises for faculty. (CFR 4.3, 4.4)

Data collection research and evaluation systems have become more robust as assisted by the hiring of three additional staff for data, research, and evaluation (DRE). (CFR 4.2) The DRE team embraces assessment requirements and provides reports for data review and analysis. Planning for evidence-based decisions occurs resulting in actionable plans, as occurred with the provision of data to support the assessment and evaluation leading to the refinement of the Dimensions of Leadership. (CFR 4.4)

The merging of the program review with assessment and other data collection processes have resulted in quality assurance that has contributed to improvements as well as a commitment for continued improvement. (CFR 4.7)

Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment

The Broad Center and its two core programs have a unique financial model that provides more than adequate support for institutional needs and developments. The programs are fully funded
through generous donations from the Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation. Budgets are developed in two-year cycles and funding occurs based upon identified needs and strategies. It is interesting to note that budget creation follows a fairly traditional approach; areas/departments present projected needs to leadership who hold discussions with the Broad Foundation, link needs with strategic plans, compare projections with previous year’s actuals, and present a final budget to the Foundation. The model/system appears to function well for an institution that does not charge tuition.

Regular financial management is successfully monitored through an in-house Director of Talent and Operations as well as a financial management organization, Family Office Financial Services. At this time, there is not a CFO who oversees the entire financial management of the organization. Senior leadership routinely monitors expenditures and provides feedback to teams/departments. The system appears to be robust and financially sound as external audits prove fiscal responsibility. TBC has never had a deficit annual budget and although reference is made to “other investments”, it continues to depend upon the Broad Foundation for its operational expenses. (CFR 3.4, 3.5, 3.8)

The institutional report indicated that additional revenue streams were being considered and the team discussed the financial future of TBC based upon its unique funding model. Based upon projections, the landscape is changing. The newly developed Strategic Plan projects diminishing budgets throughout the next five years. The Broad Foundation has encouraged TBC to seek additional partners who will also embrace the mission and vision and will begin to financially support TBC. The institution has also begun to seek creative ways to develop additional revenue streams that will allow TBC to sustain its future endeavors. These discussions are at the most elementary level. Thus, TBC is encouraged to tap into the many creative resources and partners to establish financial stability and viability into the future. (CFR 3.4, 3.5)

The Broad Center appears to be acutely aware of the need to link strategic priorities with funding, leadership development, verifiable management practices, and inclusion dialog with external constituents. The evidence presented and affirmed during the visit, indicates an institution that is serious and deliberate about establishing priorities and operating within known systems of operation while also being flexible and creative to fulfill a dynamic future. To that end, TBC carefully and systematically scans the urban K-12 environment for talent development with attention to diversity. (CFR 4.7)

During the OSR and the on-site visit, ample evidence was located to support TBC’s commitment to providing the resources required to support educational effectiveness and improved quality of instruction while remaining focused on their mission. Resources are invested in systems and processes that are monitored to achieve outcomes. TBC is also sufficiently nimble to alter their methods and practices when data supports a required change. (CFR 4.3, 4.4)

The 2018 program review provided data and insight into several operational objectives and institutional priorities including expansion of the cohort. Based upon this review and additional data, TBC determined that larger cohorts were not beneficial to achieve their educational outcomes and program goals. Thus, the size of the incoming cohort of residents was reduced and budgets were readjusted. (CFR 4.1, 4.3, 4.5) By linking data/outcomes with strategic priorities and plans, TBC aligns goals to activities with confidence, accuracy, and speed.

TBC routinely scans the broader K-12 urban education environment to better inform their decisions and plans. They involve stakeholders and significant educational systems to ground their focus on critically relevant data as they seek to be on the cutting edge of developing educational
leaders for the future. By working closely with numerous urban school systems across the nation, they can grasp and adjust to changing environments for the benefit of their students and the systems they will serve. (CFR 4.7)

**Component 8: Optional essay on institutional specific themes**

The Broad Center did not choose this option.

**Component 9: Reflection and plans for improvement**

The Institutional Report contained a very thoughtful and complete summary of the findings, plans, interpretations, and conclusions found throughout the other components. The Institution divided this component into three sections: Reflections on the Self-Study Process; Strengths and Areas for Improvement; and Moving into the Future – Significant, Sustainable Impact.

In the section on Reflections on the Self-Study Process, the Institution made the following points:

- The timing of the self-study dovetailed with the conclusion of their current three-year Strategic Plan. This allowed the self-study's deep dive into the longitudinal data using a rigorous and disciplined process to gain insights on what has and has not worked. This has increased self-awareness and deep reflection and led to new ideas and plans to also be captured in their new Strategic Plan.
- The Institution also felt the collaborative and expansive nature of the self-study process, bringing people together for broader perspectives and richer discussions and insights, which generated better short and long range plans for the future.

In the section on Strengths and Areas for Improvement, the Institution made the following points:

- As a result of their in-depth self-study work, they identified the Institution's strengths as remaining mission-driven, deeply committed to diversity, equity and inclusion, maintaining and fostering a culture of inclusive and collaborative community. They are also proud of evidence that demonstrates that their master's degree is well regarded, has integrity, and is known for high standards. They identified as a major strength that 90% of students complete the program and demonstrate proficiency on capstone projects and other program assessments. The Institution collects, analyzes, and routinely uses data to inform and drive decisions. The Institution sees this as both a strength and an area that could be even more refined with the current investment in data collection and research, as well as the staff and faculty's capacity to use data to improve academic program effectiveness.
- The Institution found evidence through the exceptional volume of data collected that when the number of students in a cohort increased, the program quality or level of support expected could not be maintained. TBC are taking positive steps to use the analysis of these data to restructure smaller a smaller cohort size with a different mix of matched and associate residents.
- The Institution will also be looking to develop additional assessments to more directly measure student learning. Additionally, they are looking into ways to develop, collect, and monitor data that measures the impact and contributions of the Residents in their workplace.

In the section on Moving into the Future – Significant, Sustainable Impact, the Institution made the following points:
• As a key outcome of the self-study process, the Institution will be looking for ways to increase and sustain the impact of this program on the public and charter partnership schools in which their residents and alumni serve. The focus will shift from growth to reducing the cohort size, as well as the number of partner districts, resulting in a focus on depth of program and increased support for Residents.

• The Institution itself wants to be financially enduring and sustainable into the future. The generous, ongoing commitment of funds by the Broad Foundation is appreciated and that pledge is honored by being a lean, efficient organization. They continually look for ways to economize without impacting the academic program. They also look for outside streams of income and grants.

SECTION III – OTHER TOPICS

No additional issues are required to be addressed.

SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings

The team reports that The Broad Center and its core program, The Broad Residency in Urban Education, is continually focused on its mission to transform American public education into an engine of excellence and equity by identifying, preparing and supporting leaders in urban school systems. Evidence exists that the master’s degree in Educational Leadership prepares residents to lead educational programs in large, diverse, urban, public and charter school districts.

Our findings, based on the full report, show an institution that has actively embraced and woven the WSCUC process and CFRs into their everyday culture. TBC welcomes peer review, has ongoing processes for deep reflection, and a bias for action. The team finds that TBC is in substantial compliance with all CFRs with the understanding that only the Commission can make a final determination.

The visiting team had a thorough discussion on the recommended term and easily arrived at a unanimous decision based on the evidence contained in the team report. Additionally, the visiting team has high confidence that the TBC senior staff and Board have the capacity and will to address the three recommendations in a comprehensive and timely manner.

Commendations

The Broad Center is to be commended for:

• Impacting urban public education with positive results directed by residents, alumni, and collaborative partners fulfilling the mission and vision of Eli and Edythe Broad.

• Exhibiting sincere and passionate dedication to create and implement an inclusive accreditation process that appears to be fully vested at all levels from the Board through the leadership and staff, faculty, and residents.

• Locating, empowering, and supporting its excellent leadership team who exhibit great depth and breadth of knowledge, skills, and creative expressions among all staffing levels of the organization.
• Designing and implementing an inclusive process for developing the most recent draft of the strategic plan that contains necessary elements to plot the future direction of TBC.
• Investing in the data, research, and evaluation team who collect and provide meaningful data for review and continuous improvement.
• Caring for the student experience from the intentional selection of candidates, purposeful curriculum, plentiful resources, and valuable supports that extend beyond the residency.

Recommendations

The team recommends that The Broad Center:

• Develop the onboarding of external faculty for mission, teaching, and assessment of the curriculum including the foundations of diversity, equity, and inclusion. (CFR 3.3)
• Clearly define and support the roles of faculty to include curriculum ownership, institutional service, and scholarly engagement with the broader education environments. (CFR 2.8)
• Continue to explore diverse funding streams and external partnerships to ensure long-term institutional viability. (CFR 3.4)
APPENDICES
Federal Compliance Forms

Broad Compliance Affirmation.pdf
OVERVIEW
There are four forms that WSCUC uses to address institutional compliance with some of the federal requirements affecting institutions and accrediting agencies:

1 – Credit Hour and Program Length Review Form
2 – Marketing and Recruitment Review Form
3 – Student Complaints Review Form
4 – Transfer Credit Policy Review Form

Teams complete these four forms and add them as appendices to the team report. They are included here in order for the institution to provide the necessary information for the team. Teams are not required to include a narrative about any of these matters in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations section of the team report.

1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM
Under the federal requirements referenced below, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's credit hour policy and processes as well as the lengths of its programs.

Credit Hour - 5602.24(f)
The accrediting agency, as part of its review of an institution for renewal of accreditation, must conduct an effective review and evaluation of the reliability and accuracy of the institution's assignment of credit hours.

(1) The accrediting agency meets this requirement if-
   (i) It reviews the institution's-
      (A) Policies and procedures for determining the credit hours, as defined in 34 CFR 600.2, that the institution awards for courses and programs; and
      (B) The application of the institution's policies and procedures to its programs and coursework; and
   (ii) Makes a reasonable determination of whether the institution's assignment of credit hours conforms to commonly accepted practice in higher education.
(2) In reviewing and evaluating an institution's policies and procedures for determining credit hour assignments, an accrediting agency may use sampling or other methods in the evaluation.

Credit hour is defined by the Department of Education as follows:
A credit hour is an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally established equivalency that reasonably approximates not less than—

(1) One hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out of class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time; or
(2) At least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph (1) of this definition for other academic activities as established by the institution including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours.

See also WSCUC Senior College and University Commission's Credit Hour Policy.
Program Length - 5602.16(a)(1)(viii)
Program length may be seen as one of several measures of quality and as a proxy measure for scope of the objectives of degrees or credentials offered. Traditionally offered degree programs are generally approximately 120 semester credit hours for a bachelor's degree, and 30 semester credit hours for a master's degree; there is greater variation at the doctoral level depending on the type of program. For programs offered in non-traditional formats, for which program length is not a relevant and/or reliable quality measure, reviewers should ensure that available information clearly defines desired program outcomes and graduation requirements, that institutions are ensuring that program outcomes are achieved, and that there is a reasonable correlation between the scope of these outcomes and requirements and those typically found in traditionally offered degrees or programs tied to program length.

TBC Statement Found in Syllabus of TBR 2018-20 Handbook (p. 40)
A master's degree in Educational Leadership is obtained by completing a minimum of 44 credit hours. This includes passing instructional courses (see details below), attending at least 90% of sessions, and completing a two-year Residency in a school district, charter management organization, or state/federal education department. Credit hours for practicum courses are calculated based on the recognition that 120 hours worked is equivalent to 1 credit hour, so the minimum number of 1200 hours worked per year equals 10 credit hours. Other course credits are calculated on the recognition that 15 clock hours of engagement in session activities and application of learning projects, or 60 clock hours of reading and applying course related materials is the equivalent of 1 semester credit hour.

Courses
101 Foundations of Urban Education (5 credit hours)
201 Leadership Development (5 credit hours)
301 Organizational Chang (5 credit hours)
401 Strategic Transformation of Educational Systems (5 credit hours)
501 First Year Practicum (10 credit hours)
601 Second Year Practicum (10 credit hours)
701 Capstone/ Master's Thesis (4 credit hours)
1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Under the federal requirements referenced below, WSCUJC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's credit hour policy and processes as well as the lengths of its programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions/Comments (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Policy on credit hour | Is this policy easily accessible? ☑YES ☑NO  
If so, where is the policy located? Resident Handbook (includes Syllabi), Process for Designating Credit Hours document on the internal file storage system  
Comments: Process for designating credit hours should be reviewed during periodic review of credit hour assignments to maintain accuracy (see Process for Designating Credit Hours attachment) |
| Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour | 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)? ☑YES ☑NO  
If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? ☑YES ☑NO  
Comments: This occurs every five years during program review, or more frequently during TBR’s strategic planning process. The team was reminded of this policy during the self-study. |
| Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet | Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? ☑YES ☑NO  
Comments: See Compliance with Federal Requirements Credit Hours attachment |
| Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level. | How many syllabi were reviewed? N/A  
Type of courses reviewed: ☑ online ☑ hybrid  
What degree level(s)? ☑ AA/AS ☑ BA/BS ☑ MA ☑ Doctoral  
What discipline(s)?  
Are students doing the amount of work per the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? ☑YES ☑NO  
Comments: |
| 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) Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level. | How many syllabi were reviewed? All courses  
What kinds of courses?  
What degree level(s)? ☑ AA/AS ☑ BA/BS ☑ MA ☑ Doctoral  
What discipline(s)?  
Are students doing the amount of work per the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? ☑YES ☑NO  
Comments: See Exhibit 4.02: Sample Syllabi in 2019 Institutional Report |
| Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials) | How many programs were reviewed? 1  
What kinds of programs were reviewed? Graduate Program  
What degree level(s)? ☑ AA/AS ☑ BA/BS ☑ MA ☑ Doctoral  
What discipline(s)? Educational Leadership  
Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of an acceptable length? ☑YES ☑NO |

---
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**MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM**

Under federal regulation §602.16(a)(1)(vii), WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions and Comments: (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections of this table as appropriate.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Requirements</strong></td>
<td>Does the institution follow federal requirements on recruiting students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ YES □ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We do not provide incentive compensation to employees or third-party entities for their success in securing student enrollments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree completion and cost</td>
<td>Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ YES □ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ YES □ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no cost to Residents/students for the degree program and information on length is available on the website, handbook, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers and employment</td>
<td>Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ YES □ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ YES □ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Throughout the recruitment and admissions process, we provide information regarding where our graduates work and at what levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 requirements do not apply to the recruitment of international students residing in foreign countries who are not eligible to receive Federal financial aid.**

---
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### 3 - STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation*8602-16(1)(x) WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s student complaints policies, procedures, and records. (See also WSCUC Senior College and University Commission’s Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions/Comments (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections of this table as appropriate.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Policy on student complaints | Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints?  
Is the policy or procedure easily accessible?  
If so, where? Appendix O: Academic Policy (p. 70-73) 2018 Resident Supervisor Handbook  
Comments: |
| Process(es)/ procedure | Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints?  
If so, please describe briefly  
Grievance may be made by students arising out of a decision or action taken by faculty/staff that violates TBC’s written policies/procedures or constitutes arbitrary, capricious, or unequal application of written policy. Student submits letter of grievance to Director, Program explaining the situation and provides supporting documentation. After submission, Director of Program investigates grievance in an attempt to resolve the situation. This investigation might include interviews, review of documentation, and the convening of a committee to review the grievance. The Director of Program shall respond to the grievance within 30 days. The student may appeal in writing the decision in which case the grievance will be escalated to the managing director or executive director. The executive director’s decision shall be in writing and shall be considered final.  
If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure?  
Comments: |
| Records | Does the institution maintain records of student complaints?  
If so, where?  
Yes, within internal cloud-based storage (SharePoint)  
Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time?  
If so, please describe briefly:  
Currently data monitored in Excel document within our internal storage cloud. Future efforts to migrate into SF  
Comments: |

*Signature*
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**4 - TRANSFER CREDIT REVIEW FORM**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions/Comments (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections of this table as appropriate.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Credit Policy(s)</td>
<td>Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for reviewing and receiving transfer credit? No transfer credit is allowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If so, is the policy publicly available? N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If so, where?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer credit policies do not apply to our program (students do not transfer into our program).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*§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.
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