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ABSTRACT

The History of the Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership at Brandman University From an Innovation Theory Perspective: Beta Cohort 2013-Zeta Cohort 2017

by Rebecca Farley

Purpose Statement. The purpose of this historical research study was to document the evolution of the Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership at Brandman University from concept and design to implementation to present iterations (2013-2017). In addition, it was the purpose of this study to examine changes in vision, structure, curriculum, and the factors that influenced key leaders and decisions from the perspective of Bolman and Deal's 4-frame model, including structural, human resource, political, and symbolic frames.

Methodology. This study is part of a 2-person thematic qualitative historical study on the Brandman doctoral program, with 1 researcher studying program design and implementation with the Alpha cohort in 2012, and this researcher studying the evolution of the program from the Beta cohort of 2013 through the Zeta cohort of 2017. Interviews were conducted with 16 key leaders of the program during the time period being studied. Additionally, relevant documents, artifacts, and relics were reviewed to triangulate interview data.

Findings. Findings of this research study relate to the importance of leaders using a variety of frames through which to view their organization and make strategic leadership decisions regarding systematically pursuing innovation. Additionally, the findings
address the importance of aligning hiring practices and program structures to the core values and mission of the organization.

**Conclusions.** Utilizing Bolman and Deal’s 4-frame model, the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership was evaluated in terms of its innovative approach to doctoral education. The program’s focus on transformational leadership offered in a practitioner scholar environment exemplified alignment between theory and practice.

**Recommendations.** Further study is recommended to determine the impact of the Brandman doctoral program. Recommendations include studies focused on the role of the human resources frame in the evolution of the program; impact of student transformational change projects (TCPs); evaluation of quantitative program data; analysis of the perspectives of other members of the Brandman University community; replication of this historical study, focusing on the years following 2017; and examination of the role of the Brandman University Center for Instructional Innovation (CII).
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PREFACE

Following discussions regarding the importance of historical studies of institutions of higher education—and particularly those utilizing innovative practices—two doctoral students, in collaboration with faculty members, developed a common interest in researching innovative practices in education doctoral programs. This resulted in a thematic study by a research team of two doctoral students. This qualitative historical study of the Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership at Brandman University from an innovation perspective was designed with a focus on Bolman and Deal’s (2017) four-frame model: structural frame, human resource frame, political frame, and symbolic frame. Each researcher interviewed at least 10 present or former members of the Brandman University doctoral program faculty or staff to determine the extent to which each frame, and which combination of frames, might have been most important to the development and evolution of the innovative doctoral program.

To ensure thematic consistency and reliability, the team developed the purpose statement, research questions, definitions of terms, interview questions, survey, and study procedures. This researcher interviewed Brandman University faculty and staff who were identified as having played a pivotal role in the doctoral program between 2013 and 2017. Throughout the study, the term peer researchers is used to refer to the researchers who conducted the thematic study. My fellow doctoral student and peer researcher and I studied the history of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Education with the following populations: Jennifer Dinielli, concept design through implementation with the Alpha cohort of 2012; Rebecca Farley, Beta cohort of 2013 through Zeta cohort of 2017.
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Background

Change is essential to the human experience: “Throughout our human history, as we developed and created the world around us, the sharing and building of one idea on another has been, and always will be, our best recipe for innovation” (Lockwood & Papke, 2018, p. 9). Unlike the fixed nature of the natural universe, social structures are continually changing (Drucker, 1999). Poole and Van de Ven (2004) asserted that “innovation is an important partner to change. It is the wellspring of social and economic progress, and both a product and a facilitator of the free exchange of ideas that is the lifeblood of progress” (p. ix). Through innovation “we create a better world through which we find ways to guide and change the human experience” (Lockwood & Papke, 2018, p. 10). Such innovation enables organizations to survive and remain relevant.

In recent decades, change has accelerated around the world. Kotter (2012) argued that “a globalized economy is creating both more hazards and more opportunities for everyone, forcing firms to make dramatic improvements not only to compete and prosper but also to merely survive” (p. 20). This globalization is being driven by forces such as innovations in technology and widespread economic growth and integration (Kotter, 2012). Such rapid transition has implications for leaders of all types of organizations. Ackerman Anderson and Anderson (2010) noted, “In our increasingly competitive world—leaders have little choice but to press for more with less, cut corners, try to attend to their highest priority changes while keeping customers satisfied and get results as fast as possible” (p. 2). Drucker (1999) asserted that in such rapid transition, every organization must explicitly focus on and measure its performance in innovation in order
to remain viable. Similarly, Ackerman Anderson and Anderson (2010) explained, “Superior change capability requires establishing change as a strategic discipline in the organization” (p. 2010). In order to successfully navigate change, an organization must embrace the discipline of innovation (Ackerman Anderson & Anderson, 2010; Drucker, 2006). Without such purposeful innovation, “the knowledge-based organization will very soon find itself obsolescent” (Drucker, 2006, p. 143). However, those organizations that can adeptly navigate the challenges associated with rapid change and consistent innovation will emerge as victors (Ackerman Anderson & Anderson, 2010).

**Innovation**

Kanter (1983) asserted that innovation is necessary for all living things, including human organizations. From the development of nations to the discovery of scientific breakthroughs, innovation is the source of successful evolution (Argyris, 1965; Harari, 2015; Lockwood & Papke, 2018). The traditional s-curve theory of organizational change illustrated that without innovation an organization will undergo the natural lifecycle of change and ultimately lose relevance and become irrelevant (Rogers, 2003). Building upon the traditional s-curve model, Land’s (1997) s-curve theory of transformation, originally published in 1973, described successful organizational change as a string of connected s-curves depicting the organization’s need to continually reinvent itself through innovation in order to prevent itself from moving into a final, fatal descent into obscurity. Drucker (1985a) further explained that a lack of innovation “results from senile decay, from the bankruptcy of ideas and institutions, from failure of self-renewal” (p. 254). Therefore, innovation serves as the fuel to move an organization from the downward turn of a particular organizational or product structure into its end-of-life
decline, innovation enables all organizations to reinvent and reinvigorate themselves. From the American founding fathers seeking religious and political innovation (Staloff, 2005; Thelin, 2011), to the global corporations of the 21st century, innovation serves as the vehicle for all human change (Kanter, 1983; Rogers, 2003).

**Innovation in Organizations**

Drucker (1985a) asserted that in the ever-changing global marketplace of the 21st century, success in not guaranteed. He explained that “institutions, systems, policies eventually outlive themselves, as do products, processes, and services. They do it when they accomplish their objectives and they do it when they fail to accomplish their objectives” (Drucker, 1985a, p. 253). This notion has significant implications for leaders as well as the organizations they lead. Burke (2018) explained Howard Gardner’s notion of the innovative mind, one of five key mindsets necessary for the survival of leaders in the future, as one that instinctively understands the needs of those they lead and can elicit a connection to their common beliefs as a means of guiding them through the innovation process. Drucker (1985a) continued,

“Innovation,” then, is an economic or social rather than a technical term. It can be defined the way J. B. Say defined entrepreneurship, as changing the yield of resources . . . as changing the value and satisfaction obtained from resources by the consumer. (p. 33)

In essence, innovation is the natural and continual process of revision and reinvention required for humans and human organizations to remain active and relevant.
Innovation in Higher Education

The American university continually serves as a catalyst of democracy, social and economic mobility, and world leadership (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997; Freidman & Mandelbaum, 2011; Thelin, 2011). In order to maintain its position as a leading force in the world, the American higher education system has repeatedly engaged in the cycle of innovation. Harvard College, America’s inaugural university, was designed by Puritan leaders to provide education comparable to Oxford or Cambridge in England (Geiger, 2014). Following the first World War, the American university gained acclaim for excellence in research (Drucker, 1985a). Similarly, following World War II the American university underwent another innovative turn to better meet the needs of a more diverse student body (Drucker, 1985a). Drucker (2001) explained that the approach of the 21st century brought with it the transformation of society into a knowledge society, which required redefining what it meant to be an educated person and therefore maintain relevance and influence in the new economy. Freidman and Mandelbaum (2011) noted that at the turn of the 21st century, America reduced its investment in innovation and higher education, which put the nation at risk of losing its competitive edge in the world. Ultimately, research concluded that the continued success of the American university as the leading force for the expansion of democracy, freedom, and innovation depends upon its ability to continually reinvent itself to meet the needs of an ever-changing student body, nation, and world (Friedman & Mandelbaum, 2011; Gardner, 2008; Hendrickson, Lane, Harris, & Dorman, 2013).
Theoretical Foundations for Innovation or Change Theory

Change is an inevitable part of existence for individuals and organizations, yet successfully navigating change is a complex process. Drucker (1985a) defined innovation as “a systematic examination of the areas of change that typically offer entrepreneurial opportunities” (p. 35). Tarde (1903) explained that an innovation moves through a standard cycle of adoption in which an innovator presents a new idea or process, which is then adopted and reinvented as it is embraced by ever-larger societal groups (Kinnunen, 1996; Rogers, 1962). Following Tarde’s groundbreaking work on the diffusion of innovation, numerous frameworks on change theory emerged (Ackerman Anderson & Anderson, 2010; Kubler-Ross, 1969; Rogers, 1962; Wisdom, Chor, Hoagwood, & Horwitz, 2014). Rogers’s (1962) diffusion of innovation model outlined five categories of social groups that represent the typical categories of individuals who move an innovation through the process of acceptance: innovators, early adopters, early majority, late majority, and laggards. Rogers asserted that the successful diffusion of an innovation is dependent upon adoption by innovators and early adopters, who, by nature of their social and economic position in society, have significant sway over the general populace (Grenny, Patterson, Maxfield, McMillan, & Switzler, 2013; Manning, 2017; Rogers, 2004). Most importantly, Rogers’s (1962) s-curve depicted the five-stage life cycle of an innovation or organization, demonstrating that if an organization does not reinvent itself through repeated innovation, it eventually follows the life cycle to its death (Brown, 1991; Kinnunen, 1996; Manning, 2017; Rice & Rogers, 1980; Rogers, 1962).

Related theories regarding organizational change and innovation have emerged over time. Although originally developed to illustrate the stages of the human grief
process, the adapted Kubler-Ross change curve illustrated the typical three-stage emotional experience of an individual undergoing the change process: shock and denial, anger and depression, acceptance and integration (Kubler-Ross, 1969). Collins and Porras’s (2002) organizational vision framework postulated that in order to withstand the changes required over time, an organization’s vision must be comprised of a core ideology (values and purpose) and an envisioned future (big, hairy, audacious goal and a vivid description of its achievement). Ackerman Anderson and Anderson’s (2010) change leader’s roadmap outlined a nine-step cycle for continuous transformational change. Unlike the aforementioned models, the change leader’s roadmap accounts for personal and organizational elements of the change process, identified as the four quadrants of change leader accountability: mindset, behavior, culture, and systems (Ackerman Anderson & Anderson, 2010). Although disparate in their approaches to organizational change, each of these theoretical frameworks is based on the fundamental assumption that without successfully managing the lifecycle of change, an organization will ultimately fail.

**Theoretical Foundation—Bolman and Deal’s Four-Frame Model**

Bolman and Deal’s (2017) four-frame model explained that leaders must learn to fluidly shift between four distinct mental models, or lenses (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic), in order to view their organization comprehensively and thereby lead change effectively through the lifecycle of continuous innovation. Structural challenges within an organization relate to distributing and organizing roles and tasks, whereas human resource challenges relate to the ways in which human needs, particularly the need for professional satisfaction, impact the organization (Bolman & Deal, 2017).
Additionally, Bolman and Deal (2017) contended that change can lead to political challenges because “most important decisions involve allocating scarce resources—deciding who gets what” (p. 184), thereby necessitating the creation of opportunities for individuals and coalitions to interact effectively. Finally, the symbolic frame addresses the “myth(s), vision, and values [that] imbue an organization with deep purpose and resolve” (Bolman & Deal, 2017, p. 242). During the change process, a leader can build consensus and reduce conflict by drawing on the symbols of the past or developing new rituals and ceremonies to facilitate change (Bolman & Deal, 2017). Bolman and Deal’s (2017) four-frame model can be applied to the innovation life cycle of both corporate and nonprofit organizations, thereby giving leaders a multiframe model to evaluate the strengths and needs of their organizations. More specifically, the four-frame model is uniquely adept at providing leaders of institutions of higher education a tool to successfully navigate the complex nuances of their organizations (Bolman & Gallos, 2011).

**History of American Higher Education**

The American university has distinguished itself from its European predecessors most notably in that it has served as a catalyst of social and economic mobility to an ever-widening range of students through the process of continual reinvention and innovation (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997; Hendrickson et al., 2013; Lucas, 2006). Harvard College was founded in the early 1600s by a group of more than 100 Cambridge and Oxford graduates who immigrated to America (Rudolph, 1990). Rudolph (1990) explained, “In the future the state would need competent rulers, the church would require a learned clergy, and society itself would need the adornment of cultured men” (p. 6). The early American
commitment to higher education for a broad citizenry was evident throughout the colonial era by the founding of several universities before the Revolutionary War, including Harvard, Yale, Dartmouth, and William and Mary (Rudolph, 1990). More importantly, historical documents highlight the wide variety of backgrounds of students who attended such institutions in the colonial era, including the sons of ministers, servants, and farmers (Lucas, 2006). Brubacher and Rudy (2004) noted that the social equality of the American university system yielded social mobility and “made it easier to maintain freedom in general, and academic freedom in particular” (pp. 430-431). The uniquely American commitment to decentralized power structures enabled the nation to develop a disparate yet effective system of institutions of higher education (Brubacher & Rudy, 2004).

**University Education as a Means of Social and Economic Mobility**

Following the Revolutionary War, the American public university was transformed. The war had been “a full-bodied statement to the effect that in America man counted for more, took less account of his superiors—indeed frequently denied their existence, achieved whatever distinction his own ability and the bounty of the land allowed him” (Rudolph, 1990, p. 34). Additionally, college began to appeal to middle class families as a means to improving one’s opportunities (Rudolph, 1990). However, the turmoil of the American Revolution brought about the challenge of establishing and reaffirming the tenets of a truly American university, including the belief in democracy and the value of individualism (Lucas, 2006). This new era enabled the American university to serve as a means of improving the social and economic mobility of its increasingly diverse student body.
Demographic and Philosophical Evolutions

The rapid growth of the American university led to a more diverse student population and, in turn, required a more tolerant view of religious beliefs. In 1779, Thomas Jefferson worked to eliminate the role of the professor of divinity at the university, arguing instead for the inclusion of natural sciences and modern languages (Rudolph, 1990). Similarly, the Yale Report of 1828 responded to public demand for colleges to focus on preparing graduates for specific professions by advocating for the merit of a classic university education designed to hone the habits of mind (Lucas, 2006).

The American university also served as a means of enabling students to meet their individual social and economic goals by providing technical and professional training for specific careers (Lucas, 2006; Veysey, 1965). In 1907, the president of the University of Illinois argued, “The universities that would thrive must put away all exclusiveness and dedicate themselves to universal public service. They must not try to keep people out; they must help all who are worthy to get in” (Veysey, 1965, p. 64). To that end, American universities have had to continually innovate to meet the shifting needs of the populace.

Funding the American University for Mass Consumption

In the Colonial Era, private benefactors were few, as were endowments. Subscriptions became a popular means of garnering support for universities from the common man—sometimes in the form of donated crops or labor (Rudolph, 1990). The American Education Society collected donations from Congregational churches to support the improvement of American colleges and identify potential ministerial students to support with scholarship funding (Rudolph, 1990). Colonial American colleges were
often allowed to use state-run lotteries to raise funds for the institution, and the gifting of land was a common means of support to colleges (Thelin, 2011).

President Lincoln signed the Land Grant College Act in 1862, which allowed for a portion of revenue generated by each state from the sale of land granted to them from the federal government to be used to create at least one college that focused on agriculture and mechanics (Lucas, 2006). Due to an unanticipated lack of public interest in the agricultural and mechanical (A&M) colleges and a dearth of federal funding to sustain the institutions, the land-grant colleges faced financial difficulty; however, the Morrill Act of 1890 addressed this challenge by providing annual funding to the land-grant colleges (Lucas, 2006). Following the Civil War, private colleges began to emerge as graduates achieved success and were able to provide financial stability through their philanthropy (Rudolph, 1990).

**History of the Doctorate in Education**

Doctoral education and scholarly research publication were slowly embraced as the pinnacle of American educational attainment. Not until the early 1900s was a Ph.D. typically mandatory of full-time university faculty (Veysey, 1965). Lee Shulman, president of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, described the significant role and responsibility of a doctorate degree as a degree that “exists at the junction of the intellectual and the moral. The Ph.D. is expected to serve as a steward of her discipline or profession, dedicated to the integrity of its work in the generation, critique, transformation, transmission, and use of its knowledge” (Golde & Walker, 2006, p. 3). The doctorate in education was developed in the late 1800s, with Teacher’s College at Columbia University offering a Ph.D. in education in 1893 (Shulman, Golde,
Bueschel, & Garabedian, 2006), and the education doctorate (Ed.D.), a practitioner-focused degree in education, was first offered at Harvard University in the 1920s (Perry, 2010). Nearly 30 universities offered both degree options by the middle of the 20th century (Andersen, 1983), and by 2006, the field of education awarded an average of 7,000 doctoral degrees annually, which is the largest number of total doctoral degrees of all disciplines (Golde & Walker, 2006). Currently, the majority of doctoral graduates in education are female, and minority groups are better represented than in other disciplines (Golde & Walker, 2006).

**Historical Evaluations of the Doctorate in Education**

Freeman (1931) conducted the first research study regarding the differences between the Ph.D. in education and Ed.D. Freeman’s (1931) study identified the primary differences between the two degree options as the foreign language requirement for Ph.D. students and prior professional experience requirement for Ed.D. students. Additionally, there were notable differences in the focus of the final research project; Ph.D. students were required to conduct original research while Ed.D. students engaged in the study of current research. Offering two terminal degrees in the same discipline has proven challenging for the field of education and has led researchers to explore and debate the similarities and differences between the two types of degree programs at great length.

**Evaluation in the 1960s and 1980s**

Over the course of the 1960s, a series of studies regarding the doctorate in education were conducted (Brown, 1966; Brown & Slater 1960; Ludlow, Sanderson, & Pugh 1964) in which researchers found only minor differences between the Ph.D. and the Ed.D. Ludlow et al. (1964) found that graduates from both degree programs moved into
college teaching positions. Brown (1966) also found that graduates of both degree programs were primarily men in their late 30s and that students from the southeastern portion of the country were not equally represented in either doctoral program. Ludlow et al. (1964) found that graduates of both programs typically benefitted from increased salaries, job promotions, and the opportunity to pursue positions outside of their original geographic area.

In the 1980s, another round of investigation regarding the differences between the Ph.D. in education and the Ed.D. surfaced. Andersen (1983) surveyed all 167 American universities that offered a terminal degree in education from 1981 to 1983. Half of the institutions indicated they offered both the Ph.D. in education and the Ed.D. (Andersen, 1983). The study revealed that admission requirements of each degree were found to be robust, and often they were exactly the same for both degrees (Andersen, 1983). Andersen (1983) noted that similarities between the two education degree programs were not unexpected, and explained, “Presumably there is great overlap in the base of knowledge and competencies needed to function as a researcher or practitioner,” and “generally, graduates of both types of degree programs are prepared to operate in either capacity” (p. 58). That being the case, distinguishing between the two programs became increasingly difficult.

**The Practitioner Degree**

It is not uncommon to find two terminal degrees in a single discipline. Much like the Ph.D. in law and the Doctor of Jurisprudence (J.D.) or the Ph.D. in a biomedical science and the Doctor of Medicine (M.D.), the practitioner-focused degree is no less rigorous than the research-focused degree, although their pedagogy and intended
purposes differ greatly, as do their instructional and assessment methodologies (Golde & Walker, 2006; Perry, 2010; Shulman et al., 2006; Townsend, 2002). For example, an M.D. student will apply classroom learning in a variety of medical facilities, whereas a biomedical Ph.D. student will conduct original research in a research lab (Shulman et al., 2006).

Unlike the J.D. or M.D., however, the Ed.D. has not obtained the prestige typically attributed to its practitioner-focused, terminal degree counterparts. Shulman et al. (2006) described the reputation of the Ed.D. as being a “low-end Ph.D.,” which he attributed, at least in part, to the lack of differentiation between the Ph.D. in education and the Ed.D. (p. 25). Through their work with the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate (CID), Walker, Golde, Jones, Conklin Bueschel, and Hutchings (2008) explained the responsibility doctoral programs hold regarding the formation of scholars, which includes developing both deep content knowledge and the abilities and practices expected of those serving in critical roles of scholarship. While each doctoral degree differs in intended purpose, programs for both degrees tend to place great emphasis on research and rely on innovation to remain viable over time.

Re-envisioning the Education Doctorate

Throughout the remainder of the 20th century, the Ed.D. continued to expand in popularity, and by 2004, it was producing the largest number of doctoral degrees of any discipline in the country with strong representation of women and minority students (McCarty & Ortloff, 2004). McCarty and Ortloff (2004) reported that the general demographics of education doctorate students remained similar to those of past eras. Even in a period of notable growth, numerous scholars continued to question and criticize
the lack of differentiation between the Ed.D. and the Ph.D. in education (Andersen, 1983; V. Anderson, 2010; Deering, 1998; Miller & Curry, 2014; Shulman et al., 2006; Taylor & Storey, 2011; Woody, 1947).

The Education Doctorate (Ed.D.) and Innovation—University of La Verne

Prior to the various Carnegie initiatives, the University of La Verne embarked on the development of an Ed.D. program in educational leadership beginning in 1973 as an innovative alternative to the traditional Ed.D. programs available during the era (Cook, 2000). Cook’s (2000) historical study of the University of La Verne’s doctoral program in education provided a narrative account of the various historical events that led to its development and evolution over time. More specifically, Cook (2000) shared how the doctoral program became a model of innovation by focusing on the needs of the current study body and the promise of a practitioner-focused doctoral experience.

Statement of the Research Problem

Innovation is critical to the survival of all living beings and organizations. Drucker (2008) asserted that innovation and growth are so fundamental to the evolutionary process that their absence leads to social and economic upheaval. Relatedly, researchers have explained that even successfully innovative organizations must consistently evaluate and change their innovative practices or risk finding themselves in obscurity (Drucker, 2008; Kanter, 1983; Mintzberg, 1979). Historical research can be used to gain insight into the decisions made by an individual or organization over time (Borg & Gall, 1971; Gottschalk, 1950).

Historical research studies provide a rich, detailed account of the evolution of an organization or group of people. Such studies preserve the intricacies of the lived
experience of a group and, as a result, provide a tool others can learn from and use to emulate the choices that had the greatest positive impact on those who were studied (Borg & Gall, 1971; Nevins, 1966). This is critically important information in cases regarding innovative organizations because the very nature of innovation prompts instability and shifts in political structures (Mintzberg, 1983). Preserving the thoughts and actions of those directly involved in the innovative process of an organization provides others with the opportunity to consider the multifaceted nature of innovation in light of the various perspectives that leaders have used to guide their leadership practices (Bolman & Deal, 2017).

Historical studies of business innovation are abundant (Collins, 2001; Collins & Porras, 2002; Kanter, 1983; McCord, 2017; Pugh, 2009). In these works, researchers outline the strategies employed by industry leaders to navigate the diffusion of innovation and the reinvention necessary for survival. Collins (2001) described the process as “our search for timeless, universal answers that can be applied by any organization” (p. 5). Thus, historical studies can help to inform the reflective practices of individuals and organizations as they strive to increase their own competence in innovation (Drucker, 2008).

Although the American university plays a critical role in the advancement of democracy and social mobility throughout the nation and world, very few true historical studies regarding the practices of innovative educational institutions exist (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997). Historical accounts of the American university typically chronicle large spans of time and highlight political forces of influence but rarely delve into deep, first-person historical accounts of those guiding the innovation of individual universities or
systems of higher education (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997; Rudolph, 1990; Thelin, 2011; Veysey, 1965). Other studies have addressed specific innovative efforts, often those related to a particular movement, such as a Danforth or Carnegie Foundation initiatives to improve educational leader preparation rather than providing a historical study of the evolution of particular institutions of higher education (Marsh, 2013; Milstein, 1993; Perry, 2010; Walker et al., 2008).

Research indicates that the future success of individuals, groups, and organizations is predicated on mastering the subject matter of an industry as well as the ways of thinking and habits specific to the discipline (Gardner, 2008; Drucker, 1985a). That is to say, if an institution of higher education wishes to be innovative, it must study and purposefully implement the habits of innovative thinking within higher education. In order to engage in such reflective practices, an organization would be best served by studying the discipline of innovation as practiced by highly successful institutions of higher education. However, very few historical studies of American university doctoral programs have been produced (Cook, 2000). To that end, historical studies of highly successful, innovative universities are necessary for the instruction and improvement of the American university and its continued influence on the world.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this historical research study was to document the evolution of the Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership at Brandman University from concept and design to implementation to present iterations (2013-2017). In addition, it was the purpose of this study to examine changes in vision, structure, curriculum, and the factors...
that influenced key leaders and decisions from the perspective of Bolman and Deal’s four-frame model, including structural, human resource, political, and symbolic frames.

**Research Questions**

1. What were the key *structural* factors and decisions that led to the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership?

2. What were the key *human resource* factors and decisions that led to the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership?

3. What were the key *political* factors and decisions that led to the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership?

4. What were the key *symbolic* factors and decisions that led to the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership?

5. What frame or combination of frames (structural, human resource, political, symbolic) do the participants perceive had the greatest impact on the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership and why?

**Significance of the Problem**

The American university serves as a critical component of economic innovation for the nation as a whole and as a source of social and economic mobility for individuals (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997; Lucas, 2006). Maintaining America’s political and economic edge requires “more innovation powered by better education for every American” argued Friedman and Mandelbaum (2011, p. 86). However, as the needs of the American public have shifted in regard to the ways it consumes education, leaders face a significant
challenge in ensuring that their institutions can effectively innovate in order to continue to fulfill the overarching mission of the American university (Hendrickson et al., 2013). In 2011, more than 20 million students were enrolled in American institutions of higher education (Hendrickson et al., 2013). With ever-increasing enrollment and ever-expanding student needs, the American university must continually reinvent itself in order to maintain its relevance to the nation and world.

While there is a significant body of research regarding innovation theory and the diffusion of innovation specifically (Drucker, 1985a, 1985b; Kanter, 1983; Rogers, 1962), the majority of innovation studies address business and industry (Collins, 2001; Collins & Porras, 2002; Drucker, 1985a, 1985b; Martin, 2011; McCord, 2017; Pugh, 1995), with relatively few studies addressing innovation in higher education. Studies that do address innovation in higher education typically address implementation of specific programs or initiatives of a particular era, but do not provide a large-scale historical study of a specific institution and its consistent adherence to the principles of innovation over time (Milstein, 1993; Perry, 2010; Walker et al., 2008). Historical studies, by their nature, reflect the evolution of an organization through the words of the individual members of the group and evaluation of pertinent artifacts (Borg & Gall, 1971; Nevins, 1966). They provide a clear account of the pivotal decisions made, reasoning utilized, and commitments to particular ways of being (Cook, 2000), which can serve as a blueprint to other universities seeking to ensure they engage in innovative practices and thereby prevent themselves from becoming outdated and irrelevant. This study provides critical historical documentation regarding the development and innovative evolution of a university doctoral program in organizational leadership, viewed through Bolman and
Deal’s (2017) four-frame model, and serve as a model to other institutions of higher education.

Governing boards of institutions of higher education at large can benefit from this study as they seek to understand innovation theory in the context of successful institutions of higher education. Similarly, administrative leaders of doctoral programs may find this study useful in identifying practices and policies that enable the development and consistent reinvention of a doctoral program of organizational leadership. Additionally, university faculty members may find value in this study’s exploration of the role of professors and instructors in the implementation of the discipline of innovation throughout the history of an institution of higher education.

If university governing boards, leaders, administrators, and instructors do not commit themselves to studying the discipline of innovation and the habits of highly successful innovative universities, they will be vulnerable to the inevitable decline from innovation to obscurity (Drucker, 1985a). The nature of innovation requires an institution to regularly reinvent itself. This reinvention process requires consciously exploring sources of innovation and structuring itself in such a manner as to maximize the climate for innovation (Drucker, 1985a; Martin, 2011). Leaders can position themselves to best manage the challenges of navigating change and innovation by systematically evaluating core elements of their organization for insights (Bolman & Deal, 2017; Bolman & Gallos, 2011).
Definitions

The terms and definitions to follow are relevant to this study.

Theoretical Definitions

**Organizational change.** An alteration of an organization’s form or function that is so profound, the members of the organization must alter their perspective, actions, or approach in order for the change to be sustained (Ackerman Anderson & Anderson, 2010; D. Anderson & Ackerman Anderson, 2010; Collins, 2001; Collins & Porras, 1994, 2002; Kotter, 2012; Kubler-Ross, 1969; Rogers, 1962).

**Structural frame.** The structural frame describes the architecture of an organization, including goals, strategy, metrics, rubrics, technology, specialized roles, formal relationships, and the coordination of these into a structured organization chart supported with policies, procedures and rules (Argyris 1998; Bolman & Deal, 2017; Helgesen, 1995; Mintzberg, 1979; Thompson, 1967; Weber, 1947).

**Human resource frame.** The human resource frame describes understanding people and relationships, including human needs, feelings, fears, skills, biases, development opportunities, and the fit between the individual and the organization (Bolman & Deal, 2017; Cable & DeRue, 2002; Collins & Porras, 1994; Follett, 1918; Mayo, 1945).

**Political frame.** The political frame describes power and gaining access to scarce resources through competition among individuals and groups based on diverse interests, values, beliefs, behaviors, and skills (Bolman & Deal, 2017; Cyert & March, 1963; Gamson, 1986; Pfeffer, 1992).
**Symbolic frame.** The symbolic frame describes strategies for engaging people through ritual, ceremony, story, play, and culture (Bolman & Deal, 2017; Collins, 2001; Collins & Porras, 1994; Hofstede, 1984; Kotter & Cohen, 2002).

**Operational Definitions**

**Concept.** The foundational idea behind a program intended to provide meaningful direction for the process of design and implementation (Drucker, 1985a).

**Curriculum.** The knowledge and skills students are expected to learn in Brandman’s Ed.D. program, including instruction, instructional resources, and delivery design (Watermark Insights, 2011).

**Design.** A practical approach to solving an existing or predicted organizational problem through forming, modeling, and shaping a concept into a reality (Drucker, 2014).

**Organizational change.** A process critical to organizational survival by which actions are taken to shape program development and leadership decisions toward the predicted future (Drucker, 2014).

**Structure.** The architecture of an organization, including goals, strategy, metrics, rubrics, technology, specialized roles, formal relationships, and the coordination of these with policies, procedures and rules (Bolman & Deal, 2017).

**Vision.** A picture of a predicted future state which serves as an enduring guide for the organizational change (Collins & Porras, 1994; Drucker, 1985a).
Delimitations

This study was delimited to Brandman University faculty and staff involved in the concept, design, and implementation and of the Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership at Brandman University from 2013-2017.

Organization of the Study

This study was organized into six chapters, references, and appendices. Chapter I provided an introduction to the study and background of the American higher education system. Additionally, Chapter I provided the statement of the research problem, purpose statement, research questions, and significance of the problem. Chapter II provides a review of the literature regarding the framework of the study, beginning with storytelling and historical research, then addressing innovation and change theory, and Bolman and Deal’s (2017) four-frame model. The literature review then addresses the American higher education system and innovative education doctoral programs. Chapter III outlines the methodology utilized in the study, as well as the population and sample studied. Chapter IV presents the narrative of the development and implementation of the Brandman University Doctor of Education in Organizational Leadership, as told by the faculty and staff involved in the process, and organizational artifacts. Chapter V provides an analysis of the data collected from interviews of key faculty and staff and organizational artifacts. Chapter VI provides key findings, related conclusions, and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Overview

This review of the literature examines current and past research related to innovation, theories of innovation and change, and their relationship to the history of American higher education. First, this review explores innovation theory and provides examples of several prominent innovation and change models. Next, Bolman and Deal’s (2017) four-frame model of innovation is explored in detail because it serves as the theoretical framework for this study. This review further explores the critical role of American higher education and various historical innovations in education doctoral programs (Lucas, 2006; Rudolph, 1990; Veysey, 1965). Additionally, this review explores historical research methodology, including histography and oral history methods, which facilitate the study of historical documents, relics, and testimonies regarding past events in order to produce a longstanding record and instructive narrative for subsequent generations (Borg & Gall, 1971; Gottschalk, 1950; Starr, 1996). This review concludes with a discussion of the research gap that exists in historical studies of innovative doctoral programs, necessitating a historical study of the innovation utilized in the implementation and refinement of Brandman University’s Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership from 2013 to 2017 (Cook, 2000; Marsh, 2013; McCarty & Ortloff, 2004; Perry, 2010; Townsend, Newell, & Wiese 1992).

Innovation and Change

Innovation

Bridges and Bridges (2009) asserted that “the continuation of anything depends on its changing” (p. 107). Drucker (1985a, 1985b, 2001) explained that change comes
through innovation, whereby an action, organization, system, or item is imbued with value it did not previously possess or produces a different outcome than before. Researchers also refer to innovation as the active pursuit of change (Bridges & Bridges, 2009; Drucker, 1999; Wright, 2009). Addressing the necessity of innovation, Poole and Van de Ven (2004) asserted that innovation is critical to all progress. Gardner (2008) further explained that innovations designed to address the most challenging needs are those most likely to have the greatest and most sustained impact. Accordingly, the study of innovation has evolved to include applications spanning large-scale organizations and multiple disciplines.

**Innovation Theory Defined**

Seminal researcher and French sociologist Gabriel Tarde first explained the adoption and diffusion of innovation as a natural process of human imitation (Kinnunen, 1996; Tarde, 1903). Tarde’s (1903) theory described the process by which an innovation is adopted throughout a population following a curve of diffusion. When graphed, the diffusion of innovation theory follows a traditional sigmoid shape, or s-curve, depicting the process by which an innovation is adopted first by a small number of group members referred to as early adopters (Rogers, 1962). The diffusion of innovation process continues to achieve an increasingly larger scope of adoption over time until reaching the final portion of the population, known as late adopters, thus marking the full diffusion of the innovation throughout the population (Dearing, 2009). Wisdom et al. (2014) explained, “Many theoretical frameworks seek to describe the dynamic process of the implementation of innovation” (p. 1). Each framework addresses the tension that exists
in the process of ensuring that an innovation achieves full diffusion while simultaneously working to begin the innovation process anew before it reaches a terminal end.

**Frameworks for Innovation and Change**

Drucker (1985a) explained that innovation is the work of entrepreneurship, whereby resources are catalyzed to produce greater outcomes. While the type of change an organization undergoes is in large part due to the structure of the organization, without successfully navigating change and moving to renewal, an organization will eventually die (Mintzberg, 1983). Rather than innovation occurring by chance, Drucker (1985a, 1985b) asserted that successful innovation is the product of systematic practices and deliberate actions. Tushman and O’Riley (2002) echoed a similar sentiment: “Innovation results from creative ideas successfully implemented. Competitive advantage is as much about execution as it is about strategy” (p. 219). In order to maximize their potential for positively navigating innovation and change, researchers have found that successful organization leaders regularly exercise disciplined habits of innovation (Collins, 2001; Day, 2007; Drucker, 1985a, 1985b; Gardner, 2008; Liedtka, 2018; McGrath & MacMillan, 1995).

Systematic processes of pursuing change and innovation vary. For example, Bridges and Bridges (2009) advocated for utilizing a transitional “neutral zone” designed for structured reflection, training, experimentation, and brainstorming in order to fuel innovation during periods of change (pp. 50-51). Rice and Rogers (1980) proposed a five-step process for innovation that enables an organizational leader to carefully align a current problem with potential innovative solutions that can be implemented and absorbed as part of the organization’s ongoing process of reinvention. Similarly, Drucker
(1985a) advocated for using a structured approach to identifying opportunities for innovation, explaining, “Systematic innovation therefore consists in the purposeful and organized search for changes, and in the systematic analysis of the opportunities such changes might offer for economic or social innovation” (p. 35). To that end, Drucker (1985a, 1985b) recommended that leaders regularly monitor seven areas that often provide opportunity for innovation, including unexpected successes or failures, changes in an industry, and changes in demographic trends.

Similarly, Liedtka (2018) advocated for the benefits of the structured approach of design thinking, explaining that a structured process for innovation can help to counter the immobilization that can manifest in individuals during the exploratory stage of innovation. In essence, by utilizing a disciplined approach, a leader can ensure continual innovation within an organization, thereby preserving its overall viability during the transition when one innovation reaches full diffusion and the next begins (Brown, 1991). Lockwood and Papke (2018) described the recent trend of using design thinking as a means of generating “competitive advantage in accelerating innovation and investing in a new type of innovation readiness” (p. 18). Although numerous innovation and change models exist, each provides a particular framework for analyzing and supporting an organization and its members through the change process (Kezar, 2001). Kezar (2001) additionally asserted that the majority of change models can be classified into one of six categories: evolutionary, teleological, life cycle, dialectical, social cognition, or cultural. Six of the most commonly referenced theoretical frameworks were selected for this study and are reviewed in the following sections.
**Rogers’s Diffusion of Innovation Model**

Building upon Tarde’s (1903) notion of the diffusion of innovation through social imitation, Rogers’s (1962) seminal study introduced the theory of the curve of diffusion, a life-cycle change model that graphically represents the process by which an innovation is introduced and spread throughout a population. Prompted by his research regarding the reluctance of Iowa farmers to adopt innovative farming practices, sociologist Everett Rogers identified a five-step process for the diffusion of innovation (Manning, 2017). Rogers’s (1962) theory also identified five categories of individuals within a given population and the critical role each group plays in the adoption process of an innovation (Grenny et al., 2013). More specifically, Rogers (1962) explained that an innovation is adopted at a rate that resembles a normal bell curve distribution, with the innovation reaching the tipping point of adoption once the innovators, early adopters, and early majority embrace the innovation, as illustrated in Figure 1 (Manning, 2017; Rogers, 1962, 2004).

Rogers (2004) noted that unfortunately, many innovations never reach full diffusion because they are neither accepted nor promoted by early adopters or the early majority; therefore, the innovation never achieves the critical mass required for diffusion. Early adopters play a critical role in the adoption process because, unlike innovators, who are often outside the established core of a group, early adopters are “socially connected and respected” (Grenny et al., 2013, p. 166). Rogers (2004) described the diffusion process as “a kind of universal micro-process of social change” (p. 16), reflecting the broad applicability of the model to guide the implementation of innovation across a wide range of organizations and groups, illustrated in Figure 2.

In the context of an organization, Rice and Rogers (1980) asserted that the successful adoption and implementation of an innovation required a process of organizational reinvention. Poole and Van der Ven (2004) further explained that “reinvention facilitates the transition of innovation ownership from developers to implementers and permits tailoring an innovation to the adopting organization’s specific needs and constraints” (p. 271). The diffusion of innovation model was readily embraced by disparate disciplines that relied on the development of strong social networks and the role of internal influencers to initiate change, such as agriculture, education, and public health (Dearing, 2009).

While diffusion research has been widely accepted and applied broadly, Rogers (2003) acknowledged that the “absence of critical viewpoints” (p. 106) of the model resulted in the theory lacking critical examination in its infancy. Criticism that emerged over time cited that the theory was biased in favor of innovation and overemphasized the role of the individual in the diffusion process (Rogers, 2003). Regardless of this criticism, diffusion studies have proliferated, providing context for the study of organizational adaptation (Poole & Van de Ven, 2004).

Kübler-Ross Change Curve

The Kübler-Ross change curve is the result of research conducted by psychiatrist Elisabeth Kübler-Ross (1969). Developed based on interviews Kübler-Ross conducted with terminally ill patients in Chicago in 1965, the original life-cycle change model identified five stages of grief a person undergoes when facing death: denial, anger, bargaining, depression, and acceptance (Elrod & Tippett, 2002). Ira Byock (2014), in his foreword to Kübler-Ross’s (1969) book, *On Death and Dying*, explained that in a post-
World War II era of national celebration and innovation, Americans did not discuss death openly. Kübler-Ross (2000) found that Americans’ fear of death increased the loneliness experienced by those who were dying. As in the process of grieving the loss of human life, the process of coming to understand and accept the loss of another or of a beloved organization is also one of complexity wherein those involved move through the phases fluidly rather than in a linear fashion. Relatively, acceptance of the pending loss can be too painful for some to even discuss for quite some time but having a framework for processing the experience can help those involved conceptualize and navigate the experience more effectively (Kübler-Ross, 2000). To that end, the Kübler-Ross change curve (Figure 3) has served as an effective theoretical framework for individuals and organizations navigating the change process.

![Figure 3. Kübler-Ross’s change curve.](image)

In its most current form, the Kübler-Ross change curve has been expanded to include seven stages of the grief cycle (Elisabeth Kübler-Ross Foundation, 2019). Although not intended to imply the process is experienced sequentially, the stages
include shock, denial, frustration, depression, experiment, decision, and integration (Elisabeth Kübler-Ross Foundation, 2019). In the first two phases, a person who is newly faced with a significant change may feel completely immobilized by and in denial of the situation (Kübler-Ross, 1969). As time progresses, individuals typically experience the various remaining emotional phases of the change process, moving through a period of grieving and letting go of the past and then moving toward accepting and committing to the new (D. Anderson & Ackerman Anderson, 2010).

The Kübler-Ross change curve provides leaders and managers with a framework for predicting and identifying the emotional impact a change might have on the people within their organization. Such knowledge enables leaders to anticipate and appropriately acknowledge the sense of grief individuals may experience through a change process and develop strategies and rituals to help facilitate the transition (Bolman & Deal, 2017). Numerous change models have been developed from the Kübler-Ross model, providing more nuanced illustrations of the human experience of transition (Elrod & Tippett, 2002). For example, Menninger’s 1975 morale curve depicted the emotional journey of Peace Corps volunteers serving overseas, and Bupp’s 1996 International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers’ (IAMAW) change model details a 10-step process of change for the industry (Elrod & Tippett, 2002).

**Bridges and Bridges’s (2009) Seven Stages of Organizational Life and Three Phases of Transition Models**

Bridges and Bridges’s (2009) seven stages of organizational life is a life-cycle change model depicting the various steps an organization undergoes over time as it rises from a vision or dream and navigates through the natural process of implementation,
illustrated in Figure 4. As a life-cycle change model, the seven stages of organizational life model depicts change as a natural, unchangeable process that all organizations undergo (Kezar, 2001). In order to ensure that an organization lives beyond its initial life cycle, Bridges and Bridges (2009) proposed that an organization could purposefully enact a process of renewal that reinvigorated the team and infused the organization with the energy necessary to begin the life cycle anew. However, such a dramatic shift in focus and momentum poses significant challenges for the people within the organization.


As a supplement to their organizational development model, Bridges and Bridges (2009) offered a second life-cycle change model depicting the emotional experience of individuals within the organization who are undergoing transition. D. Anderson and
Ackerman Anderson (2010) explained, “When change is introduced, many people will go through a natural emotional response. In the simplest of terms, it starts with resistance, then moves through a letting go phase and ends in commitment” (p. 151). Fashioned much like the Kübler-Ross change curve, Bridges and Bridges’s (2009) three phases of transition model illustrates the personal emotional phases experienced by members of the organization as they navigate the significant, long-term change required by the organizational renewal process as depicted in Figure 5.

![Figure 5. Bridges’s three phases of Transition model. Recreated from Managing Transitions: Making the Most of Change, by W. Bridges, 2009, p. 5 (Philadelphia, PA: Da Capo Press). Copyright 2009 by Da Capo Press.](image)

Phase 1 of the three phases of transition model represents a period of loss or grieving as individuals come to understand that the former organizational structures, processes, and identities will no longer exist (Bridges & Bridges, 2009). Phase 2 represents the “neutral zone,” a period of time when “the critical psychological realignments and repatterning take place” (Bridges & Bridges, 2009, p. 5). This phase can produce anxiety and disengagement as individuals seek to make sense of the systems
that are falling away and the new systems that are being established (Bridges & Bridges, 2009). Phase 2 can be a frustrating period for individuals because of the uncertainty they experience in the void seemingly created by the transition (D. L. Anderson, 2017). However, it can also be a time of great innovation because individuals are less constrained by habits or expectations of the old system, and the constraints of the new system are not yet in place (Bridges & Bridges, 2009).

Finally, Phase 3 represents the last stage of the transition process, wherein the individual moves from the uncertainty of the neutral zone to being committed to the new organization or structure (D. Anderson & Ackerman Anderson, 2010). Bridges and Bridges (2009) explained, “Beginnings are psychological phenomena. They are marked by a release of new energy in a new direction—they are the expression of a new identity” (p. 57). Burke (2018) described the new beginning phase as a period when individuals experience the psychological readiness to explore and embrace the change. Generally, researchers admonished leaders to exercise great care and patience during the three phases of transitional change to ensure that individuals complete the process successfully (D. L. Anderson, 2017; D. Anderson & Ackerman Anderson, 2010; Bridges & Bridges, 2009; Burke, 2018).

**Collins and Porras’s Organizational Vision Framework**

Another significant life-cycle change model is Collins and Porras’s (1994, 2002) organizational vision framework. Much like the models of Kübler-Ross (1969, 2000) and Bridges and Bridges (2009), Kezar (2001) classified the Collins and Porras’s (1994) framework as part of a subset of life-cycle change models known as adaptability to change models due to their focus on the human experience of change over time. The
vision framework stems from Collins and Porras’s study of 18 companies of long-term success and 18 comparison companies to determine what it takes “to start and build an enduring great company from the ground up” (Collins, 2001). The four key characteristics identified in the study were (a) “Clock Building, Not Time Telling”; (b) “Genius of the AND”; (c) “Core Ideology”; and (d) “Preserve the Core/Stimulate Progress” (Collins, 2001, pp. 197-198).

Collins and Porras’s (1994, 2002) organizational vision framework illustrated the seeming paradox exemplified by the most successful companies they studied. Bolman and Deal (2017) further explained, “Excellent companies manage to embrace paradox. They are loose yet tight, highly disciplined yet entrepreneurial” (p. 307). To that end, the Collins and Porras’s (1994) organizational vision framework is modeled after the traditional yin and yang symbol, with one half representing the immovable components of an organization’s core ideology (core values and core purpose), and the other half representing the ever-evolving elements of the organization’s envisioned future (10-30 year big, hairy audacious goal [BHAG] and vivid descriptions; Collins & Porras, 1994, 2002). The elements of the envisioned future require consistent changes over time to reflect the needs of the market and technological innovations (Collins & Porras, 1994, 2002). As depicted in Figure 6, the organizational vision framework illustrates both the unwavering and the ever-changing components of leadership required for the long-term success of an organization and their equal importance in its life cycle.
Within the Collins and Porras (1994, 2002) vision framework, core values are defined as “the organization’s essential and enduring tenets” (p. 222). Likewise, the core purpose is a timeless declaration of the organization’s purpose for existence (Collins & Porras, 1994, 2002). On the opposite side of the model, the BHAG is defined as a goal that will take 10 to 30 years to accomplish, and the organization is only 50% to 70% likely to meet the goal. Similarly, the envisioned future requires vivid descriptions of what it will look like when the BHAG is achieved in order to inspire and motivate those within the organization to work toward accomplishing their shared goal (Collins & Porras, 1994, 2002).

Although initially used as a framework to assess the success of exceptional corporations, the Collins and Porras (1994, 2002) vision framework has since been used as the theoretical framework for a historical study of innovation in higher education (Cook, 2000). Cook’s (2000) study of innovation in the doctorate of education program...
at the University of La Verne demonstrated that the vision framework was effective for analyzing the various complexities of a university doctoral program.

In general, the various lenses through which the vision framework enables leaders to view the often-contradictory elements of an organization are in keeping with other more complex change and innovation models. Criticism of the vision framework includes its intense focus on financial gain as the indicator of an organization’s success and the lack of attention given to political considerations within an organization (Bolman & Deal, 2017). However, the framework continues to be referenced by scholars of change and innovation (Ackerman Anderson & Anderson, 2010; Collins, 2001; Tushman & O’Reilly, 2002).

**Ackerman Anderson and Anderson’s Change Leader’s Roadmap**

A fifth organizational change model for review is Ackerman Anderson and Anderson’s (2010) change leader’s roadmap. This teleological change model (Kezar, 2001) focuses on the role of the change leader in moving the organization through the process of transformational change (Ackerman Anderson & Anderson, 2010). The nine-step change leader’s roadmap is designed to help guide a leader through the various stages of leading a comprehensive transformational change, paying particular attention to four areas of focus: mindset, behavior, systems, and culture (Ackerman Anderson & Anderson, 2010). According to Ackerman Anderson and Anderson (2010), the transformational change process begins by the leader acknowledging a “wake-up call,” or warning of impending trouble. Stages I-III of the change leader’s roadmap are identified as upstream tasks, or preliminary components. Stages IV-VI are midstream or design
tasks, and Stages VII-IX are downstream or implementation tasks (Ackerman Anderson and Anderson, 2010), as depicted in Figure 7.


A criticism of the change leader’s roadmap is that although it provides a robust multilens model for leaders to follow when planning and implementing a large-scale change initiative, the model does not explicitly address the political elements of an organization (Ackerman Anderson & Anderson, 2010), which are critical factors in any change effort. This is problematic because, as Bolman and Deal (2017) asserted, politics are at the core of all organizational decisions. Nevertheless, the model provides specific strategies for addressing the human elements of fear and insecurity typically generated by
a change initiative (Ackerman Anderson & Anderson, 2010). Additionally, a unique element of the model is its emphasis on the importance of the strength and continual development of the change leader because “transformation requires significant personal strength on the part of leaders to trust the wake-up calls for change and the personal and collective discovery process required for inventing a new way of being and operating in the organization” (D. Anderson & Ackerman Anderson, 2010, p. 72). More specifically, D. Anderson and Ackerman Anderson (2010) explained that the success of a transformational change initiative is related to the leader’s commitment to personal development. To that end, the change leader’s roadmap has far greater focus on the role and responsibility of the leader of change and innovation within an organization than the other change models previously explored in this review of the literature.

**Theoretical Framework: Bolman and Deal’s Four-Frame Model**

Bolman and Deal’s (2017) four-frame model asserted that leaders must learn to fluidly shift between four distinct mental models, or lenses (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic), in order to view their organizations comprehensively, and thereby lead change effectively through the life cycle of continuous innovation. As a teleological change model, Bolman and Deal’s four-frame model focuses on the role of the leader to guide an organization successfully through the various stages of the life cycle (Kezar, 2001). This framework is the theoretical model that is used in this historical study of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership.

Leaders are often limited by the single frame through which they view their organization, rather than being able to view the much larger scope of possibilities.
available for any given situation (Bensimon, 1987; Kahneman, 2011). Bolman and Deal’s (2017) four-frame model advocates for the use of four frames, or lenses, through which a leader can gain greater clarity about the needs of the organization and its members, as illustrated in Figure 8. Bolman and Gallos (2011) further explained, “Reframing is the deliberate process of looking at a situation carefully and from multiple perspectives, choosing to be more mindful about the sensemaking process by examining alternative views and explanations” (p. 23). The four-frame model can be applied to the innovation life cycle of both corporate and nonprofit organizations, including institutions of higher education, thereby giving leaders a multifaceted model to evaluate the strengths and needs of their organizations (Bolman & Deal, 2017).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metaphor for organization</th>
<th>Structural</th>
<th>Human Resource</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factory or machine</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Jungle</td>
<td>Carnival, temple, theater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles, goals, policies, technology, environment</td>
<td>Needs, skills, relationships</td>
<td>Power, conflict, competition, politics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social architecture</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>Advocacy and political savvy</td>
<td>Inspiration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attune structure to task, technology, environment</td>
<td>Align organizational and human needs</td>
<td>Develop agenda and power base</td>
<td>Create faith, beauty, meaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Structural Frame**

According to Bolman and Deal (2017), the structural frame focuses on the ways in which work gets done within an organization, including elements such as organizational charts, reporting structures, communication systems, and workflows. Structural challenges within an organization often relate to distributing and organizing roles and tasks (Bolman & Deal, 2017). However, although often favored, the structural frame alone is not sufficient for reevaluating and guiding an organization. For example, Lockwood and Papke (2018) postulated that leaders often gravitate toward structural solutions because they are most familiar and do not require a great deal of creativity or innovation. Further, Kezar (2001) explained that structural change efforts often fail because their rigid formats do not fit the complex reality of organizations, particularly institutions of higher education. Additionally, Beer and Nohria (2000) explained that structural changes are most easily managed by the leader of an organization but proposed a Theory E and Theory O paradigm for leaders to consider the inherent challenges of leading from the structural lens, with Theory E representing a focused use of financial incentive for structural compliance and Theory O representing a more organic, culturally focused approach to change efforts. Although Theory O requires more ambiguity and participation of a broader team, adding the human element to the change effort is likely to increase the long-term effectiveness of a change effort from a structurally focused model (Beer & Nohria, 2000).

**Human Resource Frame**

The human resource frame relates to the ways in which an organization and its employees interact symbiotically to meet the needs of each other (Bolman & Deal, 2017).
Utilizing the human resource frame, a leader focuses on egalitarian structures and collaborative decision-making (Kezar, 2001) as well as developing the talents and capacity of individuals within the organization (Bensimon, 1987; Buckingham, 2005). However, Kezar (2001) explained that “seen through the human resource lens, organizational change is difficult for individuals because they have to change their current approach, which is tied to their identity and strengths” (p. 39). Human resource challenges relate to the ways in which human needs, particularly the need for professional satisfaction, impact the organization (Bolman & Deal, 2017).

As innovation advances organizations of all types, the relationship between organizations and their employees has become more complex (Bolman & Deal, 2017). As Drucker (1999) hypothesized, the era of knowledge workers has made organizations dependent upon the skill and knowledge of highly specialized workers. In spite of growing pressure to innovate for efficiency and the use of fewer resources, knowledge workers are increasingly more critical to organizational success, and their needs differ from the workers of previous eras (Bolman & Deal, 2017). In order to maximize the effectiveness of a workforce, Drucker (2008) argued that the organizational system must be redesigned to serve the worker insomuch as it treats them as equals and provides opportunities for interesting and fulfilling work. Such a notion underscores Collins’s (2001) assertion that one of the most critical determinants of the success of an organization is hiring the right people for the right jobs.

**Political Frame**

The political frame addresses the political elements of an organization and any change effort it undertakes. Organizations are inherently political because they are
comprised of various people and coalitions, each committed to their own distinct goals and philosophies (Bolman & Deal, 2017). Politics is defined by White, Harvey, and Fox (2007) as “the use of power toward and through other people in an environment inside or outside the organization” (p. 3). Fairholm (2009) explained that politics, or power use, is required in all organizations to manage the finite resources available within the group. Further, Bolman and Deal (2017) explained that change can lead to political challenges because “most important decisions involve allocating scarce resources—deciding who gets what” (p. 184), thereby necessitating the creation of opportunities for individuals and coalitions to interact effectively. Kezar (2001) cautioned leaders that “to not be aware of the political aspects, even if one rejects that approach, is naïve” (p. 111). In essence, political decision-making involves “bargaining, influence and coalition building” (Bensimon, 1987) and is a key function of all individuals.

The conflict that ensues from various individuals and coalitions vying for access to resources and power is a natural part of organizational life; therefore, it is simply a dynamic to be managed rather than eradicated (Bolman & Deal, 2017). More specifically, due to the complex political structure of American higher education, Kezar (2001) advocated for the use of a political lens through which to guide its leaders. To that end, Bolman and Deal (2017) promoted the use of four research-based political skills for leaders to effectively understand the political challenges of an organization and successfully navigate change in this arena: (a) “setting an effective agenda,” (b) “mapping the political terrain,” (c) “networking and building coalitions,” and (d) “bargaining and negotiating” (pp. 208-209). By utilizing the political frame to evaluate the needs and agendas of all the various coalitions within an organization, a leader can
more effectively identify the strategies and structures that will provide the greatest level of satisfaction for the greatest number of individuals. Additionally, the political frame requires that each leader exhibit strong ethical behavior to successfully navigate the politics of organizational change (Bolman & Deal, 2017; Fairholm, 2009; White et al., 2007).

Symbolic Frame

The symbolic frame focuses on the symbols and culture of an organization (Bolman & Deal, 2017). Moua (2010) defined culture as the “shared beliefs, values and assumptions of a group of people who learn from one another and teach others that their behaviors, attitudes, and perspectives are the correct ways to think, act, and feel” (p. xv). Although more elusive than organizational structures or human resource processes, the symbolic elements of an organization, such as its myths, vision, values, stories, heroes, rituals, and ceremonies, provide mechanisms for individuals to become acculturated into the group, celebrate milestones, process transition and loss, and develop pride in membership (Bolman & Deal, 2017). Gardner (2008) described the respectful mind, one of five ways of thinking necessary for success in the knowledge economy, as a mind that demonstrates acceptance and respect for the symbols and rituals of all groups, because these elements are endemic of the human race. During the change process, a skillful leader can build consensus and reduce conflict by drawing on the symbols of the past or developing new rituals and ceremonies to facilitate change (Bolman & Deal, 2017).

The Importance of Reframing

Reframing is an essential management skill because “leaders have to find new ways of asking the right question to shift points of view when needed” (Bolman & Deal,
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Bensimon (1987) advocated for the use of multiple frames in organizational leadership, explaining that “leaders who incorporate elements of several frames are likely to be more flexible in responding to different images of the organization and provide different interpretations of events” (p. 7). Similarly, Kezar (2001) asserted that change can be effectively implemented by leaders who are able to view their organization through multiple frames. Argyris (1965) postulated that a leader with strong interpersonal skills will be able to produce successful outcomes repeatedly by being able to see the true problems of an organization and utilize long-term solutions that do not cause unintended harm. Bolman and Deal (2017) asserted that “managers are imprisoned only to the extent that their pallet of ideas is impoverished” (p. 21). By exploring the strengths and challenges of multiple frames, a leader benefits from the expanded depth of understanding made available and develops a wider array of tools to help guide the development, transformation, and innovation of their organization.

**History of American Higher Education**

From its founding, the American university has distinguished itself from its European predecessors as a means of providing social and economic mobility to a wide range of students through the process of continual reinvention and innovation (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997; Hendrickson et al., 2013; Lucas, 2006). Harvard College was founded in the early 17th century by a group of more than 100 Cambridge and Oxford graduates who immigrated to America (Rudolph, 1990). Their intention was to have Harvard College serve as a place to educate Puritan ministers and the leaders of the new world (Rudolph, 1990). Rudolph (1990) explained, “In the future the state would need competent rulers, the church would require a learned clergy, and society itself would need the adornment of
cultured men” (p. 6). Nine colleges were founded in America before the Revolutionary War, including Harvard, Yale, Dartmouth, and William and Mary (Rudolph, 1990). While there was very little emphasis on completing a degree in the colonial period, students typically attended for a year or two and then began their professional lives (Thelin, 2011).

University Education as a Means of Social and Economic Mobility

Following the Revolutionary War, the American public university was transformed. The war had been “a full-bodied statement to the effect that in America man counted for more, took less account of his superiors—indeed frequently denied their existence, achieved whatever distinction his own ability and the bounty of the land allowed him” (Rudolph, 1990, p. 34). Additionally, college began to appeal to middle class families as a means to improve one’s opportunities (Rudolph, 1990).

Demographic and Philosophical Evolutions

The rapid growth of the American university necessarily led to a more diverse student population and, in turn, required a more tolerant view of religious beliefs. In 1779, Thomas Jefferson worked to eliminate the role of the professor of divinity at the university, arguing instead for the inclusion of natural sciences and modern languages (Rudolph, 1990). Similarly, the Yale Report of 1828 responded to public demand for colleges to focus on preparing graduates for specific professions by advocating the merit of a classic university education designed to hone the habits of mind as opposed to focusing on religious training (Lucas, 2006).
Funding the American University for Mass Consumption

In the Colonial Era, university funding was sparse because private benefactors were few, as were endowments. Subscriptions became a popular means of garnering university support from the common man—sometimes in the form of donated crops or labor (Rudolph, 1990). The American Education Society collected donations from Congregational churches to support the improvement of American colleges and identify potential ministerial students to provide with scholarship funding (Rudolph, 1990). Colonial American colleges were often allowed to use state-run lotteries to raise funds for the institution, and the gifting of land was also a common means of support to colleges (Thelin, 2011).

The Land Grant College Act was signed by President Lincoln in 1862, which allowed for a portion of revenue generated by each state from the sale of land granted to them from the federal government to be used to create at least one college that focused on agriculture and mechanics (Lucas, 2006). Due to an unanticipated lack of public interest in the agricultural and mechanical (A&M) colleges and a dearth of federal funding to sustain the institutions, the land grant colleges faced financial difficulty; however, the Morrill Act of 1890 addressed this challenge by providing annual funding to the land grant colleges (Lucas, 2006). Following the Civil War, private colleges began to emerge as graduates achieved success and were able to provide financial stability through their philanthropy (Rudolph, 1990).

History of the Doctorate in Education

The doctorate in education was developed in the late 1800s, with Teacher’s College at Columbia University offering a Ph.D. in education in 1893 (Shulman et al.,
2006). Roughly 30 years following the emergence of the Ph.D. in education, the Ed.D., a practitioner-focused degree in education, was first offered at Harvard University (Perry, 2010). By 1947, 27 institutions were offering both terminal degree options in education, and the trend continued to expand as both degrees gained popularity across the nation (see Figure 9; Andersen, 1983). By 2004, between the two types of degree options, the field of education awarded the largest number of doctoral degrees of all disciplines (McCarty & Ortloff, 2004).

Table 1

*Evolution of the American Doctorate in Education 1891-1982*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of institutions</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of institutions</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>31-33</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Historical Evaluations of the Doctorate in Education**

Freeman (1931) conducted the first research study regarding the differences between the Ph.D. in Education and the Ed.D. Freeman’s (1931) landmark study found that the primary differences were the foreign language requirement for Ph.D. students and prior professional experience requirement for Ed.D. students. Additionally, there were notable differences in the focus of the final research project; Ph.D. students were required to conduct original research while Ed.D. students engaged in the study of current
research. Offering two terminal degrees in the same discipline has proven to be a challenge for the field of education and has led researchers to explore and debate the similarities and differences between the two types of degree programs.

**Evaluation in the 1960s.** Over the course of the 1960s, a series of studies regarding the Ed.D. were conducted (Brown, 1966; Brown & Slater, 1961; Ludlow et al., 1964) in which researchers found only nominal differences between the Ph.D. and the Ed.D. Ludlow et al. (1964) found that graduates from both degree programs moved into college teaching positions. Brown (1966) found that graduates of both degree programs were primarily men in their late 30s, and that students from the southeastern portion of the country were not equally represented in either doctoral program. Ludlow et al. (1964) found that graduates of both programs typically benefitted from increased salaries, job promotions, and the opportunity to pursue positions outside of their original geographic area. The research from the 1960s supported the conclusion that the Ph.D. in education and Ed.D., particularly from their inception through the 1960s, were relatively equal in terms of program design and outcomes for graduates.

**Evaluation in the 1980s.** In the 1980s, another round of investigations regarding the differences between the Ph.D. in Education and the Ed.D. surfaced. Andersen (1983) surveyed all 167 American universities that offered a terminal degree in education from 1981 to 1983. Half of the institutions indicated they offered both the Ph.D. in Education as well as the Ed.D. (Andersen, 1983). The study revealed that admission requirements were robust for both degrees and were often identical. The vast majority of both degree programs required qualifying examinations, with 88.2% of Ed.D. programs and 92.3% of Ph.D. in Education programs mandating such assessments (Andersen, 1983). The
difference identified in the study regarding qualifying examinations was that Ed.D. programs tended to administer the examinations earlier, with 32% of institutions administering the examinations at the initial stage of the program, compared to only 23% of Ph.D. programs assessing in the initial stage (Andersen, 1983).

Andersen (1983) identified numerous other similarities between the two types of programs, including length of program (3-4 years), required residency during the traditional academic year to complete the program, and research skills required of students. As identified in the 1960s, differences between the two types of degree programs were again nominal. Identified differences included a greater expectation that Ph.D. students would complete courses in a variety of disciplines, including foreign language, while greater acceptance of nontraditional dissertation topics or methodology would occur within Ed.D. programs (50%) than in Ph.D. programs (19%; Andersen, 1983).

Andersen’s (1983) findings supported previous findings that Ph.D. graduates tended to take professorship roles while Ed.D. graduates tended to remain working in K-12 education roles. However, the study also revealed that graduates of both degree pathways often chose roles in either arena (Andersen, 1983). This finding underscored the similarities between the two types of degree programs even further, highlighting the parallel in future employment for graduates of both.

Andersen (1983) noted that the similarities between the two education degree programs were not unexpected and explained that “presumably there is great overlap in the base of knowledge and competencies needed to function as a researcher or practitioner, [and] . . . generally, graduates of both types of degree programs are prepared
to operate in either capacity” (p. 58). This notion of expected overlap in the different types of doctoral degrees is echoed in Shulman et al.’s (2006) assertion that doctoral education is designed to “educate and prepare those to whom we can entrust the vigor, quality, and integrity of the field” (p. 27). Shulman et al. further explained that those who earn a doctorate are “future leaders who will creatively generate new knowledge, critically conserve valuable and useful ideas, and responsibly transform those understandings through writing, teaching, and application” (p. 27). Regardless of their role in generating or applying the knowledge of a discipline, those who earn a doctorate serve a critical role as “stewards of the discipline” or “stewards of the practice,” respectively (Shulman et al., 2006).

**The practitioner degree.** Although the existence of the Ph.D. in Education and the Ed.D. has been widely debated, it is not uncommon to find two terminal degrees in a single discipline. Much like the Ph.D. in Law and the Doctor of Jurisprudence (J.D.) or the Ph.D. in a biomedical science and the Doctor of Medicine (M.D.), the practitioner-focused degree is no less rigorous than the research-focused degree, although their pedagogy and intended purposes differ greatly, as do their instructional and assessment methodologies (Perry, 2010; Shulman et al., 2006; Townsend, 2002). For example, a student in an M.D. program of study will complete a series of residencies to apply her or his learning and gain experience in a variety of medical facilities under the supervision of an attending physician, whereas a Ph.D. student in biomedical science will instead typically generate original research in a laboratory setting (Shulman et al., 2006).

Unlike the J.D. or M.D., however, the Ed.D. has not obtained the prestige typically attributed to its practitioner-focused, terminal degree counterparts. Shulman et
al. (2006) described the reputation of the Ed.D. as being a “low-end Ph.D.,” which they attributed, at least in part, to the lack of differentiation between the Ph.D. in education and the Ed.D. (p. 25). Through their work with the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate (CID), Walker et al. (2008) explained the responsibility doctoral programs hold regarding the formation of scholars, which includes developing both deep content knowledge and the abilities and practices expected of those serving in critical roles of scholarship. While each doctoral degree differs in intended purpose, programs for both degrees tend to place great emphasis on research.

**Lack of Differentiation**

In a 2007 study, the Council of Graduate Schools differentiated the two general categories of doctoral degrees by describing practitioner-focused degrees as “preparation for the potential transformation of that field of professional practice, just as the Ph.D. represents preparation for the potential transformation of the basic knowledge in a discipline” (p. 6). McCarty and Ortloff (2004) explained, “The practice of doctoral preparation in education, as in many academic disciplines, often presupposed that the student will become a full-fledged member of the academy. . . Thus, most doctoral programs in education…are geared to the future researcher and scholar” (p. 15). Experts differentiate the two degrees by highlighting their intended focus and purpose. To that end, beginning in 2007, the Carnegie Program on the Education Doctorate (CPED) has challenged institutions of higher education to carefully consider two critical questions regarding the Ed.D.:

1. “What are the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that professionals working in education should demonstrably have?”
2. “How do we prepare them to have these?” (Perry, 2013, p. 114)

Based on the CPED’s collectively evolved understanding of the purpose of the Ed.D., each partner institution, and all other interested institutions, were challenged to use their new understanding in a process of innovation to refine their Ed.D. program (Perry, 2013).

**Re-envisioning the Educational Doctorate**

In America throughout the 20th century, the Ed.D. continued to expand in popularity, and by 2004, it was producing the largest number of doctoral degrees of any discipline in the country with women and minority students well represented (McCarty & Ortloff, 2004). In their research, McCarty and Ortloff (2004) reported the general demographics of Ed.D. students remained similar to those of the past, with graduates averaging 43.8 years old, having worked in the field of education prior to their doctoral studies, and pursuing the doctorate part time. However, numerous scholars continued to question and criticize the lack of differentiation between the Ed.D. and the Ph.D. in Education (Andersen, 2010; Deering, 1998; Miller & Curry, 2014; Shulman et al., 2006; Taylor & Storey, 2011; Woody, 1947).

Criticism regarding the Ed.D. continued over time. Golde and Dore (2001) argued that the Ed.D. neither provided students the educational content they desired, nor aligned with their career aspirations. Perry and Imig (2008) similarly argued that Ed.D. programs “often fail(ed) to provide leaders in K–12 and higher education with practical knowledge and the capacity for expert leadership” (p. 44). Townsend’s (2002) research found that those who earned the Ed.D. often did so for the “symbolic value” of the degree and career advancement opportunities the degree afforded (p. 36). Similarly, Cremin
(1978) found that even from the earliest years, doctoral students in education often already possessed the professional experience necessary for success in the field and pursued the doctoral degree for the sake of the validation it provided of their knowledge and skill. Furthermore, Ed.D. recipients bemoaned the poor public status of their degree and indicated that if they were to pursue a terminal degree again, it would be in another discipline (Townsend, 2002). As a result of retaining the majority of the structure of the Ph.D. while responding to the demands of the changing demographics of its doctoral students and their realities as fully employed educational practitioners, the Ed.D. at many universities reflected the addition of program elements regarding leadership and creative part-time scheduling options but lost the credibility of its practitioner-focused counterparts, the J.D. and M.D. degrees (McCarty & Ortloff, 2004; Perry, 2010, 2013). Rather than making distinctive paths with express purposes, the similarity undercut the value of both.

As part of CID, a 5-year study (2001-2005) on doctoral education across six disciplines, education emerged as the discipline most in need of attention due to lack of clarity between its two doctoral degree paths (Perry, 2013). The CID stressed the importance of revising the professional doctoral degree in education, indicating that the discipline would otherwise “risk becoming increasingly impotent in carrying out their primary missions—the advancement of knowledge and the preparation of quality practitioners” (Shulman et al., p. 25). Shulman et al. (2006) proposed eliminating the Ed.D. entirely and recommended creating the professional practice doctorate (P.P.D.) in education in its place.
Unlike Levine’s (2005) recommendation to reduce the Ed.D. to a master’s level degree similar to the M.B.A., Shulman et al. (2006) validated the need for a practitioner-focused doctorate in education that was “an extremely demanding, rigorous, respectable, high-level academic experience that prepares students for service as leading practitioners in the field of education” (p. 29). The P.P.D. proposed by CPED would be achieved by creating a set of assessments of the highest level of performance for practitioners in the field of education, and then build backward to design the curriculum and programmatic elements that would prepare doctoral students for successful completion of the examinations (Shulman et al., 2006). Such a degree program would utilize the practitioners’ working environment for the practice of skills obtained, focus heavily on applied research and culminate in a residency year (Shulman et al., 2006). Shulman et al. (2006) concluded, “If we can bring the education doctorates for practice and scholarship in better alignment with their professional and disciplinary analogues, we will make a powerful contribution to American education” (p. 30). The challenge laid in identifying the process for such alignment.

**Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate**

In response to the CID recommendation, CPED was launched in 2007 to identify ways to improve the professional Ed.D. (Perry, 2013). Beginning with 25 university partners, CPED (2009) focused on three design frameworks, including the development of a common definition for the Ed.D. and a set of “working-principles” to guide program development/refinement (Perry, 2013, p. 116). The CPED (2018) developed the following definition: “The professional doctorate in education prepares educators for the application of appropriate and specific practices, the generation of new knowledge, and
for the stewardship of the profession” (p. 1). Currently, CPED (n.d.) includes 105 institutions representing both public and private higher education institutions of various sizes. As delineated in Figure 9, the design principles and design concepts developed by CPED reflected the vision of the organization regarding what a professional doctorate of education is and which key elements should be reflected in such a program.


**Innovation in the Education Doctorate**

In response to the pressures facing Ed.D. programs, many university leaders have embarked on a process of reflection and innovation to reinvision their purpose and
approach. Several doctoral programs noted in the literature for such innovation are explored here to show the various approaches taken. For example, Shulman et al. (2006) commended the University of Southern California (USC) for restructuring both their Ed.D. and Ph.D. in education programs to meet clear objectives and serve distinct student groups. At USC, the Ed.D. program is now a three-year, part-time program with a practitioner focus, whereas the Ph.D. program is a full-time program heavily focused on research (Shulman et al., 2006).

**Lynn University**

Lynn University of Boca Raton, Florida, opted to discontinue its Ph.D. in Global Leadership and focus on revising its Ed.D. program according to the framework established by CPED (Taylor & Storey, 2011). Using a needs-assessment model, Lynn University polled local educational leaders to ascertain current needs of the practice and then developed instructional programming to ensure doctoral students would develop the skills and knowledge necessary to address such issues. In lieu of a traditional dissertation, Lynn University Ed.D. students would work in teams to engage in analyzing and solving a real issue put forth by a local organization following the consultancy model (CM; Taylor & Storey, 2011).

**University of Central Florida**

Similarly, the University of Central Florida (UCF) revised the Ed.D. in PK-12 Educational Leadership to the PK-12 Executive Ed.D. in Educational Leadership (Taylor & Storey, 2011). UCF opted to require 15 units of research focused on addressing current local educational issues instead of the traditional dissertation, emphasizing the importance of both research and its application in real educational settings (Taylor &
An additional benefit of the development of the more structured nature and student focus of the refined Ed.D. program at UCF was that it provided an opportunity to address issues of academic freedom of professors in a productive manner (Taylor & Storey, 2011).

**Morehead State University**

Morehead State University of Morehead, Kentucky, was granted permission to launch its first doctoral program in 2008 (Miller & Curry, 2014). Using the principles outlined by Shulman et al. (2006), Morehead developed an Ed.D. program in educational technology leadership based on three key focus areas outlined in Figure 10. The fully online program was developed to meet the needs of the employed education practitioner population and to build student capacity as practitioners, scholars, and servant leaders (Miller & Curry, 2014). Much like the programs outlined above, Morehead selected a capstone project based on a real organizational issue in lieu of a dissertation (Miller & Curry, 2014).

**Figure 10.** Guiding focus of Morehead State University Ed.D. Reprinted from “But I Don’t Want to be a Professor! The Innovation of an Online Practitioner Doctorate Focused on Educational Technology Leadership,” by C.T. Miller, & J. H. Curry, 2014, *Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 15*, p. 35. Copyright 2014 by Information Age Publishing. Reprinted with permission.
University of La Verne

The University of La Verne began exploring the creation of a distinctive doctoral program in 1973 under the guidance of Dr. Leland Newcomer, which resulted in the development of the Ed.D. in Educational Leadership (Cook, 2000). Newcomer’s disdain for the qualifying and comprehensive examinations required in traditional doctoral programs led him to create a doctoral program for educational professionals that was relevant to their needs and offered in a manner that was complementary to their professional schedules (Cook, 2000). Cook’s (2000) historical study of the development and evolution of the doctoral program at the University of La Verne provided an overview of the internal and external context in which La Verne’s program was conceived and developed. As a historical study, Cook’s (2000) narrative included interviews with key leaders of the university who played critical roles in the development of the Ed.D. program that “would change the way graduate education was viewed in the state of California” (p. 76). With a focus on foundation exams and “change episodes,” La Verne doctoral students were able to demonstrate their mastery of content knowledge and skill in educational administration as they progressed through the system (Cook, 2000). With a focus on serving current school administrators exclusively, the La Verne program described itself as “predominately field-oriented, performance based, and matched to the identified learning requirements of each participant” (p. 79). Furthermore, the program leadership cultivated a clear vision that the program would “create a more innovative and creative administrator” (Cook, 2000, p. 80). However, La Verne’s doctoral program’s innovative approach was not readily understood or embraced by some. For example, in their “weaknesses and recommendations” list, the 1981 WASC accreditation visiting
committee criticized the program for its “extremely liberal” admissions criteria and lack of rigorous focus on traditional research practices (Cook, 2000, p. 112).

As a theoretical framework, Cook (2000) utilized Collins and Porras’s (1994, 2002) framework for visionary organizations for the historical study of the University of La Verne’s Ed.D. program. For example, the program’s attention to building systems and gaining WASC accreditation were viewed through the lens of Collins and Porras’s “Clock Building, Not Time Telling” (Cook, 2000, p. 120). Similarly, La Verne’s staunch adherence to the vision of serving as a catalyst for “changing the face of education in California” (Cook, 2000, p. 120) was viewed as an example of the doctoral program adhering to Collins and Porras’s (1994) theory that visionary organizations are guided by a BHAG. Finally, Cook (2000) noted that the doctoral program’s refusal to focus exclusively on research, to the exclusion of practitioner relevance, exemplified the program’s use of Collins and Porras’ (1994) theory of “no tyranny of the OR” (p. 120), meaning the university chose to view these elements of doctoral study as complementary rather than mutually exclusive. Cook (2000) concluded that the University of La Verne’s innovative, practitioner-focused doctoral program model, in light of Collins and Porras’s (1994) framework for visionary organizations, serves as a model of educational change for other institutions to emulate.

**Storytelling and Historical Study**

From ancient times, humans have shared stories to communicate their experiences and transfer knowledge to one another (Gottschalk, 1951; Oral History Association, 1968). In the 400s B.C., Herodotus gathered the oral history of the Persian War (Starr, 1977). By 330 B.C., Aristotle had outlined the importance of adherence to a set of
guidelines in order to best capture and relate the tales of human experience, which included the requirements of developing a carefully crafted storyline and multidimensional characters (Hammond, 2001). Similar to the storytelling of ancient Greece, modern storytelling in institutions often serves to encourage members of the organization to engage in a particular behavior, prompt change, or enable the leader to convey their vision for the organization (Denning, 2011). Kouzes and Posner (2003) asserted that storytelling is an effective means of developing common values within an organization, which enables members of an organization to work together more effectively. Additionally, stories have been shown to better persuade individuals than the use of data (McCarty & Ortloff, 2004). Modern historical researchers echo Aristotle’s view of the importance of recording and sharing these firsthand historical stories to educate and motivate the public, and the care with which these stories are to be captured and retold to convey a true sense of the subject’s experience (Borg & Gall, 1971; Oral History Association, 2009; Vasina, 1996).

**Understanding Historical Research**

“History itself is part of humanity’s primordial reckoning with time, a manifestation of the ‘historical condition’ in literate societies” explained Godfrey, Hassard, Rowlinson, and Ruef (2016, p. 590). Historical research is the process of carefully gathering, recording, and critically analyzing the existing stories and artifacts of the past (Carr, 1961; Gottschalk, 1950). Historical research provides the opportunity for those in the present to evaluate and learn from successes and failures throughout history (Gottschalk, 1950). In order to produce a valid historical account, a historian must engage in the historical method, which entails identifying a subject of study, gathering
relevant sources of information on the subject (documents, oral testimonies, and relics), and determining which sources will be included in the study based on the credibility of each (Gottschalk, 1950; McMillan & Schumacher, 2010).

Historical research studies provide a rich, detailed account of the evolution of an organization or group of people. Such studies preserve the intricacies of the lived experience of a group and, as a result, provide a tool by which others can learn from and emulate the choices that had the greatest positive impact on those who were studied (Borg & Gall, 1971; Nevins, 1966). This is critically important information in cases regarding innovative organizations because the very nature of innovation prompts instability and shifts in political structures (Mintzberg, 1983). Preserving the thoughts and actions of those directly involved in the innovative process of an organization provides others with the opportunity to consider the multifaceted nature of innovation in light of the various perspectives that leaders used to guide their leadership practices (Bolman & Deal, 2017).

**Role of historian.** The historian plays a significant role in the work of gathering and producing historical research, serving not only as the catalyst for the work, but as the instrument of the study (Patton, 2015). The historian plays two roles, the first being to collect and evaluate the historical documents and interviews of those describing the past, and the second being to evaluate the credibility of each source by triangulating with the other pieces of data to produce an historical account that is most likely to be as accurate as possible (Carr, 1961; Gottschalk, 1950). Moss (1975) further explained that the document analysis portion of the work develops a credibility in the researcher that will engender trust in interview participants.
**Historical analysis and historiography.** Gottschalk (1950) defined historiography as “the imaginative reconstruction of the past from the data derived by that process” (p. 48). It is the role of the historical researcher to produce a narrative that accurately portrays the past as objectively as possible. Carr (1961) explained, “The function of the historian is neither to love the past nor to emancipate himself from the past, but to master and understand it as the key to the understanding of the present” (p. 29). Similarly addressing objectivity, Gottschalk (1950) cautioned historiographers to guard against personal bias in their writing by both consciously pushing against and notifying readers of the researcher’s biases. As with Cook (2000), a historical study of an institution of higher learning provides a detailed study of the organization’s founding and evolution by means of collecting and analyzing oral interviews of significant members of the organization along with relevant artifacts. Such an account of the means by which an organization successfully navigated the diffusion of innovation and reinvention processes provides a model for other institutions to follow.

**Oral history.** Sitton, Mehaffy, and Davis (1983) defined oral history as both the work of the historian and the history produced by the historian from evaluation of verbal accounts of the past. Traditionally, researchers conducted in-person interviews to gather the necessary historical accounts (Moss, 1975). More specifically, Moss (1975) described oral history interviewing as a “systematic collection, arrangement, preservation and publication of recorded verbatim accounts of people who were witnesses to or participants in events likely to interest future scholars” (p. 7). Although oral history tradition waned as a primary mode of transmitting historical information because nations gained widespread literacy, oral history experienced a rebirth in the United States in the
early 20th century (Borg & Gall, 1971). President Roosevelt’s New Deal funded a project to conduct interviews with former slaves, and Columbia University’s Oral History Research Office conducted initial oral history projects regarding radio broadcast journalism, the life of Henry Ford, and oil prospecting in Texas (Starr, 1977). The resurgence of interest in oral history led to the development of principals and standards to govern the practice. For example, the Oral History Association’s (OHA, 2009) general principles for oral history explained that the purpose of such an interview is to gain the personal insights of the interviewee regarding their past experience.

**Credibility in historical research.** Credibility is the cornerstone in all research but is particularly important for historical research because of the likelihood that oral accounts gathered from participants are influenced by factors such as personal bias and the degradation of memory quality over time (Moss, 1975; Rowlinson, Hassard, & Decker, 2014; Sitton et al., 1983). Relatedly, Gluck (1996) explained that the interviewer must also be perceived as credible by interviewees. To that end, they can utilize a letter of introduction from a faculty member to help establish their role as a credible researcher (Gluck, 1996). Lastly, the credibility of findings from historical research studies can be buttressed by the inclusion of an analysis of original documents from the era/organization being studied to verify or contradict the oral testimonies of interview participants (Rowlinson et al., 2014).

**Research Gap**

This literature review identified that while there is a significant body of research regarding innovation theory and the diffusion of innovation specifically (Drucker, 1985a, 1985b; Kanter, 1983; Rogers, 1962), the majority of innovation studies address business
and industry (Collins, 2001; Collins & Porras, 2002; Drucker, 1985a, 1985b; Martin, 2011; McCord, 2017; Pugh, 1995), with relatively few studies addressing innovation in higher education. Studies that do address innovation in higher education typically discuss the implementation of specific programs or initiatives of a particular era but do not provide a large-scale historical study of the institution and its consistent adherence to the principles of innovation over time (Milstein, 1993; Perry, 2010; Walker et al., 2008). Historical studies, by their nature, reflect the evolution of an organization through the words of the individual members of the group and evaluation of pertinent artifacts (Borg & Gall, 1971; Nevins, 1966). They provide a clear account of the pivotal decisions made, reasoning utilized, and commitments to particular ways of being (Cook, 2000), which can serve as a blueprint for other universities seeking to ensure they engage in the process of innovation, and thereby prevent themselves from becoming irrelevant and outdated. The purpose of this study was to provide such critical historical documentation regarding the development and innovative evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership (2013-2017), viewed through Bolman and Deal’s (2017) four-frame model and the ways in which the two serve as a model to other institutions of higher education.

Governing boards of institutions of higher education at large can benefit from this study as they seek to understand innovation theory in the context of successful institutions of higher education. Similarly, administrative leaders of doctoral programs may find this study useful in identifying practices and policies that enabled the development and consistent reinvention of a doctoral program in organizational leadership. Additionally, university faculty members may find value in this study’s
exploration of the role of professors and instructors in the implementation of the discipline of innovation throughout the history of an institution of higher education.

If university governing boards, leaders, administrators, and instructors do not commit themselves to studying the discipline of innovation and the habits of highly successful, innovative universities, they will be vulnerable to the inevitable decline from innovation to obscurity (Drucker, 1985a, 1985b). The nature of innovation requires an institution to reinvent itself regularly by consciously exploring sources of innovation and structuring itself in such a manner as to maximize the climate for innovation (Drucker, 1985a, 1985b; Martin, 2011).
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Overview

Patton (2015) discussed Loevinger (1976) who explained that the ability to make meaning of life is the distinguishing characteristic of humanity. McMillan and Schumacher (2010) described analytical (qualitative) research as a tool for making meaning of a topic, as outlined in the four elements of the process: selection of an appropriate topic, use of internal and external criticism, determination of facts, and then making meaning from the identified facts. More specifically, the historical research method delves into the careful collection, analysis, and interpretation of historical information in order to provide insights and guidance for modern readers (Borg & Gall, 1971; Gottschalk, 1950). In order to withstand the s-curve of the diffusion of innovation, which inevitably leads to an organization’s death, the American university must continually reinvent itself by engaging in disciplined innovation (Drucker, 1985a, 1985b; Rogers, 2003). With a commitment to innovation and studying the past for insights that are applicable to the present and future, the American university will remain a vital catalyst for democracy (Friedman & Mandelbaum, 2011; Gardner, 2008). Innovators at Brandman University (2011) engaged in such work with the evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership.

This chapter provides the methodology utilized in this qualitative historical research study of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership. In particular, the study explored the factors and decisions that informed and influenced the evolution of the program from 2013 to 2017 utilizing Bolman and Deal’s (2017) four-frame model. This chapter presents the purpose statement and research
questions that guided the study. Additionally, this chapter provides an overview of the research design utilized and the justification for the design choice. Next, this chapter discusses the population and sample population utilized in this study. Subsequently, a description of the instrumentation utilized in the study, validity and reliability measures, data collection procedures, and data analysis processes are provided. The chapter concludes with the limitations of the study and a summary of the methodology implemented in the study.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this historical research study was to document the evolution of the Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership at Brandman University from concept and design to implementation to present iterations (2013-2017). In addition, it was the purpose of this study to examine changes in vision, structure, curriculum, and the factors that influenced key leaders and decisions from the perspective of Bolman and Deal’s four-frame model, including structural, human resource, political, and symbolic frames.

**Research Questions**

1. What were the key *structural* factors and decisions that led to the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership?

2. What were the key *human resource* factors and decisions that led to the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership?

3. What were the key *political* factors and decisions that led to the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership?
4. What were the key symbolic factors and decisions that led to the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership?

5. What frame or combination of frames (structural, human resource, political, symbolic) do the participants perceive had the greatest impact on the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership and why?

**Research Design**

Gay, Mills, and Airasian (2009) contended that the purpose of qualitative research is to better understand a particular situation or group. The purpose of this study was to explore the evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership as experienced by those directly involved in the process from 2013 to 2017. This study is part of a two-person, thematic, qualitative historical study on the Brandman doctoral program, with one researcher studying program design and implementation with the Alpha cohort in 2012, and this researcher studying the evolution of the program from the Beta cohort of 2013 through the Zeta cohort of 2017. To that end, the peer researchers evaluated several qualitative research designs in order to identify the design that best fit the subject matter and would produce the intended result.

**Historical Research**

“History itself is part of humanity’s primordial reckoning with time, a manifestation of the ‘historical condition’ in literate societies,” explained Godfrey, Hassard, Rowlinson, and Ruef (2016, p. 590). Historical research is the process of carefully gathering, recording, and critically analyzing the existing stories and artifacts of the past (Carr, 1961; Gottschalk, 1950). In order to produce a valid historical account, a historian must engage in the historical method, which entails identifying a subject of
study, gathering relevant sources of information on the subject (documents, oral testimonies, and relics), and determining which sources will be included in the study, based on the credibility of each (Gottschalk, 1950; McMillian & Schumacher, 2010).

Historical research studies provide a rich, detailed account of the evolution of an organization or group of people. Such studies preserve the intricacies of the lived experience of a group and, as a result, provide a tool others can learn from and use to emulate the choices that had the greatest positive impact on those who were studied (Borg & Gall, 1971; Nevins, 1966). This is critically important information in cases regarding innovative organizations because the very nature of innovation prompts instability and shifts in political structures (Mintzberg, 1983). Preserving the thoughts and actions of those directly involved in the innovative process of an organization provides others the opportunity to consider the multifaceted nature of innovation in light of the various perspectives that leaders used to guide their leadership practices (Bolman & Deal, 2017). In this qualitative historical study of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership, details of the innovation utilized in the evolution of the program from the Beta cohort of 2013 through the Zeta cohort of 2017 were chronicled. The study included interviews with key leaders of the evolution of the program from 2013 through 2017 as well as analysis of university artifacts and relics from that same time period.

Role of historian. The historian plays a significant role in the work of gathering and producing historical research, serving not only as the catalyst for the work, but as the instrument of the study (Patton, 2015). The historian plays two roles, the first being to collect and evaluate the historical documents and interviews of those describing the past,
and the second being to evaluate the credibility of each source by triangulating with the other pieces of data to produce an historical account that is most likely to be true (Carr, 1961; Gottschalk, 1950). Moss (1975) further explained that the document analysis portion of the work develops a credibility in the researcher that will engender trust in interview participants. In this study, the researcher collected relevant primary and secondary sources regarding the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership and evaluated each for validity. The researcher also confirmed the reliability of data that were included in the study by triangulating with other interview testimony, artifacts, and relics in order to produce the most accurate portrayal of the evolution of the program.

**Historical analysis and historiography.** Gottschalk (1950) defined historiography as “the imaginative reconstruction of the past from the data derived by that process” (p. 48). It is the role of the historical researcher to produce a narrative that accurately portrays the past as objectively as possible. Carr (1961) explained, “The function of the historian is neither to love the past nor to emancipate himself from the past, but to master and understand it as the key to the understanding of the present” (p. 29). Similarly addressing objectivity, Gottschalk (1950) cautioned historiographers to guard against personal bias in their writing by both consciously pushing against and notifying readers of the researcher’s biases. As with Cook (2000), a historical study of an institution of higher learning provides a detailed study of the organization’s founding and evolution by means of collecting and analyzing oral interviews of significant members of the organization along with relevant artifacts. Such an account of the means by which an organization successfully navigated the diffusion of innovation and reinvention processes
provides a model for other institutions to follow. In this study, the data collected were evaluated using external criticism to determine each was authentic, and internal criticism in order to ensure any bias was mitigated (Gottschalk, 1950).

**Oral history.** Sitton et al. (1983) defined oral history as both the work of the historian and the history produced by the historian from evaluation of verbal accounts of the past. Traditionally, researchers conduct in-person interviews to gather the necessary historical accounts (Moss, 1975). More specifically, Moss (1975) described oral history interviewing as a “systematic collection, arrangement, preservation and publication of recorded verbatim accounts of people who were witnesses to or participants in events likely to interest future scholars” (p. 7). Although oral history tradition waned as a primary mode of transmitting historical information as nations gained widespread literacy, oral history experienced a rebirth in the United States in the early 20th century (Borg & Gall, 1971). President Roosevelt’s New Deal funded a project to conduct interviews with former slaves and Columbia University’s Oral History Research Office conducted initial oral history projects regarding radio broadcast journalism, the life of Henry Ford, and oil prospecting in Texas (Starr, 1977). The resurgence of interest in oral history led to the development of principals and standards to govern the practice. For example, the Oral History Association’s (OHA; 2009) general principles for oral history explained that the purpose of such an interview is to gain the personal insights of the interviewee regarding their past experience (OHA, 2009). The researcher of this study adhered to the OHA guidelines.

**Credibility in historical research.** Credibility is the cornerstone in all research but is particularly important for historical research due to the likelihood that oral accounts
gathered from participants are influenced by factors such as personal bias and the
degradation of memory quality over time (Moss, 1975; Rowlinson et al., 2014; Sitton et
al., 1983). Relatedly, Gluck (1996) explained that the interviewer must also be perceived
as credible by interviewees. To that end, they can utilize a letter of introduction from a
faculty member to help establish their role as a credible researcher (Gluck, 1996). Lastly,
the credibility of findings from historical research studies can be buttressed by the
inclusion of an analysis of original documents from the era or organization being studied
to verify or contradict the oral testimonies of interview participants (Rowlinson et al.,
2014).

Method Rationale

Research on innovation in institutions of higher education have been conducted
utilizing several methodologies, including case study, mixed methods, and historic
research. The case study methodology was defined by Creswell (1998) as “an
exploration of a bounded system or case (or multiple cases) over time through detailed,
in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information rich context” (as cited
in Patton, 2015, p. 259). While this methodology has been used to highlight specific
developmental periods of educational institutions (Perry, 2010), it was not the appropriate
method for this study because it did not provide the level of historical depth required to
chronicle the innovative practices of an institution from its inception through its first 6
years of implementation.

The mixed methods research methodology is a single study containing both a
qualitative study and a quantitative study. Patton (2015) asserted that such a study helps
to mitigate the bias inherent in any one research methodology. While the mixed methods
research design has been used to study an educational institution’s implementation of a particular innovation (Marsh, 2013), this methodology was not appropriate for this study because it does not focus on the depth and breadth necessary for a comprehensive study of an organization from its inception.

The historical research methodology is “the systematic and objective location, evaluation, and synthesis of evidence in order to establish facts and draw conclusions concerning past events” (Borg & Gall, 1971, p. 260). Gottschalk (1950) outlined the four elements of historical reach as follows:

1. Collection of relevant artifacts and interviews
2. Identification of “unauthentic” artifacts or interviews (or their parts)
3. Identification of “credible” elements of artifacts or interviews
4. Arrangement of these credible elements into a narrative that accurately reflects the time, place, and people involved in the historical subject of study.

Gottschalk (1950) identified one of the critical benefits of historical research as its ability to enable humanity to learn from the actions and thinking of the past. A historical researcher must engage in both external and internal criticism. External criticism relates to determining if a particular document or artifact is truly from the attributed source, whereas internal criticism relates to determining the credibility of what is contained in the document, artifact, or personal interview (Borg & Gall, 1971; Gottschalk, 1950). The historical method utilized in Cook’s (2000) study of the inception and evolution of the University of La Verne’s doctoral program serves as a strong model of the depth a historical study provides regarding the individual contributions and perceptions of an organization’s evolution.
Ultimately, the peer researchers of this study, with faculty guidance, decided historical research was the most appropriate research method for this study because, as Borg and Gall (1971) explained, “although historical research is perhaps the most difficult type of educational research to do well, it is important and necessary because it gives us an insight into some educational problems that could not be gained by any other technique” (p. 260). Researchers further explained that historical research provides insight into human nature that can be applied to current situations (Borg & Gall, 1971; Gottschalk, 1950). Unlike early historical research, which relied on historical documents and artifacts as the primary means of generating meaning from the distant past (Borg & Gall, 1971), this study relied on the collection and analysis of primary source data gathered through interviews with individuals directly involved with the institution, as well as institutional artifacts and relics. In order to ensure the history of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership was accurate, the data collected in this study were subjected to rigorous analysis using both internal and external criticism.

**Population**

A population is a “group of elements or cases, whether individuals, objects, or events, that conform to specific criteria and to which we intend to generalize the results of the research” (McMillian & Schumacher, 2010, p. 129). Borg and Gall (1971) further clarified that a study’s population refers to “all the members of a real or hypothetical set of persons, events or objects” (p. 115). The population of a historical study is of critical importance because “the historical method is . . . a process by which the historian attempts to test the truthfulness of the reports of observations made by others” (Borg &
In this study, the population studied included all 178 leaders of the Brandman University Doctor of Education in Organizational Leadership program from its inception to 2017. This population included 18 members of the Board of Regents, 34 administrators, 99 faculty, and 27 campus directors across California and Washington (Brandman University, 2013, n.d.-a., n.d.-b.). Due to the constraints of distance, time, and finances, the researcher was not able to interview the entire population of 178; therefore, a representative target population was identified as a subset within the full population.

**Target Population**

A study’s target population refers to “the population to which the researcher would ideally like to generalize study results” (Gay et al., 2009, p. 125). For this study, purposeful sampling was used to identify the target population with the following criteria: key leaders who worked at Brandman and were directly involved in the implementation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership from 2013-2017, taken from the full population of 178 leaders.

**Sample**

Researchers often use a sample population, or smaller subset of the target population, from which to gather data. This practice typically enables researchers to control for limiting factors such as the geographic distance between members of the population and the cost and time it would require to reach all members of a population (Borg & Gall, 1971). Due to the relatively small number of individuals included in the target population of this study, the target population and the sample population were the same.
Sample Participant Selection

The sample for this study was identified utilizing the snowball sampling method. Snowball sampling is defined as a process whereby “each successive participant or group is named by a preceding group or individual. Participant referrals are the basis for choosing a sample” (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010, p. 327). The initial snowball list was obtained by the peer researchers e-mailing the founding dean of the school of education to familiarize her with the study and request a list of names of individuals who were influential in the concept, design, and implementation of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership from concept and design through 2017. As she knew all of key leaders, Dr. Zeppos, provided a list of recommended key leaders to be interviewed and divided by the target dates of this thematic study: concept and design through implementation with the Alpha cohort of 2013; and program evolution from the Beta cohort of 2013 through the Zeta cohort of 2017. The peer researchers reviewed this list in consultation with Brandman University faculty.

Once the study was granted Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval by Brandman University (Appendix A), the members of the initial list of the sample population were asked to participate in the study’s interview process. Participants were requested to participate in the study using the following protocol:

1. An e-mail was sent by the researcher to the potential sample participant, introducing the study and requesting interview participation.
2. Once the potential sample participant confirmed their willingness to participate in an interview, they were provided with four guiding documents:
   a. Formal invitation to participate in the study (Appendix B)
b. Brandman University Research Participant Bills of Rights (Appendix C)

c. Informed Consent Form (Appendix D)

d. Copies of the interview protocol and questions (Appendix E)

The snowball list of interview participants was expanded as the interviews were conducted with the key leaders identified by Dean Zeppos on the initial list. At the conclusion of each interview, the interview participant was shown the list of interview participants. Each leader was then asked to provide recommendations of other leaders who were most critical to the development of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership, and therefore, should have been included in this historical study of the program. Names of individuals recommended by more than one interview participant were then reviewed by the peer researchers, in consultation with faculty, to determine if they should be included in the study.

**Instrumentation**

Carr (1961) explained, “The function of the historian is neither to love the past nor to emancipate himself from the past, but to master and understand it as the key to understanding the present” (p. 29). This study utilized a historical method, which gathers a rich and detailed account of participants’ experiences through interviews and artifact review to produce an accurate account of the past (Gottschalk, 1950). The process of historical data triangulation provided the researcher the opportunity to validate interview responses with artifacts from the institution, thus producing a more well-rounded study than would have been available through the analysis of a single type of historical data (Borg & Gall, 1971). The historical method utilized in this study included qualitative interviews with key leaders of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in
Organizational Leadership and analysis of guiding documents of the university. Data were collected regarding the factors and decisions that influenced key leaders in their innovative design and implementation of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership, based on Bolman and Deal’s (2017) four-frame model, which includes the structural, human resource, political, and symbolic frames.

**Qualitative Data: Artifact and Relic Review**

Artifacts and relics were gathered and analyzed for this study. Gottschalk (1950) explained that such artifacts and relics “are the raw material out of which history may be written” (p. 43). Historical data for this study were gathered from the Brandman University website and proprietary Digital Commons website, as well as directly from university faculty and staff. Artifacts and relics included accreditation reports, organizational charts, planning documents, meeting minutes, curriculum, and budgets. Artifacts and relics were carefully evaluated before being included in the study using both external criticism methods to determine the authenticity of each item and internal criticism methods to determine the authority and correctness of each item (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). All artifacts and relics were stored electronically after thorough evaluation by the researcher.

**Qualitative Instrument: Interview**

Brubacher and Rudy (1997) explained that a historical study is most effective when the analysis of historical documents and the reports of related participants produces a cohesive view of the past. To establish the context and credibility necessary to conduct effective historical interviews in this historical study, the researcher conducted an extensive review of the literature regarding historical research methodology, innovation
research, and innovation in American higher education. Additionally, the researcher conducted an in-depth review of historical documents and artifacts from the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership.

The Brandman Historical Interview Protocol was developed for this study. For a qualitative historical study, interviews of individuals directly involved in the topic of study are critical to the development of a well-rounded historical account, particularly when corroborated by relevant artifacts and documents (Dunaway & Baum, 1996). Borg and Gall (1971) explained that well-crafted interviews provide “a desirable combination of objectivity and depth and often permit gathering valuable data that could not be successfully obtained by any other approach” (p. 214). The primary source data collected through the use of an interview enables a researcher to reconstruct the events of the past, which can then serve as a guide for the future (Gottschalk, 1950).

The Brandman Historical Interview Protocol included 23 semistructured questions addressing the various aspects of Bolman and Deal’s (2017) four-frame model. The interview questions were developed collaboratively by the peer researchers and reviewed in consultation with Brandman University faculty to verify alignment with the research questions of the study. The interview protocol was divided into seven sections to clearly explore the elements of Bolman and Deal’s (2017) four-frame model as they relate to the evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership (2013-2017). Section 1 addressed background information and enabled the researcher to build rapport with the interview participant. Section 2 asked the participant to reflect on the innovation perspective. Sections 3-6 asked questions regarding each of Bolman and Deal’s (2017) four frames: political, symbolic, human resource, and structural. Finally,
Section 7 provided four closing questions designed to give the participant an opportunity to reflect upon the use of multiple frames, any other items they had not yet shared, and any other individual who should have been included in the study.

As participants confirmed their willingness to participate in the study and scheduled an interview date, they were e-mailed the letter of invitation to participate (Appendix B), which provided an overview of the study and interview process. Next, participants were sent an e-mail which provided the interview questions to help build familiarity with the study and rapport with the researcher. As is consistent with the historical method, interview participants were provided with the interview questions (Appendix E) in advance to give them adequate time to reflect on their role and experience with Brandman University in preparation for their historical study interview. In advance of the interview, the researcher also emailed each participant the informed consent form (Appendix D) and the Research Participant’s Bill of Rights (Appendix C).

A 2-hour interview appointment was scheduled with each participant to be held at a Brandman University campus location in California, other convenient location, or an online meeting room platform utilized by the university. Interview locations were scheduled to be most convenient for each participant. The interview process entailed a brief introductory period where the participant and researcher engaged in informal dialogue to make the participant comfortable. Then, during the introductory conversation, the researcher utilized the Brandman Historical Interview Protocol to review the purpose and format of the interview session, Research Participant Bill of Rights, and the informed consent form. The researcher then asked the interview participant to sign the informed consent form and collected the signed document. The
interviews were digitally recorded on a cellular phone with a digital recording backup device to ensure capture of the interview and facilitate transcription. The interviews were IRB sanctioned by Brandman University. Interview data were transcribed using the transcription software, NVivo, with refinement by the researcher directly following each interview and coded by the researcher using NVivo to sort coded data. Frequency tables were created to organize the data and determine the frequency with which each theme was reported.

**Role of the Researcher**

Due to the active human element of the process, qualitative research inherently involves the researcher as an instrument of the study (Patton, 2015). The researcher’s life experiences, career in education, and philosophies all influenced her interaction with the elements of the research process. Additional bias may exist due to the researcher being a current Brandman University doctoral student. In acknowledgement of the participatory role of the researcher in a qualitative study, Patton (2015) advocated for qualitative researchers to utilize empathetic neutrality, or human care and understanding of the experiences of the participants, in a study without ascribing judgement. Similarly, McMillan and Schumacher (2010) described the role of the qualitative researcher as one of continuous self-reflection. Likewise, Borg and Gall (1971) emphasized the importance of the use of external and internal criticism to ensure all data included in a qualitative study are authentic and lead to the development of accurate analysis.

In order to minimize the potential for researcher bias inherent in an historical study, the researcher of this study adhered to the protocols of the historical research method and utilized precautionary measures to ensure validity and reliability, as detailed
later in this chapter. Additionally, the researcher completed the Brandman University IRB-required course provided by the National Institutes of Health titled “Protecting Human Research Participants” (Appendix F). This course is designed to ensure that researchers are aware of the rights of research participants and the various ways researcher bias can be mitigated.

Researchers agreed that in order to be fully prepared to engage in the historical interview process they must be well-versed in the history of the organizations, theories, and individuals relevant to the study (Cuttler, 1996; Moss, 1975; Sitton et al., 1983). As a means of ensuring the researcher was fully prepared for the interview process and could mitigate bias and fully engage each interview participant, the researcher conducted a rigorous review of the literature regarding the historical method, innovation and change theory, and innovation in higher education. Additionally, the researcher developed a thorough understanding of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership by reviewing university artifacts such as websites, Digital Commons documents, brochures, fliers, photographs, proposals, and evaluations. Such background knowledge enabled the researcher to better analyze and organize the data collected from each interview in relationship to the other data collected throughout the study.

**Instrumentation Pilot Test**

A pilot test is utilized in qualitative research as a tool for the researcher to practice the interview process, gather feedback regarding any potential issues with the protocol or interview questions, and assess if the interview will yield the specific types of data being sought (Borg & Gall, 1971; Gay et al., 2009; McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). The peer researchers of this study conducted pilot tests of the interview protocol instrument, one
in-person and one online utilizing a video conferencing tool, with members of the Brandman University faculty. The protocol was organized into the following seven sections: background, innovation perspective, political frame, symbolic frame, human resource frame, structural frame, and closing (Appendix G). Feedback was gathered from pilot-test interview participants using the field-test participant feedback questions (Appendix H). A faculty member from the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership who was trained in qualitative research served as an observer of both pilot tests and provided feedback on the process using the interview feedback questions (Appendix I). After multiple iterations, and in consultation with faculty, the 23 interview questions were selected based on feedback gathered through the pilot test process. Adjustments to the interview protocol and probing questions were also made based on feedback from pilot-test participants and researcher observation, in consultation with faculty.

**Validity**

Patton (2014) explained validity as the degree to which a study accurately assesses what it is intended to assess. Similarly, Angen (2000) described the validity of a qualitative study as its “trustworthiness or goodness” (p. 387). McMillan and Schumacher (2010) indicated that a study’s validity is determined by how closely its explanation of a particular event or situation reflects truth, or how closely the researcher’s explanations mirror those of the study’s participants. In order to ensure the validity of this study, the researcher utilized several of the strategies recommended in the literature, including digitally recording interviews with participants, providing participants with transcripts of their interview to review and provide feedback, utilizing rich, detailed
quotes from participant interviews in the study narrative to accurately capture the experiences of participants (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010), and triangulating the data gathered through interviews with faculty and staff of Brandman University with data collected through analysis of related university artifacts and relics (Borg & Gall, 1971; Creswell & Poth, 2018; McMillan & Schumacher, 2010).

**Reliability**

Gay et al. (2009) defined reliability in qualitative research as “the degree to which study data consistently measure whatever they measure” (p. 378). This study utilized several strategies for improving reliability, including developing and utilizing an interview protocol approved by Brandman University faculty and staff. Next, the peer researchers administered a pilot test of the interview protocol to Brandman University faculty. Additionally, triangulation was used to evaluate data gathered through interviews and document analysis. Relatedly, Creswell and Poth (2018) explained that qualitative data analysis can be evaluated for reliability through intercoder agreement, meaning that a researcher can confirm that the data from their study have been coded in a manner consistent with the interpretation of other researchers. For this study, the researcher independently coded each interview transcript three times. The researcher then utilized the NVivo software to store and sort coded data for analysis purposes. Intercoder agreement is established through a process whereby multiple coders evaluate the same sample data sets and determine the extent of agreement in coding between coders (Creswell & Poth, 2018). For reliability testing, the peer researchers of this thematic study both coded one of the same interviews from each study and established an intercoder reliability of at least 80%. Frequency tables were created to organize the data
and determine the frequency with which each theme was reported. Codes, themes, and data tables are included in Chapter IV.

**Data Collection**

Data collection for this study began in August 2019, following the approval of the Brandman University IRB. Study participants were identified through the snowball sampling method, and then each was engaged to participate in a 2-hour interview either in person or using an online video conferencing tool. Once each interview was scheduled, the participant was provided three preparatory documents: the letter of invitation to participate (Appendix A), informed consent form (Appendix D), and Research Participant’s Bill of Rights (Appendix C). Participants were also notified that participation in the study was voluntary and data would be stored confidentially.

Interviews were recorded digitally, and interview recordings were then transcribed by the researcher. As part of the letter of invitation to participate (Appendix A), each participant was asked to provide the researcher with documents, artifacts, and/or relics that pertained to the interview topics and should be included in this qualitative historical study.

**Data Analysis**

This qualitative historical research study utilized data analysis methods consistent with the historical method for interviews of individuals directly involved in the creation, implementation, and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership and the analysis of related artifacts and relics. The data collected were analyzed using internal and external evaluation. This study adhered to Gottschalk’s (1950) methodological outline of a historical study in the effort to create an accurate and detailed historical account of the people and events involved in
implementing and refining the Brandman doctoral program, as expressed in the words of the participants.

Relatedly, the historical data gathered for this study were also analyzed and arranged according to the theoretical framework of Bolman and Deal’s (2017) four-frame model. By engaging each interview participant in reflection regarding the role of the structural, human resource, political, and symbolic frames in their decision-making process, the researcher was able to craft a historical narrative highlighting the lens(es) each leader utilized in the evolution of the various components and phases of the Brandman doctoral program. Then the data were arranged chronologically with a first grouping from program concept, design, and implementation with the Alpha cohort of 2012, and then a second grouping from the Beta cohort of 2013 through the Zeta cohort of 2017. The results of the study regarding the historical inquiry and the innovation study utilizing the Bolman and Deal’s (2017) four-frame model are addressed in Chapter IV.

Limitations

Limitations are elements of a study which impede generalization of results (Roberts, 2010). Such elements in a historical study are typically related to the people to be studied, geographic location of the study, time period to be studied, and role of the people or organization to be studied (Gottschalk, 1950). This study explored the evolution of the Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership at Brandman University from concept and design to implementation to present (2013-2017). Additionally, this study examined changes in vision, structure, curriculum, and factors that influenced key leaders and decisions from a perspective of Bolman & Deal’s (2017) four-frame model.
Although the thematic researcher team took great care to implement preventative measures to protect the study from limitations, the following limitations were identified:

- The scope of study only included one private university, which may have hindered generalizability.
- There was potential bias associated with the qualitative researcher as the instrument of the study.
- There were potential inaccuracies in the interview data due to interview participant memory, bias, or omission.
- There was potential lack of full access to interview participants, potentially sensitive documents or topics of study due to current litigation between the university and a former administrator of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership.

The limitations of this study were mitigated by the peer researchers’ adherence to the historical research method. The researcher conducted an extensive literature review regarding the history of American higher education, as well as innovative doctoral programs across the United States, in order to ground the study in the larger context of innovative doctoral programs in the nation. Interviews were conducted using a pilot-tested, expert researcher-approved interview protocol. Data collection and coding procedures were evaluated using reliability testing to establish an intercoder reliability of over 80%. The researcher conducted an extensive review of university artifacts to triangulate the data gathered from interviews. Additionally, the researcher reminded each interview participant of the opportunity to conduct the interview without digital recording or to indicate when the recording was to be stopped at any point during the interview in
order to ensure the recording process did not unnecessarily impede complete and transparent interview question responses.

**Summary**

Chapter III outlined the methodology utilized in this qualitative historical study of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership. The chapter began with the purpose statement, five research questions, and design of the study. Additionally, the chapter defined the study population and method utilized for identifying a target population. A detailed overview of the research instruments used, measures taken to ensure study validity and reliability, and data collection and analysis procedures were then addressed. Limitations of the study were discussed as well as the steps taken by the researcher and thematic research team to mitigate the impact of the limitations. Chapter IV addresses the results of the data gathered in this study, including in-person interview data and artifact analysis data regarding the development, implementation, and evolution of the Brandman doctoral program (2013-2017).
CHAPTER IV: RESEARCH, DATA COLLECTION, AND FINDINGS

Overview

The historical research method delves into the careful collection, analysis and interpretation of historical information in order to provide insights and guidance for modern readers (Borg & Gall, 1971; Gottschalk, 1950). In order to withstand the s-curve of the diffusion of innovation, which inevitably leads to an organization’s death, the American university must continually reinvent itself by engaging in disciplined innovation (Drucker, 1985a, 1995b; Rogers, 2003). With a commitment to innovation and studying the past for insights that are applicable to the present and future, the American university will remain a vital catalyst for democracy (Friedman & Mandelbaum, 2011; Gardner, 2008). Innovators at Brandman University engaged in such work in the evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership (Brandman University, 2011).

This qualitative historical research study of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership explores the factors and decisions that informed and influenced the evolution of the program from 2013 to 2017 utilizing Bolman and Deal’s four-frame model. As is consistent with historiography, the qualitative data for this historical research study were gathered through in-depth interviews with key leaders of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership’s past and present administration, faculty, and staff. Additionally, program artifacts were analyzed to triangulate the data collected in the interviews.

This chapter presents the purpose statement and research questions that guided the study. Additionally, this chapter provides an overview of the research design utilized and
the justification for the design choice. Next, this chapter discusses the population and sample population utilized in this study. Subsequently, there is a description of the instrumentation utilized in the study, validity and reliability measures, and data collection procedures provided. Chapter IV then provides a detailed narrative of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership (2013-2017), as gathered from the interview and artifact analysis processes. Chapter IV concludes with a presentation and analysis of the qualitative historical data gathered in this historical study and a summary of the results.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this historical research study was to document the evolution of the Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership at Brandman University from concept and design to implementation to present (2013-2017). In addition, it was the purpose of this study to examine changes in vision, structure, curriculum, and the factors that influenced key leaders and decisions from a perspective of Bolman and Deal’s four-frame model, including structural, human resource, political, and symbolic frames.

**Research Questions**

1. What were the key *structural* factors and decisions that led to the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership?

2. What were the key *human resource* factors and decisions that led to the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership?
3. What were the key political factors and decisions that led to the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership?

4. What were the key symbolic factors and decisions that led to the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership?

5. What frame or combination of frames (structural, human resource, political, symbolic) do the participants perceive had the greatest impact on the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership and why?

**Research Design**

Gay et al. (2009) contended that the purpose of qualitative research is to better understand a particular situation or group. The purpose of this study was to explore the evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership, as experienced by those directly involved in the process from 2013 to 2017. This study is part of a two-person thematic qualitative historical study on the Brandman doctoral program, with one researcher studying program design and implementation with the Alpha cohort in 2012, and this researcher studying the evolution of the program from the Beta cohort of 2013 through the Zeta cohort of 2017. To that end, the peer researchers evaluated several qualitative research designs in order to identify the design that best fit the subject matter and would produce the intended result.

**Historical Research**

“History itself is part of humanity’s primordial reckoning with time, a manifestation of the ‘historical condition’ in literate societies,” explained Godfrey et al. (2016, p. 590). Historical research studies provide a rich, detailed account of the
evolution of an organization or group of people. Such studies preserve the intricacies of the lived experience of a group and, as a result, provide a tool whereby others can learn from and emulate the choices that had the greatest positive impact on those who were studied (Borg & Gall, 1971; Nevins, 1966). This is critically important information in cases regarding innovative organizations because the very nature of innovation prompts instability and shifts in political structures (Mintzberg, 1983). Preserving the thoughts and actions of those directly involved in the innovative process of an organization provides others the opportunity to consider the multifaceted nature of innovation in light of the various perspectives leaders used to guide their leadership practices (Bolman & Deal, 2017). In this qualitative historical study of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership, details of the innovation utilized in the evolution of the program from the Beta cohort of 2013 through the Zeta cohort of 2017 were chronicled. The study included interviews with key leaders of the evolution of the program from 2013 through 2017 as well as an analysis of university artifacts and relics from that same time period.

**Role of historian.** The historian plays a significant role in the work of gathering and producing historical research, serving not only as the catalyst for the work but as the instrument of the study (Patton, 2015). In this study the researcher collected relevant primary and secondary sources regarding the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership and evaluated each for validity. The researcher also confirmed the reliability of data that were included in the study by triangulating with other interview testimony, artifacts, and relics in order to produce the most accurate portrayal of the evolution of the program.
Historical analysis and historiography. Gottschalk (1950) defined historiography as “the imaginative reconstruction of the past from the data derived by that process” (p. 48). It is the role of the historical researcher to produce a narrative that accurately portrays the past as objectively as possible. Carr (1961) explained, “The function of the historian is neither to love the past nor to emancipate himself from the past, but to master and understand it as the key to the understanding of the present” (p. 29). Similarly addressing objectivity, Gottschalk (1950) cautioned historiographers to guard against personal bias in their writing by both consciously pushing against and notifying readers of the researcher’s biases. As with Cook (2000), a historical study of an institution of higher learning provides a detailed study of the organization’s founding and evolution by means of collecting and analyzing oral interviews of significant members of the organization along with relevant artifacts. Such an account of the means by which an organization successfully navigated the diffusion of innovation and reinvention processes provides a model for other institutions to follow. In this study, the data collected were evaluated using external criticism to determine each was authentic, and internal criticism in order to ensure any bias was mitigated (Gottschalk, 1950).

Methodology

Research on innovation in institutions of higher education has been conducted utilizing several methodologies, including case study, mixed methods, and historic research.

Ultimately, the peer researchers of this study, with faculty guidance, decided historical research was the most appropriate research method for this study because, as Borg and Gall (1971) explained, “although historical research is perhaps the most
difficult type of educational research to do well, it is important and necessary because it gives us an insight into some educational problems that could not be gained by any other technique” (p. 260). Researchers further explain that historical research provides insight into human nature that can be applied to current situations (Borg & Gall, 1971; Gottschalk, 1950). Unlike early historical research, which relied on historical documents and artifacts as the primary means of generating meaning from the distant past (Borg & Gall, 1971), this study relied on the collection and analysis of primary source data gathered through interviews with individuals directly involved with the institution as well as institutional artifacts and relics. In order to ensure that the history of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership was accurate, the data collected in this study were subjected to rigorous analysis using both internal and external criticism.

**Population**

A population is a “group of elements or cases, whether individuals, objects, or events, that conform to specific criteria and to which we intend to generalize the results of the research” (McMillian & Schumacher, 2010, p. 129). Borg and Gall (1971) further clarified that a study’s population refers to “all the members of a real or hypothetical set of persons, events or objects” (p. 115). The population of a historical study is of critical importance, because “the historical method is . . . a process by which the historian attempts to test the truthfulness of the reports of observations made by others” (Borg & Gall, 1971, p. 262). In this study, the population being studied included all 178 leaders of the Brandman University Doctorate in Organizational Leadership program from its inception to 2017. This population included 18 members of the Board of Regents, 34
administrators, 99 faculty, and 27 campus directors across California and Washington (Brandman University, n.d.-a., n.d.-b., 2013). Due to the constraints of distance, time, and finances, the researcher was not able to interview the entire population of 178; therefore a representative target population was identified as a subset within the full population.

**Target Population**

A study’s target population refers to “the population to which the researcher would ideally like to generalize study results” (Gay et al., 2009, p. 125). For this study, purposeful sampling was used to identify the target population, using the following criteria: key leaders who worked at Brandman and were directly involved in the implementation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership from 2013-2017, taken from the full population of 178 leaders.

**Sample**

Researchers often use a sample population, or smaller subset of the target population, from which to gather data. This practice typically enables researchers to control for limiting factors such as the geographic distance between members of the population, and the cost and time it would require to reach all members of a population (Borg & Gall, 1971). Due to the relatively small number of individuals included in the target population of this study, the target population and the sample population were the same.
Sample Participant Selection

The sample for this study was identified utilizing the snowball sampling method. Snowball sampling is defined as a process whereby “each successive participant or group is named by a preceding group or individual. Participant referrals are the basis for choosing a sample” (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010, p. 327). The initial snowball list was obtained by the peer researchers e-mailing the founding dean of the school of education to familiarize her with the study and request a list of names of individuals who were influential in the concept, design, and implementation of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership from concept and design through 2017. As she knew all key leaders, Zeppos provided a list of recommended key leaders to be interviewed, divided by the target dates of this thematic study: concept and design through implementation with the Alpha cohort of 2013 and program evolution from the Beta cohort of 2013 through the Zeta cohort of 2017. The peer researchers reviewed this list in consultation with Brandman University faculty.

Once the study was granted Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval by Brandman University (Appendix A), the members of the initial list of the sample population were asked to participate in the study’s interview process. Participants were requested to participate in the study using the following protocol:

1. An e-mail was sent by the researcher to the potential sample participant, introducing the study and requesting interview participation.

2. Once the potential sample participants confirmed their willingness to participate in an interview, they were provided with four guiding documents:
   a. Formal invitation to participate in the study (Appendix B)
b. Brandman University Research Participant Bills of Rights (Appendix C)

c. Informed Consent Form (Appendix D)

d. Copies of the interview protocol and questions (Appendix E)

The snowball list of interview participants was expanded as the interviews were conducted with the key leaders identified by Dean Zeppos on the initial list. At the conclusion of each interview, the interview participant was shown the list of interview participants. Each leader was then asked to provide recommendations of other leaders who were most critical to the development of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership, and therefore, should be included in this historical study of the program. Names of individuals recommended by more than one interview participant were then reviewed by the peer researchers, in consultation with faculty, to determine if they should be included in the study.

Instrumentation

This study utilized a historical method, which gathers a rich and detailed account of participants’ experiences through interviews and artifact review to produce an accurate account of the past (Gottschalk, 1950). The process of historical data triangulation provided the researcher the opportunity to validate interview responses with artifacts from the institution, thus producing a more well-rounded study than would have been available through the analysis of a single type of historical data (Borg & Gall, 1971). The historical method utilized in this study included qualitative interviews with key leaders of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership and analysis of guiding documents of the university. Data were collected regarding the factors and decisions that influenced key leaders in their innovative design and implementation of the
Brandman Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership, based on Bolman and Deal’s four-frame model, which includes the structural, human resource, political, and symbolic frames.

**Qualitative Data: Artifact and Relic Review**

Artifacts and relics were gathered and analyzed for this study. Gottschalk (1950) explained that such artifacts and relics “are the raw material out of which history may be written” (p. 43). Historical data for this study were gathered from the Brandman University website and proprietary Digital Commons website as well as directly from university faculty and staff. Artifacts and relics included accreditation reports, organizational charts planning documents, meeting minutes, curriculum, and budgets. Artifacts and relics were carefully evaluated before being included in the study, using both external criticism methods to determine the authenticity of each item and internal criticism methods to determine the authority and correctness of each item (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). All artifacts and relics were stored electronically after thorough evaluation by the researcher.

**Qualitative Instrument: Interview**

The Brandman Historical Interview Protocol was developed for this study. For a qualitative historical study, interviews of individuals directly involved in the topic of study are critical to the development of a well-rounded historical account, particularly when corroborated by relevant artifacts and documents (Dunaway & Baum, 1996). Borg and Gall (1971) explained that well-crafted interviews provide “a desirable combination of objectivity and depth and often permit gathering valuable data that could not be successfully obtained by any other approach” (p. 214). The primary-source data
collected through the use of an interview enables a researcher to reconstruct the events of the past, which can then serve as a guide for the future (Gottschalk, 1950).

**Role of the Researcher**

In order to minimize potential researcher bias inherent in an historical study, the researcher of this study adhered to the protocols of the historical research method and utilized precautionary measures to ensure validity and reliability, as detailed later in this chapter. Additionally, the researcher completed the Brandman University Institutional Review Board-required course provided by the National Institute of Health titled “Protecting Human Research Participants” (Appendix F). This course is designed to ensure that researchers are aware of the rights of research participants and the various ways researcher bias can be mitigated.

Researchers agreed that in order to be fully prepared to engage in the historical interview process they must be well-versed in the history of the organizations, theories and individuals relevant to the study (Cuttler, 1996; Moss, 1975; Sitton et al., 1983). As a means of ensuring that the researcher was fully prepared for the interview process and could mitigate bias and fully engage each interview participant, the researcher conducted a rigorous review of the literature regarding the historical method, innovation and change theory, and innovation in higher education. Additionally, the researcher developed a thorough understanding of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership by reviewing university artifacts such as websites, Digital Commons documents, brochures, flyers, photographs, proposals and evaluations. Such background
knowledge enabled the researcher to better analyze and organize the data collected from each interview in relationship to the other data collected throughout the study.

**Instrumentation Pilot Test**

A pilot test is utilized in qualitative research as a tool for the researcher to practice the interview process, gather feedback regarding any potential issues with the protocol or interview questions, and assess if the interview will yield the specific types of data being sought (Borg & Gall, 1971; Gay et al., 2009; McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). The peer researchers of this study conducted pilot tests of the interview protocol instrument, one in-person and one online utilizing a video conferencing tool, with members of the Brandman University faculty. Feedback was gathered from pilot test interview participants using the field-test participant feedback questions (Appendix H). A faculty member from the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership who was trained in qualitative research served as an observer of both pilot tests, and provided feedback on the process using the interview feedback questions (Appendix I). After multiple iterations, and in consultation with faculty, the 23 interview questions were selected, based on feedback gathered through the pilot-test process. Adjustments to the interview protocol and probing questions were also made based on feedback from pilot-test participants and researcher observation, in consultation with faculty.

**Validity**

In order to ensure the validity of this study, the researcher utilized several of the strategies recommended in the literature, including digitally recording interviews with participants, providing participants with transcripts of their interview to review and provide feedback, utilizing rich, detailed quotes from participant interviews in the study.
narrative to accurately capture the experiences of participants (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010), and triangulating the data gathered through interviews with faculty and staff of Brandman University with data collected through analysis of related university artifacts and relics (Borg & Gall, 1971; Creswell & Poth, 2018; McMillan & Schumacher, 2010).

**Reliability**

This study utilized several strategies for improving reliability, including developing and utilizing an interview protocol approved by Brandman University faculty and staff. Next, the peer researchers administered a pilot test of the interview protocol, administered to Brandman University faculty. Additionally, triangulation was used to evaluate data gathered through interviews and document analysis. For this study, the researcher independently coded each interview transcript three times. The researcher then utilized the NVivo software to store and sort coded data for analysis purposes. Intercoder agreement is established through a process whereby multiple coders evaluate the same sample data sets and determine the extent of agreement in coding between coders (Creswell & Poth, 2018). For reliability testing, the peer researchers of this thematic study both coded one of the same interviews from each study and established an intercoder reliability of at least 80%. Frequency tables were created to organize the data and determine the frequency with which each theme was reported. Codes, themes, and data tables are included in Chapter IV.

**Data Collection**

Data collection for this study began in August 2019, following the approval of the Brandman University Institutional Review Board (IRB). Study participants were identified through the snowball sampling method and then each engaged to participate in
a 2-hour interview either in person or using an online video conferencing tool. Once each interview was scheduled, the participant was provided three preparatory documents: the letter of invitation to participate (Appendix B), informed consent form (Appendix D), and Research Participant’s Bill of Rights (Appendix C). Participants were also notified that participation in the study was voluntary and data would be stored confidentially. Interviews were digitally recorded and interview recordings were then transcribed by the researcher. As part of the letter of invitation to participate (Appendix B), each participant was asked to provide the researcher with documents, artifacts, and/or relics that pertained to the interview topics and should be included in this qualitative historical study.

**Presentation and Analysis of Data**

**Research Question 1**

*What were the key structural factors and decisions that led to the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership?*

For the purpose of this study, the structural frame was defined as the architecture of an organization, including goals, strategies, metrics, rubrics, technology, specialized roles, formal relationships, and the coordination of these into a structured organization chart supported with policies, procedures, and rules (Argyris 1998; Bolman & Deal, 2017; Helgesen, 1995; Mintzberg, 1979; Thompson, 1967; Weber, 1947).

**Qualitative data presentation and analysis.** The qualitative data for the themes identified regarding the structural frame are outlined in Table 2. The structural frame included the five themes of goals and strategies; technology; specialized roles and formal relationships; metrics and rubrics; and policies, procedures, and rules. Table 2 outlines the subthemes identified within each theme and the frequency at which each occurred in
# Table 2

**Total Codes for the Structural Frame**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Goals and strategies</td>
<td>Total for all goals and strategies codes</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transformational change and TCP are critical structures</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality dissertations and related components are essential - QR, IRB</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral program has a persistent focus on innovation through continuous improvement—feedback</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All elements of curriculum are intentionally designed: sequencing, writing, grading, core faculty, two-track curriculum, course lead, use of technology</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Immersion and its components address engagement: miniversity, innovation tournament, boot camp</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cohorts and cohort mentors are key components of the program structure</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral program provides online classes</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral program offers flexible hybrid structure</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral program provides a supportive structure</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The practitioner-based design and applicable assignments are key elements</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attention is paid to leveraging alumni network to impact world</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Succession planning is critical component of sustaining the structure of the program</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recruitment and enrollment of the right students is critical to creating the right program and establishing a brand</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong, diverse faculty is essential to program success</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional development and strong, frequent communication is important</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strict program structure and accelerated pace are unique to program</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Total for all technology codes</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technology support is provided to faculty: CII, instructional designers, Zoom</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Challenges were experienced using and changing away from Adobe Connect</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technology usage is embraced: Digital Commons, expanded reach of live broadcast</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Live tech support is available for faculty, cohort mentors, students</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complex layering of tech causes lost efficiency and impedes expansion capacity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The programs cycle of continuous improvement includes technology—School of Ed Tech Committee</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technology provides numerous benefits and tools for collaboration: Flexibility, accessibility to geographically diverse populations; student use of tech in curriculum: wiki, Google Drive, Zoom</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Specialized roles and formal relationships</td>
<td>Total for all specialized roles and formal relationships codes</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evolution required sharing specialized work—too heavy of a load for single person (QR, IRB); continuously improved and implement change quickly</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recruiting, hiring, assigning and mentoring the right faculty and staff is critical</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specialized roles developed in math and research</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specialized roles developed in curriculum and tech</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the 16 interviews conducted for this study. The structural frame amassed a total of 471 codes across the five themes.

**Goals and strategies.** The theme of goals and strategies had the most codes within the structural frame, with 16 subthemes amassing 387 (82%) of the total 471 codes. It should be noted that five of the subthemes identified within the goals and strategies theme were coded with greater frequency than each of the other four themes within the structural frame, and nine of the subthemes were coded with greater frequency than the subthemes of the other themes within the structural frame. In general, the goals and strategies theme had a frequency greater than 10 times that of the next closest theme.

Within the goals and strategies theme, as well as in the structural frame overall, the subtheme of transformational change and the transformational change project (TCP) had the greatest frequency, with a total of 90 of the 387 codes for the theme. Regarding the importance of the role of transformational change within the program, Patricia Clark White explained,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Metrics and rubrics</strong></td>
<td>Total for all metrics and rubrics codes</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program completion/grad rates are exceptional</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transformational change project required refinement in calibration, outcomes, impact</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cohesiveness and quality increased for courses and dissertation with addition of rubrics and trainings</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student progress in writing is measured by scores on writing benchmarks</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Policies, procedures and rules</strong></td>
<td>Total for all policies, procedures and rules codes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty are held accountable to implementing program as designed - Dissertation quality is upheld through review process and mandatory training</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The structural frame amassed a total of 471 codes across the five themes.

### Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Specialized roles developed regarding the dissertation</strong></td>
<td>Specialized roles developed regarding the dissertation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specialized roles required working with larger university leaders: provost, marketing, School of Ed Dean</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specialized roles developed regarding immersions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Metrics and rubrics</strong></td>
<td>Total for all metrics and rubrics codes</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Policies, procedures and rules</strong></td>
<td>Total for all policies, procedures and rules codes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total structural frame codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Specialized roles developed regarding the dissertation</strong></td>
<td>Specialized roles developed regarding the dissertation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specialized roles required working with larger university leaders: provost, marketing, School of Ed Dean</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specialized roles developed regarding immersions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Metrics and rubrics</strong></td>
<td>Total for all metrics and rubrics codes</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program completion/grad rates are exceptional</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transformational change project required refinement in calibration, outcomes, impact</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cohesiveness and quality increased for courses and dissertation with addition of rubrics and trainings</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student progress in writing is measured by scores on writing benchmarks</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Policies, procedures and rules</strong></td>
<td>Total for all policies, procedures and rules codes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty are held accountable to implementing program as designed - Dissertation quality is upheld through review process and mandatory training</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sequence is established so that one course builds on the last course. So, every course is a building block to get to the pinnacle of transformational leadership. We really depend on what you have learned in your first few courses in order to get to the last course and to get to the transformational change project and to get to the dissertation. All of these courses build on each other. I think that’s very innovative (see Appendix J).

White further explained that the hallmark TCP was created in lieu of the comprehensive examinations required in traditional doctoral programs: White said,

I think the fact that we don’t have comps or quals and instead we have the authentic assessment of having our students actually engage in the transformational change project, which demonstrates in a real world setting what they actually can do to lead transformational change as opposed to “Can I write about it, can I answer multiple choices questions about it.” It’s a whole different concept. I think that’s one of our main attributes that is very innovative.

Similarly, Patrick Ainsworth explained the genesis of the TCP as follows:

Rather than having that bridge of compensatory exams we get across, this was a hands-on practice to actually demonstrate we’ve gained some skills and could do it out in the field. I think those things have made a real difference to distinguish what we do from others.

Regarding the evolution of the TCP over time, Ainsworth said,

Actually, the change project has evolved over time, the analysis portion and how we bring that together. But that’s probably the biggest piece and the biggest difference between what we’re doing and most other universities, particularly as
you have that bridge to beyond. . . . And others are trying to incorporate that now trying to model half of what we’re doing and nobody can do it yet, but they’re trying.

Phil Pendley explained the transformational leadership project as a hallmark of what we do, and I think the fact that students have gotten promotions, have gotten recognition, heck one of my students passed the Bond election at his community college, that was his TCP. That was in a community that had not ever passed a Bond election ever. There’s a transformational change for you.

The subtheme with the second greatest frequency within the theme of goals and strategies, as well as in the structural frame overall, was quality dissertations and related components, with 56 (14.5%) of the 387 codes for the category. Alan Enomoto noted the innovation of the Brandman doctoral program introducing the dissertation to students very early in their coursework. Similarly, Doug DeVore lauded the additional dissertation supports the Brandman program provides to doctoral students, such as artifacts, workshops, and assistance with securing a dissertation committee chair.

The subtheme with the third greatest frequency within the goals and strategies theme, and in the structural frame overall, was the subtheme of persistent focus on innovation through continuous improvement and feedback, which amassed 46 (11.9%) of the 387 codes for the theme. Pendley explained that the program is continually undergoing refinement and increasing its level of sophistication. Laurie Goodman shared a similar sentiment, describing the program structure as one of constant reflection, evaluation, and improvement:
For every single course, for every Immersion, for every professional development day. That structure of feedback and analysis, and they don’t just take the qualitative from the interviews and surveys. They also look for artifacts. That structure which aligns, of course, with what research is, has increased everything about the program.

Maris Alaniz further explained that one of the benefits of the Brandman EdD model is that “we’re able to implement change immediately.”

The subtheme of all elements of curriculum are intentionally designed had the fourth greatest frequency within the goals and strategies theme, as well as in the structural frame overall, with 41 (10.6%) of the 387 codes. Pendley explained, “I think what’s happened is those courses that were initially developed have been improved. I know that my practice in teaching those courses is much better now than it was when I initially started it.” Similarly, Ainsworth shared,

There’s been an evolution in these courses over time. Like [EDOL] 724, which is a culminating one, was occasionally conceived as an alternative to comp exams, and so the idea back then was to have you bring everything together and analyze it in this giant, 50-page paper. Students hated it. Then Len [Hightower] had it, and he trimmed it down. Then I got it this past year . . . so I changed it. I think there is a dimension of this program . . . there’s a real intention to improving these courses so that they stay more relevant and that they become a better experience for students, and that there’s alignment.

The subtheme of immersion and its components address engagement had the fifth greatest frequency in the goals and strategies theme, as well as in the structural frame
overall, with 38 (9.8%) of the 387 codes for the theme. Carlos Guzman shared his view about the importance of immersion, saying,

I think Immersion is the backbone of the program. If we didn’t have Immersion, I don’t think we would have a program, because that’s our time with students, faculty, cohort mentors, we have keynote speakers that come in. Just the whole experience of Immersion I think pretty much says it all. It’s just the time of connection and learning. Faculty, we learn too. We’re not just faculty. We learn from our students and then that’s probably the most rewarding part of the work that we do.

DeVore shared a similar sentiment about the importance of immersion to the program structure explaining that the quality guest speakers and TED-talk style presentations from the faculty members provide a unique learning opportunity for students during the immersion events. Ainsworth attributed much of the successful evolution of the immersion structure to full-time faculty member Marilou Ryder, explaining:

Marilou Ryder has been key because she spends a lot of time looking for innovative approaches to use at the immersions and so the guest speakers, the miniversities, the career sessions, speed dating, all of those little things, Marilou Ryder has been a key innovator and especially with the innovation tournament.

**Technology.** Within the structural frame, the theme of technology had the second greatest frequency of the five themes. The technology theme, with seven identified subthemes, amassed 30 (6.4%) of the 471 total codes for the structural frame. The subtheme of technology support is provided to faculty was the most prominent, with 10
(33%) of the 30 codes for the category. Ainsworth explained that doctoral program instructors have access to a wide range of video trainings to assist them in navigating their role. Similarly, Jeffrey Lee discussed the technological benefits available to the doctoral program and staff, including the Center for Instructional Innovation (CII), instructional designers, digital commons, and the School of Education Technology Committee. DeVore likewise noted,

The technology support this university provides our students, is an extraordinary. . . . That doesn’t mean it always works. It doesn’t mean all those people always have the answer, but I mean, everybody has a help desk. Everybody has a help desk. I have never seen that many people from technology spend a weekend [at immersion], the Labor Day weekend, the Martin Luther King Day weekend, and volunteer to do it.

Specialized roles and formalized relationships. The theme that earned the third most codes within the structural frame was specialized roles and formal relationships, which amassed 29 (6.2%) of the 471 total codes for the frame. The subtheme of evolution required sharing specialized work had the greatest frequency within the theme of specialized roles and formal relationships, amassing eight (27.6%) of the 29 codes for the theme. With the inaugural cohort of Brandman EdD students being exponentially larger than expected, the dire need for additional faculty and staff resulted in assignments that were more utilitarian than the team would have liked. However, as the initial panic subsided, the leadership team was able to be more discerning in their hiring and assignment decisions. Pendley shared,
We scrambled ourselves out of that initial phase, then when people came along, like Dr. Larick or Dr. Lee or Dr. Guzman that brought structure to other parts of it, then it really . . . what you see now then began to crystallize and form.

In the same vein, Alaniz described the gradual shift toward structured roles in the EdD program office:

So at the beginning it was very reactive, building processes and policies and then implementing them the next day, and then course correcting it as needed, and over time, once we had that foundation, it took about three years, then I was able to hire one person to support me who handled the day to day, so I was able to really focus on like bigger picture items that are beneficial to the program, and so WASC and things of that nature.

Relatedly, the process for identifying and onboarding new members of the team was refined over time. Keith Larick described the process in this way:

Dr. Ainsworth came in, he took over what Dr. Hightower did in terms of managing all of the adjunct faculty. So if I have two or three people who’ve called me and they want to get on as an adjunct faculty member, I send . . . Dr. Ainsworth their information, I tell the applicant he’ll be contacting them, he interviews them . . . and then comes back to the core planning team and [says] here are my recommendations for staffing the upcoming courses. So, everybody’s taking their piece of it, [it is an] important part of what we do.

**Metrics and rubrics.** The theme with the fourth greatest frequency within the structural frame was the metrics and rubrics theme, which amassed 20 (4.2%) of the 471 total codes for the structural frame. The subtheme of program completion/grad rates are
exceptional had the highest frequency within the metrics and rubrics theme, amassing seven (35%) of the 20 codes for the theme. Pendley described the program’s degree completion rate by saying, “Compared to any other place that you want to, I mean it’s just incredible.” Similarly, Myrna Cote identified the most successful element of the program as “the number of graduates who go through the program . . . who finish up, and walk.” Enomoto explained why the Brandman EdD program graduation rates are noteworthy:

The national rate of [doctoral program] completion is like 42% after seven years, it’s 42%. The Alphas and I don’t know exactly what that number is, but it’s like in the mid-80s already. So even if it stopped now and no one [else] finished . . . it’s really high. And when you think of it then, double what the national rate is, [it] is really encouraging. And that’s really what we’re here for.

Policies, procedures, and rules. Within the structural frame, the policies, procedures, and rules theme had the smallest frequency of the five themes, with a total frequency of 5. The subtheme of faculty are held accountable to implementing the program as designed encompassed all of the codes for the theme. Cote described the program as,

Small enough faculty-wise to ensure accountability, that academic freedom, per se, doesn’t get in the middle of somebody doing their job. Whereas in larger doctoral programs, this is my academic freedom to do whatever, we’re guided by the CAG, we’re guided by the course information. We’re given the rules and regulations, and we’re held accountable. We know we’re accountable to them.
More specifically, several interviewees noted the evolution of the policies and procedures related to the dissertation process, and credited Keith Larick with providing stability and credibility to Brandman EdD dissertations. To that end, Pendley shared,

When Dr. Larick came aboard, he brought some organizational structure to particularly the dissertation process. I mean he really, the whole quality review process, which we all hate, but is absolutely necessary because it gets you accredited. I mean, it really keeps the quality high.

As a member of the IRB, Enomoto shared that he observes the consistent quality of dissertations that are submitted to IRB from the EdD program. Enomoto further explained that Larick provides a series of mandatory trainings for dissertation chairs, which helps ensure consistency in the quality of dissertations produced.

Research Question 2

*What were the key human resource factors and decisions that led to the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership?* For the purpose of this study, the human resource frame was defined as understanding people and relationships, including human needs, feelings, fears, skills, biases, development opportunities, and the fit between the individual and the organization (Bolman & Deal, 2017; Cable & DeRue, 2002; Collins & Porras, 1994; Follett, 1918; Mayo, 1945).

Qualitative data presentation and analysis. The qualitative data for the themes identified regarding the human resource frame are outlined in Table 3. The human resource frame included the six themes of skills; fit between organization and individual; relationships; development opportunities; human needs; and feelings, fears, and biases.
Table 3 outlines the subthemes identified within each theme and the frequency at which each occurred in the 16 interviews conducted for this study. The human resource frame amassed 428 codes across the six themes.

**Skills.** Within the skills theme, the subtheme of faculty and staff have experience at multiple levels of leadership had the greatest frequency, with a total of 39 (23.4%) of the 167 codes for the theme. Regarding the importance of faculty and staff being seasoned practitioners, Alaniz explained,

> The majority of members of the team are retired superintendents. So, they had the bird’s-eye view, they think at the macro level. So, they’re able to see things that other people may not see, and because that was their former career, they’re politically savvy in ways that other people may not be.

She went on to explain,

> They have this wealth of experience on top of it, this life experience that they bring to the table, and I think one common denominator that I would say the majority of the team has is they’re very passionate about what they do, and they’re workaholics. Like it’s difficult to take them away from work because it doesn’t feel like work to them. They just love what they do.

Guzman similarly noted the diverse skill set of the doctoral program faculty and staff, describing the team as a “very diverse core faculty for sure.” He went on to list the types of experiences and skills of the core faculty, explaining that “many [are] from K through 12 education, superintendency for the most part, leadership roles, leaders in their community, leaders in their organization. That one definitely stands out. Then other
Table 3

*Total Codes for the Human Resource Frame*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Total for all skills codes</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty and staff have experience at multiple levels of leadership-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>scholarly practitioners; legendary in their field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased faculty and staff size yielded increased levels of expertise in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>each area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The program benefited from the ability to tap broad network for talent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(faculty, staff, mentors, students)—onboarding and evaluating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity of experience and perspective benefited the team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Team has quantitative and qualitative research background: EdD and PhD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Previous connection to La Verne was important</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation process experience was critical: chairs, QR, IRB, handbook,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rubrics</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum development and refinement skills were necessary</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tech skills were needed</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transformational change experience and transformational leadership</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>was required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong work ethic and commitment to the program were important -</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>life’s work; legacy; passion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Immersions require a broad set of skills to implement</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fit between individual &amp; organization</td>
<td>Total for all fit between the individual and organization codes</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty and staff and students are “bought in” to the mission and vision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of the program and exemplify the DNA of the Brandman way of being</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>committed to norms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty and staff and students are transformational leaders; leave a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>legacy of transformed leaders behind them; aligned values; Goal: faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and staff have been superintendents and taught at the doctoral level;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>belief in the power and necessity of scholar practitioners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty and staff are generous with themselves—go the extra mile to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>support students; willing to do what needs to be done</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty and staff add value and bring specific expertise to the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty and staff who do not fit or who violate the norms are exited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>from the program—commitment to honesty and transparency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is an acknowledged need to intentionally seek diverse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>leaders/professors in the program: African American, Hispanic, female,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>those from fields other than K-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty and staff are provided mentoring to ensure alignment and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>successful execution of their roles</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty and staff share a commitment to continuous improvement,</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>innovation and inclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Team commitment to transformational change and La Verne’s student-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>centered model made the program design possible and exponentially</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>more effective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Total for all relationships codes</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Warm relationships of trust and equality create a family feel - people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and relationships are the backbone of transformational leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Networks: New faculty, staff and students are often identified through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>professional and personal networks of current faculty and staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cohort mentors and their cohorts have strong relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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skills like creativity.” In the same manner, Cheryl-Marie Osborne Hansberger noted the importance of the diversity and skill of the core faculty to the development of the program, saying, “They write books, they’re developing theory . . . I think they’re really top notch in their knowledge and really respectable.” Several interviewees noted that various members of the faculty and cohort mentor team are well regarded or legendary in their professional spheres.

**Fit between individual and organization.** Within the theme of fit between the individual and the organization, the subtheme of faculty and staff and students are “bought in” to the mission and vision of the program and exemplify the DNA of the Brandman way of being had the greatest frequency, with a total of 29 (26.4%) of the 110 codes for the theme. Regarding the importance of fit, Lee noted, “One thing that’s a
differentiator, a separator from this program and other programs, is that there’s a group of like-minded individuals that are not afraid to take risks.” He went on to describe the ideal candidate who could fit the DNA of the core faculty as somebody who is student-centered, who is compassionate, relationship focused, who is at the end of it all is going to be firm and hold the rigor of the program, hold the students responsible to meet those rigors. But it doesn’t mean that it’s very cutthroat, it’s not like you get a C, little feedback, here you go. It’s done with a very positive mindset, a growth mindset if you will, if you’re familiar with Dweck’s work, is that we are there to help the students succeed.

Relatedly, Enomoto recounted observing some members of the EdD team not returning to professional development days and noting that their departure was not unexpected due to their lack of fit with the culture of the program.

**Relationships.** Within the theme of relationships, the subtheme of warm relationships of trust and equality create a family feel had the greatest frequency, with a total of 56 of the 97 codes for the theme. Regarding the importance of relationships amongst the core and adjunct faculty and cohort mentors, Goodman shared that her enthusiasm for the program continues to grow because they make you feel like you belong. When you step into this with all these very smart people, you’re like, “Do I belong with all these people?” But then they make you feel like you belong, and they validate your voice. They continue to work with you on being a dissertation chair. That continues with my role of how to be on their team and be supportive of whatever they need.
In the same vein, White explained the intentionality with which adjunct instructors and cohort mentors are included in the planning and revision efforts of the program:

[The core faculty] open ourselves up, and we say, “Okay, so what books have you read lately? What’s out there? What’s perking out there? What should we be thinking about? What are the trends?” So, we collaborate and involve them in what goes on and what goes forward, and we listen to them and we act on what we hear.

She went on to explain the benefit of this inclusive culture saying, “That influences their trust, and it influences them to be better scholars and be out there looking and thinking and reading so that, when we open ourselves, we come back and we hear the best and latest ideas.”

Several interviewees noted the importance of relationships the core faculty had with others before they were part of the Brandman EdD program to the team’s ability to identify and assemble a highly aligned and effective team in a short period of time. Larick concluded, “So, prior acquaintance, prior relationship, prior work together helped bring the team together faster than it might otherwise.” Relatedly, several interviewees noted the importance of strong relationships between faculty, staff, and students to the success of the Brandman EdD program. Froehlich reflected,

What I’ve always really admired is how student centered we are. Right. So, they’re very hands on with students. Always willing to go above and beyond with their time to try to help people through it. Very collaborative. They always give
a really safe space for people to try new things so we can either fail or succeed to move the program forward.

In the same manner, Enomoto described his commitment to supporting students:

That’s what it’s all about, that you can help people become the best version of themselves that they can become, not the best version that I want them to be, but the best version of themselves and they feel productive and healthy and feel like they are enjoying what they’re doing.

**Development opportunities.** Within the development opportunities theme, the subtheme of students are encouraged to grow authentically and pursue their own goals and dreams while being mentored by scholar practitioners had the greatest frequency, with a total of 26 (61.9) of the 42 codes for the theme. Regarding the importance of mentorship by scholarly practitioners, Cote explained,

So, this program, using practitioners partnered with researchers . . . gives the students an incredible opportunity to be mentored not only on large issues, but also on, “What do I do if this teacher doesn’t like me?” Or something, you know? “How do I handle this?” And they can be mentored or assisted by someone who’s actually been there, and to me that makes this program just so completely different and so worthwhile.

Several interviewees noted the significant changes students undergo throughout the doctoral program process. Alaniz reflected, “This program will change your life.” Cote noted that her most memorable experience as a cohort mentor in the program is the change she observes in her students from beginning to end.
**Human needs.** Within the human needs theme, the subtheme of the program addresses needs of adult learners had the greatest frequency, with a total of four of the eight codes for the theme. Goodman explained the genesis of the program:

It was [Dr. White’s] brainchild to begin with and she saw a need. She went to Dr. Zeppos, who never takes a no for anything. Between Dr. White and Dr. Zeppos, they pulled in Dr. Larick, who has chaired 500 dissertations and worked very closely with another university.

Goodman then went on to explain the initial Brandman team’s motivation:

They saw a need for something different, something that met the needs of the adult learner, that met the needs of leaders throughout California, that met the needs across industry, a program that would meet the needs that would include innovation, would include application, and would literally transform lives.

Likewise, Christine Zeppos discussed the intentional design of the program to promote a balanced approach to leadership that aligns with a person’s core values. She shared,

I really wanted to tell administrators, especially women, we’re told so much that you can’t be a mom and I wanted students to also see that you can do it all and you can also be happy in all those areas of your life. So, don’t forget that your kids are important and you need time for your husband or partner.

**Feelings, fears, and biases.** Within the feelings, fears, and biases theme, the subtheme of instructors and cohort mentors help minimize student fears had the greatest frequency, with a total of four of the four codes for the theme. DeVore noted the great willingness of faculty and staff to meet the needs of students and support them through the doctoral journey. More specifically, Enomoto discussed students fearing the
statistical components of the research courses, and shared that the faculty make a concerted effort to minimize student fears and assist them through the more complicated elements of the quantitative and qualitative research courses.

**Research Question 3**

*What were the key political factors and decisions that led to the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership?*

For the purpose of this study, the political frame was defined as power and gaining access to scarce resources through competition among individuals and groups based on diverse interests, values, beliefs, behaviors, and skills (Bolman & Deal, 2017; Cyert & March, 1963; Gamson, 1968; Pfeffer, 1992).

**Qualitative data presentation and analysis.** The qualitative data for the themes identified regarding the political frame are outlined in Table 4. The political frame included the three themes of diverse interests related to power and resources, values and beliefs related to power and resources, and behaviors and skills related to power and resources. Table 4 outlines the subthemes within each of the three themes identified in the political frame and the frequency at which each occurred in the 16 interviews conducted for this study. The political frame amassed a total of 273 codes across the three themes.

**Diverse interests related to power and resources.** Within the diverse interests related to power and resources theme, the subtheme of university leaders control all funding—dean is not provided a budget had the greatest frequency, with a total of 47 (31.8%) of the 148 codes for the theme. Regarding the challenge of not having a specific budget allocated to the doctoral program, several interviewees noted the political
### Table 4

**Total Codes for the Political Frame**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Diverse interests related to power and resources</td>
<td>Total of all diverse interests related to power and resources codes</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding: University leaders control all funding; dean is not provided a budget—must request funding for individual expenses</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Due to cost, university leaders requested that immersions be eliminated</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding for staffing the growing program remains a challenge—salary amounts, reliance on adjuncts, and stipends are challenges</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral program is profitable—Cash Cow, Golden Goose but outside factors impact reinvestment in the program</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrate value of the program and program needs</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding: program expansion and innovation; transformational change center; space to house the program</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University leaders to not have relationship with doctoral program - have never attended key events</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political challenges include program decisions made above the Dean; Dean shields faculty from politics</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enrollment: Declining enrollment impacted funding provided by the university for the program; required decreased teaching loads</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding: Program has distinct marketing needs; marketing department out of sync with program leadership and guidance; inadequate marketing resources and funding provided; recruitment needs to address needs of current students and workforce, diversity; need to build a reputation; new program has greater needs than existing; continuous improvement</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No shared governance of funding; unclear role of faculty senate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Succession planning: leadership needs to understand program to understand the funding needs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student interests: Tuition—have fought to keep low in order to retain student interest; various political agendas during group assignments</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding: Program has technology needs that are not adequately funded; journal, research resources</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enrollment: Initial cohort was 5x the expected size, which caused a great strain on the program financially—Instructors, mentors, etc.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University does not fund travel for dissertation chair to attend oral defense</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University leaders initially denied funding hooding ceremony</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enrollment: as program grows, expenses increase</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enrollment and retention: program must meet university goals and projections</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program was developed to fill void in market—scholar practitioner program</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Values and beliefs related to power and resources</td>
<td>Total of all values and beliefs related to power and resources codes</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Core values include transformational leadership and innovation - producing scholar practitioners</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment to servant leadership; focus on serving and supporting students</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment to hiring only those who share and exemplify core values</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment to continuous improvement</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment to diversity, valuing different perspectives</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment to core values</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Behaviors and skills related to power and resources</td>
<td>Total of all behaviors and skills related to power and resources codes</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced transformational leaders exemplify vision, diversity, collaboration, political intelligence, leading change, serving others, transforming selves first</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Firm commitment to cycle of continuous improvement in all areas</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tech refinements are critical to program sustainability</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic networking and recruitment is important to growth and quality</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment to diversity of student body</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total political frame codes</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

challenge of having to vie for limited and undefined resources. Several interviewees also noted that not being provided a budget was very different than the fiscal practices of other K-12 districts and universities in which they had previously worked. Additionally, interviewees commented on the seeming disconnect between the amount of revenue generated by the program and the amount of funding returned to the program for operation and expansion. Interviewees used terms such as cash cow, golden goose, and quite profitable to describe the amount of revenue generated by the doctoral program.

Several interview participants noted the concern they felt regarding the pressure from the university to reduce or eliminate immersions from the doctoral program, indicating such a change would fundamentally alter the quality and effectiveness of the program. Others noted their concern for a lack of funding for dissertation chairs to attend dissertation defenses, faculty to travel to and participate in immersions, and the university’s initial disapproval of the doctoral hooding ceremony as unnecessary.

**Values and beliefs related to power and resources.** Within the values and beliefs related to power and resources theme, the subtheme of core values include transformational leadership and innovation—producing scholar practitioners had the
greatest frequency, with a total of 18 (28.6%) of the 63 codes for the theme. Regarding the program’s continued commitment to its original values and beliefs, White reflected, “The vision is still oriented toward transformational change. We still have the philosophy of serving people. We have a philosophy, a very strong philosophy toward diversity.” Elaborating on the element of diversity, she went on to say,

I think that has evolved to an even greater extent, that we want to not serve just the elite cream of the crop people who come in with the very highest IQs, the highest GPAs, and all the skills in the world, and just narrow it down and just take 25 of those white males who apply, but we want to have a very diverse clientele.

Froehlich echoed this sentiment:

So I think the initial vision for this has stayed the same, right. Trying to create transformational leaders. And I think over the years they have just fine-tuned everything that they’d done with this to just make it the best program they possibly could.

Len Hightower noted that the Brandman doctoral program’s focus on student success originated in many of the core faculty’s earlier experience with the EdD program at the University of La Verne. He explained the values of the program are ingrained in some of these key people. That’s not something they read in a book someplace. They experienced it firsthand. They lived it out, because they were doctoral students going through that experience, and they saw the power of it.

Commenting on the process the doctoral program team uses to ensure adherence to the core values, Larick explained,
We meet every year. We sit down and take a look at our core values and say,

“What’s changed? Who do we want to be five years from now and 10 years from now? Does that shift any of our core values?” It hasn’t shifted our core values at this point.

**Behaviors and skills related to power and resources.** Within the behaviors and skills related to power and resources theme, the subtheme of experienced transformational leaders exemplify vision, diversity, collaboration, political intelligence, leading change, serving others, transforming selves first had the greatest frequency, with a total of 28 (45.2%) of the 62 codes for the theme. White described the critical behaviors and skills exemplified in the program saying, “We wanted to make sure that these transformational leaders paid close attention to vision, diversity, collaboration, political intelligence.” She went on to explain that it was important for graduates to be “really focused on change and leading transformational change effectively and doing it with the idea of serving people and lifting people up and transforming themselves first so that they could transform others who could then transform their organizations.”

Hightower noted the political intelligence required of the founding dean and associate dean of the school of education in establishing commitment to the program throughout the state by convening advisory committees and asking leaders from each regional group to identify the skills and traits of their future workforce. He reflected,

It was brilliant, because she in essence was doing research, and the program is to some extent centered around what they learned. Of course, I think Pat [Clark White] probably knew already, and Keith [Larick] knew already probably what was going to be said.
Hightower continued, “But it’s in the asking is the power, and the politics is in the power. These things are all interfaced. It’s getting people sitting around the table and having a meaningful conversation.” He noted those conversations were critical because “in essence you’re saying, ‘You’re important to us. We care what you think.’ What we’re doing at the very same time is we’re winning you over without saying it. That was like, oh, that’s brilliant.”

**Research Question 4**

*What were the key symbolic factors and decisions that led to the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership?*

For the purpose of this study, the symbolic frame was defined as strategies for engaging people through ritual, ceremony, story, play and culture (Bolman & Deal, 2017; Collins & Porras, 1994, 2001; Hofstede, 2001; Kotter & Cohen, 2002).

**Qualitative data presentation and analysis.** The qualitative data for the themes identified regarding the symbolic frame are outlined in Table 5. The symbolic frame included the five themes of culture and vision, rituals, play, story, and ceremony. Table 5 outlines the subthemes identified within each theme and the frequency at which each occurred in the 16 interviews conducted for this study. The symbolic frame amassed a total of 275 codes across five themes.

**Culture and vision.** Within the culture and vision theme, the subtheme of culture of pride and enthusiasm is shared by administration, faculty, staff, and students had the greatest frequency with a total of 14 (13%) of the 108 codes for the theme. From interactions with the EdD Working Team to the opinions of individual instructors,
Table 5

*Total Codes for the Symbolic Frame*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Culture and vision</td>
<td>Total for all culture and vision codes</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Culture of pride and enthusiasm is shared by admin, faculty, staff, and students</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Core values have remained</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty and staff do whatever is needed</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Culture of respect, honesty, and hard conversations</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students are treated as colleagues</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Culture of play and fun: clicker, EdDy</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community of people committed to leadership and making a difference</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on continuous improvement</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Culture of inclusion and diversity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Culture of student support and faculty support</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Culture of confidence and experience—practitioners and wise, experienced leaders</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Culture of relationships and commitment to the vision and culture of the program</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong communication of the vision</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Culture of gratitude for being involved in something much greater than self</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on producing students who can do things</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shifts in symbols reflect personalities of different cohorts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Culture has to be sustained and perpetuated by those who know it</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Symbolism engages people’s hearts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rituals</td>
<td>Total for all rituals codes</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Immersion structures are rituals: theme, icebreaker, community builder, video retrospective on last day, nametag, moving from lt. to rt. side of room</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Immersion activities are rituals: innovation tournament, political rally, Greeting Card Scenario, Amazing Race, Transformational Change Symposium</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 2 luncheon is ritual of passing the torch to new cohort</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean’s presentations at each immersion reiterate culture—focus on student support</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cohort model and mentors facilitate development of collective identity—shirts; division of labor in cohorts; structuring devices used in cohort meeting facilitation</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Programmatic symbolic items: doctoral program symbol, padfolio, pin, alumni hat, cohort photo</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EdDy and BEdDy represent doctoral students’ future</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rituals related to completing the dissertation include Advancement to Candidacy and Dissertation Defense</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hooding ceremony is a personalized ritual</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reception at Dean Zeppos’ home for graduates before hooding is important ritual</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rituals at graduation include Dean hugging each graduate, graduates cheering for all Education mentions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Early program rituals to prepare students for the program include the intake interview and boot camp—first handshake is from the Dean</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ritual of the cycle of Continuous Improvement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
mentors, and students, all interviewees indicated that they had observed and share in a
genral enthusiasm for the doctoral program. Interviewee L used terms such as *passion*
and *pouring my heart into it* to describe his enthusiasm for the doctoral program.

Froehlich described her observation of faculty and staff attending conferences to promote
the program, and Goodman shared about her habit of recruiting for the program any time
she was on an airplane trip. Similarly, Cote noted that the program leadership
demonstrated such passion for the program it inspired others to follow. She explained,

The enthusiasm from Dr. Zeppos, the enthusiasm from Dr. White, Dr. Larick, Dr.
Ryder, I mean, their continued enthusiasm and obvious love for the students and
the program has really resonated throughout the years. So that’s also made quite
a difference.
**Rituals.** Within the rituals theme, the subtheme of immersion structures are rituals had the greatest frequency with a total of 24 (24.5%) of the 98 codes for the theme. Regarding the importance immersion, DeVore shared,

> Immersion is a happening that you just don’t experience anywhere else. I’ve not seen it in any other program, anything like it. The energy, the student-centeredness, the power of it, I’ve never seen anything like it and I’m thrilled to be a part of it.

Similarly, Lee shared, “One of the strengths of this program is, we have Immersions, and they’re a differentiator, a separator.” He went on to explain the role of immersion in the student interview process:

> We have some folks that are in the online cohort that are out of state, but when I interview those students unanimously, they’ll tell me, I don’t want an all online program. I want a hybrid program, a blended program where there is a face to face component to it.

Lee concluded the reason for the emphasis on joining a program with an immersion component is that “there’s a unique value in sitting in a room looking somebody eye to eye. Shaking their hand still means something.”

**Play.** Within the theme of play, the subtheme of EdDy and BEdDy have playful adventures had the greatest frequency, with a total of 16 (51.6%) of the 31 codes for the theme. Interviewees concurred that play was an intentional component of the culture of the doctoral program, which included jokes between Larick and White about sabotaging each other’s use of the clicker during keynote presentations (see Appendix K), and the evolution of a single mannequin purchased to display the doctoral program regalia during
immersions. Zeppos described how EdDy was gifted clothes from her husband’s closet to add formality [mainly pants] to his regalia. She then shared that the Beta cohort from Visalia wanted their own representative of a doctoral graduate, so they ordered a second mannequin, a female, and named her Beta BEdDy (see Appendix L). Zeppos explained the purpose of initially purchasing EdDy: “I just wanted [students] to see the end [of the doctoral program] and then, over time the jokes with EdDy—that Alpha class would steal EdDy and they would do different things with him (see Appendix M). And it was just so awesome.”

As EdDy’s popularity with the doctoral students grew, so did EdDy’s post-doctoral program adventures. Zeppos recalled,

And then those first Facebook years of the stuff that they would do with Eddie and he’s having a good time at dinner tonight or whatnot were just really, because it was so intense in the program, but it was just so playful and awesome at night.

Froehlich shared that there was an infant mannequin at one point in the photo life of EdDy and BEdDy, but that it never made its way to the university. Zeppos shared,

It was just great fun. I mean, they’d steal EdDy, he’d be upstairs in this hotel and I’m like, “Oh, my God, one of these days, my name’s going to be all over the paper. What are they doing to this poor mannequin?”

**Story.** Within the theme of story, the subtheme of the foundation of Brandman University doctoral program stems from La Verne doctoral program had the greatest frequency, with a total of 13 (52%) of the 25 codes for the theme. With many of the Brandman EdD core faculty, adjunct faculty, and cohort mentors having previous affiliation with the University of La Verne EdD program, references to the La Verne
program being the foundation of the Brandman program emerged throughout the interviews. Hightower, who worked at La Verne for more than a decade, explained that many of the key components of the EdD program long-time professor Tom Harvey developed at the University of La Verne served as a model for the work done at Brandman. Hightower explained the La Verne program “was really intentional. It was really on purpose. It wasn’t just a traditional take a class, write a paper type doctoral experience.” But rather,

it was, we’re going to teach you something, now go try to live that out. Then we’re going to talk about it, and work process it. We’re going to get you ready for the next one, and talk it through. That’s how they ran that program. That’s the genesis of [the Brandman EdD] program.

According to Hightower, similar to the Brandman EdD program, the La Verne EdD program was a hybrid program with thematic topics of study. Hightower described the La Verne program’s leader, Tom Harvey:

What he had was a real belief in people can become better leaders. He totally understood his subject matter in and out. His thing was, you’ve got to step up and you’ve got to learn, and you’ve got to begin to apply this.

Ceremonies. Within the theme of ceremonies, the subtheme of ceremonies relate to milestones in the curriculum had the greatest frequency, with a total of seven of the 13 codes for the theme. Ainsworth noted important ceremonies related to completing the doctoral program, such as dissertation completion, the hooding ceremony, and graduation. Goodman similarly noted the importance of advancement to candidacy and graduation as well as the leadership portfolio that students complete over the course of
the program. Within the ceremonies and ritual themes, several interviewees noted the deep symbolic nature of the luncheon held at the final immersion of the elder most cohort, in which the upperclassmen prepare videos and entertainment for the faculty, staff, and lowerclassmen, and then ceremoniously pass the torch to the younger cohort and encourage their journey toward program completion and lifelong transformational change.

**Research Question 5**

*What frame or combination of frames (structural, human resource, political, symbolic) do the participants perceive had the greatest impact on the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership and why?*

**Qualitative data presentation and analysis.** The qualitative data for the question regarding which frame or combination of frames identified as having the greatest significance on the evolution of the Brandman doctoral program are outlined in Table 6. Table 6 outlines the frequency with which each frame was cited as having the greatest impact on the program, as noted in the 16 interviews conducted for this study. The frames were addressed a total of 31 times in relation to their impact on the evolution of the Brandman doctoral program. Table 6 details the coding frequency for each of the frames.

**Frame analysis.** When identifying the frame or combination of frames that have had the greatest impact on the evolution of the Brandman doctoral program, all 16 interview participants provided a response. Six interviewees cited the human resource
frame as the most impactful, which is the frame that received the most codes either being cited as the most influential individually or in combination with other frames. One interviewee identified the structural frame as the most impactful and another interviewee identified the symbolic frame as the most impactful frame. The remaining eight interview participants cited a combination of the frames as being most impactful to the evolution of the doctoral program, with three citing the combination of the human resource frame and the structural frame; three citing the combination of the human resource frame and the symbolic frame; two citing the combination of all four frames; and one citing the combination of the human resource, structural and symbolic frames.

White summarized her identification of all four frames as important, with the human resources frame being most impactful:

I think the best part of this program is that we are able to give attention to all four frames and that we have really been able to integrate all four frames into what we do, but it’s always going to be human beings who are the most.

Goodman concluded that the focus on continuous improvement and innovation in all four frames has been the most impactful element of the Brandman doctoral program:

When you’re looking at the symbolic, human resource, structure, and political, the innovation involved in each of those for continuous improvement, examination,
refining, reformation and then innovation. I think that’s one thing that. . . . People will do it in one spot and not another. But to do it for all four, pretty remarkable.

**The power of multiple frame analysis.** The ability to shift one’s focus from one frame to another gives leaders the advantage of a broader understanding of their organizations and potential opportunities for innovation (Bolman & Deal, 2017). By consciously attending to all four frames in great detail, the administrators, faculty, and staff of the Brandman University doctoral program in organizational leadership were able to create and launch a doctoral program in record time, at five times the projected size, and then continue to scale the program, year after year without losing the crucial focus on transformational leadership. Bolman and Deal (2017) noted that often leaders fail due to “faulty thinking rooted in inadequate ideas” (p. 23). By adhering to a multiframe perspective and surrounding themselves with like-minded leaders skilled in the art of reframing, the doctoral program leadership team was able to achieve record-breaking student success rates in only 7 years of existence.

The most innovative element of this doctoral program has been its continuous improvement and commitment to innovation in all areas: structural, human resource, political, and symbolic. The team’s great clarity of their core values and vision for the types of transformational leaders they would employ in order to produce the next generation of transformational leaders exemplify Bolman and Deal’s (2017) notion of a successful organization needing “resilient values and elastic strategies” (p. 421). With non-negotiable norms such as being absolutely student focused, committed to regular personal transformation, transparent with one another, and dedicated to teamwork, the core team set the expectations for excellence that then enabled them allow the broader
team flexibility in implementation, which yielded ownership, loyalty and exceptional student outcomes.

**Qualitative Data Summary**

This study included interviews with 16 members of the Brandman doctoral program. In total, the interviews produced 1,478 codes across the four frames and the analysis of the frame or combination of frames that had the greatest impact on the evolution of the program. In alignment with Bolman and Deal’s (2017) four-frame model, the participants’ analysis of the role of each frame, as well as the combination of frames, demonstrated the significance each, as well as the interdependence of each frame on the others. It is interesting to note that when asked which frame or combination of frames had the greatest impact on the evolution of the program, the human resource frame was noted most frequently by participants, either independently or in conjunction with another frame. However, the greatest number of codes were generated from the structural frame. This outcome is also consistent with Bolman and Deal’s notion that successful leaders manage the complexity of organizational life by fluidly shifting between lenses and to envision the future they intend to create.

**Historical Narrative by Peer Researcher**

The next part of this chapter frames the data collected in a historical narrative of the Brandman program in the words of the key leaders who were involved at the time. The story of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership is one of innovation launched by a vision and fueled by a group of passionate individuals who leveraged their experiences, relationships, and acumen to make a lasting contribution to the legacy of leadership. The study demonstrates how the program began
as an idea for innovation in the mind of Christine Zeppos, founding dean of the School of Education at Brandman University. The story then describes the year leading up to the launch of the program under the leadership of founding Associate Dean Pat Clark White. Finally, the story tells how the program became accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges and was offered at Brandman University beginning in the fall of 2012. The years following the program’s launch from 2013 through 2017 are told by a peer researcher as part of this thematic study and are included in this study to provide the reader the benefit of continuity. Sources cited in the historical narrative told by the peer researcher are found in the reference section of that complete study.

The History of Brandman

To understand the story of the Brandman doctoral program, the context of the creation of the university was provided. This started with Chapman University, one of the oldest and most prestigious private universities in the state of California encompassing eight schools and colleges. In the years leading up to the creation of Brandman University, Chapman enrolled 6,000 traditional college students annually in undergraduate, graduate, and law programs. Additionally, starting in 1958, Chapman University College, one of Chapman’s eight colleges, offered programs to adult learners through their facility located at the El Toro Marine Air Station.

By the early 2000s, Chapman University College wanted to become a separately accredited institution in the Chapman University system. The college stated this interest as a desire to “better meet the educational needs of adult learners through innovative flexible delivery options and relevant curriculum and degree programs” (Brandman University, 2010a). To this end, on February 12, 2007, a Structural Change Proposal was
submitted to WASC with the details of this new strategic direction. On June 1, 2008, Chapman University College formally separated from the 149-year-old Chapman University. Eight months later, on February 10, 2009, Chancellor Gary Brahm was formally notified of successful WASC accreditation of the institution of Chapman University College (Brandman University, 2009).

Chapman University College was founded with a distinctive and innovative vision. The institution was created to “be more flexible and responsive to the ever-changing needs of working adults and dedicated to extending the Chapman education to adult students online and through a network of 25 campuses in California and Washington” (Brandman University, 2009, p. 2). The vision of the institution was stated as, “We will be the recognized leader in the evolution of adult learning.” (Brandman University, 2009, p. 2). A vision of innovation was not new for the college. Rather, this type of thinking was evident in the institution’s beginnings in 1958 as the Residence Education Center Program, where nontraditional adult students were served not on an elaborate campus, but at the El Toro Marine Air Station where they lived and worked.

In 2009, a half-century after the Residence Education Center Program began in 1958, Joyce Brandman gave a $10,000,000 gift to the university to support the vision of providing higher education to working adults. At that time, the Board of Regents approved renaming the school Brandman University. Brandman developed programs swiftly and was given WASC approval to offer its first practice-focused doctoral program, a Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) degree, on June 23, 2010 (Brandman University (2010b). In the same time period, Brandman underwent a “university-wide transition from traditional classroom instruction to both fully online courses and a
A blended model where 50% of instructional time is delivered online and 50% is delivered in the traditional classroom setting” (Brandman University, 2011e, pp. 24-25).

This spirit of innovation anchored in excellence is in the roots of Brandman University. From its beginnings at an air station serving nontraditional learners, to its boldness in separating from an established and prestigious university, to its ongoing creation of innovative programs, Brandman has established itself as a leader in the marketplace. The institution’s mission to provide flexibility and relevance to a new generation of students in the evolving marketplace and world is evident throughout the story of the Brandman Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership.

The Idea for a Doctoral Program

Just as Brandman University was created from a vision of creating flexible delivery options and relevant curriculum and degree programs, the vision for an interdisciplinary professional doctoral program in the School of Education grew in a similar vein (Brandman University, 2010a). Throughout her professional life, Christine Zeppos envisioned a doctoral program that replaced the impractical and ineffective elements typical in traditional doctoral programs. This desire initially grew in Zeppos through her experience as a doctoral student at Arizona State University and continued to grow throughout her professional career in higher education.

Zeppos recalls her experience as a doctoral student saying that she never understood a lot of the traditional systems that were in place that were not making her a better researcher or helping her grow. To that end, she described her doctoral experience “very traditional, very much a rite of passage” with “an overarching culture that they were going to make this as difficult as possible for you to be worthy of being a doctor.”
However, in reflecting on her doctoral education, Zeppos also remembered the parts that were most meaningful to her. She described having the provost and the vice president of student affairs teach in the program she attended, putting theory into the “context of what crossed their desk that day and the major decisions and the political dynamics involved.” She went on to share,

That was a huge part of influence for me and really resonated throughout my entire career. Everything that I’ve touched since then I have wanted to duplicate that feeling of, hey here is the theory, but here how it applies to my job in running the university.

As a student, this critical experience in her doctoral education brought to the surface the importance of professors being high-level practitioners in order to make the learning most meaningful for students.

Zeppos spoke with passion as she reflected on this experience 20 years prior as the original thought that became the impetus for creating the Brandman University doctoral program. Over her career, Zeppos learned what it took to lead university programs. She started new programs and experienced barriers that prevented innovation and the scaling of innovative practices. From each of her experiences, Zeppos took firsthand learning that came together as a culminating desire to improve doctoral education. It was with that desire that Zeppos started her tenure at Brandman University. She described Brandman as having “the best of all the worlds. More traditional, but you’re able to implement innovative ideas.” She said, “It really was a perfect match of all the things that I was looking for in development of a doctorate, of the next kind of doctorate.”
The Vision

On July 26, 2010, Christine Zeppos started her tenure at Brandman University in the role of dean of the School of Education. She recalls that in interviews for the position she said she would really like to try to do two things for the university. One was to get NCATE accreditation as it was the gold standard in credentialing and the other was to create a doctoral program. She did not want to create “just another doctoral program.” Rather, she was impassioned to create a program that was truly needed in society and would develop a network of leaders in California and beyond. As Zeppos described,

So much of that was in my belly of, I want to do something that’s different, that’s right, not just the same old doctoral and educational leadership, or just follow somebody else’s model. But really build what’s needed and also build it in a way that people were just attracted to it just in a visceral kind of way.

Zeppos knew that she wanted to attract students to the program who wanted to change the world. She had a vision of creating the doctoral program on a large enough scale that leaders from all types of organizations would be connected to each other through the program. These leaders would each transform the organizations they led, through their networks would run for or influence political office, and ultimately would create large scale change in the world. According to Zeppos, “That’s the way I believe you make massive change, is by having people with all the same foundation and with the right lens of what they want the world to look like.”

Zeppos knew that before she could act on this driving passion, she would need to secure university approval for the doctoral program. Zeppos described that from their earliest conversations, the university administration was supportive to creating the
doctoral program. In fact, there had been dialogue within the university around creating a
degree for many years prior. According to Kimberly Greene, one of the reasons that
Zeppos was such a popular choice for the dean position was because she had the strength
in leadership to try new things and was interested in creating a doctoral program.
Greene, who was originally hired for Chapman University and College prior to the
creation of Brandman University was one of the first full-time faculty for the Brandman
School of Education. In reflecting on this time period at Brandman, she recalled, “We
really wanted that doctorate. We as a faculty really wanted to have a doctorate for our
brand-new university.”

Initial Program Inquiry

The idea of establishing a doctoral program in Brandman’s School of Education
was formally brought forward in a faculty retreat in August 2010 (Brandman University,
2011e). Widespread support for the program existed among faculty and administration.
So, the formal process for program approval was pursued starting with the New Degree
Program Inquiry Template (Brandman University, n.d.-i). As part of the initial inquiry,
Vice Chancellor Charles Bullock directed the university to engage in a series of supply
and demand analyses that would allow for the triangulation of data and trends indicating
the level of need and interest in the marketplace for a Brandman EdD program
(Brandman University, 2011e).

Demand analysis. A literature review encompassing several wide-scale market
forecasts and a viability study was conducted by a neutral third party. Initial evidence of
the need for new doctoral programs in the state of California was established in the
California State University report Meeting California’s Need for the Education Doctorate
(The California State University, 2001). The market need was substantiated through a viability study, *Demand for Education Doctoral Programs*, conducted by Noel-Levitz consulting on behalf of the university and further analyzed in an Executive Summary entitled *The EdD Program’s Potential-Demand and Competitive Analysis Review and Synthesis* (Brandman University Institutional Research and Planning, 2010).

Results signaled a demand for occupations over the next 2 decades specific to the proposed doctoral program. As specified in the study, the demand would result from a significant number of expected preschool to Grade 12 and community college administrator retirements (Brandman University Office of Institutional Research and Planning, 2010). Likewise, a study completed by West Ed Regional Educational Laboratory, *Projecting the Need for California School Administrators over 2010/11-2017/18: The Effects of Projected Changes in Student Enrollment Over Two-Year Increments*, indicated increased need for school administrators across nearly all regions of California as a result of anticipated retirements paired with increased student enrollment projections (Fong & Makkonen, 2011).

**Supply analysis.** Along with determining the marketplace need for a doctoral program, Vice Chancellor Charles Bullock requested data demonstrating the supply of students for the proposed doctoral program. These data were collected through a further review of the literature, a survey of current students and alumni, interviews of expert leaders throughout the state, and an analysis of the Graduate Record Exam (GRE) data. In addition, interest of current Brandman students and Brandman alumni in enrollment in a doctoral program offered at Brandman was ascertained through survey data.
Survey and expert interviews. According to the report *Doctorate of Education: Prospective Student Survey Results*, “A tailored invitation to participate in a Doctorate of Education survey was sent to 13,049 unique alumni and students. In a one-week period, 999 responded” (Brandman University Office of Institutional Research and Planning, 2011a, p. 1). From this survey Brandman University identified 501 prospective students who indicated high interest in pursuing this type of doctorate at Brandman. These prospective applicants indicated that the proposed program had a high level of relevance to their career. In addition, prospective students identified as ready to sign up for the program indicated the proposed immersion structure as more of a draw than any other potential program feature (Brandman University Office of Institutional Research and Planning, 2011a).

To further determine the appeal of the proposed program to educational administrators throughout the state, semistructured expert interviews were conducted by an impartial third-party (Brandman University Office of Institutional Research and Planning, 2011b). Data from these interviews of leaders in the field indicated strong support for the Brandman doctoral program and confirmed a future demand in the job market.

Graduate record exam data analysis. The final step in determining program viability was to analyze Graduate Record Exam (GRE) data and to refine enrollment projections in order to determine geographical areas that would be viable locations for cohorts of students. An analysis of the number of students taking the GRE with an indicated degree objective of the Doctorate in Education was undertaken. This analysis included data from “an 18-month period from July 2009 to December 2010. Student data
were extracted from the GRE database and regionally analyzed by zip codes within a 20 mile radius of each campus” (Brandman University Office of Institutional Research and Planning, 2011c, p. 7).

Results from this analysis further substantiated strong supplier markets of students throughout the state of California and Washington and pointed to markets with the largest and smallest potential supply of students. The strongest supply markets were Santa Clarita, Walnut Creek, Irvine, Ontario/Moreno Valley, San Diego, and Washington State, with Folsom/Roseville, Irvine, San Diego, and Ontario/Moreno Valley showing growth promise. This GRE data and the regional trends data were compared and complied into a report *Doctorate of Education: Supply and Demand Analysis and Detailed Regional Mapping*, prepared by Brandman University Office of Institutional Research and Planning (2011c) in the Spring of 2011.

**New Degree Program Approval and Planning**

On October 26, 2010, the Dean’s Council at Brandman University approved the New Degree Program Inquiry. Following program approval, a decision needed to be made initially on how quickly the university wanted to pursue the doctoral program planning process. This decision was influenced by Zeppos who had a sense of urgency and wanted to get the doctoral program planning started right away. She advocated for the potential this doctoral program would have to be a differentiator for the university and to provide revenue for the university. She argued the timing was right with teaching credentials declining in the state and nobody going into teaching with pink slips all over the news, and she shared with administration that a doctoral program would serve as a great recruitment tool for all of the university’s other programs. Zeppos stated, “If you
are producing leaders, they’re going to tell those under them, I went to Brandman University.”

While advocating for the planning of the program to begin, Zeppos knew that some critical steps also needed to be undertaken. She was aware that a no-name university would not be able to successfully offer a doctoral degree and recruit students. The university would need accreditation. Moreover, it would need credibility to compete with the established programs in the field such as USC and La Verne. She knew that she would need a team of respected and well-connected leaders experienced as high-level practitioners and as doctoral faculty to design and launch a viable doctoral program at Brandman University.

**Associate Dean—The New Program’s First Faculty**

One of the first moves made Zeppos after the university approved the doctoral program was to advocate for the hiring of Pat Clark White as associate dean. Zeppos was bold in her advocacy to recruit White immediately in September 2010, even though the new budget would not be available until the following June 2011. In advocating for the immediate hiring of White, Zeppos said,

> I have complete faith and trust in her. And I know she has a vision of what we could do to take what she has experienced at La Verne and USC. Really take the best of some of those ideas and create something that would be amazing.

These two leaders had worked closely together at Argosy University. In fact, they worked so closely, that they shared an office. As White recalled their time working together at Argosy, she shared,
The two of us became very good colleagues together and shared an office. We just hit it off immediately. We bounced ideas off of each other, and we were very creative together and lots of raucous fun together. We kept coming up with solutions to problems for Argosy.

After engaging in an interview process involving a faculty panel, an opportunity for all School of Education faculty to participate in an open phone interview, and securing the support of university administration, Zeppos offered White the position as associate dean (Brandman University, 2011e). As White recalled being offered the opportunity to work with Zeppos at Brandman and design a doctoral program, she said, “It was a dream job. I couldn’t think of anything that I would want to do more than that, and so of course accepted and came over and the rest is history.” In November 2010, Pat Clark White started her position as associate dean at Brandman University with the charge of designing a new doctoral program. At this time, White was the only faculty working in the doctoral program.

**Building the Doctoral Core Planning Team**

As founding associate dean, one of White’s earliest moves was to build a team that would develop the program under her leadership. The university allocated staffing for the program with existing faculty and adjunct faculty thinking this was a reasonable allocation to develop a small program. As indicated in the WASC proposal, “Because Brandman already has highly qualified faculty for their other graduate programs, the hiring will be limited to selecting adjunct faculty from leading practitioners, who will become cohort mentors for the first year” (Brandman University, 2011e, p. 15). Accordingly, White recruited current skilled Brandman School of Education faculty
Kimberly Greene and Tamerin Capellino as core team members and program co-chairs. Initially, they both would work with White designing in the doctoral program while continuing to work in their existing roles in the School of Education at the university.

Five-Phase Planning Process for New Degree Programs

With this initial team established, the planning commenced following Brandman University’s five-phase planning process for new degree programs which included the following: (a) literature review and input from practitioners, (b) comprehensive analysis of traditional and nontraditional degree programs, (c) creation of new curriculum, (d) stakeholder feedback, and (e) advisory board feedback and assurance of learning for continuous improvement (Brandman University, n.d.-j; Brandman University, 2011e). In addition, timelines were developed to guide the program through all phases of the design process culminating in new program initiation projected for May 2012. These timelines were detailed in an internal document entitled New Doctorate in Education Timeline (Brandman University, n.d.-k).

The Steering Committee

According to the Brandman University WASC Proposal for the Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership, the Steering Committee consisted of five staff members, three being White, Greene, and Capellino (Brandman University, 2011e). The charge brought forward to Greene and Capellino was to co-chair this Steering Committee, which would plan all elements of the doctoral program. This included program design, course design, preparation of all necessary documents for submission to the approval bodies, and design of all corresponding program components (Brandman University, 2011e). Greene
and Capellino both described rolling up their sleeves and starting the planning almost immediately.

**Designing the Program**

The doctoral program was designed with the same commitment and momentum with which it was initially approved. Capellino recalled this fondly saying, “We were not given too many constraints regarding what that was going to look like, or even what it was going to be called, or the content.” She recalled it as, “All right, internal department approval, and then we’re going to have to write a lot. Go for it.” This team did exactly that.

In recalling this time period, Capellino shared that for the first year, a three-person team of herself, White, and Greene worked to develop the program including all of the initial planning, development, accreditation approval, and internal approval to launch. She spoke with fondness and passion as she recalled, “It was literally the three of us doing everything humanly possible for the first year.” Greene describes this early development of the program as “a passion project” noting that she, Capellino, and White “were all in.”

This was described as a time of great energy and momentum by the team with free reign to design the program they imagined. Capellino recalls,

We were only told no a couple times. Otherwise, we just thought the world is our oyster. We’re going to just develop the best darn doctoral program we can drum up and hopefully Brandman’s going to say, yeah, you can implement it. Other universities would’ve never ever in a million years been able to pull off developing a doctoral program with that speed.
In the same vein Greene says there was support all around, noting that while White may have shielded them from politics that existed, it felt like the team had the resources and support they needed.

Within 6 months, this team had created a doctoral program that was ready for internal and accreditation review. As White recalled,

I started in November of 2010. By April of 2011, we had a program all designed and ready to take to the Board of Regents and to WASC to have our accreditation established. That was established by June of that year.

This type of momentum is precisely why White was so fervently recruited to lead the Brandman program. Along with her team, she accomplished in 1 year what would take most teams 5 to 10 years to accomplish. This becomes a critical part of the Brandman doctoral program story. The alignment of the right people in the right place at the right time to innovate in a monumental manner.

**Stakeholder Input**

This period of initial program design was marked by a process of internal and external stakeholder input. Brandman students, faculty, and administration were involved as internal stakeholders, and individuals from industry and professional organizations across the state of California were involved as external stakeholders. The input provided shaped all aspects of the doctoral program, based on a fervently held value to create a program that would develop the type of leaders organizations needed and were desiring.

**Advisory boards.** To receive meaningful external stakeholder input from across the state of California, 17 advisory boards were created by the doctoral team. These
advisory boards were made up of high-level administrators in education and business. Their input focused on the type of skills they needed the leaders of their organizations to have in order to lead the type of change required. Not only was this input considered in forming the foundation of the doctoral program, but these boards recruited leaders from their organizations to be the first students in the program once it was created.

**Advisory council.** Another structure created to provide input was an Advisory Council that consisted of 33 members including school district superintendents and assistant superintendents, college presidents and chancellors, and other educational administrators. On December 15, 2010, they met in collaboration with a team of eight liaisons to the Advisory Council to brainstorm about the doctoral program (Brandman University, 2010b). As indicated in the minutes from this Advisory Council meeting, this council engaged in carousel brainstorming to generate a list of ideas for the doctoral program including the following: factors that should be considered in forming the program vision, knowledge and ideas that graduates of the program should be exposed to, skills a graduate should have, thoughts related to the research capstone or dissertation, and input about the delivery model (Brandman University, 2010b; see Appendix J). This input was considered in depth by the Steering Committee as it made decisions in the design of the program.

**School of Education and School of Business faculty input.** The Steering Committee also sought internal stakeholder input from the Brandman School of Education and School of Business faculty. All documents that were under development were shared for faculty review in a password-protected website with feedback to the Steering Committee accepted via e-mail. In addition, meetings were held via an online
collaboration system called Wimba. In these meetings, faculty could ask questions and provide feedback. As with the external feedback and input, the ideas shared by Brandman faculty were utilized by the Steering Committee to shape the direction of the doctoral program (Brandman University, 2011e).

**Faculty Curriculum and Academic Committee Approval**

Following these processes for doctoral program development, on March 31, 2011, the Faculty Curriculum and Academic Committee (FCAC) approved the program design materials including the EdD course descriptions and syllabi for all 21 classes in the proposed program (see Appendix K). In attendance at this meeting was the FCAC Chair Nedra Davis and members Judith Connell and Marnie Elam while three additional members, John Freed, Betty McEady, and Kurt Takamine, attended by teleconference. The program materials were ready to be presented to the Board of Regents for approval.

**Board of Regents Program Approval**

On April 22, 2011, in Room 326 at the Brandman University home campus in Irvine, a meeting of the Academic Affairs committee was held. In attendance were Zeppos and White along with University Chancellor Brahm and Vice Chancellor Bullock, Regents Janes, Leatherby, and Martinez, and faculty Ringenbach, Davis, and Hale. As documented in the Academic Affairs Committee meeting minutes, at this meeting, the Regents in attendance voted to recommend the approval of the proposed doctorate in education to the Board of Regents on April 25, 2011 (Brandman University, 2011a; see Appendix L). At the subsequent Board of Regents meeting on April 25, 2011, the doctoral program was unanimously approved to be offered as a Doctor of Education
in Organizational Leadership under the School of Education (Brandman University, 2011b; see Appendix M).

**Start-Up Budget**

A start-up budget for the first 2 years of the program was approved allocating marketing at $100,000 per year to establish awareness of the program and program differentiations as well as to convert prospects to students (Brandman University, n.d.-f; see Appendix N), books for faculty at $10,000, accreditation fees of $5,000, and other miscellaneous expenses (Brandman University, n.d.-e). Operating costs needed for the program were projected to be minimal since the plan was for existing School of Education faculty and resources to support the doctoral program (Brandman University, 2011e).

Table 7

**Brandman University Doctorate in Education Program: Three-Year Financial Projection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Development 2011-12</th>
<th>Year 1 2012-13</th>
<th>Year 2 2013-14</th>
<th>Year 3 2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net student revenue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>235,600</td>
<td>696,590</td>
<td>925,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total faculty comp.</td>
<td>108,534</td>
<td>342,123</td>
<td>484,470</td>
<td>526,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total staff comp.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67,600</td>
<td>69,628</td>
<td>71,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total compensation</td>
<td>108,543</td>
<td>409,723</td>
<td>554,098</td>
<td>597,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total non-personnel operating expenses</td>
<td>113,834</td>
<td>152,134</td>
<td>142,492</td>
<td>146,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total operating expenses</td>
<td>222,377</td>
<td>561,857</td>
<td>696,590</td>
<td>744,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net contribution from operations</td>
<td>-222,377</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital expenditures</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six Program Learning Outcomes

The Steering Committee now had its original program vision along with internal and external stakeholder input and knowledge from an extensive needs analysis and literature review. With this, they were able to define and clearly articulate the focus of the Brandman doctoral program. Six program learning outcomes emerged from these processes:

1. Visionary Leadership: Create a vision of the future as an ethical agent of change, who mobilizes stakeholders to transform the organization.

2. Diversity: Integrate the strengths that individual and cultural differences contribute to create an organization that is equitable, respectful, responsive and morally accountable in a global society.

3. Collaborative Relationships: Build a culture of trusting relationships and purposeful involvement that supports critical and creative problem solving and decision making through effective communication and conflict resolution.

4. Political Intelligence: Generate organizational influence to ethically advocate for causes and changes that will advance the organization’s vision and mission.

5. Strategic Thinking: Construct a systems-oriented learning organization to develop, implement, and assess effective, futures-based plans that facilitate innovation, problem solving and continuous improvement.

6. Creativity and Sustained Innovation: Develop a culture of divergent thinking and responsible risk taking that harnesses the potential of available human capital to transform the organization. (Brandman University, 2011c, p. 1)
Enlisting Help for Program Design

Following the development of the program learning outcomes, the doctoral program was ready to be designed. To develop the program the doctoral team needed to enlist help. They looked to the Brandman School of Education and School of Business’s existing faculty. As White described it,

Almost everybody on the faculty got to do something, because we had to design a whole program. I designed kind of the framework for it, and then we had to do all the coursework. All the courses had to be developed. So, it was a very big job.

This curriculum development team made up of White, Capellino, Greene, and faculty from the School of Education and School of Business worked to design 21 syllabi and a delivery model (Brandman University, 2011e). Courses were developed to support the type of leaders who would have the skills, knowledge, and personal dispositions to go out and change the world as expressed in the original vision of Zeppos. Program delivery was developed in a hybrid model using synchronous and asynchronous technologies to best serve adult learners in a relevant manner.

Program Guiding Principles

The doctoral team was led by guiding principles to develop “visionary leaders who are creative and capable of bringing about needed change” and the belief that “great and lasting change is best effected through collaboration, innovation, positive influence, strategic thinking and a profound commitment to lifelong learning” (Brandman University, 2011e, p. 11). When Greene reflected on the guiding principles of the program, she said:
We wanted people to be able to go out and authentically change the educational world in their own unique ways, so transformation, transformational, it was a key word that was there from the beginning. . . . It was part of the oxygen we were breathing. There was no doubt.

**Program Philosophy**

In addition to a foundation of strong guiding principles, the doctoral program was rooted in a philosophy “that good leaders are inherently those individuals with sound values and beliefs, ethical character, and a deep, abiding concern for others, who have the knowledge and skills to deliver the vision for their organization” (Brandman University, 2011e, p. 1). This philosophy was inspired by significant thought leaders such as Bennis, Covey, Fullan, Heifitz, Kouzes and Posner, Lencioni, and Senge. Accordingly, introspection, continuous improvement, and innovation are key in the program philosophy.

**Program Framework**

The framework developed for the program was rooted in connectedness, designed to put the guiding principles of the program into practice and to support attainment of the six program learning outcomes. The doctoral program was designed as a 2-year cycle of coursework in which students would work in a cohort of approximately eight students assigned to a cohort mentor. There would be 12 content courses (36 units) and nine research courses (21 units), three annual immersions where all students in the program came together in Southern California for 3 to 4 days, a transformational change project, cohort meetings held twice per month, and the completion of a dissertation. Cohorts
would connect to coursework, change project design and implementation, and
dissertation coaching (Brandman University, n.d.-m; see Appendix O).

**Cohorts.** While the concept of cohort mentors existed in the doctoral world, the
Brandman team intentionally created a structure for cohort mentors that would
differentiate the program from others. They decided that cohort mentors would need to
have an earned doctorate, be leading practitioners, receive additional ongoing training in
research and dissertation, and serve as coaches in the development of dissertation topics
and concepts. In addition, the vision for cohort mentors was that they would be a
personal mentor and guide for each student as they journeyed through the program.
Cohort mentors would also be connected to the coursework that students were engaging
in and would coach the students along in the program as they worked to complete
courses. Initial cohort mentors would be hired as adjuncts and mentored by the full-time
faculty.

**Course design and structure.** Another differentiator in the design of the
Brandman program was the way the team designed courses so that students would be
automatically enrolled in the course sequence throughout the program and the way
courses would be held in a hybrid format with synchronous elements including webinars
allowing for faculty-to-student direct contact and asynchronous elements such as posting
in group discussions. This design was aimed at leveraging new technologies that allowed
for online instruction and utilizing best practices in face-to-face instruction in order to
serve the needs of working practitioners who may not live near a campus and whose
personal and professional needs are best served by being able to attend online.
Building out courses. In order to write the syllabi for each of the 21 courses that would be offered, the team needed to expand. With faculty in the university who were experienced in course development, White reached out to faculty across the university. As was done with initial program planning, faculty from the School of Business and School of Education came on board to help develop the syllabi. All hands were on deck with everyone pitching in to get these courses developed. As Capellino recalled, “Even Dean Zeppos wrote a syllabus for the resource class . . . and an associate dean or two wrote syllabi.” This wide-reaching involvement allowed the work to be completed swiftly. Table 8 includes a listing of the initial courses.

Table 8

Brandman EdD in Organizational Leadership Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course number</th>
<th>Course title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDOL 700</td>
<td>Preparing for 21st Century Leadership</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDOL 705</td>
<td>Organizational Communication and Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDOL 706</td>
<td>Team and Group Dynamics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDOL 707</td>
<td>Organizational Theory and Development</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDOL 708</td>
<td>Strategic Thinking</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDOL 720</td>
<td>Ethical Problem Solving and Decision Making</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDOL 721</td>
<td>Creativity, Innovation, and Sustainable Change</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDOL 722</td>
<td>Diversity and Intercultural Aspects of Leadership</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDOL 723</td>
<td>The Leader as Change Agent</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDOL 724</td>
<td>Innovation in Resource Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDOL 750</td>
<td>Writing for Research and Publication I</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDOL 751</td>
<td>Writing for Research and Publication II</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDOL 752</td>
<td>Quantitative Inquiry I</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDOL 753</td>
<td>Quantitative Inquiry II</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDOL 754</td>
<td>Qualitative Research Methods I</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDOL 755</td>
<td>Qualitative Research Methods II</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDOL 756</td>
<td>Assessment, Evaluation, and Accountability</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDOL 780</td>
<td>Transformational Change Field Experience</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDOL 790</td>
<td>Developing the Dissertation Prospectus</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDOL 791</td>
<td>Dissertation I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDOL 792</td>
<td>Dissertation II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. From WASC Substantive Change Proposal, by Brandman University, May 2011, pp. 16-17 (unpublished document).
Syllabi were developed to support the stated program learning outcomes, specific course objectives, instructional strategies, methods of evaluation, and to include a strong research component in each course (Brandman University, n.d.-c). All syllabi were developed utilizing a university-approved syllabus template. Once developed, syllabi approval of the Steering Committee and the University Faculty and Academic Committee was required. This process was designed in order to ensure that all courses were developed to the standards of the university including alignment with program learning objectives, signature assignment and rubric, course units; and review of relevancy, pedagogy, and bibliography. Additionally, “Once a year, course curriculum and syllabi would be reviewed by the school curriculum team to ensure currency in the field and appropriate pedagogy” (Brandman University, 2011c, p. 17).

The creation of the TCP. Another part of the program development involved the creation of the transformational change project. This project grew out of a desire to create a more relevant alternative to comprehensive exams that would help develop leaders who were prepared to lead transformational change. Each member of the Core Planning Team vividly recalled the day that the TCP was envisioned.

Greene recalled this day, reminiscing on just completing scoring comprehensive exams for Pepperdine where she was a doctoral alumni and faculty. As she recalled, she walked into White’s office and said, “We can’t do comps. We have to do something that’s richer, more meaningful, and more experiential. Something that truly offers the opportunity for a transformational experience.”
Greene described that Capellino “Lit on fire” saying, “A transformational change project. That’s what we need, that’s what brings this all together.” Greene went on to describe that

There was suddenly this big, delicious light that elevated everything we’d been trying to talk about and mapping out and planning with the department. Suddenly there was a light that every single one of our ideas and our plans really was lit by. Everything fell under that spotlight; it all came together.

Capellino said that this concept was in line with the original vision of creating a program that was nontraditional and aligned with input from the stakeholder advisor board meetings where the message was wanting our “leaders to be able to actually lead and do these things.” Capellino said the idea just fell into place and the team agreed with her sentiment, “Why don’t we actually have them implement change and have it be a class?”

The transformational change project was conceived and created. It was developed as a multiyear project that would connect to multiple courses in the doctoral program. The project would require each student to lead transformational change in an organization. Structures for leadership would be learned and put into practice over time with the student growing through the process and the organization benefitting through the impact of meaningful change. This TCP has become a hallmark of the Brandman program.

**Prospectus class.** Another component of the Brandman doctoral program that grew out of a desire to do something different than experienced in traditional doctoral education was the structure of starting on the dissertation from the beginning. Capellino,
the most recent doctoral graduate on the faculty, described her experience with the prospectus as a student at the University of La Verne as being very ambiguous. Her experience was typical of doctoral programs at the time, with most universities having the first dissertation course at the end of coursework. The Brandman team decided not to make dissertation a secret. They agreed with White’s sentiment, “Let’s just have a prospectus class,” noting that other universities have since followed suit.

Dissertation support was developed with a thread woven throughout the program to support students in writing and research. This included the initial EDOL 750 and EDOL 751 courses (Writing for Research and Publication I and II) and presentations at immersion. In reflecting on this, Capellino stated, “People were literally starting [the] dissertation from day one.” In addition to supporting the vision of creating a nontraditional program, Zeppos shared that this idea of a prospectus class folded into the larger vision at Brandman to support students in completing the program and to have them start the program with the end in mind.

This focus on the dissertation from the beginning of the program was also expected to support students in completing the program at higher rates and in less time than seen in traditional programs. As indicated in the Brandman University (2011e) WASC Proposal: Doctor of Organizational Leadership, “The typical student will complete coursework in two years and have a solid start on their dissertation. It is expected that the typical student will complete the dissertation in the third year but may possibly extend into their fourth year” (p. 19).

**Admission and graduation requirements.** Requirements for admission included a master’s degree with a minimum GPA of 3.0, and submission of a portfolio
demonstrating leadership experience, professional development, professional recognition, achievement awards, letters of reference, and a letter of intent indicating the applicant’s interest in the program. Applicants would need strong writing skills and a professional position that would allow the individual access to engage in meaningful field-based assignments to apply theory into application (Brandman University, n.d.-g).

Graduation requirements were developed to include completion of coursework with a 3.0 GPA and student presentation of a portfolio to a faculty review panel. This portfolio would include successful completion of the transformational change project and a final paper in place of comprehensive exams, successful presentation of the dissertation prospectus, and completion of the leadership development plan based on 360-degree feedback from the student’s workplace. Following these requirements and advancement to candidacy, students would complete a dissertation. Students would have the opportunity to complete this research work in a traditional format or in a thematic group format where students study a problem from various perspectives.

**WASC Accreditation**

In order to offer the program, the university needed approval from WASC. While the team was busy planning the program, they were also preparing the necessary documents to apply for WASC accreditation. In May 2011, the doctoral team completed the preparation of the WASC Proposal: Doctor of Organizational Leadership (Brandman University, 2011e). This proposal included all required elements for accreditation: an institutional and program overview; program mission, vision, and learning outcomes; established program need; indicated program supply, interest, and recruitment plan; outlined university planning and approval process for the doctoral program; detailed the
curriculum, courses, and program design; admission and graduation requirements; evaluation elements; program review process; faculty workload, requirements, and support; student supports, information and library resources; and technology. As required by WASC, documents were provided to support all areas of the application.

The Brandman Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership not only received WASC accreditation but was accredited with no program changes needed. In recalling the day that WASC granted accreditation to the doctoral program, Zeppos called attention to the work of the team as innovative and distinctive. She considered the perspective of the WASC accreditation team saying, “We had a perfect accreditation. That doesn’t exist. And because of the true authentic collaboration that we really value each other and so forth, it was palpable to them.”

**Adding Faculty**

The doctoral program would initially be operated by existing full-time faculty in the School of Education, all who had doctoral degrees. Additionally, the program was to be supported by the School of Education’s existing Distance Learning Team consisting of a total of 11 staff, including a manager, instructional technology specialists, and support staff as well as Brandman’s learning management system administrator. The only initial hiring would be cohort mentors who would be hired as adjuncts and mentored by the full-time faculty. As indicated by Brandman University (2011e), criteria for selecting these cohort mentors included an “earned doctorate from a regionally accredited university; well-recognized success as a senior organizational leader for at least 10 years; skilled in effecting organizational change; experienced in coaching others in leadership development; collaborative leadership style” (p. 27).
It was further noted by Brandman University (2011e) that additional faculty would be added as the program grew. Initial projections assumed 24 students in the first year of the program and 42 students in the second and third years. Plans for adding faculty to the program were based on this projected rate of growth in the student population as seen in Table 9. This plan assumed 1.75 full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty to teach year 1 research and content classes, and three adjuncts to serve as mentors for the three planned cohorts of eight students each. Year 2 would require 3.25 FTEs to serve the growing number of students as well as 16 dissertation chairs and 32 dissertation committee members.

**Program Chair—Growing the Doctoral Faculty**

The first full-time faculty member to be added to the Brandman doctoral team joined in Spring 2012 at the invitation of White. This faculty member was Keith Larick. As a retired superintendent of over 20 years for three school districts, a senior-level executive for two private organizations, and a board member of various technology companies, Larick was well networked and well respected across the state. He brought his experience, network, commitment, and established relationships to the Brandman doctoral team.

In fact, White and Larick had worked together previously as superintendent colleagues in California. They had a deep respect for the leadership and accomplishments of one another. Also, they both had roots in the La Verne doctoral program providing them with a common experience and common framework for doctoral education. Larick joined the Brandman team in the role of doctoral program chair.
Table 9

Doctoral Program Full Time Equivalent Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of full-time faculty</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student-to-Full-Time-Faculty Ratios**

*Ratio for students in course-work only*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Students in course-work- Fall 1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student (course-work) to FT Faculty ratio</td>
<td>1:14</td>
<td>1:13</td>
<td>1:13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ratio for all students in program, including dissertation students* *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Student Headcount- Fall 1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Student FTE- Fall 1*</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Student FTE to FT Faculty ratio*</td>
<td>1:14</td>
<td>1:13</td>
<td>1:14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*During the dissertation period, six students are estimated to equal one full-time equivalent

Maximum Class Size | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 |

*Note. From WASC Proposal: Doctor of Organizational Leadership, Brandman University, May 2011, p. 19 (unpublished document).*

In describing his interest in joining the doctoral team, Larick said, “What brought me here was wanting to continue to make a contribution to lead a legacy of leaders who are out in the field, still doing good things, who then would leave a legacy for more so that what we had in mind about leadership would continue.” Initially his role included helping the team finish curriculum needed to launch and recruiting people into leadership roles in the program. Later, his work was planned to shift to building out the dissertation processes necessary for the program.

### Preparing to Launch

After obtaining WASC approval, the next step for the doctoral team was to prepare to launch the program and recruit the first class of students. Zeppos believed that the first class of students would set the path for the success of the program. She also knew that a tremendous amount of course development work remained. Accordingly, she
advocated to the provost to delay launching for one year so the team could engage in a well-designed recruitment strategy to recruit the type of students they envisioned entering the program and prepare to launch. This provost approved this request and Zeppos and her team launched their recruitment strategy while also continuing to design the program.

Plans for the coming year had been detailed. While the work that lay ahead was known, it was a tremendous task to be accomplished in such a short time frame. As indicated in the WASC proposal,

Moving forward into the next academic year, the doctoral faculty will continue to work together in developing courses for each of the syllabi that has been prepared. The team will work collaboratively with individuals preparing drafts and sending them to the Steering Committee of Associate Dean and Ed.D. Curriculum Team Co-Chairs. The Steering Committee will review, discuss and make suggestions to the individual writers. An emphasis will be placed on state-of-the-art ideas, books, and activities, as well as seminal works. The team will meet at each of the Faculty Retreats scheduled for 2011-12 and succeeding years. Teleconferences will be held over the next year with the members of the doctoral faculty. Agendas will be determined by the Steering Committee and by faculty members, based on what is needed to develop the doctoral-level culture and support for faculty research, as well as dissertation preparation. (Brandman University, 2011e, p. 28)

**Student Recruitment and Enrollment Plan**

As the team was preparing for students by further developing the doctoral program, they were also recruiting the students who would become the first class. They identified their target student as an individual who “aspired to lead organizations—
schools, districts, county offices, colleges, cities, governmental agencies, non-profits, small businesses or corporations” (Brandman University, 2011e, p. 22). Student recruitment was personal and widespread as Zeppos and her team leveraged networks throughout the state to reach out to students individually and through interactions with leaders they knew and trusted.

**Projected student enrollment.** The doctoral team projected that the first group of students would start coursework in the summer of 2012 and complete coursework in the summer of 2014, with new students beginning each fall. Initial planning was for 24 students the first year of the program (2012-2013) with “cohorts on three regional campuses with eight students enrolled at each location” (Brandman University, 2011e, p. 19). Projections indicated one new cohort of eight students in the second year with this pattern of eight first-year students and eight second-year students repeated for each of the next 3 years. This plan would allow for slow incremental growth of the program as it incorporated a mix of first- and second-year students in the second year and the additional mix of dissertation students that would occur in year 3.

**Dreams of high student recruitment.** While the target was to recruit approximately 24 students, doctoral team members imagined how exciting it would be if they were to receive an even higher number of applicants. Capellino recalls the team thinking they would start with 20 students, “but then secretly we thought, wouldn’t it be cool if we got 40?” She went on to share that the team was thinking, “Then we can have two instructors teach each team, and that would be cool.” The team eagerly anticipated the first round of student applications hoping that they had enough students to successfully launch the program they were busy planning.
A flood of applications. Dreams of a large number of applicants came to a magnified fruition as the program was flooded with over 200 student applications. While the team was hopeful to recruit 24 applicants, they had received eight times that amount of applicants. In attempting to explain how Brandman “got 200 applications for a no name program,” Zeppos pointed to the personal touch in recruitment. She explained how them team leveraged networks throughout the state to reach potential students and then made personal contact with each student. In fact, Zeppos recalled, “I personally interviewed like 90% of those students because the faculty were busy building the courses and other program curriculum.” While this level of interest in being a student in the program was exciting for the team to consider, it also far exceeded the scope that anyone on the team expected or was prepared to manage.

Scaling Up the Program to Size

While it was clear at this point that the doctoral program would start much larger than initially planned, resources had been allocated and faculty had been recruited based on the original plan. The plan to start with 24 students in three regions quickly grew to a plan to start with 100-200 students from regions across the state (Brandman University, n.d.-b). With the program now preparing to start between five to eight times the size originally planned for, the doctoral team quickly realized the impact on all parts of the program design from faculty to teach courses to facilities to hold the initial immersion event that was being planned, to cohort mentors to work with the students. As Larick put it, the team had a problem to solve, “but an elegant problem.” Capellino recalled this time with excitement:
This is the March before we launched. So there’s three of us. So we’re like, “Oh my goodness. We’re going to have these 180 students.” Okay? That now brings it up to 10 sections, which is meaning 10 adjuncts for every course, right? And we’re going to have 180 students. That means we can’t hold immersions at Brandman anymore. We have to look for an alternative location. It also means we’re going to have to figure out how we’re going to do all these immersion sessions and speaking, and we’re going to really have to hustle to bring everyone we possibly know on board, right?

Greene describes the largest barriers facing the team at this time as “Barriers of reality.” She recalls thinking, “How in God’s green earth are we going to do this, this thing we want to do? Yeah. How are we going to manage this many students? How are we going to ensure that faculty are able to engage this way?”

The Team Rallied

The team rallied. They all contacted everyone they knew in the field. They recruited additional cohort mentors (see Appendix O). They recruited people to co-present and lead sessions at Immersion. They planned to do the majority of sessions themselves between their core team. At the same time, they were getting courses developed in time for launch, getting the necessary technology training to teach the online courses, and all just in time before students started the program. Ainsworth recalled this time as follows: “The student management part was so difficult, and the lack of personnel to develop courses. I think that’s another big barrier. I mean those people were killing themselves developing courses and developing the immersions. It was just 24/7.”
Even though it was seemingly impossible at the time, the Brandman doctoral team pulled it off and launched the program to a class of 115 students in the fall of 2012, even as the program was still being built (Brandman University, n.d.-b). White shared, “People could not believe we got a doctoral program from zero to students in that short a period of time. That is really unheard of. Other universities were saying it would have taken us eight years to do this.” However, the team who worked on the concept, design, and implementation of this program had the experience, connections, commitment, and passion to put this vision into action.

The First Immersion

As planned, by September 2012, just 2 years after the program concept was originally brought forward as an idea at the August 2010 faculty retreat the doctoral program launched. At five times the projected size, the first group of 115 students joined in Irvine, California, for the inaugural immersion (Brandman University, n.d.-b). Over a period of the 3 days from September 1 through September 3, 2012, the students and faculty brought the Brandman program to life (Brandman University, n.d.-b).

Immersion sessions. The first immersion provided an example of the nature of the program and commitment of the faculty. The immersion was planned and organized by the program faculty with participation of adjunct faculty cohort mentors. Not only did the content of the event need planned, but planning included organizing the event, securing the facility, creating the information, planning and organizing activities, presenting material and teaching the seminars, as well as hiring presenters. Presenters included Zeppos, White, Larick, Capellino, adjunct faculty, cohort mentors, and keynote speaker Linda Ackerman Anderson.
Day 1 kicked off with registration and breakfast followed a welcome and introductions led by Dean of the School of Education Christine Zeppos, founding Associate Dean Pat Clark White, doctoral program faculty, and cohort mentors. This community building time was followed by an introduction to transformational leadership session led by Keith Larick, doctoral program chair. Time was then allocated for cohorts to meet and provide intentional self-introductions using a purpose and values project as a guide. The afternoon included a session entitled “Keys to Leading Successful Transformation” by keynote speaker Linda Ackerman Anderson. In the evening, a chancellor’s reception was hosted.

Day 2 of the immersion opened with community building related to values and vision and was followed by sessions entitled “Leadership from the Inside Out” and “Transformational Leadership Development Plan and Portfolio” led by White and Larick. The afternoon included a session on change drivers led by Larick and a panel discussion led by Pat Faverty and Jeneane Prince. This session included a review of an assignment on change drivers in which students completed their coursework. The afternoon concluded in small group sessions allowing students to meet with their instructors for the coming terms and allowing cohorts additional time to meet.

Day 3 of the immersion launched with a session called “Introduction to Communication, Conflict, and Crucial Conversations” facilitated by Tamerin Capellino and Phil Pendley. This was followed by an introduction to the transformational change project led by White and Larick. A session on choosing a dissertation topic facilitated by White included a panel presentation including Phil Pendley, Pat Ainsworth, Cheryl-Marie Osborne, and Nicole Simmons Johnson. Time was also provided for small groups of
students to meet in job-alike discussions on potential dissertation topics. The day concluded with a final presentation entitled “ABD to EdD” given by Capellino and Perry Wiseman and closing remarks by White.

Presentations ranged from more traditional information sessions to less traditional allowing the students to see the staff as people and the learning as relevant. One of White’s presentations included using movie posters to facilitate conversations about various visions for leadership. Capellino and Pendley’s presentation on communication included Larick and a colleague loudly bursting into the ballroom in an argument to illustrate a point about communication. This was a marked difference from the type of theoretical presentation a student might get in a more traditional doctoral program.

**The unscheduled immersion sessions.** In addition, interactions between faculty and students and among students continued beyond the immersion sessions. Relationships and networks developed naturally as people got to know each other professionally and personally in the immersion setting. Opportunities to network and interact presented themselves in formal immersion sessions as well as in informal gatherings in the lobby where meals were shared, conversations were held, and people got to form relationships outside of the classroom.

**The energy of immersion.** The energy of immersion was very different than that of a typical university seminar. Marilou Ryder, an adjunct faculty at the time of the first immersion, recalled the profound difference. She said, “I was just overtaken with just amazement and awe of all the people that they signed up.” She went on to say, “I was just overtaken. I said, ‘Oh my God. I want to be part of this.’” Similarly Greene recalled this event saying, “The very first immersion was almost surreal, because we’d been
planning and dreaming and starting from nothing, and then we have everything and here’s these people.” This same sentiment was shared by Capellino:

The energy of that weekend and in that room, you could feel it. Everyone could. It was absolutely off the charts. Magical, magical, magical. . . . I felt we had just pulled off a peak performance that no one would have ever thought a small little team would have ever been able to pull off what we just pulled off. I literally got tears in my eyes and started to cry. It was just overwhelmingly, just relief but joy. Everyone knew in that room something magical literally had just happened.

That same sentiment was expressed by Larick who shared the incredible amount of work the team was doing preparing for the first immersion: “We were doing all the presentations, staying up until midnight and beyond preparing for the next day. Then seeing that it worked. The evaluations we got back said, yes, this is working for us. That was a highlight.”

Patrick Ainsworth, a cohort mentor in the doctoral program at that time, reflected on that immersion, noting that it was “a touchstone of the culture demonstrating a level of importance and seriousness, at the same time of love and caring, and you can do this, and creating kind of that atmosphere that was larger than life.” He also shared, “Getting everybody together from such far-flung distances was another huge symbolic thing.” During the course of that first immersion a culture developed along with symbols and rituals that were planned and those that emerged organically.

EdDy. One of these symbols was a mannequin who would come to be called EdDy. This mannequin dressed in Brandman regalia; EdDy was the idea of Dean Zeppos. In an effort to have a representation to students that was a vision of graduation
from the beginning of the program, which also paired perfectly with the vision of the doctoral team to build an element of play into the immersion. Zeppos described how she ordered this mannequin, dressed him in Brandman regalia, and realizing his legs were bare, added some pants and shoes from her husband’s closet. Then she brought him to the first immersion and placed him in the meeting room. In reminiscing, Larick said, EdDy quickly became a symbol of fun and a foundation of the Brandman culture at the first immersion. During that weekend students kidnapped him and took him away. He was recovering from a hangover and would join us at some time that day and then never did. Then got pictures of him lying in bed with a wine glass, but it became part of that playful aspect of the program. It was a demonstration of the culture of having fun while learning.

**The clicker.** Larick described another ritual that emerged in those first immersion presentations as the play with the clicker. He described how he and White had some playful interactions during presentations where they hid the clicker from one another or removed the batteries. He says that this was intentional to model the kind of play they wanted in the program showing “that we’re serious about learning, but we’re serious about relationships and having a good time.” This play with the clicker was embraced by students and lived on well beyond this first immersion.

**Cohort culture.** Another part of the culture that emerged at that first immersion came from the students and cohorts. Somewhat organically, cohorts started coming up with their own symbols to identify as cohorts. As Ainsworth described, “They had cohort t-shirts. One of them got cohort pins and they had their own logo. So all of that just became very symbolic of the culture.
That first immersion started with a speech from former Dean Zeppos welcoming students to the program and sharing the vision, and it ended with a closing video showing highlights of the event. Both of these became important rituals in the Brandman doctoral culture.

**Growing Pains**

During the initial implementation of the program, everything was being done for the first time and the faculty were moving quickly to stay one step ahead of the students. Lessons were learned along the way with an upward trajectory of growth and continuous refinement. This was expressed by faculty in various statements and recollections.

In reflecting on the program in this time period, Ainsworth said, “You know, I think it went through that initial entrepreneurial phase of everybody’s just creating things on the fly. The first immersions were like crazy making. People were doing stuff by the seat of their pants you know, hoping it would work.”

**Immersion 2013.** One such event that was a lesson learned not to be repeated was an immersion in 2013 that had to be held with limited funding and resources. Zeppos shared this memory:

So in 2013 we had to do immersion at Brandman. So one of the cohorts that we had, actually the Monterey cohort, they lost their funding source for the cohort. So we had like 30 students that had to drop, so the numbers got low enough that we were able to house immersion on the second floor of Brandman. Well, at the same time, my assistant went on medical leave and we didn’t have an event planner and so Maris was a brand-new employee, so it was Maris and I, like full facilities and everything, I’m changing tablecloths. It was the most awful
experience of my life. It was just . . . It was hot, it was just horrible. Oh, it was just horrible. I never want to do something like that again. And thank goodness we never had another immersion in there because it was too big to be able to it at that facility. So that was the worst.

**Missteps along the way.** The fast growth affected other areas of the program from course development to hiring. While a vision existed for the type of faculty and mentors that would be recruited into the program, practical measures required some flexibility in that criteria initially. Zeppos shared, “As you grow, again, you struggle. Pat and I and the faculty hired based on relationships with people that we knew that said yeah, I’d vouch for that person having that same philosophy.” She shared, “We’ve had some missteps with some people that didn’t have it and hopefully through student feedback and so that evolves.”

**The Development of the Culture of Innovation**

The Brandman doctoral faculty came to this program for the opportunity to create an innovative program that would change the face of leadership in California and beyond. Their commitment was not to be bound by tradition but to take the best of the existing programs and to reimagine all other elements. This spirit of innovation allowed the team to put values into action and create a program where faculty and students were partners, that the program would be launched with the end in mind, that the student body would look like the demographics in the state of California, that theory would be applied, and that doctoral-level education would be delivered to students wherever they were located.

As Greene recalled, “Innovation and transformation were part of the call of the entire design, as opposed to, we should add this in, this would be a good thing. They
weren’t add-ons, they weren’t gingerbread. They really were at the heart and soul of all that we were trying to do.”

Relationships. One of the key innovations in this program was the focus on relationships and to put students first. This is described by Zeppos:

That innovation of really, the authenticity and the focus on values and relationships and going outside of your comfort zone and talking about courageous leadership, I just don’t think any of those things, those aspects had been developed in a program previously. There might be dabblings of it in other programs, but not in the same way that I think we’ve been able to make that shift in students from their start of coursework to the end of the program. . . . So I think that part is probably the greatest innovation. that students get to really transform who they are to be their most authentic self. And hopefully that will not only make them a better leader, but a more fulfilled person too. Because the truer we are to ourselves, the happier we are going to be in life.

Some of the structures put in place to ensure this focus on relationships included planning all of the courses so that a thread ran through them, block scheduling students into classes so they moved through in an intentional sequence, assigning students to a cohort that they moved through the program with under the guidance of a mentor who is a senior-level administrator in an organization as well as a doctor, and bringing all students together three/four times per year to learn together and connect face to face.

White said,

So, that in itself I think is a huge innovation that most programs don’t have, that connectedness. You are going to go through all these experiences together. The
sequence is established. The sequence is established so that one course builds on the last course. So, every course is a building block to get to the pinnacle of transformational leadership. We really depend on what you have learned in your first few courses in order to get to the last course and to get to the transformational change project and to get to the dissertation. All of these courses build on each other. I think that’s very innovative.

This connectedness was described by Capellino as well: “We initially developed the content courses connected to the research courses. Then all the research courses to each other. And then all the content courses connected to each other and then also connected to the change project.” She described how the research courses all connected to the dissertation saying, “This whole integration of things was a key factor.”

**Block scheduling.** Another innovation in the Brandman program was described by faculty as the block scheduling that takes place. In this type of scheduling, rather than signing up each term for required classes, students are scheduled into the entire program in a sequence and they move through the classes with a group of students. As described by White,

> In this program, you have a block of two years. You are automatically registered. You’re assigned to a cohort, and that cohort stays with you for two years. That cohort mentor who is a leading practitioner in the field stays with you for two years.

**The cohort and the cohort mentor.** That leads into another part of the Brandman innovation, which is the cohort and the cohort mentor. While the cohort is
seen in other university doctoral programs, it is the design of the Brandman cohort and the skill level of the cohort mentor that sets Brandman apart. White said,

> The cohort, the cohort mentor is a very innovative concept that isn’t typical across the nation. I think more and more universities are looking at what we’re doing, and I think adapting some of our practices, even some of our language. . . . We may see that as being more of a standard operating procedure in the future for a lot of places, but not all.

Likewise, Ainsworth shared, “The attention to the cohort is something that sets it apart. We had learning groups at La Verne, but there wasn’t much structure to them. It really depended on the personality and the experience of the person running it.” He described that the cohort allows students to engage in cocurricular experiences where they “are learning and networking together and creating new learning, and new ideas, and new thoughts, and new opportunities for each other.” Ainsworth shared that even though he was an experienced mentor and high-level educational leader at the state level, he was provided with valuable mentoring in how to be an effective cohort mentor. He shared, “The cohort gives people an anchor locally or virtually with a core group of people that’s smaller.”

**Student and faculty relationships.** Another innovation in the program was the relationships and connections between faculty and students. Capellino described this as what should happen in a program but something that Brandman did much better than other programs from the very beginning. She said, “Our cohort mentors, our adjuncts, our full-time faculty, we were in the trenches of everybody and had real good personal
relationships and connections.” She described how in many doctoral programs the professors are “on pedestals” and not accessible to students in a personal way.

**Application of theory to practice.** Another part of the Brandman culture that is innovative is the commitment to connecting theory to practice and providing students with opportunities to create change in the organizations where they work. In describing the transformational change project as a relevant opportunity to develop as a leader and provide a benefit to the organization where a student works, White said, “I think that’s one of our main attributes that is very innovative.”

**360-degree feedback.** Related to the importance of leading change within the organization where they work, is the idea of engaging students in receiving feedback from their constituents in order to grow their skills. The Transformational Leadership Skills Inventory and 360-degree assessments, which are part of the program, provide all students with feedback from the field. This is provided twice throughout the program along with cohort mentor support in using the feedback. In describing the benefit to students, White said, “You can see where your areas of strength are and where your areas of development are, and then you can track your progress into your second year. So, I think that those are some of the major innovations.”

**Blended model.** Another part of the innovation at Brandman is the blended model developed in the doctoral program. The model is developed to balance asynchronous class sessions and discussion boards with synchronous class sessions, and in-person cohort meetings and immersions. Ainsworth said, “Traditional programs where you have to drive to a location are dying. Plus the next generation are expecting a different way of delivery.” He went on to say,
You look at other doctoral programs that are online, I taught some at Brandman, they never see the teacher’s face, or they never have a synchronous meeting. Everything’s asynchronous. There’s something there that’s missing. And the research on having virtual meetings basically anchor it, and face to face to begin with, and periodically when you can getting people together. . . . I think this modern, blended approach, doing the best of face to face, but the majority of the coursework online, is what sets it apart from other programs.

**Hiring practices.** This commitment to nontraditional practices and innovation is something that the program brings into hiring as well. Zeppos reflected on this:

And so that was something that I always used in hiring too. What are you going to do to keep the students there? What are you going to do when a student is struggling that maybe we’re not paying you for that extra time, that you’re going to be able to still be there for that person? And it’s not like payment per se, but where’s your heart lie? And that’s, that’s a tough thing, and I worried about it a lot as the program grew because you don’t want to grow so fast that you lose those kinds of people who are going to touch my students, because I don’t want the faculty who is not going to care about my students in the program. That’s not this program. So that was very much a part of the philosophy.

This culture of innovation was embedded in the original concept for the program and was woven through all facets of the program design.

**Historical Narrative Told by the Researcher**

The next section of this chapter is the historical narrative of the evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership from 2013 to 2017.
As a historical study, the narrative is told in the words of the key leaders of the program who were identified as having been directly involved in the creation and evolution of the doctoral program during the identified time frame. Study participants include the founding dean of the school of education, associate dean of the school of education, full-time and adjunct faculty, adjunct cohort mentors, and support staff. This study explores how key leaders continued to build and refine the components of the doctoral program to ensure the inaugural class, eventually known as the Alpha cohort, had the structures and resources available to complete the second year of coursework and the dissertation process, as well as the cohorts that followed.

**Expanding and Refining the Team**

The vision of a scholarly practitioner faculty. As identified in the data analysis portion of this chapter, the faculty and staff who created the Brandman Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership viewed the human resource frame as having had the greatest impact on the program’s evolution and success. To that point, the founding dean of the school of education, Christine Zeppos, underscored the great care that was taken in identifying team members for the expanding doctoral team to ensure that each was a good fit in terms character and skill as a scholar practitioner. Zeppos noted that she was ultimately seeking “people doing great work who have had that experience, being able to also teach and really care about their students.” She explained these traits were “a huge part of the foundation of what I wanted in this doctorate and a huge part of the faculty decision-making later on too.” Zeppos’s vision for building a team exclusively of scholarly practitioners was unique.
Historically, scholarly practitioners have not represented the majority of doctoral program faculty. Zeppos shared, “You can have tons of content experts that are okay, but ones that are also good human beings that truly care about sharing their experience and mentoring students at the same time, that doesn’t exist everywhere.” Even in her own doctoral program experience at Arizona State University, Zeppos found that scholar practitioners were rare, yet incredibly valuable to her development as a practitioner:

It certainly didn’t exist within the other part of my doctoral program or with the traditional faculty. Those were not the people that I was learning the most from. Those were the people I was doing research with. There was certainly some value in that, but not nearly as to what I was using in my administration career later on. It was from the people that were the practitioners that were telling me valuable advice and skills.

**Personal experience to program concept.** Based on her positive interaction with a few highly skilled scholar practitioners, such as the provost of Arizona State University, Zeppos came to deeply value the role of such professors in higher education. She reflected,

That was a huge part of influence for me and really resonated throughout my entire career. Everything that I’ve touched since then I wanted to duplicate that feeling of, “Hey, here is the theory, but here how it applies to my job in running the university.”

Zeppos further explained, “Students have to feel that the professor understands their practitioner role in order to really let [the theory] digest in a meaningful way.” This was a critical component of the team Zeppos went on to build at Brandman.
Although the Brandman Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership is a hybrid program, with the majority of instruction occurring online, Zeppos, in partnership with Patricia Clark White, embedded the program with distinctive elements that provide the scholar practitioner experience for all students. Zeppos shared, “Really the differentiator, your cohort meetings in the immersions . . . like I had with the provost at ASU and the others . . . takes [the experience] to that next level of learning.” Zeppos further explained the purpose and importance of the cohort mentors and immersion experiences as hallmarks of the Brandman doctoral program:

So hopefully those experiences, the mentors that you’ve been able to make through those face to face interactions have made [the learning] come to life . . . your cohort and your cohort mentor and your immersions just make all of the program truly unique.

In order for Brandman doctoral students to have the quality of mentoring Zeppos envisioned for them, the in-person components of the program were essential, as was hiring the right team.

**Identifying a lead scholar practitioner.** The first faculty member Zeppos hired to help create the Brandman Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership was Patricia Clark White, with whom Zeppos had been colleagues previously at Argosy University. White recalled, “I came upon Argosy, and they had an opening. I applied for it, and I got it. So, while there, I met Christine Zeppos, and so the two of us became very good colleagues together and shared an office.” White went on to describe her work with Zeppos: “We just hit it off immediately. We bounced ideas off of each other, and we were very creative together and lots of raucous fun together. We kept coming up with
solutions to problems for Argosy.” The fortuitous meeting of Zeppos and White eventually became the foundation upon which the Brandman doctoral program was built.

Len Hightower described the connection between the Brandman program and La Verne: “Pat got asked by Christine Zeppos to come and make [the doctoral program] happen, right? Pat seized the opportunity, but she had a philosophy, she had a point of view that she brought to it.” Hightower went on the note that White “also had a framework in the La Verne program, so there was a starting point. They didn’t just make this stuff up out of the air. It was like, okay, they took bits of that framework, the best of it, and they brought it here. Then they added to it.”

Much of the La Verne framework served as a foundation for the program Zeppos and White created, including the team they would build to implement this innovative practitioner-focused doctoral program. White shared,

After a certain point in time, they changed the program at La Verne, and there was a change in leadership at La Verne. I loved La Verne. I really enjoyed my whole time there, but when there was this change in the program and change in the leadership, a number of us left. So, I was one who decided to leave rather than to stay with the new system and the new people. So, I started looking around for a position in Orange County.

Once Zeppos hired White, the two began to assemble the scholar practitioner team they had dreamed of creating.

White, the inaugural associate dean and current interim dean of the Brandman School of Education, explained that as she and Zeppos worked to hire the doctoral program team, all potential faculty and staff “had to be service-oriented, service to
students. They had to really care about students. They had to put students first. That had to be top priority.” White commented, “I needed to have scholars as well as practitioners. So, they had to be both. . . . They had to be cutting edge. They had to be innovative and flexible in their approaches.” White explained that potential faculty and staff had to be willing to be very generous with themselves, generous with their time, generous with their resources, generous in helping each other, people who could really function well as a team, who could model all the things that we were trying to teach in transformational leadership. And I think we got them.

**Defining the model scholar practitioner.** As the Brandman doctoral program moved into its second cohort and beyond, the faculty and staff also grew in number. In order to ensure that the program retained its original focus of being a student-centered practitioner program, the leadership carefully selected each new team member and ensured that the expectations of the character and focus of those who would be part of the team were clearly communicated to all. Jeffrey Lee, full-time doctoral program faculty member, referred to the desired traits of a Brandman doctoral program team member as a particular DNA. Lee explained,

What does that DNA look like? It’s somebody who is student-centered, who is compassionate, relationship focused, who is, at the end of it all, is going to be firm and hold the rigor of the program, hold the students responsible to meet those rigors.

However, Lee also clarified, “It doesn’t mean that it’s very cutthroat, it’s not like you get a C, little feedback, here you go. It’s done with a very positive mindset, a growth mindset
if you will . . . we are there to help the students succeed.” Indeed, the Brandman doctoral program DNA was required of all new hires.

Myrna Cote, Brandman doctoral program adjunct instructor and cohort mentor explained,

This program, using practitioners partnered with researchers, I believe it gives the students an incredible opportunity to be mentored not only on large issues, but also on, “What do I do if this teacher doesn’t like me?’ Or something, you know? ‘How do I handle this?”

Cote explained the benefit to students: “They can be mentored or assisted by someone who’s actually been there, and to me that makes this program just so completely different and so worthwhile.” Laurie Goodman, Brandman cohort mentor, outlined the traits required of a successful Brandman doctoral program faculty or staff member, noting the importance of their “level of expertise, innovative planning, empathy, availability to students, [and] connecting to students.” Based on their decades of leadership experience, each Brandman doctoral program faculty member and cohort mentor is equipped to provide an expert level of support to their students.

*Appeal of the scholar practitioner role.* Keith Larick, professor and quality review lead in the Brandman doctoral program, explained that he was drawn to the program because of its practitioner focus. Having previously taught as a full-time faculty member in the University of La Verne’s EdD program, Larick was familiar with the value of the practitioner model. He explained that he came to Brandman at a point where La Verne got off point. Both their chancellor and their president had said, “We are not going to hire any more professors in the program that are
practitioners. We want PhDs.” We explained that was a serious, serious mistake.

Their program went from 100 in each group down to about 25 very quickly. Although Larick tried to redirect the La Verne program back toward a practitioner model, he was unable to convince the university leadership.

This change in direction has serious implications for La Verne, both in terms of reduced student enrollment and in faculty disengagement. Larick recalled,

I met with the president three or four times and laid out, “Here’s what I think needs to be done.” She chose not to listen, so I quit. Pat had already quit before that. Then later, Dr. DeVore quit and came over here.

Larick went on to explain that several other faculty members from the La Verne program made the same decision to leave that program due to its divergence from the practitioner model. Larick noted, “All those people basically are people we pulled out of the La Verne program,” to join the newly created, practitioner-focused Brandman doctoral program, which had the same practitioner focus and commitment to student success they had once loved at La Verne. Hightower noted that due to their prior affiliation with the La Verne EdD program, many of the core faculty and planning team members of the Brandman EdD program had a common framework upon which to build. He continued, “They took that program, those ingredients, those ideas, and they just took them to a whole new level. But they did that because that’s what was in their heart to do.”

**Attracting the right team.** Larick was not alone in his appreciation of the practitioner-focused doctoral program model. As the Brandman faculty team was expanded, a commitment to the model directly influenced the selection process. Larick
noted that the faculty understood the power of the scholarly practitioner model and wanted to implement such a model across the program. To that end, Larick reflected, Dr. Lee and Dr. Guzman were brought in because of their expertise and research. As a whole it was prior experience, same thing was true, was all of the cohort mentors and others that are really grounded in a lot of experience.

Jeffrey Lee explained his transition away from a full-time faculty position at another university, noting the unique composition and capacity of the Brandman team. He shared, “One thing that’s a differentiator, a separator from this program and other programs, is that there’s a group of like-minded individuals that are not afraid to take risks. And that’s something special about this group of people.” Lee further elaborated on the strength of the team: “It’s that we know what needs to be done and we know that sometimes we’re short staffed or the workload appears to be impossible sometimes.” Lee explained that this is why “you really need to have a very high functioning team that works well together. And I think the innovation part of it is really important.” Similarly, Cote reflected on her time as a doctoral student at USC, and noted that although she learned a great deal and was challenged there, she experienced a disconnect between her professors who had never led educational institutions, and her needs as a doctoral student serving as an educational leader were not always met. She explained, “I would say things like, ‘But in the real world, this is the way that occurs,’ and that went nowhere.” The Brandman doctoral program’s practitioner focus appealed to leaders from a wide range of doctoral programs that followed the more traditional and detached faculty model.

**Establishing doctoral program norms.** One of the hallmarks of the Brandman doctoral faculty and staff is an unwavering commitment to student success, which is
relationally driven at its core. Brandman doctoral program student support is time intensive to provide, yet the faculty and staff readily provide this level of support which, in turn, produces exceptional doctoral program completion rates. Lee noted, “I think I can say this for most faculty and adjuncts and cohort mentors that they don’t put a dollar sign to it, they don’t put number of hours to it. It’s whatever it takes.” Lee also noted the readiness with which students learn to embrace the support offered them. Lee explained, “I think students struggle sometimes and the first thing they do is they pick up their phone and call the cohort mentor, who is like their lifeline.” Lee further commented that this commitment is for lack of better words, that DNA, that cohort mentors and instructors and adjuncts and administration who are affiliated with this program [have]. There’s is just that common non-negotiable way to be, that way to act, the way to live as someone who’s associated with this program. And those are kind of the attributes that I would say are at the core of somebody who’s a full-time faculty in this program.

Former Brandman EdD Program Manager Maris Alaniz shared a similar sentiment about the Brandman doctoral team’s passion for excellence, saying, They want this to be the best program in the country. If there’s something that we need to change, even if it’s daunting work and even if it’s going to cause a lot of people to work through the summers. She continued, “I’ve never been a part of something like that, but we have a great team.”

**Intrinsic motivation vs. extrinsic.** Tenure is not offered at Brandman, which means that faculty members must remain fully engaged and productive to retain their
full-time position with the university. Even so, the Brandman doctoral program was able to attract faculty away from tenured full-time positions because of their desire to be part of this innovative work. Alan Enomoto, associate dean and associate professor in the Brandman School of Education noted that the core faculty came from tenured positions in order to “take a lot of the best parts of [a] program, which they helped create years ago and to make it even better . . . that’s the beauty of it.”

Course correcting the norms. Larick noted that as members were added to the team, there was not always adherence to the faculty norms. He recalled, “We had issues in the beginning where people would come to a meeting, open up their computer and be busy on their computer while we were having the discussion.” He explained how this violation of the team’s operating norms was addressed: “So, we had some real hard talks about you don’t come and multitask, you bring your full attention to that meeting or don’t come to the meeting” (Larick).

Improved norming also occurred within the team as a result of intentional and broadened professional development efforts. In alignment with the WASC/EER recommendation that the doctoral program team more fully and regularly engage the adjunct faculty in program planning and revision processes (see Appendix N), the three annual professional development (PD) days held the day prior to each of the three immersions became an incredible source of collaboration and inclusion for the team. Multiple adjunct faculty members and cohort mentors who were interviewed as part of this study noted the unique and welcoming culture these PD days developed among the tenured and adjunct team members that enabled them to function effectively together. Reflecting upon the solidarity and cohesiveness of the doctoral team, DeVore observed,
“I just think you could do the same thing with another group of people and not have anything near the Brandman program. I think it’s about the people and having the right people and having people that have shared values, not the same mindset, but the shared values about what’s important.”

**Focus on Fit: Skills and Experience**

As the doctoral faculty and staff expanded over time, great emphasis was placed on identifying those who were a good fit for the program, particularly in terms of skill and prior experience. Larick explained that being on the Brandman doctoral team was appealing to leaders from many fields because “no matter what job, whatever way, leaders are teachers. If you’re not teaching, you really aren’t going to be a good leader. That’s part of what I think brought most of us here is our commitment to teaching.”

Larick continued,

> Whether you’re in a corporate sector or whether it’s a superintendent, you’re a teacher. My change [was] from being a sixth-grade teacher to students to a principal, teaching teachers, parents and kids, to an assistant superintendent, to a superintendent, where my classroom is the entire community.

Larick explained the criteria for new Brandman doctoral team members: “For the entire core faculty, it was experience. For most of us experienced in the field and prior experience teaching at the university. So, bringing both of those together, looking at it as really practitioners.” Larick also noted,

> The opportunity to teach in a doctoral program and work with adults the way we are doing is a phenomenal one. And we’ve got more people, [an] unbelievable
amount of people who would like to be doing what we’re doing that we cannot accommodate, which is a good thing.

True to their intent, the doctoral team was able to attract additional members with exceptional leadership accomplishments. Many of the core faculty, adjunct faculty, and cohort mentors have experience as assistant superintendents, superintendents, or high-level state education positions. They also have earned a doctorate themselves, and many have prior experience teaching at the doctoral level. The team members themselves noted the importance of their previous leadership experience to their success working in the doctoral program. For example, Ryder shared of her previous role as a superintendent, “I think it’s important that I was able to see the big picture, and be able to use the tenants in the program to be able to bring that to the instructional team.” Likewise, Pendley referred to his previous career saying, “I tell students I’m a retired superintendent, like a lot of my colleagues are. This is my retirement hobby. This is what I do. It’s what I like to do.”

Additional faculty members shared similar stories. Hightower noted the importance of his prior professional experience focused on leadership development. He explained,

I have spent about 35 years in higher education in various capacities, mostly about 20 plus years in senior administration, and then of course I kind of worked my way up over the years. Along the way, I always taught on an adjunct basis.

Goodman similarly explained that she was invited to the Brandman doctoral program as a cohort mentor because of having “almost 30 years in education, and being a Deputy
Superintendent and a Superintendent. Also, I have a doctorate, and I’ve worked in higher education for 23 years.” She explained the benefit of her prior experience:

Those experiences make me able to answer questions and do more effective mentoring and direction for students in the program, as well as have empathy for some of their day to day jobs as well as the journey of getting their doctorate.

Team members with widely varied backgrounds found their rich experiences helpful to navigating the terrain of the Brandman doctoral program during its formative stages. Ainsworth noted that in addition to her career in K-12 education, other professional experiences had also helped prepare him for a successful role at Brandman. He noted,

Certainly, having been the equivalent of a cohort mentor at La Verne was hugely important because I was able to come over here and do the cohort mentor and probably was among a few others, kind of the early examples of how to do it.

That really helped me with that.

Furthermore, he explained, “I think the other part was my political background. Working in state capitol for 16 years helped me understand about higher ed and the different cultures in the higher ed system.”

The doctoral program leadership team’s commitment to engaging highly experienced professionals extended to the doctoral program specialist role as well. Alaniz said of her role,

I had 10 years of administrator experience in higher education. At the time I had an MBA and I was wrapping up my master’s in education, and I had a lot of
experience in dealing with the administrivia and the community, and so they just thought it was the right fit.

Alaniz went on to say that she was able to succeed in her role managing much of the program logistics for the newly launched doctoral program due to “having that organizational leadership experience and having the knowledge to be able to look at areas of opportunity for processes and getting them to work harmoniously.” Because none existed previously, Alaniz had to develop all the infrastructure and all the processes during the first years. She recalled, “We were literally creating them, and implementing them, and then course correcting every single day.” Over time, Alaniz’ role became less focused on creating processes and more focused on refining existing processes and managing the ever-increasing number of doctoral students in each phase of the process.

**Focus on Fit: Commitment to Leadership Development in Self and Students**

In addition to extensive prior leadership experience, a second element identified as critical for members joining the doctoral team over time was the commitment to continual transformational leadership development, both personally and with students. Larick shared that he was motivated to come to Brandman to continue to make a contribution, to leave a legacy of leaders who are out in the field, still doing good things, who then would leave a legacy for more so that what we had in mind about leadership would continue.

He noted that the role of a superintendent is one of being a teacher, and as such, is an excellent precursor to serving in a university. Being a superintendent, Larick said,
gives you such an opportunity to truly change in a deep way lives not only of kids, but the people who work there and to shift an entire community. That’s a very special opportunity. Not many people get to do that.

Having been a superintendent as well as having taught at the university level since 1980, Larick developed a wealth of practitioner experience and scholarly expertise to share with future generations of leaders.

Such a commitment to internal as well as external transformational leadership was a crucial attribute of all Brandman doctoral program faculty and staff. Lee noted, “I look around the room and I see cohort mentors and adjuncts at professional development day and everybody is just so eager and hungry to do two things: to support one another, but also to be a lifelong learner.” Lee noted the selfless commitment of the faculty, explaining, “I really admire some of the instructors and cohort mentors in the program who can live a very comfortable retirement life, but yet they’ve taken interest in the students, but they’ve also taken interest in their ongoing growth.” Lee also noted that the personal transformation was not always easy for these seasoned veterans. He described the majority of the faculty as “people that’ve been retired for a while, eager coming to learn about Zoom and breakout rooms and different ways to teach because they’ve never taught that way before.”

Lee attributed the passion for learning and self-development to the quality of the individuals involved and their relationships with one another, saying “the relational piece of it and the people piece of it is really important. But it’s the mindset of, we’re in it for the students and we’re in it to learn ourselves that makes this program so special.” Similarly, Cote reflected,
The relationships and the support and the friendships have been critical. When you see all of us who are retired, we thought, from hard work, most of us are retired, where we led the innovation, spending as much time as we are trying to ensure that the next group will be able to do that. I really think that’s been critical to the development, selecting the right people to do that to help students along that way.

DeVore shared a similar sentiment, saying the human resource element of the program that focuses on the human condition is a great strength. He additionally noted, “I’ve never been in an organization . . . with so many people that are like-minded about service and student focus.”

**Developing transformational leaders.** In the Brandman doctoral program, transformational leaders develop future transformational leaders. Len Hightower, former full-time faculty in the doctoral program noted that although the hybrid model of the program is not unique to Brandman, the power of the program’s model is the way in which the commitment to transformational leadership is lived out. Hightower commended the faculty’s “commitment to personal growth . . . commitment to really insisting the students take an honest look at themselves and really try to begin to see where they can change and possibly need to change.” Hightower further explained, “The students experience that, and you see that in students. Literally, I see people’s lives changing, and that blows you away. That is not typical at all, not at all.” Hightower noted that the personal transformation experienced by Brandman doctoral students is not a traditional doctoral program outcome. He explained, “I went through my own doctoral experience, and I’ve taught in other doctoral programs. No, it’s really rare.” However,
Hightower noted that in the Brandman program such transformation “is more of a norm. It’s this environment. It’s the milieu that’s been created. Wow, what’s in the air here? It’s not a mistake, it’s all these ingredients have been put together in a certain way to promote that.” The combination of highly successful transformational leaders both living and teaching transformational leadership to doctoral students helped to cultivate this unique Brandman environment.

When reflecting on his most memorable experiences in the Brandman doctoral program, Hightower cited those students who have embraced the program and their own experience of transformation “in a fearless sort of very courageous way, kind of let themselves be open to new ways of seeing and thinking, and new ways of viewing themselves. It just kept right on through the dissertation.” Unlike other doctoral programs that typically do not promote a depth of personal and professional transformation, Hightower noted the importance of such learning in the Brandman program. He explained his philosophy as a professor: “What I really want to know is you have developed the capacity for learning. . . . I really want you to learn about you and not to be afraid.” Hightower continued, “Because guess what, we’re all messed up. We all have flaws.” He then summarized his point by saying,

You don’t need to be like anybody else. You’re who you are, but you need to figure out what your next step is in the learning. If you really want to be in leadership and stay in leadership, that’s what’s going to keep you there. It’s not the latest technique. You need to know those things, but it’s your capacity to be self-effacing and to have courage about that, and to acknowledge, “I don’t know. I
need your help.” Wow, okay if you can do that, then you get to be a leader.

Right?

Again, it was noted that the student leadership development focus of the Brandman doctoral program originated from the philosophy and model of Tom Harvey, long time EdD professor at the University of La Verne. Hightower noted that the Brandman program is designed to produce transformation. He explained,

It isn’t just my idea. I stepped into their idea. It was already running. It was already there, part of it. It was a part that [Tom] Harvey wanted [at La Verne], but Harvey was so critical of the students sometimes that he didn’t let people get to the point of that honesty.

Hightower noted that, conversely, Pat White and Keith Larick understood the core of Harvey’s model. When he considered the Brandman model, Hightower said he thought, “Oh, okay, so this is the personal development side that was missing in that La Verne program in some respects. They married those two things together.” The Brandman model demands a level of deep humility of faculty and students, as well as a supportiveness of students, that the La Verne model lacked.

**Academic challenges.** Doctoral program faculty and staff continued to refine their focus on the type of student that would benefit most from the Brandman doctoral program. Larick recalled, “The very first year we started, we personally, personally, face-to-face interviewed all 120 people that enrolled.” Larick noted that while it became logistically impossible for the core faculty to conduct intake interviews for more than 100 candidates per year, the intake process was still crucial. He underscored the importance of them continually: “Asking the question, ‘Are these the kind of people we want?’ Not
skill-wise, but the kind of people who we think will fit into what we want to do at Brandman.”

That being said, casting a wider recruitment net than most doctoral programs came with inherent challenges, namely the need to ensure that students could meet the requirements of doctoral-level writing. Hightower shared, “I can think of a number of students who have gone through this program where I’m going, ‘Oh my god, I don’t know if they’re going to make it,’ because the writing skills aren’t there.” However, Hightower concluded that writing skills were not the final determinant of doctoral program success. Instead, he noted that he knew students were the right fit by their heart and determination, it’s just off the charts. It’s like, wow, amazing. Anyone can learn to write, you really can. It’s a lot of work if you haven’t done it before, but you’ll get there. You’ll get there, just keep going for it.

With the academic supports available in the Brandman doctoral program, students with great talent and passion have been able to address initial gaps in their writing skills and successfully perform at the doctoral level.

**Focus on Building and Maintaining Relationships**

The Brandman EdD program was created upon a foundation of relationship and mutual respect. From the strong rapport between founding dean, Christine Zeppos, and founding associate dean, Patricia Clark White, grew the highly successful and innovative doctoral program in organizational leadership. DeVore explained, “That is where it started and then Chris [Zeppos] hired Pat [Clark White] in that process and Pat is a transformational leader. Pat is highly relational.” DeVore continued,
I would work with Pat anywhere, any place, anytime, anywhere, anytime, no matter where it is, and I think she’d say the same for me. She’d probably say the same thing. We’re very different people but we have very strong values about people and this program, programs like this, and where we come from. We value people, no matter who they are.

In a similar vein, DeVore shared his sentiment about the relational culture Zeppos had created in the doctoral program. He explained,

Dean Zeppos developed a culture of trust with us, developed a culture of risk taking with us, developed a culture of “I’ve got your back and I’ll do anything I can to get you resources to support you,” with us, developed a culture of strong communication channels and developed a culture of strong relationship.

This foundation of respect and trust flowed into all other aspects of the doctoral program, strengthening relationships with members of the team, student body, and external partners.

**The impact of trust.** A trusting environment leads to openness and allows teams to glean the best contribution from each member. White explained,

When we go to, for example, a professional development day, and we don’t have a closed operation where we say, “Okay, this is the program. Listen up. This is the way it’s going to be. We have it in concrete now because it’s working.” . . . We open ourselves up.

She went on to explain that rather than telling the team how things will be, the team instead asks questions, such as “Okay, so what books have you read lately? What’s out there? What’s perking out there? What should we be thinking about? What are the
trends?” In so doing, the core faculty collaborates with and involves the entire team in the process of creating what goes on and what goes forward. White noted,

We listen to them and we act on what we hear. . . . That influences their trust, and it influences them to be better scholars and be out there looking and thinking and reading so that, when we open ourselves, we come back and we hear the best and latest ideas.

The open relationship between full-time and adjunct faculty enables the entire team to benefit from the full participation of all members.

**Prior relationships.** As is common practice during the entrepreneurial phase of any organization, Zeppos and White recruited leaders for the doctoral program they were creating from those with whom they had worked in the past. Pendley observed, “It’s not unusual to go to a horse you know can run.” He explained,

Dr. Larick was somebody we had worked with. Dr. Devore is somebody we had worked with. Dr. Ryder had not been a faculty member with us over there, but she was somebody who got her degree [at La Verne] and had known Dr. White. Likewise, DeVore shared, “Marilou and I have known each other for a long time, long before Brandman. . . . Keith and I go back 30 plus years. Pat and I go back 30 plus years.” These established professional relationships proved to be an important foundation for the core faculty of the Brandman doctoral program.

DeVore also noted that several of the Brandman doctoral faculty were doctoral students at La Verne during the years he taught in that program, such as Patrick Ainsworth, Cindy Petersen, and Marilou Wilson [now Ryder]. DeVore explained, “All
of those were my students, and many others of them, so we’re steeped with one another as far as relationship and they all are positive, so that’s a good thing.” Larick recalled, And then ultimately Dr. DeVore came in. He did the same thing as Dr. White, myself, we left [La Verne]. DeVore [left] for other kinds of reasons, but that was a very natural fit. That was probably the easiest [addition to the team], again because we’d known each other so long.

Larick noted the distinct benefit of having been able to leverage such strong players to build the all-star Brandman doctoral program faculty: “Prior acquaintance, prior relationship, prior work together helped bring the team together faster than it might otherwise.” Indeed, the Brandman doctoral team came together rapidly and was able to function at a very high capacity from its earliest days.

**Professional networks.** In addition to leveraging their prior professional relationships to build the doctoral program faculty, many of the key leaders also leveraged their membership in professional networks to help design the program and recruit excellent students. Froehlich explained, “People’s relationships influenced the evolution of the program…it has to do with the contacts and relationships that most of these people have had in the past.” She further explained the importance of those networks in developing the program and getting it approved. Froehlich noted, This goes back to the advisory boards that they had at the beginning and the input that they had from these current or past leaders on what was really needed within their districts, within their areas, and type of leaders that were needed.
She further explained that due to the strong rapport the team had with the advisory boards, they were able to demonstrate both the need and the desire for a transformational change program, and, therefore successfully advocate to launch the program.

Student recruitment was also benefitted by the faculty’s connections to professional networks. Froehlich explained that the relationships with professional organizations helped the team to bring “the right people into this program.” Zeppos noted that her affiliation with Association of California Community College Administrators (ACCCCA) was an opportunity to connect with potential doctoral students. Likewise, Larick noted, “Part of what both Dr. White and I brought is our connections from the superintendents’ organizations and connections statewide to touch people to get them here.” These connections were so successful in fact, that the inaugural doctoral class was more than four times the anticipated size. Larick noted, “It was an elegant problem, but it was a problem.” The well-connected faculty and administration drew such a large inaugural class that the team had to expand before it could begin teaching that first group.

**Building new relationships.** Not all Brandman doctoral program faculty and staff were prior acquaintances. Over time, the team identified areas of need that required a more traditional hiring process to target candidates with very specific skills. The resultant broadened network provided greater diversity within the team while retaining focus on a critical shared trait. To that point, DeVore shared,

The folks that we brought into the program, the cohort mentors, the adjunct, the faculty, they come from lots of different places but I think they have brought that
strong relational [focus] and a feeling of trust. They want to do what’s best for [students].

Larick noted that they became more of a team each time a new member was added. He recalled, “When Dr. Hightower was added, [he] added a new dimension to the program and he came from entirely different perspective. And there was some rub from that perspective initially when he came into the program that resolved over time.”

Other team members outside the immediate personal networks of the core team were also added to fill specific programmatic needs. Pendley noted that Jeffrey Lee was not a personal acquaintance of the team when he was hired to teach research courses, and he supported the inclusion of the healthy difference. Pendley noted, “I think it’s important that not all of the people that you bring in be personally connected. You need other people and other perspectives that come from different places.” He further explained that the doctoral team has been “a combination of people that Dr. White was familiar with and brought into the program, and also other people who had specific expertise that the program needed. I think it’s been a good balance over time.” Similarly elaborating on the importance of healthy diverse relationship development, Hightower noted,

You’ve got to build up the goodwill, because there are days and times [when] you’re going to need that person to really step out and be really honest with you, or to take on a challenge. If you don’t have the relationship in place, it’s not going to happen.

Such honest feedback and collective commitment to excellence have been defining traits of the Brandman doctoral faculty.
Relationships with students. The Brandman investment in relationships extended to adjunct faculty and students as well. Pendley asserted, “The relationship between the staff and the students is another hallmark of what we do that’s just different. Intentionally different, but it’s different than what I experienced or what I’ve seen.” He acknowledged the existence of a distinction between staff and students but noted that on a personal level, there is equality. Similarly, Osborne noted, “The core faculty have built this culture of trust. So, then people like me who work part time, we’re not afraid to be vocal with them or to be honest or to tell them things.” Additionally, she noted the level of trust built with students, saying, “The students are not afraid to say, ‘Hey, this really stunk or this was really good.’”

Guzman noted, “We’re about relationships. If somebody asks me that question, ‘What is the Brandman doctoral program really about?’ I would say, ‘At the core of it is relationships, definitely.’” These relationships developed between students and faculty extend beyond graduation. Guzman shared, “We have alumni that are involved in our program and continue to help, help it grow. We’ve had alumni actually take on, either become employees at Brandman and continue that, with whether it be with the marketing piece or with the recruitment piece.” Likewise, Goodman noted that the doctoral students “just become like one big family. The family’s going on 500, so it’s a huge family. Over time, they know that they can call on the Core faculty team. They can call on their Cohort mentors.” She continued,

I still work very closely with my Alphas and my Betas. It’s been so many years. I went to an Alpha reunion this summer, so I think that that has helped us find the value in the program, continue with the relationship part of it.
Even as the program expands, the founding leaders work to retain and sustain the Brandman family. Zeppos shared that she regretted not getting to know the later classes as well as the first few. She explained,

I know the first three classes pretty darn well because not only did I interview a lot of them, I spent more time at immersion with them and it was really very important to me that I get to know these folks as much as possible.

Zeppos also noted that sustaining the relationships is “why we do the dessert and drinks for graduation at my house, which is why I would go to every immersion. I just think those relationships and those conversations hopefully keep that family together.”

**Focus on Fit: Process for Evaluating and Refining the Team**

As in all organizations, over time it becomes apparent that not all team members are the right fit. The participants of this study reflected on the intentionality with which each team member was evaluated over time and then transitioned out of the organization if they were found to be out of alignment with the guiding values, principles, or culture of the program. Larick described challenges within the initial core faculty:

In the beginning, it was a little bit of a struggle. There was so few of us, and that initially a couple of people wanted roles bigger than what they were given, under one case went behind another’s back to try to advocate for a different role and that backfired.

When the misalignment surfaced, the core team took action. Larick explained,

That person was removed from the doctoral program and given assignment elsewhere in the university. So, we made very clear by the actions we took and
behaviors that this was going to be a team that cared about one another and it’s worked.

**Norming with cohort mentors.** In some instances, cohort mentors did not fit well with the culture of the team. Ryder explained that the initial set of cohort mentors were chosen by White because she knew them: “She knew that they were people that were not gotcha people, not negative people. They were positive scholars and were going to be of that mindset, so that was really key in the development of this program.” Ryder noted that White was confident that those mentors would skillfully implement her vision. However, Ryder reflected that there were other hires that were made when White could not locate a prior acquaintance and in some instances these cohort mentors were not a good fit. Ryder attributed the difficulty to the mentors’ lack of connection with White. Ryder explained, “They didn’t have that vision [of] the way she wanted the program to run in a positive way, very supportive for students, so they didn’t stay with us.”

Similarly, Ainsworth noted, “Over time, the weak instructors got sorted out, and the weak cohort mentors kind of got pushed to the side. They weren’t re-employed. It’s kind of like in and out.” Ainsworth further clarified, “People got phased out. In some cases, they got let go, and deservedly so. If they’re not doing the right thing for students then they got let go. I think that’s really important.”

In this study, the most commonly cited criteria for a successful cohort mentor was a focus on serving and supporting students thoroughly. Lee commented, “Not everyone’s a perfect fit. We’ve had cohort mentors that have been let go before because they didn’t have that core DNA that jives with the rest of the folks in the program.” He further explained, “Sometimes [it is] trial by error, but I think after five or six years we’ve got it
pretty well dialed in where cohort mentors are very philosophically aligned with what the program stands for.” Lee noted that this has not always been the case. He noted that there have been “one or two that have come along where we’re just like, ‘We’re done after this term. We’re going to have a new cohort mentor for your cohort.’ But for the most part it’s very well selected individuals to take on some of those roles.” In this manner, the core faculty have been able to maintain the program’s core philosophy while expanding the team to serve increasing numbers of students each year.

The challenges of adjunct faculty. Similar to the process of hiring and monitoring cohort mentors, equal attention was paid to identifying and developing quality adjunct faculty. Ainsworth noted that Hightower did well in identifying and onboarding adjuncts as part of his responsibilities in the program. When Ainsworth later assumed the role of managing adjunct faculty, he became more aware of the challenges inherent in the role. Ainsworth also shared a story of an adjunct instructor he had hired from USC who was ultimately not a good fit. He shared that the sudden loss of the instructor “caused me a lot of difficulty, but I spend more time now making sure the adjuncts know what’s expected of them. As they’re hired, I keep track of them. I check in with them.” He further noted, “Just making sure that they feel welcome is really important. . . . We’re making sure we put the right people in those cohorts because it takes a certain amount of skill and maturity to do that.” By providing clear and regular communication and onboarding, adjunct instructors are provided the opportunity to acculturate with the Brandman doctoral faculty.

The process of identifying the right candidates and discreetly exiting those who do not fit has also evolved over time. Enomoto noted that although he has observed
changes in the adjunct faculty over time, many of the adjustments have been very subtle. He explained that occasionally there may have been someone involved with the program who is longer invited to be involved. Enomoto shared,

They want to make sure that the instructors . . . are as good as they can get, and someone that’s student centered, and if they’re not or if they don’t reply to people when they have questions on emails and such, they probably aren’t going to be invited back.

The high level of expectation of student-centered performance extended across all roles within the program.

**Transformational Change Leadership**

**Theoretical Framework: Change Leader’s Roadmap**

The Brandman University doctoral program in organizational leadership utilizes the theoretical framework of transformational change as its foundation. More specifically, the doctoral program uses the change leader’s roadmap model by Ackerman Anderson and Anderson (2010). After the first year of the doctoral program, the Brandman core faculty invited the Andersons to speak about transformational change at immersion. Although the doctoral program could only afford to pay for the authors’ travel expenses, the Andersons graciously agreed to the speaking engagement, which has continued annually since. The partnership with the Andersons continued to evolve over the years and led to the doctoral program awarding them both honorary doctorates in 2017. Larick summarized the partnership with the Andersons by saying, “So, we’ve kind of married them into the program. . . . Linda has a great perspective on transformational
leadership as applies to most of our students.” To that end, the change leader’s roadmap model is the foundation of the Brandman transformational change work.

A Vision of Producing Transformational Leaders

In alignment with Brandman’s focus on providing a practitioner-focused degree in organizational leadership, the doctoral program utilizes the transformational change project (TCP) as a core learning experience. Keith Larick explained that the purpose of the TCP was to demonstrate mastery of key concepts, theories, and skills. He elaborated, “Rather than having that bridge of compensatory exams we get across, this was a hands on practice to actually demonstrate we’ve gained some skills and could do it out in the field.” To that end, doctoral program literature explains the TCP as follows:

To integrate change theory into real world settings and provide an opportunity for clinical practice, each student will design, implement, and assess a Transformational Change Project (TCP), which will be operationalized in a real organization. The Transformational Change Project will be introduced and explored in various courses throughout the program, beginning with the first course, EDOL 700 Transformational Leadership. Field-based assignments in which students begin to work on projects and deliverables that will be used in their second year TCP will spiral through every content course in their first year (see Appendix O).

As a foundation to their learning about transformational change, students begin exploring their vision for leadership as well as their strengths and weaknesses in EDOL 700. To that end, students participate in the Transformational Leadership Skills Inventory (TLSi; see Appendix P) during their fall immersion of the first year. Students also develop a
leadership vision statement (see Appendix Q) and are introduced to the Transformational Change Leaders Portfolio (see Appendix R), which they will create over the course of the 2-year program.

The promotional literature goes on to explain that in the second year, doctoral students implement the TCP in their identified organization as part of a 16-week fieldwork course titled Transformational Change Field Experiences (EDOL 780). Students will then reflect upon their learning as part of the course titled The Leader as Change Agent (EDOL 724). Finally, during their spring immersion of the second year, “students will participate in a Transformational Change Symposium, in which they will present their findings, implications for practice, and recommendations for further research.” Larick reflected on the development of the TCP saying,

Actually, the change project has evolved over time, the analysis portion and how we bring that together. But that’s probably the biggest piece and the biggest difference between what we’re doing and most other universities, particularly as you have that bridge to beyond.

Larick further noted that the TCP did not originate at Brandman, but rather,

That idea actually came also from La Verne, because we had to have that program do six many change projects from our own work. And ultimately there we decided six was too many, it was cut to three. And so, what we have now at Brandman we have one big Transformational Change Project.

Transformational Change Project (TCP)

The TCP is an innovative structure designed to assist students in learning to lead change efforts in their own organizations and beyond. Noting the project’s importance to
the overall success of the doctoral program, during the interviews for this study, faculty and staff used terms such as linchpin and backbone. Core faculty member Jeffrey Lee described the TCP as an opportunity for students to “test out some of the skills they’ve learned. How to assemble a team, engaging stakeholders, and perhaps there’s conflict, how do you work through conflict, how do you build a team.” He went on to explain the structure of the TCP model as one where students are given “time and space to develop their TCP, to work under the direction of your cohort mentor. So, it’s guided practice.” The importance of the structure is that each student engages in real transformational change “but it’s also a very safe environment. It’s like sandbox time, where you go and field test the theories you learned.” Lee noted that the structured practice of transformational change is critical to the development of the doctoral students “because the next time you do it, you won’t have the support of cohort mentors. You’re doing it in your organization without a TCP assignment and infrastructure. You’re doing it for real.” Similarly, cohort mentor and adjunct faculty member, Phil Pendley noted the benefit of students having the opportunity to practice implementing a transformational change “in a living breathing real organization and experience the good stuff that can happen and the not so good stuff that can happen. That’s a tremendous experience.”

One of the many benefits of the Brandman TCP is the personalized guidance each student is provided along the way. Lee likened the TCP to an application of Vygotsky’s theory of the zone of proximal development, saying that through the TCP students are taught to implement transformational change at a level and in an environment that is challenging but also safe. He described it as an experience,
Where you can optimize your learning to really maybe push the envelope of the upper end of that zone to try some crucial conversations that you’ve never tried before, to really have feedback and guidance from your cohort mentor. . . . That is very intentional in terms of helping students learn and use those transformational leadership skills.

**Developing a Faculty of Transformational Leaders**

Although most cohort mentors had only a superficial understanding of transformational change theory when the doctoral program launched, over time their understanding of transformational change and ability to effectively guide students through the transformational change process evolved. Likewise, transformational change theory and practice became more deeply embedded in the overall structure of the program. Ainsworth reflected on the evolution of transformation change within the doctoral program, saying, “I think it is talked about at every professional development meeting. The word is used all the time. . . . We get prompts at professional development about transformational change that we have to use to discuss or to figure out something.” Ainsworth further noted that transformational change “is always a central organizer that keeps people focused on what we’re about.”

Although the TCP was an original component of the doctoral program, its significance and prominence within and throughout the program intensified throughout the early years. Ainsworth explained, “In the beginning I think the most successful element [of the doctoral program] was the immersions. I actually think the most successful important thing [now] is the TCP because it’s included in so many courses.”

Likewise, former Doctoral Program Specialist Maris Alaniz commented, “I think the
most successful element is that there isn’t one or two classes that are built around transformational change, it’s like the entire program is looked at under that lens, which is very powerful for our students.”

**Defining Transformational Change**

Founding associate dean of the Brandman School of Education, Patricia Clark White, reflected on the initial challenge the cohort mentors faced in guiding students through the transformational change project. She recalled, “At first, we had to really explain the difference between transformational change, transactional change, incremental change.” White surmised that many cohort mentors were initially willing to approve transactional-level projects “because they hadn’t really had a lot of people experience transformational change.” Initially, the faculty’s general lack of experience with true transformational change left room for broad interpretation of TCP expectations.

Marilou Ryder explained the process the faculty underwent to clarify the role of the TCP throughout the coursework. Ryder explained that within the last 3 years, the faculty created a map to outline the core learning objectives of each of the TCP components that are addressed in each course and their connections to one another.

Laurie Goodman elaborated on the evolutionary development of the TCP:

It started with just the TCP. The TCP was the project, and there were assignments that helped [students] understand . . . the requirements of the TCP and the change leader’s roadmap. It was one aspect in the beginning, at the Alphas and Betas. Now, it’s infused in everything they do.

Goodman noted that in the early years, the program did not typically begin by explaining how the student will be transformed as a leader through the doctoral program experience.
They introduced the leadership 360-degree evaluation at the first immersion as well as the leadership development plan, “but they didn’t talk about that you’re going to be transformed from the day one,” said Goodman.

In contrast, Goodman reflected that now, transformational change is “just part of the vernacular of everything that’s part of Brandman, that this is transformational.” Similarly, Guzman noted that the faculty’s focus on transformational change has extended beyond their teaching to guiding their behavior as transformational leaders themselves. Guzman reflected, “We’re about transformational change. . . . We’re mindful of the students that we serve and I think as a transformational leader, you need to be mindful of the people that you serve.”

In the same vein, during the interviews for this study, faculty and cohort mentors frequently referenced their own evolution as transformational leaders through their experiences in the Brandman doctoral program. Faculty member Ainsworth explained that the program “challenges the staff to look at themselves to be, how are you transforming yourself? Because a lot of us are old you know, or we’re retired, quite a few of us.” He reflected that the faculty and staff of the Brandman doctoral program “walk the walk of transformational leadership . . . work in a collaborative team . . . work together for the common good.” Ainsworth further noted, “I think most of the people that are in the program or working this program do it because it’s transformational to them and they want to keep growing and transforming. . . . I want to keep growing, and contributing, and doing.” Additionally, Ainsworth observed, “Over time that idea of transformation has magnified or amplified where it becomes even more important both at a personal level and an organization level.”
Improving Student Understanding of Transformational Change

Greater clarity of transformational change has better enabled faculty and cohort mentors to guide students through the TCP progress. Pendley explained, “We’ve gotten better at communicating what transformational change looks like.” He clarified that instructors and mentors are now adept at guiding students in refining their TCP work. “If they don’t address beliefs, if they don’t address culture, if they don’t address behavior, if all of those [transformational change elements] are not addressed,” stated Pendley. In contrast, Pendley noted, “I don’t think we were nearly as good early on at being specific and articulating exactly what transformational change should look like.” In fact, Pendley reflected that some of the TCPs he did with his students in the early years of the program: “Probably would not pass muster at this point in time. I think we’ve gotten better at that whole thing.”

Marilou Ryder expressed a similar sentiment regarding her evolution of understanding of transformational change, saying that it wasn’t until her second year in the program that she began to truly understand. She recalled, “I even showed up at the TCP symposium and I just didn’t really get how this whole process works, so if I didn’t get it, I don’t know if the students really got it.” However, Ryder noted, “We get it now. I think every single one of the instructors, and the core planning team, we get how this process works, and how it builds on one another.”

Improving Transformational Change Mentorship

Patricia Clark White commended the growth of the cohort mentors’ skill in guiding students through the TCP progress. White noted the cohort mentors “have grown a lot in their competence in helping their cohorts understand the differences and upping
the ante.” She elaborated, saying that while a student may begin with a project proposal that is less than transformational,

the cohort mentors now . . . are more able to push them to think, “Okay, how can we think about this from the standpoint of what are the assumptions that need to change? What aspects of the culture need to change? What are the big things that are impacting your organization, and are you going to get breakthrough results as an outcome from this change?”

Cohort mentor Laurie Goodman explained that, throughout the program, students are reminded, “Your TCP is not about doing a TCP. Your TCP is about learning the process of change management and understanding the difference between something that’s transformable as opposed to something’s that transactional.” Goodman further elaborated, “Closing the door is transaction. Changing how doors function for safety in and out of a building is transformational.” In the same vein, Cote noted that over time, faculty and cohort mentors have become adamant that TCPs must actually address transformational-level change efforts, “because if it isn’t transformational change, they don’t understand the concept at the end.” In like manner, Lee noted that the TCP process had changed over time, saying that cohort mentors have a different approach to the TCP with every student. Lee elaborated, “And so, especially with the TCP, you have a very good case for differentiation of instruction. You’re getting very tailored feedback on your TCP, which is different than the TCP of somebody sitting next to you in a class.”

An example of such personalized guidance for the TCP is the support given to students in the development of the planning documents and tools that will guide the
launch and implementation of the project. Ryder explained the plan to plan assignment required in EDOL 707 as an important process in the program. She shared,

I don’t believe that you can fail a student on the plan to plan, because if you fail a student on the plan to plan, they’ve got a horrible plan to plan that they’re going to take back to their organization.

Ryder further clarified that the general philosophy of the program is to support students in the developmental journey of mastering the skills necessary to lead transformational change, particularly because the stakes of the TCP are so high as a result of the project being implemented in the student’s workplace.

The Impact of Transformational Change

Transformational change projects produced by Brandman University doctoral students are noteworthy. However, the nature of transformational change makes it difficult to mark a distinct end to the work. As a result, students often find themselves concerned with the lack of a formal conclusion to the 2-year project. Cote assured her students, “The rollercoaster ride of how you implement your TCP is as important as a learning factor as actually finishing the project.” She explained, “You’ll learn how to work with people, you’ll learn how to handle the dissonance, the political challenges, all those pieces are what you learn doing the TCP.”

To this point, many participants of this study noted that the best part of the transformational change project is the professional and personal evolution of the doctoral students themselves as leaders. Ainsworth noted, “It has such an impact on people even though the students hate it at times.” Similarly, Goodman noted, “They said, ‘50% of
you will be promoted or you will take a job,’ because that’s what this program does. It changes you. It’s not about the project.” Pendley recalled,

Students have gotten promotions, have gotten recognition, heck one of my students passed the Bond election at his community college. That was his TCP. That was in a community that had not ever passed a Bond election ever. There’s a transformational change for you. I think that is one hallmark of what we do.

Reflecting on her observations of the program over time, Froehlich noted, “I find it amazing . . . even with people in their first year, what they’ve learned through this program and how much it’s helped transform them into a better leader, to be able to lead into a bigger role.” Similarly, Osborne noted the importance of the outcomes the TCP produces. She explained that because the TCP is an applied piece of program learning that occurs in the student’s place of work, students are often recognized for their accomplishments. Osborne noted, “I think that’s where their promotions come from . . . all of a sudden [people are saying] ‘Wait, I underestimated you.’ Or ‘Wow, you’ve really grown.’”

Alaniz attributed the personal transformation of Brandman doctoral students to the practitioner focus of the doctoral program and the TCP. She explained that from the program coursework and learning, students “go to work and you start looking at things differently and trying to reframe your thought process.” She noted that faculty and staff have the opportunity to “see an evolution of this person that came into the program with maybe not a lot of self-confidence in their leadership skills, and then after the first year it’s life changing.”
Showcasing Transformational Change

In order to highlight the incredible learning and transformation of doctoral students, the June immersion of the second year of their program includes the transformational change symposium, where students present their accomplishments to the faculty, staff, fellow students, and members of the community. Froehlich noted that the first symposium in June 2014 was a remarkable opportunity to see the culmination of all the Alpha cohort students had accomplished throughout the program (see Appendix S).

The personal transformation experienced by Brandman doctoral students through their process of learning to lead a transformational change project is profound. Ryder described the experience of witnessing this transformation:

I sit through those events with the candidacy meetings, and I hear story, after story, after story of how this program has influenced them and made them different, made them change. I joke with everybody it’s almost like you’re joining a cult.

On a more serious note, Ryder shared, “Our students leave with life changing experiences. They’re very different people at the end.” Compared to her own doctoral experience at the University of La Verne, she reflected that she did not experience the magnitude of change that the Brandman students experience. She indicated that she learned to facilitate large-group meetings, but when she considers the outcomes of the Brandman doctoral graduates, “I almost wish I could go back to school and start over . . . because these students are leading with such a toolbox, and such a shift in their mindset from how they came in.”
Evolution of Culture and Symbolism

Culture of Pride and Results

At its core, the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership was built on the idea of a community of people bound together by a commitment to leadership, according to Larick. He further explained,

And they are people who want to make a contribution and that’s a key element of what we bring to it, but we want all the graduates to bring to it is ultimately making a contribution or whatever your field is, you’re making a contribution.

To that end, the doctoral program strives to produce the highest doctoral degree completion rate in the nation. At the end of the 2017-2018 academic year, doctoral program completion rates exceeded the national average by nearly 10 percentage points (see Table 10). When interviewed for this study in 2019, Larick noted, “Now that that Alpha group will be at about 87% complete with dissertation, . . . that’s just unbelievable. I don’t know of any university that’s doing that. It’s the result of special efforts to support people.” These special efforts include a firm commitment to the value of the doctoral program and its impact on students and the world. This vision of long-term significance is exemplified in the 50 Year Plan of Excellence Zeppos created, which outlines the naming convention she used to identify each year’s class by a letter in the Greek alphabet, and delineates anniversaries in 5-year increments for 50 years of existence (see Appendix T).
Table 10

*Brandman University EdD Program Overview as of Spring 2018 (2017-2018)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Name (Starting Year)</th>
<th># Students</th>
<th># Graduates</th>
<th>Grad Rate (as of 2017-2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpha (2012)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>78.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta (2013)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamma (2014)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>64.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta (2015)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epsilon (2016)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeta (2017)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eta (2018)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>962</strong></td>
<td><strong>264</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Culture and Rituals of Play**

One of the more striking elements of the doctoral program, particularly in light of its unrelenting focus on the academic success of its students, is its equally enthusiastic cultural focus on having fun. Acknowledging these somewhat disparate elements, Goodman explained, “The culture is one of success and it’s a culture of humor.” From friendly pranks between leaders related to a presentation clicker and the escapades of two mischievous doctoral mannequins, to dancing community builders, lip-syncing administrators, and cohort bowling trips, the Brandman doctoral program encourages a healthy diet of fun to balance the intensity of the academic journey. Faculty members repeatedly noted the aspects of fun and humor embedded within the doctoral program culture. Osborne noted the cultural impact of the humorous elements of the program, saying, “The playful, funny part contributes greatly.” Goodman explained that the symbols of play are “just the norms of how we behave.”

**Administration and faculty lip-sync.** One playful ritual that was noted by participants in this study entailed the administration and faculty gathering in Dean Zeppos’s van to lip-sync a silly song for an immersion video. Zeppos recalled the
experience humorously saying, “Crazy stuff. Every time I hear that song you think of us in the car, you know how many takes we did of that? What was I wearing? I think they made me put a shirt on. So, I’m like in a skirt with like the shirt over.” Zeppos continued,

I’m thinking it’s just gonna be like a teeny part of my face because you know, the camera’s so close and whatever. I’m like, okay, I’m going to know the words. They all have practiced and rehearsed this. You know, I’m coming straight out of other retreat meetings . . . and then I look at it and I’m like “I’m right in the front!” Huge on my face, I should’ve studied the words more!

She laughed as she further reflected,

It was hilarious. Like, Oh my God. . . . The people that were not into it, and like you could barely see them in the back, they were like “yeah, we got to put those guys in the back.” That’s my car! . . . There’s, there’s just so many good memories.

**Adventures with the clicker.** Another playful ritual that has evolved over time has been the banter between Larick and White about the presentation clicker they share during the opening address and subsequent sessions throughout immersion (see Appendix U). Larick explained, “Initially there were a couple of symbolic pieces that have shifted over time. And that is our intent to make it playful, to have everybody lighten up just a bit. . . Dr. White and I arguing over the clicker.” Larick shared that they were, purposefully trying to model some relationships that were playful, but at the same time we were doing our work. It wasn’t by design . . . but we recognized it when we did it that it worked. It changed the mood.
Likewise, White noted that a playful tradition of the program is “Dr. Larick and me playing with the clicker and having fun with that, and the students usually get a kick out of that and make it an ongoing joke.” Larick elaborated, saying that although there is silliness in the clicker banter, “in the back of our minds, that’s the kind of play we wanted to model for everybody that we’re serious about learning, but we’re serious about relationships and having a good time.” As the clicker joke has evolved, it has even been featured highlight on immersion promotional flyers (see Appendix U) and the clicker itself was featured on a world tour video when one of the Zeta cohorts stole it at the end of their first immersion and took turns filming themselves with it at various international destinations.

Community builders. During each immersion a particular cohort is responsible for planning and leading a community builder activity aligned with the overarching theme of the immersion. Over time, these community builders have included cohorts writing and singing songs, performing skits, and dancing. DeVore noted that while some students are not as comfortable as others with this level of play, inherently, People clamor for that. They won’t tell you they do, but they do. . . . We want to be free. We want to be able to show our emotions. We want to be in an environment where we can have fun, cheer, and do that, and not always have to be prim and proper.

He further noted, “And I think our program certainly demonstrates that and we grow on that.” As the community builders evolved, the creativity and fun demonstrated by each class contribute to the program’s culture of balance.
Social media. Another playful ritual leveraged by the Brandman doctoral faculty, staff and students has been the use of closed Facebook groups for members of the program. The primary group, titled Brandman EdD, is a place where members of the doctoral community post updates, ask questions, celebrate milestones, and share humorous memes and phrases (see Appendix V). During immersions, cohorts frequently post photos of themselves engaged in various activities and highlight their latest cohort-branded apparel. Fellow members of the Brandman doctoral community can then respond to one another in playful banter or issue challenges between cohorts to keep friendly competitions alive. Offshoots of the primary Brandman EdD Facebook page include those for individual cohorts and even one for the program mascot mannequins, EdDy and BEdB.

EdDy

Founding Dean Christine Zeppos took great care in designing the doctoral program regalia as part of the initial cultural elements. She then purchased a mannequin, which was later named EdDy, to wear the regalia during immersions as a symbol to students of their near future. Much to the doctoral team’s surprise, EdDy became an instant favorite among the doctoral students. Zeppos recalled that before she knew it, “Everyone’s taking pictures with the stupid mannequin. So that just evolved into a much bigger thing than I ever thought it was. I just wanted them to see the end.”

Over time, the Alpha class began to steal EdDy and take him on adventures. Zeppos explained,

It was just so awesome. And then those first Facebook years of the stuff that they would do with EdDy and he’s having a good time at dinner tonight or whatnot
were just really [fun], because it was so intense in the program, but it was just so playful and awesome at night.

Similarly, Froehlich explained, “We had people stealing the mannequins, dressing them up, taking them to the beach, and they’d post all of this on Facebook, which was amazing.” Larick also recalled,

Students kidnapped [EdDy] and took him away. I kept notes on my phone that he was recovering from a hangover and would join us at some time that day and then never did. Then got pictures of him lying in bed with a wine glass, but it became part of that playful aspect of the program.

Zeppos laughingly recalled that EdDy took on a life of his own through the evening adventures the doctoral students orchestrated for him:

Come on! Pictures of EdDy in a wheelchair . . . At a car racing place . . . EdDy on the beach . . . Can’t think of different places that I’ve seen him. They should all be on the EDD Facebook, if you go back far enough . . . Yeah. And then they, people, got these domains. So, like there is an EDD Brandman, EdDy Brandman . . . these are real people! And they’ve got a Facebook page too . . . Oh yeah. Oh, this evolved into stuff that we’re not planning..

**Beta BEdDy**

Not to be outdone by their predecessor, the Beta class bought a second mannequin to add to the program. Zeppos shared that when she asked the Betas what the second mannequin was, they responded, “It’s Beta BEdDy. She’s ours.” Zeppos was eventually able to provide BEdDy a proper doctoral robe following the commencement ceremony where the Andersons were awarded honorary doctorates for their *Change Leaders*
Zeppos also recalled that Beta doctoral student Ricardo from the Moreno Valley and Riverside cohorts built a foundation to hold EdDy and BEdDy complete with an inscribed plaque (see Appendix L).

Froehlich noted that the fun with the doctoral mascots continued to progress, saying students, “had a baby doll that they used in some of these pictures too with EdDy and BEdDy and now their baby. And it was cute.” Similarly, Zeppos recalled the raucous fun the students had with EdDy and BEdDy while making them their own. She shared,

It was just great fun. I mean, they’d steal EdDy, he’d be upstairs in this hotel and I’m like, “Oh, my God, one of these days, my name’s going to be all over the paper. What are they doing to this poor mannequin?” (Zeppos, 2019).

Although the mascot mannequins engendered a great deal of fun, the faculty and staff noted their serious significance to students as well. Enomoto and Hightower both discussed the importance of students being able to visualize themselves in the future. Hightower shared,

That’s such an important symbol, such an empowering thing. It can be intimidating when times are rough and you’re wondering if you’re going to make it or not. But on other days it’s like, “no, no, that’s me. I’m going to get there. I’m going to do that.”
The Power of Fun

Reflecting on the power of fun in the doctoral program, Ryder, who is jokingly referred to as the *immersion goddess* or *immersion czar* by her colleagues, shared a story. She recalled, “I just had a smile last night. I was down at the bar. I didn’t want to leave. I was so tired, but I didn’t want to leave because I was just looking around. It brought tears to my eyes really, because everybody was having so much fun.” She recounted seeing one of her students sitting with someone other than her cohort members and when Ryder inquired how they had met, the student explained, “Oh, I don’t know. I was on some team with them.” Ryder marveled at the joyful camaraderie of the students within and across cohorts, saying, “They’re all friends. I don’t know. It just brings you a really good feeling of how supportive, and how special this program is. It’s very different than anything I’d ever been involved in, in my entire educational career.” Ryder further shared that when her husband asks her when she is going to retire, she responds, “I’ll quit when it stops being fun. When I get too old and I can’t get up and speak, and do this work.” And then Ryder concluded,

But I really feel like I’m involved in something that’s much greater than myself. And how lucky am I to have dropped into that? Nobody gets a chance to do that, and there are so many people who would just love my job. There really is. It’s been like a gift from Heaven to be able to be involved with something like this.

Culture of Respect, Inclusion, and Diversity

The Brandman Doctoral Program was designed with structural and symbolic elements to ensure the development of an inclusive, diverse, and respectful culture. From the deliberate creation of welcoming professional development for all faculty and staff,
both adjunct and full time, to a curriculum that can be applied to a wide range of industries, the diversity of the program’s structures and key elements have yielded a truly diverse student body. Larick reflected that the faculty wrestled with the question of “How do we integrate across so many fields into one culture?” That’s why we begin every immersion with going back over those core values and belief systems, talking about respect and hard conversations.”

**Developing culture within faculty and staff.** The culture of respect and inclusion was noted repeatedly by participants in this study. The most common observation of the faculty and staff was summarized by Goodman’s reflection:

> They make you feel like you belong. When you step into this with all these very smart people, you’re like, “Do I belong with all these people?” But then they make you feel like you belong, and they validate your voice.

Goodman further noted that the inclusion process entailed providing all members of the faculty and staff with training to be successful at their work, like serving as dissertation chair. She shared that the respectful and inclusive culture engendered loyalty. Guzman shared a similar sentiment, indicating that his enthusiasm for the program was demonstrated through his willingness to take on additional tasks to better serve students. By conducting intake interviews, joining campus committees, and serving as the program’s diversity lead, Guzman expressed his pride in serving the doctoral program and his sense of alignment with its beliefs (see Appendix U).

**Developing culture within the student body.** Beyond developing an inclusive culture for faculty and staff, Larick expressed the program’s profound belief in creating a respectful and inclusive culture for students, which models the culture all
transformational leaders must create in their organizations across the world. In particular, Larick discussed the importance of the ability to listen actively and engage in hard conversations with those of opposing views while remaining respectful and inclusive.

Noting his recent update to a staple of the immersion experience, Larick explained,

    Tomorrow when I do That Used to Be Us, I’ve changed a lot of the questions for discussion. They’re not going to be easy ones because I’ve taken issues like immigration, of homelessness, of the environment and I’ve really put a bullseye on them with some really hard questions.

Explaining his plan, Larick continued,

    We’re going to talk tomorrow about “what is it like to have a civil conversation?”

    That’s an evolving part of our culture and a symbol of how we can be very different people with belief systems, but we can come together and have a conversation about hard issues without being angry with one another.

Rather than the common ground exercise typically utilized with the study of this book, Larick explained that students would instead be given several potential solutions proposed by The White House: research each proposal, and then asked to “come back and have a conversation and come up with what you think we ought to be doing to resolve the issue of immigration because it needs to be resolved. We can’t ignore it. It isn’t going anywhere the way it is now.” Larick noted that the goal of the exercise was to help students answer the question, “How do enlightened people committed to being civil have that kind of conversation?”

    More globally, Larick shared that being a doctoral student is “about exploring and pushing your old boundaries, and listening enough to somebody else that you understand.
It doesn’t mean you have to agree, but you understand where they’re coming from.” He also noted the intensified evolution of this particular curriculum exercise reflected the faculty’s sense that the skill of managing tough conversations had become increasingly more important for leaders. He continued, “We’ve got to build into what we’re doing here some rational ways of going about having those conversations.” Larick then concluded, “How that will ultimately look like a culture, I’m not sure, but hopefully it’s a culture where we have tough conversations about tough issues in a way that’s okay.”

**Structure**

**Structure: Hybrid Model**

Members of the Brandman doctoral program in organizational leadership attribute much of the program’s success over time to its blended, hybrid structure. White explained,

The structure of the program has a lot to do with its success, the fact that it produces the convenience and flexibility of being online, but at the same time has the personal connection, the face-to-face, the support of cohorts and immersion and webinars. Successful blending of online and in-person components is the result of intensive focus on meaningful personal connections and a comprehensive learning experience that enables students to seamlessly transition between online coursework and in-person activities. Furthermore, in-person experiences in the Brandman doctoral program primarily provide students with the opportunity to put theory into practice and receive personalized mentoring.
Although other doctoral programs have online courses and in-person gatherings, such as La Verne’s weekend symposiums, Ainsworth explained, “The difference really is, in terms of innovation, is the blended model, really embracing technology and tapping into this Brandman infrastructure which is so robust.” Regarding the Brandman University core instructional model, Ainsworth noted, “It’s really hard to even describe until you’ve been behind the scenes and seen all of the course developers, and the technology people, and all the people that are working to make the system work.”

Likewise, DeVore noted the strength of the Brandman blended model: “The structure of cohorts, immersions and online instruction [are], by far, the strength of our program and who we are.” DeVore also noted that during intake interviews, students regularly indicate they are attracted to the Brandman doctoral program because of the blended model. DeVore shared that program applicants often say, “I want to be online, but I really need the human component. I really want to be with people. I really want a face to face. I heard about your cohorts, that’s really important to me. Immersion doesn’t scare me, it excites me.” In the same vein, Osborne noted the importance of the hybrid structure, saying, “You get the networking, that we look out for each other, but you also get the quality and you get the flexibility. So, I think you get it all.”

DeVore underscored the importance of the human connection provided through the doctoral program’s immersion requirement. Although Brandman EdD students incur the expense of travel to and from the immersion events three times per year, along with the cost of accommodations and dinners during the event, students continue to embrace the model for the benefit of the human interaction. DeVore explained, “It’s what they want. They will pay top dollar for it, although we’re not, by far, not the most expensive,
but they’ll pay good dollar for it, and they will come on the weekends.” DeVore also shared that although he was embarrassed to admit it, he had fought against the weekend seminars at a former institution when the university attempted to cut them as a cost-saving measure. DeVore recalled they used reasoning such as, “This is too much for students. They don’t want to do this. They don’t want to drive; they don’t want to do that.” In response to these proposed reasons to cut the in-person components of a doctoral program, DeVore retorted,

Number one: hockey pucks, they do it. They’ll do it. If it’s valuable, they’ll do it.

. . . Money is not a major motivator to people. Money has to do with having security. But money does not bring about strong levels of satisfaction.

Similarly, Ainsworth noted the value of the online component of the program,

I think it’s a very modern program. I think all you have to do in southern California is try and drive in Los Angeles. It is miserable. I mean even driving from here to Trader Joe’s a while ago I was shocked how congested the streets were, worse than ever.

He further elaborated that traditional programs that require commuting to a particular location are becoming obsolete. Additionally, Ainsworth noted, “The next generation [of students] are expecting a different way of delivery. . . . I think this modern, blended approach, doing the best of face to face, but the majority of the coursework online, is what sets it apart from other programs.”

**Structure: Cohort Model**

In addition to immersion, one of the most successful elements of the in-person components of the Brandman doctoral program is the cohort model. Larick noted, “The
cohort model is fundamental to what we do.” White explained the design of the cohort model, saying,

In this program, you have a block of two years. You are automatically registered. You’re assigned to a cohort, and that cohort stays with you for two years. That cohort mentor who is a leading practitioner in the field stays with you for two years.

White discussed the importance of the cohort model, which “maximizes the nurturing element, the bonding element, the closeness, the support, the personal coaching you get from your top-level field practitioner who’s your cohort mentor.” She also reflected, “The cohort, [with] the cohort mentor is a very innovative concept that isn’t typical across the nation.” White noted that other universities are observing the Brandman model and its success; therefore, “we may see that as being more of a standard operating procedure in the future for a lot of places.”

**Cohort relationships.** Some of the most profound relationships developed in the doctoral program are those formed within the cohort structure. More personally, Larick shared,

The strongest [relationships] I have over a lot of years are people that I had at a cohort. We’re still staying in touch, still get notes and letters from. So those relationships technically don’t go away, that’s kind of a family unit and that’s an important piece it.

In addition to providing an in-person support structure, the cohorts serve a critical role in the learning experience of the doctoral students. Guzman explained that within the cohort, students learn leadership skills and teamwork. He noted, “You’re assigned the
next community builder, or you’re working on innovation tournament, or whatever the case might be, they’re practicing their leadership skills and learning how to collaborate, communicate, organize, plan. All those things are done in our program.” Goodman made a similar observation, saying,

The first thing [students] do is they learn how to be cohorts. That’s always a unique experience and challenge, because there’s so many different personalities coming together to work as a team and to acknowledge the needs of each other.

Enomoto noted the nature of the bonding that occurs within the cohorts: “They’re meeting every month for several hours and getting together and you can see the impact of it.” Enomoto further described the way in which cohort mentors are shown great respect and appreciation by students at each immersion:

Every time, on the first day of immersion, they introduce the faculty, they introduce the core planning team and everything else, but then when they introduce the cohort mentors, boy, they get a super round of applause, because the students are connected with them, with those folks, and they’re connected with them continuously for two years. But again, all of that helps them, I think in terms of the completion rate.

Guzman similarly noted the distinctiveness of the Brandman cohort model:

It’s not just “take a course, sit behind your computer, take a test, and then do your dissertation and bye bye.” There’s a rich learning experience that’s tied into immersion, the transformational change project and with that, the cohort experience.
Grouping students into cohorts is not a new practice. However, Ainsworth explained, “I do think that the attention to the cohort is something that sets [the Brandman program] apart. We had learning groups at La Verne, but there wasn’t much structure to them. It really depended on the personality and the experience of the person running it.

After joining the Brandman doctoral team as a cohort mentor and being briefly mentored by the faculty, Ainsworth was authorized to lead his Brandman cohorts independently. Although he had previously served as a cohort leader at La Verne, he noted the distinctiveness of the Brandman cohort model: “The cohort gives people an anchor locally or virtually with a core group of people that’s smaller.” Ainsworth also commented on the importance of the more informal aspects of the cohort experience, such as forming a cohort identity and engaging in activities outside of the formal structure. He explained, “It’s really co-curricular in a sense that people are learning and networking together and creating new learning, and new ideas, and new thoughts, and new opportunities for each other.”

A key driver in the success of the Brandman cohort model is the purposeful integration of the program curriculum into the cohort experience and the related ongoing training provided to cohort mentors to lead such learning. Larick shared that the cohort experience is truly embedded into each course through elements such as the course-at-a-glance overview document, the cohort responsibility to review particular course readings, and including assignments in each course that are graded by the cohort mentor. Larick shared, “What we did was be very intentional about what’s done at a cohort meeting as being connected back to the coursework that’s being done.”
To ensure alignment between the course instructors and cohort mentors, the core faculty provide cohort mentors with extensive training and support. White explained, “What we do differently is the investment we make in their professional development and the work that we do with the cohort leaders to allow them to do what they do with the students in the cohorts.” In order to blend the cohort experience seamlessly into the learning in the coursework, the Brandman program again focused on the importance of the human connection. Larick explained that although the professional development experiences for mentors address course content, they also are training for all of us and for all of them so that very purposefully, they go about doing their work with top of that list is building relationships. That’s what people were doing out here today in the new cohorts is building relationships.

Larick then reflected that such a focus on building relationships should not be considered innovative because the research shows how important it is, but in comparison to other doctoral programs, the extent to which the Brandman program focuses on building strong personal relationships is, indeed, innovative in doctoral education.

**Cohort support network.** The cohort model is innovative in that it allows a university to reach far beyond a traditional geographic boundary while maintaining cohesiveness and reducing the impersonality that can accompany a fully online experience. Enomoto shared, “The cohort structure I think is wonderful . . . since it’s a real distributed system, and you have cohorts in Washington and online now and then all over California. And that helps create that family.” Former doctoral program staff member and current doctoral program student Maris Alaniz reflected, “I think the fact that it’s technically a fully online program, but it’s cohort-based . . . it gives people a
sense of belonging, especially you have the campus core locations and now we have the online [cohort].” Alaniz also noted the potential opposite result, saying, “If it wasn’t cohort-based, it would be very easy for students to give up, because they don’t have that support system.” Alaniz further explained, “Having the cohort, having that support speaks volumes and really helps students get through the process.”

**Symbolism: Cohorts and cohort identity.** Many of the participants of this study noted the symbolic elements of the cohort experience, such as each cohort creating a name, logo, and cohort-branded apparel to be worn at immersion and on cohort excursions (see Appendix W). The cohort identity helps to solidify the bonding element of the cohort experience and serve as a motivator during difficult times. During program competitions and on social media, Brandman doctoral students frequently refer to themselves by their cohort name (i.e., real Zetas of Orange County, Online Zetas). Relatedly, Cote shared that it is “hugely symbolic wearing these [indicates cohort shirt she is wearing]. . . . The identity that’s formed by some of the cohorts is hugely symbolic of the program, and all of this is supported.”

**Managing cohort personality.** And while not all cohorts build the kind of bond that sustains them through and beyond the doctoral program experience, most create lasting friendships. Cote shared that in general the cohort model provides a unique and personalized learning experience for students. She explained,

> Not all cohorts work that great. My last cohort did not meld, they were a challenge from the very first session to the very last. The cohort I have now . . . I don’t think you could tear them apart from one another, so each group is a little bit different.
Regardless of the variation in depth of relationships, the cohort structure provides a vital component of support to students.

**Immersion**

One of the most innovative elements of the hybrid structure of the Brandman doctoral program is the immersion experience, where all doctoral students gather three times per year in Irvine “for extensive relationship-building with faculty and students program-wide, presentations by expert speakers, and in-depth engagement in learning” (Brandman University, 2019). Patricia Clark White, founding associate dean of the School of Education explained,

> Our immersions are innovative. The fact that we bring all the students together three times a year. . . . We bring in keynote speakers that are extremely high quality, national gurus really and authors. Then all of the engagement activities that we plan for students . . . I think that’s innovative.

During the immersion weekends, which were initially offered as two 3-day and one 4-day events, students are introduced to the themes of upcoming courses as well as given the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of the previous term’s learning (see Appendix X). Additionally, students engage in guided leadership practice to hone the development of transformational leadership skills. Students are also provided access to faculty and industry experts with whom they can discuss course content and theory. Furthermore, students engage in research activities, seminars, and conversations with experienced dissertation chairs, which help to prepare students for successful completion of the dissertation (Brandman University, 2019). Doug DeVore reflected on the uniqueness of the immersion experience:
Immersion is a happening that you just don’t experience anywhere else. I’ve not seen it in any other program, anything like it. The energy, the student-centeredness, the power of it, I’ve never seen anything like it and I’m thrilled to be a part of it.

**Renewal Through Curriculum and Connection**

Similar to faculty descriptions of the TCP, Brandman faculty repeatedly referred to immersion as the *cornerstone* or *backbone* of the doctoral program, citing the significance of the in-person learning experience (see Appendix Y). Jeffrey Lee shared that the immersion component of the program is a distinct selling feature for students. He explained that during intake interviews, even students who live at a great distance from the main campus in Irvine note the importance of the immersion component because “there’s a unique value in sitting in a room looking somebody eye to eye. Shaking their hand still means something.” Similarly, Carlos Guzman noted, “If we didn’t have Immersion, I don’t think we would have a program, because that’s our time with students, faculty, cohort mentors. . . . It’s just the time of connection and learning.” Guzman said, “We learn too. We’re not just faculty. We learn from our students and then that’s probably the most rewarding part of the work that we do.”

However, there is a delicate balance the faculty strive to achieve during the limited hours of immersion. Larick shared,

We always struggle with a balance between trying to deliver content and knowing that we don’t want to have too much seat time . . . trying to infuse activities and discussion and interaction and . . . trying to mix groups over time.
Likewise, Lee noted, “These immersions are prime opportunities for us to ebb and flow and very organically get through the curriculum.” Lee further elaborated on the important role of symbols and traditions during immersion that require an investment of time but are critical to the program’s success and model the behavior of transformational leadership. Lee explained, “We always have a community builder at the beginning of most days at immersion and we believe in that, for lack of better words, ritual, because we believe in team building.” Lee also commented on the importance of rituals that reinforce the core beliefs of an organization, saying, “If you go to your organization, you’re a principal or CEO, if you would invest the time in team building, then as a transformational leader it’ll pay dividends later on in other things.”

In addition to blending curriculum with personal interaction and reinforcing culture, the immersion experience also generates a positive energy in faculty and students. Alaniz noted,

Even though it feels long when you’re [at immersion], I think people take back so much more and you almost get to recharge. You go back, you’re excited again and . . . you just get back to the learning. So, I think that’s important as well.

Doug DeVore shared a similar sentiment about the power of the immersion experience, explaining, “There’s no time that I’ve ever been to immersion, went to immersion, came home from immersion, been at immersion where I didn’t think it was just the highlight of our program.”

**Putting Theory Into Practice**

As the immersion structures have been refined, several learning activities have emerged as hallmarks of the immersion experience. Each of these activities has taken on
ritualistic importance because of its thoughtful design and innovative implementation. Typically, these immersion activities are designed as opportunities for students to practice and showcase growth in leadership competencies and knowledge gained through coursework.

**Innovation tournament.** The immersion activity that was noted most often by study participants as being both innovative and critical to the immersion experience was the innovation tournament. Modeled after the Stanford Global Innovation Challenge, second-year student teams are given an unassuming object, such as a paint stir-stick, plastic soda can rings, or leftover shrink-wrap, and challenged to transform the item into something significant over the course of the 8-week term. The tournament is designed to help students “experience the entrepreneurial process, including seizing opportunities, leveraging limited resources, and bringing ideas to life” (Brandman, n.d.-e, para. 1). Over the years, student innovation tournament teams have developed blankets for the homeless, child-safety reminder tags to be hung on the rearview mirror of vehicles, and photodegradable grass seed sheets to help prevent mudslides in areas affected by wildfires. Guzman noted the significance of the innovation tournament, describing it as a part of the doctoral program culture of “reaching out to the community, giving back, having cohorts come up with these innovative uses of products and/or items.”

While the innovation tournament has been through several iterations, and faculty have discussed the possibility of moving away from it, student enthusiasm for the tournament remains high. Cote shared, “There’s talk of doing away with it, but students come and they’re really excited about it. . . . Even though we’ve been through it a lot, it’s
something really good for the students.” DeVore similarly noted the inherent value of the experience for students, saying, “It’s so ingrained, such a powerful part of our program.”

**The amazing race.** A second immersion learning activity that was noted as being significant for students was the Amazing Race data coding activity. White described it as “a ritual that is all around research and perfecting skills for the dissertation.” As a follow-up to the qualitative research course, students engage in an afternoon of team data coding in a competition mirroring the television show of the same name. Amazing Race activity designer, and full-time faculty member, Lee reflected,

It’s awesome when . . . I look around the room and everyone’s excited with me doing the Amazing Race or whatever else because we can connect at that high of a level, students and instructor, and we can have fun, hard fun learning.

He further explained that the excitement of learning together is contagious and noted his sense of responsibility to create high-quality learning experiences like the Amazing Race to maximize the opportunity to learn collaboratively. Lee noted,

I’m really sensitive to this idea that students are spending a lot of time and energy coming to immersions. So, if you’re going to spend all this time and energy, what’s the value of getting a group of people together?

**That used to be us political rally.** As a culminating experience to reading Friedman and Mandelbaum’s (2011) book *That Used to Be Us*, student groups are charged with selecting a pillar from the topics addressed in the book and designing a political campaign presentation highlighting the area of focus they have selected as most significant for improving American and global innovation. White described the purpose of the activity as “really having our students think beyond themselves, beyond their little
group, beyond even their organization to the bigger world. That’s a ritual that is important.” Students then present their campaign speeches during a political rally held during immersion to their fellow students and faculty.

**Traditions and Rites of Passage**

The immersion experience is deeply steeped in symbolism, which helps to elevate the collaborative learning experiences. Lee noted that establishing and retaining the symbolic elements of the program models the importance of their role in organizational life for students. He shared, “Those [symbolic] types of things are important, but when times get busy, they take the back burner . . . And if you had to cut something, sometimes that’s the first thing that gets cut.” However, Lee noted, “As a transformational leader, it really should be the last thing that gets cut. And so, we just kind of keep working with it on a cohort by cohort or year by year basis to emphasize the things that we feel are important to transformational leaders.”

**Connecting with Dean Zeppos.** An initial immersion tradition that Dean Zeppos continued to develop for students to experience over the course of their six immersion sessions in the program was the Dean’s keynote address. During every immersion session, Dean Zeppos addressed each cohort with a just-in-time message related to their stage in the doctoral journey. Zeppos explained, “That’s where I kind of tried to create my role as dean, in that culture development.” The first presentation outlined the vision, symbols, and rituals of the program (see Appendix Z). The second immersion presentation outlined the importance of trusting the process. Zeppos explained her intention to let students know,
I’m the place that can help keep them going, again the buck stops here and how can I make sure that you’re feeling okay? And that you’re not going to understand everything on the second immersion, you’re just not. But we’re going to get you to the place that you need to be.

The sixth and final immersion presentation was the most personal and the most compelling. Zeppos recalled, “So, it used to be on the agenda, transformational leadership, some dry topic. Okay. Transformational leadership in the 21st century. And I’m like, ha ha ha. The big joke is this is not about that.” Instead, Zeppos shared, It’s about my journey and my gift to you all as you now go into dissertation phase. And talking about my journey and lessons learned and things that I hope for you in the future . . . but also my expectations of here’s what you’re going to do to help change the world.

Zeppos continued, “It was a very personal hour and a half of, and guiding them to the end of coming to my house and here’s you crossing the stage and so forth.” To help set the tone of ritual, Zeppos shared that she started that session off by reading what I read on the first day of the opening of commencement, for the hooding ceremony, that you’re now part of Academia. And you’re now our colleagues and you are our newest peers and welcome to the Academy. And it really took [students] to the next place of “I’m almost there. I’m almost side by side with these folks” and [Zeppos said] I can’t wait to welcome you to my home, to welcome you as our new peer. So that’s was a really great tradition.
Zeppos noted that the sixth immersion keynote speech was her favorite, noting that it ended with a reminder of the final step awaiting students: “You’ve got to finish, but we’re going to do it.” Zeppos shared her vision for her symbolic role in the doctoral program process. She explained, “I wanted you to start with me in boot camp and end with me there and then end with me at Chapman . . . we’re going through this journey together and I believe in you.” She also encouraged students to reach out to her if they should need support throughout the dissertation process. Zeppos reflected,

I can’t tell you how many students over the years just emailed me or called me and said, “I’m at my wit’s end. I’m going to quit” . . . even students now, I get students contacting me all the time [saying] “I’m at that point.”

**Moving to the right.** A rite of passage that developed as part of the immersion experience was the tradition of having first-year students sit on the left side of the general assembly room and second-year students sit on the right. This simple seating arrangement served as a means of encouraging first-year students to identify those a year further along in the process than themselves and to look forward to their own transition to the right side of the room after they completed the first year of coursework. Cote described the process of moving to the right of the room as “hugely symbolic” and said that during the initial immersion, first year students are told, “‘You’re here,’ and, ‘Don’t be nervous’, and, ‘This group was there last year,’ and so on and so forth. And the new students will sit there and go, ‘Okay,’ in the meanwhile they’re shaking in their boots.” Similarly, Enomoto commented on the rite of passage, noting that first-year students look forward to moving to the right side of the immersion room. He said the first-year students look across the room and say, “Those are the veterans; those are the seniors.
They’re the upper-class people.” In the same manner, Cote concluded, “It’s hugely symbolic that they’re moving their seats over here, which then means that they’re moving on, that they’re getting toward their dissertation.”

**Passing the torch luncheon.** Another doctoral program tradition that was addressed by many of the participants of this study was the celebration luncheon held during the June immersion to celebrate the conclusion of coursework for the senior class. During the luncheon, a ceremony occurs where members of the senior class pass a torch to members of the junior class, signifying the transfer of responsibility and legacy to the underclassmen. Cote noted that each fist-year cohort is inspired by the luncheon to create something even more motivational for their own ceremony the following year. In a similar vein, Ainsworth noted the evolution of the luncheon over time, saying, “I saw that thing move from just an idea, ‘let’s all have lunch and say thank you’ to something that just really is going to be hard to match.” Froehlich recalled,

That first June, [it] was just awesome to see everything come together for that first completion of the two years of coursework. That would be our first celebration luncheon that we did for them and the program that we did. It was just a really great experience.

Zeppos noted that her most memorable experience in the program was “that first time that the Alphas passed the torch to the Betas and they created that new tradition.” She concluded,

It’s like you all are my Transformational Change Project. And I just never thought it would be this great. You always imagined this idea, but it becomes even greater because of the people that you have around it to lift it up even higher.
**Boot camp.** An immersion structure that was developed several years into the program was the boot camp, which is a “mandatory induction program designed for candidates to gain pertinent knowledge and skills needed to be successful in the EDOL program” (Brandman University, 2019, p. 1). The boot camp is divided into an asynchronous section and a synchronous section, the first being an online tutorial to familiarize doctoral students with the Blackboard learning platform, and the synchronous portion occurring the day prior to the launch of students’ first fall immersion (see Appendix AA). Boot camp activities include meeting the Dean, reviewing program components, and taking a writing assessment. Zeppos described the origin of the boot camp:

We didn’t have a boot camp before and so it used to be like an online boot camp just to kind of get people resources and then were like, we need to see them face to face. And so, part of my responsibility that changed with the boot camp that I really wanted was that I’m the first person they see at boot camp and I’m the last person they see at graduation handing them their diploma. And so trying to inspire students that the buck stops here and that you’re going to see me at boot camp and I’m going to shake your hand across the stage and hug you at Chapman, when you cross the stage and I get to hand you your diploma. Ainsworth described the boot camp as really important:

because students needed to hit the ground running in immersion and so having an online boot camp, which is set up like a Blackboard shell, which are really nice because it gets students into that mindset before they open at 700.
He went on to note the importance of the face to face component of boot camp, saying, “I think those are some unique things that we have here.”

Refining Immersion Implementation

From the initial cohort of students far exceeding the enrollment expectation of the university, and all subsequent classes exceeding an enrollment of 90, the doctoral faculty and staff had to continually refine the logistics of implementing immersion. Several participants in this study likened immersion weekend to hosting three weddings in a row. Christina Froehlich reflected, “It was just such a huge show to put on. . . . But it was just such an amazing experience to watch.” Budget constraints were a consistent factor, as were the logistic challenges of transporting audio-visual equipment and a tech support team from the Brandman campus in Irvine to a local hotel. Enomoto noted that the team struggled to secure a venue large enough to hold the event and all participants. Regardless of the logistical challenges, however, the team persisted in refining and improving the processes to ensure this critical component of the program was successful.

Nametags and personalized itineraries. A significant improvement to the immersion process was the addition of customized nametags and personalized itineraries. Christine Froehlich explained that initially “there would be a ton of information on a name badge and then you’d have a packet of logistic papers that you would have to basically look at your name badge . . . and then go down your paper and figure out where you’re supposed to be.” She continued, “There was a lot of confusion going on [about] where they were supposed to be and what they were supposed to do.” By creating this personalized itinerary as a guiding document, students and faculty were better able to navigate the schedule of the event. Froehlich noted that the improved logistics “helped
us to be able to be more attentive to the students’ needs because we’re not always being pulled in different directions for the questions of, ‘Where am I supposed to go?’” She indicated that this improvement was most beneficial for faculty members who were leading sessions for students of both years and, therefore, had the most complex scheduling assignments.

Initial elements of the immersion nametags were also designed to assist with operational effectiveness. In addition to having the Brandman doctoral program logo, the nametags differentiated participant program level. Zeppos recalled that first-year student names were written in gold and second-year student names were written in maroon, building in a subtle rite of passage of moving from a gold nametag to maroon. Individuals who attended immersion because they were considering joining the program were noted in green and faculty names were always written in black. Zeppos also noted that the nametags contained logistical details regarding the schedule, but noted jokingly, “We phased that out, thankfully, because we have those agendas now. But that was a tradition too. Like if you could understand your name tag, you can get a doctorate.”

Reducing cost and increasing efficiency. Over time, a significant shift occurred in the general structure of immersion. White explained the transition as an effort to address efficiency while keeping the quality of the program very high. She described the transition in this way:

One of the things that happened with immersions is we used to have, as you recall, three-, three-, and four-day immersions. As we looked at it and really examined the nature of that four-day immersion, we thought, “You know what? We can do this in three. It’ll be better for students. It will be better for faculty.
And it will be more cost-effective.” So, we really worked hard on making sure that nothing really significant was lost when we took one day away from that immersion.

Several participants of this study noted that although immersions are expensive endeavors, their value far exceeds their cost. Lee noted that he keeps this value proposition at the forefront of his mind as he plans immersion activities for students, asking himself, “What’s the value of this group of people getting together for my session at immersion?” Because if I’m just going to talk for an hour, I may as well record it and send it out as a webcast or something.” However, Lee noted that the Brandman doctoral students, faculty, and staff make the significant investment to travel to Irvine and participate in this multiday learning experience because “there are just some things that you can’t do online.” Similarly, DeVore concluded, “I have many memorable experiences, but immersion is my most memorable experience, bar none.”

**The Dissertation Process**

From inception, the Brandman EdD program conceived of a doctoral process that would be unlike that of traditional doctoral programs and produce graduates at a rate that far exceeded the national average of less than 60%. To that end, the core planning team developed a program in which the successful completion of the dissertation was the end goal for all students. However, implementation of this focus has evolved over the years to ensure that the expectation of all students completing the dissertation is conveyed clearly and the supports for this goal are embedded within all elements of the program. Goodman identified that the most positive evolution of the Brandman EdD program has been the change in the dissertation process. She explained, “When we started with our
Alphas and Betas, it was ‘don’t talk about the dissertation. They’re already involved in coursework. They have a TCP. They’re doing their leadership plan. There’s already a lot on their plate.’” Rather than addressing the dissertation, instructors and cohort mentors were encouraged to help students remain focused on the learning for their courses. She shared that the initial messaging was along the lines of “We’re not going to talk about dissertation . . . We don’t want to take their eyes off the most important ball, which is the coursework.” However, this approach did not remain for long.

**Addressing the Dissertation Early**

Goodman noted that the purposeful downplaying of the dissertation in the early stages of the doctoral program changed over time and now “from day one, we’re talking about ‘you’re going to be a doctor. What does it look like? How do you start that process? How do you develop as a writer? How do you develop the passion for what you’re going to research?’” DeVore attributed the refined focus on ensuring student success through the dissertation progress stemmed from a “cradle to grave”-type philosophy. He elaborated, “We do not have an end in doctoral program, until you’ve successfully defended your dissertation.” Further, DeVore explained,

> It’s absolutely critical, that if we let a student in the program, they go through two years of program, they pass the classes, we don’t owe them a doctorate degree, but we owe them all the support to help them get the doctorate.

Ainsworth noted that the supportive structure of the Brandman program is innovative in that it is notably different than the approach of even other innovative doctoral programs. He explained,
When I was at La Verne, for instance, after our final coursework was done, we went with a week-long dissertation symposium. They called it dissertation camp. But . . . they didn’t want you working on it before then. I think part of Brandman’s magic is really getting people engaged in that, teaching them that they can do it, really helping them get a head start on their dissertation. That results in a higher completion rate.

In order to achieve this level of innovation in record time, Brandman utilized the significant knowledge and experience of its doctoral faculty to develop an integrated instructional model that purposefully guided students through the key benchmarks of the dissertation process. Zeppos noted that while Larick was initially brought on the team to help develop the doctoral program curriculum, his role naturally evolved into managing the dissertations. Likewise, Zeppos noted that DeVore’s role slowly evolved to include the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Zeppos explained, “It all started from scratch. None of that existed. So that was a lot of work [and] their roles have shifted over time.” She also noted that her own role evolved to include assisting with the research process of the program.

**Thematic dissertations.** In addition to utilizing the innovation of embedding the dissertation within the coursework of the program and leveraging the skills and prior experience of seasoned doctoral faculty members to build the processes for such a model, the faculty also introduced the thematic dissertation. The Brandman EdD Viewbook (see Appendix AB) explains the dissertation process in this manner:

For the final project of the Ed.D. program, students can either complete a traditional or thematic dissertation. The thematic dissertation is a supportive
collaboration between faculty and students that develops research plans around current issues. Each doctoral candidate researches a topic from a different perspective while sharing literature sources, providing feedback and helping peers remain focused and moving forward. A faculty mentor or dissertation chair will guide the group’s thematic direction while students write individual dissertations from their own points of view and investigation” (EDD Viewbook; Appendix AE)

Goodman explained, “Alphas didn’t have thematics. Thematics didn’t come until year two. Now there’s more thematics than ever, and the students love them.” The Brandman Digital Repository houses 42 thematic dissertations completed by EdD program graduates between 2015 and 2018.

Student support for the dissertation process. Along with the innovation of shifting the introduction of and focus on the dissertation to be embedded within the entire doctoral program, the core faculty and administration also created a robust support structure to ensure students could fully benefit from the opportunity. Goodman noted that the most successful element of the doctoral program has been the evolution of the dissertation process and implementation of professional development for the dissertation chairs and others who assist students through the process. Goodman also commended the program’s innovative use of technology, exemplars, and writing courses to ensure students are truly prepared to write the final dissertation. She explained,

Seriously, you take two years of coursework and if you don’t have a system or structure in place for the dissertation, then we end up like the rest of the universities out there with a 40 or 60% completion rate. Right now, our Alphas are almost at 90.
Embedded nature of the dissertation process. Rather than adding dissertation preparation to the program separate from the existing framework, the Brandman doctoral faculty developed an embedded system of dissertation exploration and support throughout the program to increase coherence and ensure that all students receive adequate preparation for the culminating work. For example, during the third immersion of the first year of study, students participate in an activity to meet potential dissertation chairs and share their initial ideas regarding a research topic (see Appendix AC). Guzman noted that students have the opportunity to explore a dissertation topic as early as their first writing course in year 1. He explained, “Students even get to play around with the topic in 750, when they’re just starting the program. ‘Wow. New topic development. Okay. Literature [review]. I’m already digging in, till I’m already almost starting my dissertation very early on.””

Devore noted that the Brandman doctoral program commitment to ensuring students complete the dissertation is unique. He cited the implementation and growth of the dissertation-focused miniversity breakout sessions offered during immersions as an innovative tool the program uses to promote student success (see Appendix G). Miniversity topics range from data collection methodologies and tracking tools to interview protocols and strategies for maintaining a healthy life balance during the journey.

Both Guzman and DeVore lauded the embedded nature of the dissertation process as an innovation that positively impacts the student experience in the Brandman doctoral program. Guzman explained, “By the time a student gets to dissertation, they’ve already done all this foundational work to get to that point.” Guzman said, “Another innovation
is a prospectus course that gets you ready for the dissertation process, but the students have already built up to that point and have a pretty solid topic.” DeVore reflected, “We’re different because we provide support for students from day one.” DeVore described his own doctoral program experience in which there was support provided early on:

But as I got through the mid-point on, toward dissertation, it was almost like I was just dropped off. Like I was put to the edge of the cliff and it was like, “Okay, good luck. Oh, do you have a parachute? Oh!” I mean, that’s what it felt like.

In contrast, Guzman highlighted the fact that the Brandman doctoral program provides students with consistent support throughout. He explained that he appreciated the way the dissertation process is embedded into the curriculum and students are essentially given a roadmap for completing their dissertation. To that end, guiding documents, such as the Brandman EdD Dissertation Handbook provide students with explicit guidance and timelines for completing the dissertation process in a timely manner.

EDOL 790: dissertation prospectus and advancement to candidacy. The Brandman EdD dissertation handbook explains that the EDOL 790 course is designed to assist students with developing the prospectus, which focuses on assessing the feasibility of the student’s proposed topic and research plan (see Appendix T). By the conclusion of EDOL 790, the student will produce a prospectus, which includes “most of the elements of a formal Chapter 1 plus a brief description of the anticipated research methodology and a lengthy list that shows the breadth of reading the researcher has already initiated.” Guzman described the prospectus course as a successful element of the program that “drives success in dissertation.”
In order to determine the extent to which the prospectus class assisted doctoral students in their preparation for writing the dissertation, Guzman and a fellow faculty member conducted longitudinal research on the levels of students’ perceived self-efficacy regarding their ability to take on a significant research project before and after the course. Guzman shared that over 4 or 5 years of data collection, he and his research partner have found an increase in student perception of self-efficacy across 15 domains of the research process following the completion of EDOL 790. Relatedly, Hightower noted the symbolism associated with the advancement to candidacy ritual students undergo at the conclusion of the prospectus course, where they present their overview of Chapter 1 and their personal growth as a leader, which they have documented through their Transformational Leadership Development Plan (TLDP). Hightower described the advancement to candidacy experience as “a passing to the next level in saying, ‘Hey, I’m okay. I’ve earned this. I’m ready for this.’ I think that actually has a lot of symbolism associated with it.”

**Proposal defense and the institutional review board (IRB).** Another key component to the success of the doctoral program is the Brandman University Institutional Review Board (BUIRB). According to the Brandman University website, the BUIRB has the responsibility and authority to review and approve all research projects by Brandman University faculty and students involving human or animal participants. It will approve only experiments that conform to the professional standards as understood within the relevant discipline. (para. 1)
All Brandman doctoral students must follow the requirements of the BUIRB process in order to gain permission to conduct their doctoral dissertation study. Although the BUIRB is comprised of faculty from across the university, key leaders of the EdD faculty participate on the BUIRB, which helps to ensure that consistently high standards are met for all approved dissertation studies. DeVore commented, “The way we structure dissertation support has grown immensely over the years and that’s another area where we have, probably in the human resource frame, have expanded the way we’ve done IRB. It made it more user friendly.”

**Developing a Dissertation Framework and Infrastructure**

When the Brandman doctoral program launched, there were plans to develop the dissertation process logistics, but none existed originally. That being the case, the program faculty and staff had to swiftly create these critical components necessary for students to complete the program. Former Doctoral Program Specialist Maris Alaniz recalls, “I developed all of the logistical processes for the dissertation process, which are everything on the back end. Larick developed the dissertation handbook with all of the content.” Alaniz was tasked with the daunting assignment of creating processes and resources for all logistical elements of the dissertation from scratch. She recalled her process of meeting with Larick and other faculty to identify what students would need to do to complete the dissertation, and then develop the infrastructure to ensure that those benchmarks could be met. She initially managed the workflow utilizing a spreadsheet and creating PDF documents for the various components of the dissertation completion process. She recalled, “They were very cumbersome, very laborious because everybody had to have PDF signatures and there’s a lot of follow up emails per form.” When her
initial request for funding to develop a digital dissertation tracking process was denied, Alaniz was tasked with collaborating with in-house programmers to “create an entire dissertation process from scratch. It took about a year to create that . . . in SharePoint.” Although the task of developing the dissertation process internally was incredibly time consuming, Alaniz noted that the final product cut down on a lot of the downtime, a lot of the errors that were being made because there was a lot of room for human error on the student side, and on the administrative side, and also for the chairs. Alaniz also celebrated the fact that although the process is not automated, the infrastructure she created greatly benefitted the doctoral program because “the infrastructure’s there where one person can manage it.” With the very limited operating budget of the doctoral program, this cost-saving design was critical to program success. Alaniz noted that other doctoral program competitors typically have a larger program staff, including a coordinator for each year of students as well as a director and a separate department that handles all of the dissertation work. With a mixture of disbelief and well-earned pride, Alaniz recalled, “I did all of that by myself for three and a half years and we enrolled twice as many students as other universities,” until the program was able to add a second program staff member.

**Keeping students motivated and focused on completion.** Although the doctoral program is designed to provide students with the strongest possible foundation upon which to complete their dissertation following coursework, faculty and cohort mentors acknowledged that the greatest barrier to students finishing the doctoral program was still completing the dissertation. Goodman shared that the
critical barrier is really student motivation, because it’s finding what it is that lights that fire to get your dissertation done. Is it time management? Is it I can’t just think anymore, this is too much? It’s like okay, it’s breaking it down to the pieces.

She contrasted the dissertation experience with the coursework portion of the program. She speculated that students become very skilled in achievement within the structure of the coursework, but completing the dissertation is still a significant challenge for some students. Goodman also shared an example of the complexity of trying to motivate students who fall behind in the process:

We have this group of Betas . . . I have four that I mentor, and one of them just started writing. Just started. I’m not on her committee. I’m just her mentor. I meet with her every week. She’s like, “Well, now that I only have nine months to get this done, I’m really devoted to getting it done.” I’m like, “Nine months is not very long.”

Goodman reflected that the most critical barrier to student completion is helping them to “understand, believe in themselves, have confidence, manage time and [not] stop. When you finish your advancement to candidacy, you’re writing the next day.”

Similarly, both Ainsworth and Osborne recounted their individual efforts to provide personalized support to students who had fallen behind in the dissertation process, checking in with them weekly and providing a time and place for them to focus on completing this culminating task.
Dissertation Success Rates

The 2018 Brandman EdD Viewbook advertises an 80% doctoral student graduation rate (see Appendix AE), which is significantly higher than the national average. These noteworthy outcomes are a testament to the commitment the faculty and staff have made to ensuring that doctoral students receive whatever support necessary to be able to complete the journey. Relatedly, instructors take their role as dissertation chair very seriously. For example, Lee expressed great appreciation for the training he received to then be able to expand his passion for research by providing trainings to other dissertation chairs.

In addition to their appreciation for the six comprehensive trainings that dissertation chairs receive annually, they also express great pride in assisting each student to reach his or her final goal of dissertation defense. Pendley recalled chairing the defense for the first two EdD program graduates of the Alpha cohort:

When Rowanda Coffin and Felicia Hacker were the two first graduates in this program, they defended on the same night as the first two graduates. That almost made me tear up, and that’s not an easy thing to do for me, but it was very emotional. They both did a great job. I know Dr. White was there at the defense, and I brought her in. Typically, you don’t have an outside reader, like some universities do, but I brought her in as an outside reader, she wasn’t a member, because I thought she should be a part of the first.

Similarly, Enomoto recalled a deeply moving experience from a dissertation defense ceremony he chaired at which the father of the doctoral candidate asked Enomoto via interpreter, “How does it feel to help someone achieve their dream?” Likewise,
Ainsworth identified the dissertation defense as one of his most meaningful experiences in the doctoral program. In particular, Ainsworth noted the pride associated with “having students complete the dissertation that most people thought couldn’t get it done and having them deliver a really solid product, students that I spent many, many hours with. Those have been very memorable to me.”

**Symbolism: Hooding and Graduation**

To commemorate the significant accomplishment of earning a doctorate in organizational leadership, the Brandman University doctoral program commencement weekend is steeped in symbolism and ritual. One such symbol is the doctoral program regalia (see Appendix AD). Zeppos reflected on her careful attention to detail in designing the EdD program regalia very early in the program development process to be distinctive compared to those from other programs (see Appendix Q). This same regalia was then modeled by EdDy and BEdDy for students throughout their immersion experiences as a reminder of the ultimate goal of their hard work. A second commencement symbol Zeppos and White created was a doctoral pin (see Appendix AE). Zeppos jokingly explained that she wanted the pin because “I’m not going to wear the regalia everywhere. So, Pat [White] and I designed the pin that you get at graduation.”

**Reception at Dean Zeppos’s home.** Another ritual of the commencement weekend that emerged over time was a reception hosted by Dean Zeppos at her home before the hooding ceremony for all doctoral students who completed the program. The tradition began as an offer made by Dean Zeppos during the Alpha class’s final immersion (see Appendix R). Zeppos recalled,
I said, “You guys have to finish your dissertation, you’re going to make me so mad if you don’t finish.” . . . I said, “Look, I’ll even have you come to my house, anybody that finishes, but you have to finish. You’re not welcome to my house unless you finish.”

The doctoral reception became a staple of the commencement weekend for students, their families, and the doctoral program faculty.

**Hooding ceremony.** The second gathering of commencement weekend was the hooding ceremony (see Appendix AF). According to the Brandman University website, the School of Education holds the hooding ceremony annually to “Honor doctoral graduates and celebrate the successful completion of their studies. The Doctoral Hooding Ceremony is in addition to and does not replace the University Commencement” (Brandman University, n.d.-c). The ticketed event is similar to commencement in that all faculty and graduates participate dressed in regalia and graduates are recognized individually. However, the event is more personalized than the formal commencement ceremony. The Brandman University (n.d.-c) website explains that during the hooding ceremony each graduate is called to the stage where the Dean of the School of Education places the doctoral hood over each graduate’s head “signifying his or her success in completing the doctoral program.” Each graduate is then given one minute to address the assembly regarding his or her experience. Cote reiterated the importance of the hooding ceremony, saying, “To me, the hooding is very symbolic. That process is very personal as opposed to just walking across the stage, which is what I did, and taking a picture.”
Faculty members concurred that the hooding and graduation ceremonies are deeply symbolic elements of completion of the doctoral process. Ainsworth explained that both the hooding ceremony and the graduation ceremony are quite moving. He noted the commencement weekend’s activities as his most memorable experiences in the program: “The hooding ceremony especially, but that whole graduation weekend is really the culmination of that experience.”

**Graduation.** The third and final ritual of commencement weekend is the graduation ceremony itself, which is held on the Chapman University campus on a Sunday evening in May each year. Zeppos explained that the graduation ceremony was a critical component to the symbolic aspect of the EdD experience. She noted, “If you go back and look at the tapes of commencement across the stage, there was not one student I didn’t hug on the stage. That was true.” Zeppos further recalled the exuberance of the doctoral graduates during the graduation ceremony; they would cheer for every mention of the School of Education as well as for Dean Zeppos and Associate Dean White. As Zeppos had designed, her hug to each graduate during the graduation ceremony symbolized the closing bookend of their doctoral journey, which had begun with her handshake at the doctoral program boot camp during their first immersion.

**Innovation Through Continuous Improvement**

The intentional focus on systematic evaluation, change, and improvement is a hallmark of the Brandman doctoral program. From the data collected through end-of-course surveys, to the feedback solicited at the conclusion of each day of immersion, the program is structured to engage in the cycle of continuous improvement. Alaniz shared,
What I have seen is the program get better and better each year. . . . We reevaluate the program each and every year to take a look at what we did well, what we could do better, and the things that we should continue to do and we’re not afraid of change.

In fact, Alaniz noted that the faculty and staff actually embrace change because it is the source of the program’s success. However, this process of reflective and systematic evaluation and refinement has itself evolved over the 6 years of program implementation.

**Improving Continuous Improvement**

Ainsworth reflected that the program “went through that initial entrepreneurial phase of everybody’s just creating things on the fly. The first immersions are like crazy making. People were doing stuff by the seat of their pants.” Ainsworth noted the contrast between those earlier, more chaotic years and the more recent years of the program, saying that the program transitioned to a “much more deliberate, mature kind of operation in year 3 where they really looked back at what had happened, and what needed to happen next so the development of the program became more measured.” With a solid foundation of the program’s core components in place, faculty and staff were able to move away from operating in survival mode. Ainsworth noted that rather than having to continually create things, the focus of the team turned to questions of improvement and refinement. He observed that, over time, “growth has been more deliberate and incremental compared to the gush of things that had to happen to create a new program.”

During the initial phase of the program, the evaluation and revision processes were limited in scope. However, Goodman noted that eventually the focus on revision expanded to include all elements of the program. She explained that now “its students
have a voice: it’s the food, it’s the temperature of the room, it’s the use of technology. Every time there’s an immersion, there’s another layer of innovation, another layer of excellence, another layer of support.” In alignment with change theory, Larick explained that every organization must undergo a consistent evolutionary process of innovation or risk normalizing and then declining. To that point, Alaniz noted that not only does the Brandman doctoral program embrace change, it has the unique capacity to implement change immediately and moves swiftly to implement changes that will increase the student learning experience or better address workforce needs. Similarly, Goodman noted, “They constantly again looked at that continuous improvement, that Kaizen. They don’t let go of anything. They just make what they’ve had better.”

**Refining the coursework.** From the program’s inception, there was a focus on ensuring that the coursework was innovative, relevant, and engaging. In order to ensure that each course maintains a level of excellence, a course custodian is assigned. The course custodian is responsible for engaging the faculty in a full review and revision of each course annually. Larick shared that the faculty use the student evaluation data to inform their systematic review of each course. Larick explained that they ask themselves,

“Where do we need to improve? Where do we need to change? What do we need to add to keep it current?” And then make those changes. So, every course changes every year. I think those things make what we’re doing different.

**Refining professional development.** In addition to refining the coursework annually, the Brandman faculty and staff use the same reflective model to evaluate and refine all other elements of the program, such as immersion activities, recruitment,
onboarding, and professional development exercises. Ainsworth noted that there is “more emphasis placed now on training of instructors, and that’s both a Brandman thing and a doctoral program thing.” As an example of the lack of training provided in the early years, Ainsworth shared, “We had people, we were just shoving them into roles originally and they didn’t know how to work Adobe you know? That’s me. I mean that happened to me. ‘Here, run a webinar.’ Okay. But with no training.” However, as the program structures improved, trainings such as the instructor certification course became available to all instructors. Overall, Goodman shared that the research-based change model implemented by the doctoral program faculty and staff “has increased everything about the program. I told my Thetas yesterday, ‘You are so lucky. You’re getting the best. You’re getting the best, because you’re at Brandman’s continuous improvement.’”

**Barriers to Continuous Improvement**

As is true of all organizations, the Brandman doctoral program faces barriers and challenges to the process of continuous improvement. White described the challenge of continually identifying the program’s next step. She shared that the faculty is always asking,

How can we do better? How can we take what we’ve got, which is pretty darn good, and make it even better? What are the trends? What’s perking out there on the horizon, and how do we get ourselves and our students ready for that?

Similarly, Pendley noted that because the program is currently in a very good position, “The only barriers would be barriers we create ourselves by not staying vigilant, and maybe that would be what I would say . . . a potential barrier is us becoming satisfied with good and not continuing to strive for great.”
Summary

Chapter IV presented and analyzed the data gathered as part of this qualitative historical study on the doctoral program in organizational leadership at Brandman University from 2013 to 2017. Data were obtained from 16 interview participants who were identified through the snowball sampling method due to their respective roles as key leaders in the doctoral program during the specified timeframe. Interview responses were coded according to Bolman and Deal’s (2017) four-frame model of innovative organizational leadership. The 16 interview participants generated a total of 1,478 codes across all frames. When directly asked which frame or combination of frames had the greatest impact on the evolution of the doctoral program, interview participants most often cited the human resource frame. However, in the survey responses regarding the four frames individually, the structural frame generated the most codes, accounting for 471 (31.86%) of the 1,478 total codes. Interview participants regularly noted the importance of focusing on multiple frames.

The qualitative data analysis was then followed by a historical narrative account of the evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership from 2013 to 2017. The narrative recounts key elements of the program’s successful evolution, and highlights the participants’ overarching perception that the program’s commitment to continual transformation and innovation led to its significant success. As is the custom of a historical study, the narrative provided in Chapter IV is told using the perspective and words of those who were directly involved with the program from 2013 to 2017.
Chapter IV provided qualitative data analysis of this study along with a detailed historical narrative. Chapter V addresses study findings and conclusions. Additionally, Chapter V explores both implications for action and recommendations for further research. Finally, Chapter V offers closing remarks and reflections.
CHAPTER V: FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION’S

Overview

Chapter V begins with an overview of this research study, purpose statement, research questions, research design, methodology, and population. Then the chapter reviews major findings, unexpected findings, and conclusions. Finally, Chapter V concludes with implications for action, recommendations for further research, and closing remarks and reflections.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this historical research study was to document the evolution of the Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership at Brandman University from concept and design to implementation to present iterations (2013-2017). In addition, it was the purpose of this study to examine changes in vision, structure, curriculum, and the factors that influenced key leaders and decisions from the perspective of Bolman and Deal’s four-frame model, including structural, human resource, political, and symbolic frames.

Research Questions

1. What were the key structural factors and decisions that led to the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership?

2. What were the key human resource factors and decisions that led to the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership?

3. What were the key political factors and decisions that led to the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership?
4. What were the key *symbolic* factors and decisions that led to the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership?

5. What frame or combination of frames (structural, human resource, political, symbolic) do the participants perceive had the greatest impact on the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership and why?

**Research Design**

Gay et al. (2009) contended that the purpose of qualitative research is to better understand a particular situation or group. The purpose of this study was to explore the evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership as experienced by those directly involved in the process from 2013 to 2017. This study is part of a two-person thematic qualitative historical study on the Brandman doctoral program, with one researcher studying program design and implementation with the Alpha cohort in 2012, and this researcher studying the evolution of the program from the Beta cohort of 2013 through the Zeta cohort of 2017. To that end, the peer researchers evaluated several qualitative research designs in order to identify the design that best fit the subject matter and would produce the intended result.

**Methodology**

Research on innovation in institutions of higher education has been conducted utilizing several methodologies, including case study, mixed methods, and historic research. The case study methodology was defined by Creswell (1998) as “an exploration of a bounded system or case (or multiple cases) over time through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information rich context” (Patton, 2015, p. 259). While this methodology has been used to highlight specific developmental
periods of educational institutions (Perry, 2010), it was not the appropriate method for this study, as it did not provide the level of historical depth required to chronicle the innovative practices of an institution from its inception through its first 6 years of implementation.

The mixed methods research methodology is a single study containing both a qualitative study and a quantitative study. Patton (2015) asserted that such a study helps to mitigate the bias inherent in any one research methodology. While the mixed methods research design has been used to study an educational institution’s implementation of a particular innovation (Marsh, 2013), this methodology, however, was not an appropriate methodology for this study because it does not focus on the depth and breadth necessary for a comprehensive study of an organization from its inception.

The historical research methodology is “the systematic and objective location, evaluation, and synthesis of evidence in order to establish facts and draw conclusions concerning past events” (Borg & Gall, 1971, p. 260). Gottschalk (1950) outlined the four elements of historical research as follows:

1. Collection of relevant artifacts and interviews
2. Identification of “unauthentic” artifacts or interviews (or their parts)
3. Identification of “credible” elements of artifacts or interviews
4. Arrangement of these credible elements into a narrative that accurately reflects the time, place, and people involved in the historical subject of study.

Gottschalk identified one of the critical benefits of historical research as its ability to enable humanity to learn from the actions and thinking of the past. A historical researcher must engage in both external and internal criticism. External criticism relates
to determining if a particular document or artifact is truly from the attributed source, whereas internal criticism relates to determining the credibility of what is contained in the document, artifact, or personal interview (Borg & Gall, 1971; Gottschalk, 1950). The historical method utilized in Cook’s (2000) study of the inception and evolution of The University of La Verne’s doctoral program serves as a strong model of the depth a historical study provides regarding the individual contributions and perceptions of an organization’s evolution.

Ultimately, the peer researchers of this study, with faculty guidance, decided historical research was the most appropriate research method for this study because, as Borg and Gall (1971) explained, “Although historical research is perhaps the most difficult type of educational research to do well, it is important and necessary because it gives us an insight into some educational problems that could not be gained by any other technique” (p. 260). Researchers further explain that historical research provides insight into human nature that can be applied to current situations (Borg & Gall, 1971; Gottschalk, 1950). Unlike early historical research, which relied on historical documents and artifacts as the primary means of generating meaning from the distant past (Borg & Gall, 1971), this study relied on the collection and analysis of primary source data gathered through interviews with individuals directly involved with the institution as well as institutional artifacts and relics. In order to ensure the history of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership was accurate, the data collected in this study were subjected to rigorous analysis using both internal and external criticism.
Population

A population is a “group of elements or cases, whether individuals, objects, or events, that conform to specific criteria and to which we intend to generalize the results of the research” (McMillian & Schumacher, 2010, p. 129). Borg and Gall (1971) further clarified that a study’s population refers to “all the members of a real or hypothetical set of persons, events or objects” (p. 115). The population of a historical study is of critical importance, because “the historical method is . . . a process by which the historian attempts to test the truthfulness of the reports of observations made by others” (Borg & Gall, 1971, p. 262). In this study, the population being studied included all 178 leaders of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership from its inception to 2017. This population included 18 members of the Board of Regents, 34 administrators, 99 faculty, and 27 campus directors across California and Washington (Brandman University, n.d.-a., n.d.-b., 2013). Due to the constraints of distance, time, and finances, the researcher was not able to interview the entire population of 178, so a representative target population was identified as a subset within the full population.

Target Population

A study’s target population refers to “the population to which the researcher would ideally like to generalize study results” (Gay et al., 2009, p. 125). For this study, purposeful sampling was used to identify the target population, using the following criteria: key leaders who worked at Brandman and were directly involved in the implementation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership from 2013-2017, taken from the full population of 178 leaders.
Sample

Researchers often use a sample population, or smaller subset of the target population, from which to gather data. This practice typically enables researchers to control for limiting factors such as the geographic distance between members of the population, and the cost and time it would require to reach all members of a population (Borg & Gall, 1971). Due to the relatively small number of individuals included in the target population of this study, the target population and the sample population were the same.

Sample Participant Selection

The sample for this study was identified utilizing the snowball sampling method. Snowball sampling is defined as a process whereby “each successive participant or group is named by a preceding group or individual. Participant referrals are the basis for choosing a sample” (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010, p. 327). The initial snowball list was obtained by the peer researchers e-mailing the founding dean of the School of Education to familiarize her with the study and request a list of names of individuals who were influential in the concept, design, and implementation of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership from concept and design through 2017. As she knew all key leaders, Zeppos provided a list of recommended key leaders to be interviewed, divided by the target dates of this thematic study: concept and design through implementation with the Alpha cohort of 2013; and program evolution from the Beta cohort of 2013 through the Zeta cohort of 2017. The peer researchers reviewed this list in consultation with Brandman University faculty.
Once the study was granted Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval by Brandman University (Appendix A), the members of the initial list of the sample population were asked to participate in the study’s interview process. Participants were requested to participate in the study using the following protocol:

1. An e-mail was sent by the researcher to the potential sample participant, introducing the study and requesting interview participation.

2. Once the potential sample participants confirmed their willingness to participate in an interview, they were provided with four guiding documents:
   a. Formal invitation to participate in the study (Appendix B)
   b. Brandman University Research Participant Bills of Rights (Appendix C)
   c. Informed Consent Form (Appendix D)
   d. Copies of the interview protocol and questions (Appendix E)

The snowball list of interview participants was expanded as the interviews were conducted with the key leaders identified by Dean Zeppos on the initial list. At the conclusion of each interview, the interview participant was shown the list of interview participants. Each leader was then asked to provide recommendations of other leaders who were most critical to the development of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership, and therefore, should be included in this historical study of the program. Names of individuals recommended by more than one interview participant were then reviewed by the peer researchers, in consultation with faculty, to determine if they should be included in the study.
Major Findings

The five major findings of this study are reviewed below, organized according to research question. Major findings were consistent with the literature on innovation and change management reviewed in this study, particularly the work of Drucker (1985a, 1985b, 1999, 2001, 2006, 2014) and Bolman and Deal (2017). The major findings of this study highlight the ideas and insights surfaced through interviews conducted with sixteen key leaders of the Brandman Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership for this study, as well as an analysis of program artifacts from 2013 through 2017.

Major Finding 1: Clear Focus on Transformational Leadership and Change Is Necessary

The first research question asked, “What were the key structural factors and decisions that led to the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership?”

The participants of this study repeatedly noted the critical role of the doctoral program’s focus on producing transformational leaders by means of an innovative doctoral program structure implemented by highly skilled transformational leaders. In particular, participants noted the Transformational Change Project (TCP) as a key structural element of the program that permeated all other elements and served as the replacement for traditional comprehensive exams because student completion of the TCP demonstrated sophisticated skill in implementing transformational change in a real organization. Ninety (19%) of the 471 total codes for the structural frame were generated by references to the role of transformational change and the TCP in the success of the Brandman EdD program.
Over time, the program’s clarity regarding the definition of transformational change, importance of hiring transformational leaders, and traits of a truly transformational change project increased and became deeply embedded within the structures of the program. Much like the web of inclusion and all-channel network structural models described by Bolman and Deal (2017), the Brandman doctoral program utilizes open lines of communication, training, and participation to ensure that all staff and students understand and are focused on the goal of becoming and continually evolving as transformational leaders engaged in leading transformational change efforts (Bolman & Deal, 2017).

The clearly defined expectation to be and to produce transformational leaders provides a very strong guiding purpose for members of the Brandman doctoral team to work toward, while simultaneously allowing for personal creativity in implementation (Bolman & Deal, 2017). To that end, study participants repeatedly noted the fact that students received individualized coaching and guidance on the TCP from their cohort mentor, who was a noted transformational change leader in his or her field. Participants also noted the unique identities developed by individual cohorts and team competitions, such as the innovation tournament, as expressions of creativity.

It is important to note that the Mission of the Brandman EdD program reads as follows:

The Ed. D. Program in Organizational Leadership develops visionary leaders who are creative agents of change in transforming their diverse organizations through collaboration, innovation, positive influence, strategic thinking and a profound commitment to lifelong learning. (Brandman University, 2019, “Mission”)
To that end, the first EdD Program Learning Outcome is identified as Transformational Leadership, which is described as “Creating a vision of the future as an ethical agent of change, who mobilizes stakeholders to transform the organization” (Brandman University, 2019, “Program Learning Outcomes,” para. 1). Patricia Clark White shared that hiring individuals who were skilled transformational leaders themselves was the first step. Their personal skill was critical to their role in developing EdD graduates who were also successful transformational leaders. White explained,

We wanted to make sure that these transformational leaders paid close attention to vision, diversity, collaboration, political intelligence, and just be really focused on change and leading transformational change effectively and doing it with the idea of serving people and lifting people up and transforming themselves first so that they could transform other who could then transform their organizations.

Founding Dean Christine Zeppos explained her intentional focus on transformational leadership from the beginning:

But really in filling the space of transformational leadership in this way and focusing on values and so forth . . . there is no other real competition in that way. So, I think I not only wanted to have a doctorate, but I wanted to have a different doctorate and I wanted it to be something that graduates were known to be different.

To that end, the participants of this study noted that one of the most significant outcomes of the EdD program has been the significant transformation that occurs both within and through each student. Len Hightower reflected that he could see a pronounced transformation occur in some of his students and he was sure they would make a
significant contribution “because they’ve realized their power. They’re not just this little
cog in a wheel, but they actually can impact broader things. I think it’s all about the
students actually.”

**Major Finding 2: Hiring a Team of Highly Skilled Individuals With Deeply Held
Shared Values Enables Doctoral Programs to Evolve Rapidly**

The second research question asked, “What were the key human resource factors
and decisions that led to the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral
Program in Organizational Leadership?”

The participants of this study repeatedly noted the importance of identifying
highly skilled team members who share the key value of being student focused as the
most critical human resource component of the EdD program. From the human resource
frame, 167 (39%) of the 428 total codes related to the importance of the level of skill
each faculty and staff member brought to the team. In particular, participants noted the
importance of team members being scholarly practitioners, meaning they are highly
experienced leaders in their field who also hold a doctorate and have also taught at the
doctoral level.

Extensive prior leadership experience and a deeply held commitment to student
success were hallmarks of the Brandman doctoral program faculty from the program’s
inception onward. Len Hightower humorously noted the importance of this foundation of
experienced leaders, saying:

One of the important symbols is actually, if you think about it this way, it’s a
really old faculty. . . . What you see there is the wisdom, if you can see it. If you
listen to Pat [Clark White] and Keith [Larick] talk for a while, and Doug
[DeVore] and some of the others, and the cohort mentors, you get, “Oh crud. They know what they’re talking about.” That’s a symbol actually. All that gray hair is something of a symbol of the years of experience and wisdom. You can see, I think it brought a certain peace or calm to the students. When we got up and spoke, people tended to listen.

Hightower further noted that the depth of leadership experience of the faculty enabled them to move swiftly at Brandman even when the program was in its nascent years.

For a brand-new program, we acted like we’d been around for a while almost from the beginning, at least when I first started in the program. We all acted like we know what we’re doing. We’ve been doing this for a while. In essence, that is true. It’s like, oh yeah, we have. We just haven’t done it at this particular place in this specific configuration, but a whole bunch of us have been educators trying to teach leadership forever. This is nothing new.

Due in large part to the highly skilled faculty and staff, the Brandman EdD program has achieved significant success from the start. With an inaugural cohort more than four times the anticipated size, a program completion rate more than 50% higher than the national average, and a perfect accreditation review at the end of the first year of implementation, the program has generated considerable notice from the EdD community and beyond. As a result, sentiment among the faculty is also very strongly supportive of the work. Brandman Cohort Mentor and Adjunct Instructor Myrna Cote reflected of the program’s positive reputation,
It’s taken a while, but if it wasn’t a quality program, if it didn’t deserve positive word of mouth, positive recognition, it wouldn’t get it, so I’m just really proud to be a part of it. . . . I just want to say that I’m really proud to be a part of it.

**Major Finding 3: A Lack of Transparency Between University Leaders and Doctoral Program Leaders Creates Barriers**

The third research question asked, “What were the key political factors and decisions that led to the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership?”

While all individuals within an organization regularly vie for access to power and scarce resources, participants of this study overwhelming attributed the political challenges in this arena to a lack of transparency regarding resources between university leaders and doctoral program leaders. As a result of the perceived lack of transparency, members of the doctoral team expressed deep concern for the university leaders’ lack of familiarity with the program’s structure and strengths. Several participants of this study noted that university leaders have not attended an immersion yet have put pressure on the doctoral team to reduce or eliminate the immersion component of the program. Relatedly, several participants in this study noted that the significant revenue the doctoral program generates for the program is not proportionally returned to the program for implementation. Finally, participants noted that not being provided a budget with which to work generated antagonism and decreased trust.

The strong level of unity and respect demonstrated between the various members of the EdD faculty and staff contrasted sharply with their observations and evaluations regarding the lack of sufficient funding and fiscal autonomy provided by university
leaders. This tension reflects a typical dichotomy addressed by Bolman and Deal (2017), who asserted that “agreement and harmony are easier to achieve when everyone shares similar values, beliefs, and cultural ways” (p. 185). That being said, they also noted “scarce resources and incompatible preferences cause needs to collide” (Bolman & Deal, 2017, p. 190). The interpretation of the faculty and staff regarding the budget constraints placed on the doctoral program and its individual faculty members was generally described as unfair because of the significant revenue generated by the program’s tuition, and a manifestation of the disconnection between the program and university leaders. To that end, participants shared concerns that the university was going to “starve the golden goose” by not funding it adequately. In the same vein, participants expressed deep concern that the university leaders do not attend immersion and do not appear to have a clear sense of the value of the program’s innovative design features. Expressing the general consensus that the university leaders are disconnected from the program, one participant shared, “I feel really strongly about that, that they really are not aware of how wonderful this program is.” Likewise, Christine Zeppos shared a story about the disconnection she experienced between the marketing team and the EdD program:

In the later part of 2017, when some new marketing folks came in, they thought the immersions were a huge liability for us because we can get more people into the program because they have to fly to immersions. And so, the discussion was to get rid of immersions, and I was pretty darn persistent about it, that we can’t, that I’ll create another program. We can create something in educational leadership or something that’s a check box program that can be fully online. It’s not this program. This program is set up that the immersions are critical and
maybe we can do immersions elsewhere too. At one point I was thinking if we got big enough, we would have one in Chicago, one in New York, one Texas and have these hubs of immersions.

Consistent with Bolman and Deal’s (2017) assertion that one of the key traits of effective leaders is the ability to “inspire trust and build relationships” (p. 339), the strong level of trust and relationship within the EdD program differed dramatically from the distance perceived between them and the university leaders.

Major Finding 4: Symbolic Rituals and Play Are Critical to Developing and Maintaining a Healthy Culture

The fourth research question asked, “What were the key symbolic factors and decisions that led to the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership?”

Participants in this study noted that rituals and play were most critical to the symbolic frame, with rituals amassing 98 codes and play amassing 31 codes for a total of 129 (46.9%) of the 275 total codes for the symbolic frame. More specifically, participants noted the great importance of rituals enacted at immersion to the development and perpetuation of culture, such as the innovation tournament, activities related to That Used to Be Us, and the end of year luncheon that concludes with the passing of the torch from the upper classmen to the lower classmen. Bolman and Deal (2017) explained that “enacting a ritual connects an individual or group to something mystical, more than words or rational thinking can capture” (p. 251). The EdD program rituals enacted during immersion connect students to a family of scholar practitioners,
both those pursuing a doctoral degree and those who are guiding them on the path. Enomoto shared,

The rituals . . . are really a lot of fun, and like just the fact that everyone loves to get back together and see not just . . . their cohorts, but the other cohorts that maybe they’ve had classes with, that’s been fun.

In like manner, participants of the Brandman doctoral program noted the significant role of play in developing and maintaining a healthy culture within the program. In particular, adventures with program mascots, EdDy and BEdDy, and jokes about the clicker surfaced most often as important elements of play within the program, modeling the important balance of silliness and intensity of work. Bolman and Deal (2017) described the importance of humor in an organization explaining, “It draws people together . . . established solidarity and . . . is a way to illuminate and break frames, indicating that any single definition of a situation is arbitrary” (p. 257). They also noted that “joking and playful banter are essential sources of invention and team spirit” (Bolman & Deal, 2017, p. 272). As demonstrated by the evening escapades of program mascots EdDy and BEdDy, the Brandman doctoral students embraced their role in the doctoral journey and invented additions to the collective motivational story of all the amazing fun Brandman doctoral students have once they have worn the symbolic regalia and crossed the finish line of graduation.

Major Finding 5: Hiring and Maintaining the Right Team Is Critical to Success

The fifth research question asked, “What frame or combination of frames (structural, human resource, political, symbolic) do the participants perceive had the
greatest impact on the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership and why?"

When asked to identify the frame having the greatest impact on the evolution of the doctoral program, the human resource frame was mentioned by 14 (87.5%) of the 16 interview participants. Six participants identified the human resource frame as having had the greatest impact, and the other eight participants listed the human resource frame in conjunction with one or more additional frames. While the structural frame received the most total codes of the study, when asked directly about the frame of greatest impact, nearly all participants indicated that the human resource frame was the most important or one of two most important frames.

Bolman and Deal (2017) asserted that “strong companies know the kinds of people they want and hire those who fit the mold” (p. 139). This practice is evident in the hiring practices of the Brandman Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership, where a significant number of the team members had relationships with one another prior to working for Brandman, which enabled them to solidify as a team at Brandman more quickly and cohesively than ever expected. This hiring strategy has already paid significant dividends to the university in the quality of doctoral experience the team provides to doctoral students.

Bolman and Deal (2017) noted that “When individuals find satisfaction and meaning in work, organizations profit from the effective use of their talent and energy” (p. 156). Such energy was evident in abundance throughout the interviews conducted for this study. Team members expressed great regard for one another, such as when Enomoto referred to cohort mentor, Walter Buster, as a legend among superintendents.
Several participants noted that they felt honored and out of place being in the professional development room with such acclaimed leaders. Likewise, the energy and loyalty of the team was expressed in stories shared of cohort mentors such as Cheryl-Marie Osborne and Patrick Ainsworth independently creating weekend study sessions to help students who had fallen off track to get back to work and complete their dissertation. Patricia Clark White noted the significance of the faculty living as transformational leaders themselves and being “student-oriented to the nth degree.” Likewise, participants of this study noted Dr. White’s transformational leadership of the EdD program. Marilou Ryder reflected,

   It’s a really different program in that the leadership under this program, obviously Dr. White, she is so innovative, and so embracing of creative ideas that she really never says no to anything, so we just all feel so comfortable with being able to just do anything we really want as long as it aligns with the course objectives. I think that’s what has made this program so notable throughout the whole state.

   **Unexpected Findings**

   Along with the five major findings identified in the study, aligned to each of the five research questions, four additional findings emerged unexpectedly as well. The four unexpected findings address the topics of alignment of the program to individual values, the process of continuous innovation, the challenges associated with ever-changing technology, and the doctoral program’s need for a comprehensive succession plan. Each unexpected finding surfaced throughout many of the interviews and reflect areas that may not have aligned with one of the four frames specifically but relate to the nature and success of the program, both presently and in the future.
Unexpected Finding 1: A Profound Depth of Commitment to Core Values

Author and New York Times columnist, David Brooks (2019), noted in his recent work titled *The Second Mountain*, that in the second, more fulfilling phase of life, a deeply reflective person comes to

want the things that are truly worth waning . . . they want to be the one consumed—by a moral cause . . . they want interdependence—to be enmeshed in a web of warm relationships . . . they want intimacy, responsibility, and commitment. (pp. xiii-xiv)

Such a description reflects the character of the key leaders of the Brandman Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership, as exemplified in their interviews for this study.

Many of the participants noted that their affiliation with the Brandman EdD program was due to the deep resonance they felt with the program’s core values. Each member of the team has already had a full career of leadership successes and left a legacy of success in each organization they led, yet this program offers something different: an opportunity to invest deeply in the lives of the next generation of leaders; an amazing opportunity to live out their deepest-held values regarding the way one should live in this world, alongside an all-start list of others who uphold those same values in all they do. Several participants of this study noted that they are retired and do not need to work, but they feel honored and invigorated by this opportunity to be part of something truly meaningful and incredibly satisfying.

Bolman and Deal (2019) discussed the interesting phenomenon of a growing organizational “dependence on well-trained, loyal human capital” (p. 129). While the Brandman EdD team could be described as well-trained and loyal, their loyalty has less
to do with the excellent management of the organization and more to do with deeply resonant attraction of a fervent commitment to transformational leadership, continuous improvement and growth, and the opportunity to pour into the lives of others in a way that is more meaningful and supportive than they themselves received. Jeff Lee noted that within the Brandman program,

There’s is just that common non-negotiable way to be, that way to act, the way to live as someone who’s associated with this program. And those are kind of the attributes that I would say are at the core of somebody who’s a full-time faculty in this program.

**Unexpected Finding 2: Purposeful Focus on all Four Frames Enables Continuous Innovation**

The Brandman EdD program’s innovative success has been the result of careful attention to all four frames in the Bolman and Deal Model (2017). According to the program Mission Statement, “The Ed. D. Program in Organizational Leadership develops visionary leaders who are creative agents of change in transforming their diverse organizations through collaboration, innovation, positive influence, strategic thinking and a profound commitment to lifelong learning” (Brandman University, 2019, “Mission”). These traits of transformational leadership speak to the structural, political, human resource, and symbolic elements of successful innovative leadership. Even more specifically, guiding program literature such as the Program Learning Outcomes speak to the importance of innovation through focusing on a broad spectrum of factors. Brandman University EdD Program Learning Outcome 6 reads, “Creativity and Sustained Innovation: Develop a culture of divergent thinking and responsible risk taking that
harnesses the potential of available human capital to transform the organization” (Brandman University, 2019, “Program Learning Outcomes,” para. 6). As Drucker (1985a) explained, successful innovators employ the “practice of systematic innovation,” and in so doing, they “try to create value and make a contribution” (p. 34).

In practice, key leaders of the Brandman EdD program utilized a system of relentless self-reflection and fully transparent management to ensure no element of the program became too sacred for scrutiny. Laurie Goodman described the process:

The structure is one of continuous improvement. The course custodian is the person who, whenever someone teaches a course, asks them “What about this course worked well?” So that structure of constant reflection, evaluation and improvement for every single course, for every Immersion, for every professional development day. That structure of feedback and analysis, and they don’t just take the qualitative from the interviews and surveys. They also look for artifacts. That structure which aligns, of course, with what research is has increased everything about the program. I told my Thetas yesterday, “You are so lucky. You’re getting the best. You’re getting the best, because you’re at Brandman’s continuous improvement.

Likewise, many study participants referenced the nearly religious fervency of the program’s adherence to evaluating and revising every element to remain relevant and innovative. To that point, Keith Larick noted,

You have to keep innovating. You reach that peak and then you become normal. And the challenge is going to be to keep changing and keep innovating so that every year we’re different than everybody else. And sometimes it’ll be little
things and sometimes it will be big things, but that every year we’re a little bit different.

In her concluding interview remarks, Patricia Clark White reflected on the integration of the four frames to the innovative success of the Brandman doctoral program. She shared,

I had to really think about it when I answered your question about the which is most important, when you think about which is the most important. I had to think about it because they’re all so important. I think, if it were . . . I think the best part of this program is that we are able to give attention to all four frames and that we have really been able to integrate all four frames into what we do, but it’s always going to be human beings who are the most.

**Unexpected Finding 3: The Rapidly Changing Landscape of Technology Poses a Persistent Challenge to Innovation**

Although one of the strengths of the Brandman EdD program is its hybrid structure, an unexpected finding was the challenge that student participants experienced with implementing various technology elements, training faculty to effectively utilize the tools, and building a pedagogical framework that focused on, in the words of Jeffrey Lee, the “meaningful and purposeful use of technology.” Several study participants bemoaned the challenges the instructional team faced using Adobe Connect for classes and the strong resistance of the university IT team to explore and implement WebEx. In contrast to the in-person tech support provided by the School of Education Tech Team, which was repeatedly lauded for going above and beyond to ensure that immersions had excellent
technology access, the key leaders of the Brandman program were deeply disappointed with the lack of support of the IT infrastructure team for program implementation.

The use of outdated tech tools was one constraint noted in the study. Larick (2019) explained, “Using Adobe Connect almost killed us. There were a lot of reasons behind it, but the university had a contract with Adobe which they couldn’t break, but our tech department resisted looking at anything else.” He also explained that the lack of integration of programs into a single interface created inefficiencies and frustration for team members. Larick said, “We have an overlay from Blackboard . . . We’ve got five different systems we have to access to get stuff, and it shouldn’t be that way.”

Another significant tech challenge in the EdD program was the process of expanding the knowledge and skills of a somewhat older core faculty to both navigate the tools efficiently and also fully embrace the pedagogy of effective online instruction. Hightower explained,

You have a group of faculty who have a tremendous amount of experience, life experience, professional experience, but they’re not particularly adept at teaching online. I was in charge of training all those folks. How do I get them up-to-speed with getting the most out of Adobe Connect, which is what we used at the time, and Blackboard, and just all of it? Right?”

Likewise, Jeffrey Lee noted his challenge in providing trainings to build the capacity and shift the mindset of the faculty. Lee shared, “I would do things like how do you use breakout rooms in Adobe, how do you do recorded announcements, video announcements. . . . But technology is just a tool at the end of the day.” He said, “We’ve been pretty successful over time to hold hands and guide the late adopters, but also let the
early adopters kind of run with the technology and provide these [professional development trainings] three times a year.”

**Unexpected Finding 4: Succession Planning for This Program Does Not Yet Exist, Which Poses a Significant Threat to the Long-Term Viability of This Innovative Program**

The most striking of the unexpected findings of this study was the fact that although the key leaders of the Brandman EdD program had been meticulous in identifying, engaging, and mobilizing the best and brightest leaders with shared values and a commitment to personal and professional excellence, no succession plan for the program leadership yet exists. The contrast between the laser-like focus that had been used to create the initial team did not appear to be at work to identify and groom the next generation of program leaders. Goodman explained the challenge in this manner:

I actually was having a conversation with Dr. Larick about this, and that is a succession plan. We’re old. You’re young. I’m trying to think, do we have . . . . We do have a mentor that’s in her 40s. She’s extremely experienced, just a remarkable CMO, Cheryl-Marie Osborne. Dr. Lee is in his 40s also. . . . The rest of us that are in our 50s almost 60, and 60s and almost 70s, and 70s, we need a succession plan. The succession plan to find - who would replace Dr. Larick, who would replace Dr. White? I don’t know where they’re at. It just brings tears to my eyes to even think about them not being part of the program. I don’t ever want to not be part of this program, but we need to be replaced by you guys. I think that has to be part of their structure and innovation, is working in a succession plan to replace all of us.
In the same manner, Larick reflected,

"Staffing is going to be your problem because we’re understaffed and there’s a huge potential for burnout and people leaving us to go to another university, taking the experience they have from Brandman leverage as a job, for as much money in less work. So that is a bit of concern."

He went on to explain that a second challenge the program is facing is that we have no succession plan at this point. And Dr. White and I particularly need to replace ourselves. So that’s finding other people who’ve been superintendents who’ve had university experience, who have membership under key organizations and they’re more or less known qualities in California because that attracts people. It builds trust by your track record and that we have to do again, be intentional about doing it. So, I’m watching now people who are coming into our program and graduated, they need about all right, who else there, which have a dozen people who might be good fits for us to see if we can bring back in here as faculty.

When considering the qualities of the next generation of EdD program leadership, study participants reflected on the significant level of accomplishment, experience, and connection that is needed to continue the work. Keith Larick wondered, “What people have experiences that can replace us, and push the whole agenda to another level different than what we’re doing now but without losing what our core values are all about?” In the same vein, Len Hightower noted the importance of selecting leaders who are aligned to the vision and mission of the program and, therefore, understand why the more expensive elements of program implementation are essential. He shared, “By right,
I mean people who buy into that vision, buy into those values, get why this design is so important, why that personal growth thing is so important. It’s the easiest thing to lop off.”

Noting the urgency of the succession planning matter, Patrick Ainsworth mused, Where’s the succession planning? It is just going to take one health issue with Keith, or Dr. White, or Doug, and all the sudden things are in turmoil. Marylou’s in pretty good shape but she could leave at any time. I mean, yeah people change over time. I think that’s a barrier but the QR thing, how do you continue to do that if Keith is the only person reading it? It just doesn’t seem realistic, especially if you compound it each year because each year you have some students finish but then you have the students that aren’t so suddenly you’ve got 50, 100.

Unfortunately, cultivating the type of relationship that identifies and prepares young leaders to be the next leadership team of the EdD program will not be completed quickly. Zeppos explained the process of building a diverse team of rising leaders by saying,

You have to be intentional in that, especially with people of color. And I think too many deans don’t do this. We needed more diverse faculty and it’s not going to always be people like you. And so, to intentionally go after people that may not have thought of themselves in that next role is really, we have to be intentional in doing that. Because in a lot of cultures that’s just not their nature to say push, push, push my way into this position. But I think that you have what it takes.
Zeppos went on to say,

So I’ve had to dip into people that I’ve seen having great teaching skills that I brought on this faculty and then you nurture them into the higher ed environment.
And they’ve been some of my best hires, but it’s gotta be very intentional, so.
They’re not just going to apply.

Zeppos further noted that although the key leaders they hired for the original leadership have been incredible, they were not as diverse as the program needed:

We’ve never done a good job of going outside and getting more people outside of education. And that’s probably one my biggest failures is that we needed to be more intentional of getting business leaders, higher ed leaders too. Because we’re way too K-12 focused, way too K-12 focused. Part of that’s a little political because that’s who Pat and Keith know, but each of their contacts in K-12 have been too good to pass up.

Conclusions

The use of the historical study methodology provided an opportunity to investigate the lived experience of key leaders of the Brandman Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership from 2013 to 2017 from the innovation perspective of Bolman and Deal’s (2017) four-frame model. This study yielded five major findings and four unexpected findings. Based on the findings outlined above, and in alignment with the literature, the following conclusions and implications for action are outlined. In general, the findings address the importance of leaders carefully considering each of the four frames: structural, political, human resource, and symbolic in order to most effectively understand the complexities and paradox within their organization (Bolman & Deal,
Additionally, leaders must nimbly switch between frames to grasp a broad enough sense of the landscape of their organization to ensure that they can generate a wide range of options for addressing challenges and remaining innovative (Bolman & Deal, 2017). Key leaders of the Brandman EdD program managed the paradox of the organization by holding tightly to the core values of transformational leadership and student support, while providing great latitude in implementation strategies and a warmly inclusive culture of continuous feedback and change. Such tight yet loose practices reflect Collins and Porras’s (2002) framework for visionary organizations.

**Conclusion 1: Focus on Transformational Leadership Yields Highly Skilled Transformational Leaders, Therefore Hiring Practices Should Concentrate on Core Values Such as Transformational Leadership**

Based on the findings from the study, having a clearly articulated program vision that addresses the desired traits and skills of the faculty as well as the intended traits and skills of the students is essential to achieving outcomes aligned with the vision. By focusing on the goal of developing transformational leaders through instruction and mentorship provided by transformational leaders, the Brandman EdD program was able to attract a particular quality of faculty, staff, and students, who have individually and collectively proven and increased their capacity for leading transformational change.

The data collected for this study also revealed that targeted hiring practices focusing on leveraging the professional network of key leaders enables an organization to identify candidates who have previously demonstrated alignment with the organization’s goals and culture, thereby reducing the typical amount of time required to identify those who are the right fit. Relatedly, previous relationships between colleagues speeds the
process of team norming. Hiring teams with prior affiliation enables collaboration at a rate unlike that of an unknown pairing. Likewise, leveraging networks of colleagues from previous institutions and regional organizations will enable a university to build a team of known transformational leaders who can begin their work from a position of deep trust and relationship with one another.

**Conclusion 2: Strong Communication and Transparency Are Essential Between Organizational Leaders and Program Administrators**

This study revealed that political relationships can be strengthened or weakened based on the level of communication and trust between organizational leaders and program managers. In stark contrast to the warm and collaborative culture of the EdD team, the relationship between the university leaders and the EdD leadership was repeatedly described in cold, distant, and disconnected terms. This lack of relationship engendered a general sense of distrust and a feeling of offense among the faculty regarding processes for routine tasks like building annual budget requests and processing travel claims.

**Conclusion 3: Symbolic Rituals and Play Are Essential to Program Health**

Based on the findings from the study, it is concluded that intentionally building rituals and elements of humor and play into an organizational culture is critical to balancing the intensity of the work. For example, the Brandman EdD rituals of moving from one side of the immersion room to another and participating in the end-of-year luncheon where the torch is passed from the exiting class to the remaining class imbued the program with a deeper level of significance than it would have otherwise and provided markers of accomplishment along the journey for students to look forward to
and celebrate achieving. Likewise, playful joking related to stealing the program mascot for evening adventures on the town or humorous sabotage of one another’s PowerPoint presentation using a rogue clicker infused the program with moments of levity to help offset the intensity of the doctoral journey and model healthy playful interaction in a working environment.

**Conclusion 4: The Human Resources Element of Any Organization Is the Most Critical**

The survey data from this study revealed that while leaders must reframe their view of the organization in order to grasp a more comprehensive view of the needs and dynamics at play in any given situation, the most valuable assets to an organization are the people. To that point, hiring well and building the capacity of organization members are incredibly important to its long-term health. In this study, 14 of the 16 participants mentioned the human resource frame as the most important or one of the most impactful frames in the development and evolution of the Brandman EdD program. While the human resource elements of an organization are more nuanced than other elements, great care must be taken to continuously engage faculty staff and students in the structure, politics and culture of the organization.

**Conclusion 5: Innovation Is Derived from a Continuous Cycle of Improvement**

This study was designed to evaluate the Brandman EdD program from an innovation perspective, using Bolman and Deal’s (2017) four-frame model. In this evaluation process, it was discovered that the successful repeated innovation of the EdD program is the direct result of relentless evaluation, reflection, and improvement cycles. In alignment with the s-curve on innovation model, without adherence to purposeful and
regular innovation, doctoral programs are destined to eventually shift from growth to
decline. Full-time and adjunct faculty alike engage in a thorough evaluation of all
elements of the Brandman doctoral program on a regular basis to ensure that change is
implemented in a timely manner and the program remains on the cutting edge of hybrid
higher education. Similarly, the program leaders expect full participation of all members
of the faculty and staff to ensure that all voices are valued and all the best ideas are
surfaced.

**Conclusion 6: Organizational Technology Must Be Included in the Continuous
Cycle of Improvement**

Based on the findings from the study, it is concluded that technology can either be
helpful or harmful to an organization, so careful collaboration and thoughtful integration
are critical to successful implementation and innovative practices. The robust services of
the Brandman Center for Instructional Innovation and wide variety of online tutorials
enable faculty and staff to flourish as online instructors with Brandman, regardless of
their familiarity with online instruction prior to coming to the EdD program. However,
there have been significant missteps in technology implementation that significantly
bogged down progress or overly complicated already complex systems. These challenges
increased the level of frustration between end users and technology teams. In the case of
the Brandman EdD program, which is primarily an online doctoral program,
technological innovation is fundamental to program success. However, disagreement
about the EdD program wanting to move away from Adobe Connect and the technology
team lobbying to keep it led to such heated interactions that communication was entirely
severed for quite some time. Strong, collaborative, responsive relationships between
university technology teams and doctoral program teams are essential to long-term program viability.

**Conclusion 7: A Lack of Succession Planning Can Jeopardize the Long-Term Success of an Organization**

The data from this study reveal that building a comprehensive plan for replacing current faculty and staff with a new generation of leaders, as needed, is of critical importance, particularly in an organization where the human resource element is by far the most prominent feature of the program and leaders are known to be legendary in their field, like Brandman Cohort Mentor Walter Buster and Dissertation Lead Keith Larick. The founding leadership team of the Brandman doctoral program was almost exclusively retired superintendents, which enabled them to operate from a position of strength, because none needed to work in order to provide for themselves and their families. This dynamic enabled the doctoral program leadership team to have quite honest conversations with university leadership, which greatly contributed to the successful development and launch of the program. However, the age and career phase of the core doctoral team makes it imperative that an aggressive succession plan be put into action. If such action is not taken, those outside the doctoral program will be empowered to make decisions regarding the future of the doctoral program in the event that one of the key leaders becomes ill or is otherwise unable to continue in their role.

Relatedly, it was also noted that cultivating a diverse leadership team to eventually replace the founding members of the doctoral program will require a long-term strategy, because future leaders from racial and ethnic minority groups, as well as women, do not as readily step up and recommend themselves for the higher leadership
roles for which they are well suited. If the university and doctoral program leaders do not begin to implement aggressive measures to identify, engage, and groom future leaders, the organization will likely face the negative impact of moving beyond innovation to obsolescence. In order to utilize the current founding team to help design and implement the succession plan, the university should convene a succession plan taskforce, identify the core values and traits to be exemplified by those to be targeted, outline a multiprong strategy for addressing short- and long-term staffing needs, allocate resources for mobilizing the strategy, and then begin implementing the plan immediately.

As with all elements of the doctoral program, the succession plan work should be regularly reviewed and assessed for strengths and areas in need of innovation. The succession plan work should include evaluating and identifying former and current doctoral students who are interested and well qualified to serve immediately as workshop presenters, boot camp mentors, and program support, while simultaneously being groomed to become university adjunct instructors, cohort mentors, and eventually, full-time faculty. Student interest should be identified through faculty recommendations and student survey feedback. To address more immediate needs of replacing current core faculty, should the need arise, the succession plan should also include deliberate networking with state and regional leadership groups to identify practitioners with mature careers who are in a position to explore transitioning from full-time employment in their current career to university teaching and doctoral program leadership. Skills maps, experience milestones, and desired accomplishments should be identified and shared with potential candidates to establish clear pathways to the professorate and doctoral program leadership.
Implications for Action

This study explored the history and evolution of the Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership at Brandman University, focusing on the years 2013 through 2017. The research revealed major findings regarding the structural, human resource, political, and symbolic elements of the program and their role in the development and evolution of this innovative EdD program, in alignment with Bolman and Deal’s (2017) four-frame model. Innovative hybrid doctoral programs focused on transformational leadership are not common; therefore, this research also contributes to the literature on successful evolution of doctoral programs to meet the needs of modern students in terms of the efficiency gained through online instruction. Furthermore, it addresses the significant personal and professional growth obtained through engagement in carefully constructed in-person experiences facilitated by renowned faculty and staff who are also highly skilled transformational leaders. Additionally, this research contributes to the literature by providing an in-depth historical study of a highly successful innovative doctoral program, told in the words of key leaders, to serve as a model for utilizing a cycle of continuous improvement to remain innovative year after year. Based on this research, five implications for action are drawn from the major findings, as outlined in the following paragraphs.


As identified in Major Findings 1 and 2 and Unexpected Finding 2, the Brandman EdD program’s focus on organizational leadership through transformational change has attracted faculty, staff, and students committed to personal and professional
transformation. This clearly articulated focus on transformational change is addressed in numerous guiding documents of the program and is embedded throughout the curriculum. From the initial immersion experience to the two-tier TCP, students, faculty, and cohort mentors work together to ensure that students learn the theory of transformational change as well as plan, implement, monitor, and evaluate a full TCP in their workplace. Key leaders of the Brandman EdD program shared the importance of the TCP to the overall development of doctoral students. In addition, due to the multiframe focus required to produce transformational change, the faculty and staff also noted the continuous improvement of themselves and the doctoral program in general due to the practices of continuous improvement involved in the process. Investment in the resources required to teach and mentor transformational change should be provided to ensure the continued success of producing graduates who are transformational leaders and a program that is continually being improved due to the consistent focus on innovation. Doctoral programs seeking to implement such a focus should allocate adequate resources to provide individualized mentorship to doctoral students by highly skilled transformational leaders with proven track records of leading transformational change in the field.

**Implication for Action 2: Implement strategic Hiring Practices That Prioritize Highly Skilled Candidates With a Commitment to the Organization’s Core Values**

Major Finding 1 also revealed that the doctoral program’s agility and effectiveness were due, in large part, to having established a core leadership team from the professional networks of the founding administrators. Relatedly, the findings revealed that of the four frames, focusing on the human resource frame alone or in conjunction with others was perceived to have had the greatest positive impact on the
creation and evolution of the doctoral program. Participants repeatedly shared that the same outcomes could not have been achieved within the same structure and political dynamics if the team had been composed differently.

Because the founding administration was able to create a team from those with whom they were already familiar, they were able to ensure that each new member of the team was highly skilled and had a track record of leading according to the doctoral program’s core values. The insight provided by having long-term knowledge of each person’s performance, character, and talents enabled the administration to build a team of transformational leaders committed to student success. This alignment and familiarity allowed the team to work together with speed and efficiency from the start, which yielded exceptional results and continuous improvement in record time. Organizations should leverage their professional networks to identify candidates who are deeply aligned to the core values of the program and have demonstrated ability in leading according to those values.

**Implication for Action 3: Utilize Strong Communication and Transparent Internal Practices to Reduce Potential Political Challenges**

Major Finding 3 also illuminated the importance of successfully managing the continual political struggle within an organization for power and scarce resources through strong communication channels and transparency. Key leaders of the doctoral program expressed dissatisfaction and frustration with university systems and leadership related to inefficiencies and a lack of resources for critical components of the program, such as immersions, faculty travel to program events, and technology management and improvements. The disconnection was often cited when there was a perceived
breakdown in communication or lack of transparency regarding processes and key decisions. University leaders and program administrators should continually work to ensure open lines of communication and transparency in decision-making to make sure that relationships are strong and resource allocation can be understood and negotiated effectively. To that end, university leaders should purposefully cultivate relationships with program administrators to facilitate communication. Further, university leaders should familiarize themselves with the programs they oversee by regularly attending program events to have a clear understanding of the work being done and the individuals involved. Finally, university leaders and program administrators should routinely engage in the cycle of feedback and continuous improvement together to ensure that each program and the university as a whole remain relevant and vital.

Implication for Action 4: Establish and Maintain Symbolism and Play Within the Organization to Foster a Healthy Culture

The lived experience of the key leaders of the EdD program highlighted the importance of symbolic rituals to commemorate milestones and a culture of play to help balance the intensity of the doctoral journey, as illustrated in Major Finding 4. While several key leaders noted that in many organizations these elements are often the first to be foregone during times of economic downturn or increased workload, they emphasized that maintaining rituals and play is critical to maintaining a healthy organizational culture. Whether it is a simple change in seating assignment, an annual lunch to commemorate the passing of the torch to a new class, or a hooding ceremony where each graduate has the opportunity to thank all who have made this accomplishment possible, rituals bring unity to a group and instill hope and pride. Time and resources should be
allocated to these important elements of an organization as regularly as all other core components. Relatedly, play and silliness should be built into the culture of the organization to provide an outlet for stress, opportunity for creativity, and model for healthy fun in a professional environment.

**Implication for Action 5: Continually Seek to Identify and Cultivate Purposeful Relationships With Those Whose Values Are in Alignment With the Organization in Order to Establish a Talent Pipeline for Successive Generations of Leadership**

As revealed in Major Finding 5 and Unexpected Findings 1 and 4, building and evolving a highly functioning team requires great intentionality focused on the core values of the organization. Key leaders of the Brandman EdD program shared that they gladly joined the doctoral program team because the program deeply resonated with their personal core values of transformational leadership and student support. The initial core faculty, and a few minor transitions to the team, were culled from the professional networks of those leading the program. However, as the program reaches its eighth year of implementation, and key leaders of the core faculty and administration look to transition themselves away from this postretirement opus they have written, there is no plan currently in place to ensure that future leaders are prepared to carry the torch of transformational leadership. In fact, internally there are two very different points of view about who those future leaders should be, one focusing on successful K-12 superintendents and one focused on purposefully diversifying to include transformational leaders from higher education and fields outside of education.

Because the alignment of personal core values with the core values of the organization was shown to be the most critical marker of success, program leaders should
develop a system to continually identify and cultivate relationships with those whose values are in alignment with the Brandman EdD program. Leveraging the talent and skills of current and former Brandman EdD program students would enable key leaders to build a network of potential future doctoral program leaders from a variety of backgrounds who share a deep commitment to transformational change, continuous improvement, and student support. However, building this pipeline will require the development of clear structures and processes to explicitly identify, notify, and groom future leaders so that communication differences based on culture or gender do not inadvertently exclude any with strong leadership capabilities and a heart committed to service. Additionally, multiple participants of this study suggested ways to engage Brandman EdD alumni as soon as they complete the program, such as leveraging them to provide miniversity workshops and breakout sessions at immersion. Participants also proposed developing a transformational change center, where graduates could serve as consultants to organizations seeking assistance with implementing transformational change. It is also recommended that program leaders solicit feedback from graduates regarding ways in which they believe they could be of service to current and future EdD students as well as their future aspirations for working in higher education.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

The following recommendations for further research were generated from the findings of this historical study of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership.
1. Conduct a study regarding the specific hiring practices utilized in this program to better understand how the Brandman EdD program was able to engage its incredibly unified and effective initial faculty and staff.

2. Conduct a mixed methods study of the impact of the Brandman University Doctorate in Organizational Leadership TCP on the students that complete the projects and on the organizations in which the projects are implemented.

3. Conduct a mixed methods study exploring the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership’s noteworthy student completion rates and other significant student data points, such as longitudinal writing data, course completion rates, time to degree completion, and general demographic data.

4. Conduct a follow-up study to gather other perspectives, such as students, university administrators, and marketing regarding how Brandman University was able to develop and support the evolution of this innovative doctoral program in organizational leadership.

5. Conduct a replication study of other innovative doctoral programs in order gather similar historical data regarding the processes and strategies utilized to develop and evolve the program from inception to the present.

6. Conduct a mixed methods study exploring the role of the Center of Instructional Innovation in supporting innovation within the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership.

7. Conduct a replication study focused on the student experience and perspective of the impact of Bolman and Deal’s (2017) four frames on the creation and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership.
Concluding Remarks and Reflections

In an age where technological advancements have closed geographic divides, solved age-old medical challenges, and provided access to knowledge and resources to individuals around the world, the speed and seemingly limitless abundance of change makes the world both more accessible and more challenging to navigate. Organizations of all types must continually serve their current constituents while simultaneously building processes, systems, and products for a very different, yet not so distant future. The American education system was founded on principles of innovation, accessibility, and opportunity; and in this thrilling age of technological revolution, it is more important than ever that educational institutions prepare students for success in the economy and society in which they will live. In order to achieve this lofty goal, educational institutions must develop a sophisticated capacity for change. Ackerman Anderson and Anderson (2010) explained, “Superior change capability requires establishing change as a strategic discipline in the organization” (p. 17).

Through this qualitative historical study, I have had the great honor of studying the doctoral program in organizational leadership at Brandman University, which was founded with a mission of developing innovative leaders who can successfully implement transformational change. My interactions with 16 key leaders of the Brandman EdD program during the interviews conducted for this study have provided me with incredible insight into the thinking, behavior, discipline, character, and passion of these leaders who have spent their lives cultivating superior change capability. I have been honored and inspired by the participants as they have each shared the story of their leadership journey to and then with Brandman. Their profound sense of purpose and clarity of calling to
serve the world through education has illuminated the significance of each element of the
Brandman doctoral program for me. From seemingly minor details like the color of ink
used on a nametag, to larger-than-life tales of program mascots being kidnapped for
evening adventures in the city, each symbol of the program was carefully constructed to
breathe meaning and life into the process of the doctoral journey. Likewise, from
offering the first handshake at boot camp to the final hug on the stage at commencement,
Founding Dean Christine Zeppos exemplified the archetype of a transformational leader
who is present, engaged, and continually pushing each student to strive for excellence—
to profoundly change their his or her organization for the better. Likewise, each program
administrator, faculty member, cohort mentor, and staff member exemplified the deeply
reflective and earnest commitment to serving others as they, continually pushed
themselves to learn, change, and grown.

The Brandman EdD story is a love story of sorts, a story of selflessness in the
name of giving all of oneself, individually and collectively, to teach a certain non-
negotiable way to be in this world. The architects designed and implemented a
transformational leadership program taught by seasoned transformational leaders, which
produces transformational leaders. The team of faculty and cohort mentors was carefully
constructed of exceptional leaders from across the state who willingly joined forces for
this new and innovative journey. Continuous improvement was woven into the fabric of
the program to ensure that theory and practice flowed together as seamlessly as does
engaging in personal and professional transformation. Everyone shares in the
responsibility of teaching and learning, pushing one another to greater levels of
transparency and deeper levels of commitment to the success of others. Courageous
conversations are not to be dreaded, they are expected and welcomed, because feedback
generates growth. At its core, this love story reflects a profound respect for human
dignity and the calling within each of us to live for the greater good.

As the researcher, I am truly indebted to the participants of this study who
graciously welcomed me into their worlds and explained their experiences with candor
and passion I could have only hoped for. As interview layered upon interview, it became
increasingly clear to me how important shared core values are to the formation of a team.
Although the leaders are all quite different from one another, their common purpose
unifies them in such a way that their differences only serve to strengthen their
effectiveness and provide a richness to the combined experience they produce for
students. Many times, I was struck by power of the EdD program’s clearly articulated
vision and the participants’ unrelenting commitment to living that vision as well as
teaching it.

I was also made keenly aware of the great value in building a team of individuals
who each have great strength utilizing a different lens to view their common work.
Those with exceptional political skill and instinct provide valuable direction and
guidance to the team, as do those who are deeply mindful of the human resource elements
of the organization. So, too, those with great skill in structural thinking provide a
foundation upon which those with keen symbolic understanding can build rituals,
ceremonies, and play to imbue the organization with meaning and soul. While the
leaders of the Brandman EdD program have developed the discipline of reframing their
view of the organization as needed to better navigate the inherent challenges of
innovation, they have also surrounded themselves with others who have strengths in
frames that are different than their own. This strategy ensures that the team does not sacrifice clarity of vision for the comfort of easy agreement.

I am deeply honored for having been given the gift of the opportunity to conduct this study because of the incredibly profound way it has illuminated all of the theory I studied and coursework I engaged in as a student in this program. I have been inspired, challenged, humbled, and transformed by this research experience. My hope is that by chronicling their experiences, this study of the evolution of a truly extraordinary team of transformational leaders will be studied by students, educational leaders, and others, expanding the impact of their innovation beyond their direct sphere of influence to a world seeking clarity and meaning.
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We are for your assistance in the study by participating in an interview for Phase 2 of the study, which will take approximately two hours and will be setup at a time and location convenient for you. If you agree to participate in the interview, you can be assured that you may inform any part of the interview that you wish to remain confidential. While names of participants will be used in the study per your consent, no names will be attached to any notes or records from the interview that you specifically request to be kept confidential. All interview notes will remain in locked files, accessible only to the researchers. No employer will have access to the interview notes. You will be free to stop the interview and withdraw from the study at any time. A transcript of the interview will be sent to you for review to ensure accuracy of your responses. In addition to your interview, I am also asking that you please share any documents, artifacts or relics that support or elaborate upon your interview and you feel would be of importance to this historical study. You are encouraged to ask any questions that will help you understand how this study will be performed and/or how it will affect you.

The research investigator is available by email or to answer any questions or concerns you may have as follows: Rebecca Farley rfarley@mail.brandman.edu 661-706-9765. Your participation would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,
Rebecca Farley, M.S., Ed. Doctoral Candidate
Jennifer Dinielli, M.S., Ed. Doctoral Candidate

Encl: Definitions relevant to the study

Bolman and Deal’s Four-Frame Model: This model is a way to understand leadership and organizational change. The Four Frames will be used to organize and report data for this research.
**Organizational change.** An alteration of an organization’s form or function that is so profound, the members of the organization must alter their perspective, actions, or approach in order for the change to be sustained (Ackerman Anderson & Anderson, 2010; Anderson & Ackerman Anderson, 2010; Collins, 2001; Collins & Porras, 1996, 2001, 2002; Kotter, 2012; Kübler-Ross, 1969; Rogers, 1962).

**Structural frame.** The structural frame describes the architecture of an organization, including goals, strategy, metrics, rubrics, technology, specialized roles, formal relationships, and the coordination of these into a structured organization chart supported with policies, procedures and rules (Argyris 1998; Bolman & Deal, 2017; Helgesen, 1995; Mintzberg, 1979; Thompson, 1967; Weber, 1947).

**Human resource frame.** The human resource frame describes understanding people and relationships, including human needs, feelings, fears, skills, biases, development opportunities, and the fit between the individual and the organization (Bolman & Deal, 2017; Cable and DeRue, 2002; Collins & Porras, 1994; Follett, 1918; Mayo, 1945).

**Political frame.** The political frame describes power and gaining access to scarce resources through competition among individuals and groups based on diverse interests, values, beliefs, behaviors, and skills (Bolman & Deal, 2017; Cyert & March, 1963; Gamson, 1986; Pfeffer, 1992).

**Symbolic frame.** The symbolic frame describes strategies for engaging people through ritual, ceremony, story, play and culture (Bolman & Deal, 2017; Collins & Porras, 1994, 2001; Kotter & Cohen, 2002; Hofstede, 2001).
APPENDIX C

Research Participant’s Bill of Rights

BRANDMAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

Research Participant’s Bill of Rights

Any person who is requested to consent to participate as a subject in an experiment, or who is requested to consent on behalf of another, has the following rights:

1. To be told what the study is attempting to discover.
2. To be told what will happen in the study and whether any of the procedures, drugs or devices are different from what would be used in standard practice.
3. To be told about the risks, side effects or discomforts of the things that may happen to him/her.
4. To be told if he/she can expect any benefit from participating and, if so, what the benefits might be.
5. To be told what other choices he/she has and how they may be better or worse than being in the study.
6. To be allowed to ask any questions concerning the study both before agreeing to be involved and during the course of the study.
7. To be told what sort of medical treatment is available if any complications arise.
8. To refuse to participate at all before or after the study is started without any adverse effects.
9. To receive a copy of the signed and dated consent form.
10. To be free of pressures when considering whether he/she wishes to agree to be in the study.

If at any time you have questions regarding a research study, you should ask the researchers to answer them. You also may contact the Brandman University Institutional Review Board, which is concerned with the protection of volunteers in research projects. The Brandman University Institutional Review Board may be contacted either by telephoning the Office of Academic Affairs at (949) 341-9937 or by writing to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Brandman University, 16355 Laguna Canyon Road, Irvine, CA, 92618.
APPENDIX D

Informed Consent Form

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH
BRANDMAN UNIVERSITY
16355 LAGUNA CANYON ROAD
IRVINE, CA 92618

RESEARCH STUDY TITLE: The History of the Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership at Brandman University from an Innovation Theory Perspective

RESPONSIBLE INVESTIGATOR: Rebecca Farley, Doctoral Candidate

TITLE OF CONSENT FORM: Consent to Participate in Research

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY: The purpose of this historical research study is to document the development of the Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership at Brandman University from concept and design to initial implementation with the Beta cohort of 2013 through the Zeta cohort of 2017. In addition, it is the purpose of this study to chronicle the decisions that guided program development and the factors that influenced key leaders and decisions from an innovation perspective of Bolman & Deal’s Four-Frame Model, structural, human resource, political and symbolic frames.

PROCEDURES: In participating in this research study, I agree to partake in an audio recorded semi-structured interview. The interview will take place at a Brandman location, in a Zoom online meeting room, or at an agreed upon location, and will last about an hour and a half. During the interview, I will be asked a series of questions designed to allow me to share my experiences and stories of the concept, design and/or implementation of the Brandman Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership that guided program development, the factors that influenced me and decisions from an innovation perspective.

I understand that:

1. The possible risks or discomforts associated with this research are minimal. It may be inconvenient to spend up to one hour and a half in the interview. However, the interview session will be held at a Brandman location, in a Zoom online meeting room or, or an agreed upon location, to minimize this inconvenience.

2. I will not be compensated for my participation in this study. The possible benefit of this study is to document the development of the Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership at Brandman University including chronicling the decisions that guided program development and the factors that influence key leaders from an innovation perspective of Bolman and Deal’s Four-Frame Model. The findings and recommendations from this study will be made available to all participants.

3. Any questions I have concerning my participation in this study will be answered by Rebecca Farley, Brandman University Doctoral Candidate. I understand that Mrs. Farley
may be contacted by phone at 661-606-9765 or email at rfarley@mail.brandman.edu. The dissertation chairperson may also answer questions: Dr. Keith Larick at larick@brandman.edu.

4. I may refuse to participate or withdraw from this study at any time without any negative consequences. Also, the investigators may stop the study at any time.

5. The study will be audio-recorded, and the recordings will not be used beyond the scope of this project. Audio recordings will be used to transcribe the interviews. Once the interviews are transcribed, the audio and interview transcripts will be kept for a minimum of five years by the investigator in a secure location.

6. To document the history of the program, my name will be used in the study per my consent. However, no names will be attached to any notes or records from the interview that you specifically request to be kept confidential. All identifiable information will be protected to the limits allowed by law. If the study design or the use of the data is to be changed, I will be informed, and my consent re-obtained. If I have any questions, comments, or concerns about the study or the informed consent process, I may write or call the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Brandman University, 16355 Laguna Canyon Road, Irvine, CA 92618, (949) 341-7641. I acknowledge that I have received a copy of this form and the Research Participant’s Bill of Rights.

I have read the above and understand it and hereby voluntarily consent to the procedure(s) set forth.

_________________________           ________________________
Signature of Participant or Responsible Party                   Date

Signature of Witness (if appropriate)                     Date

Signature of Principal Investigator                        Date
APPENDIX E

Brandman University Doctoral Program History Interview Protocol
Script and Interview Questions

Brandman University IRB Submitted August 2019

Interviewer: Rebecca Farley
Interview time planned: Approximately two hours
Interview place: Brandman University location, Zoom meeting room, or other agreed upon location
Recording: Digital voice recorder
Written: Field and observational notes

Make personal introductions.

Opening Statement: [Interviewer states:] Thank you so much for taking the time to meet with me. I am humbled and honored to be doing this study and excited to meet with you and hear what you have to share about the Brandman Ed.D. program.

In order to ensure uniformity across interviews, I will be directly reading this next part. To review, the purpose of this historical qualitative research study was to document the development of the Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership at Brandman University from the Beta cohort of 2013 through the Zeta cohort of 2017. In addition, it was the purpose of this study to chronicle the decisions that guided program development and the factors that influenced key leaders and decisions from an innovation perspective of Bolman & Deal’s Four-Frame Model, structural, human resource, political and symbolic frames. This study is focused on the development and evolution of the program from the Beta cohort of 2013 through the Zeta cohort of 2017. Since this is a historical study, I want to hear the stories of Brandman in your words as seen through your eyes. As part of this study I will also be collecting artifacts such as planning documents, and WASC reports to provide us with additional insight into the program.

Interview Agenda: [Interviewer states:] I anticipate this interview will take about two hours today. As a review of the process leading up to this interview, you were invited to participate via letter, and received an informed consent form that outlined the interview process and the assurance of confidentiality. Names of participants will be used in the study, but you can be assured that you may inform any part of the interview that you wish to remain confidential. In addition, no names will be attached to any notes or records from the interview that you specifically request to be kept confidential. We will begin with reviewing the Letter of Invitation, Informed Consent Form, Brandman University’s Participant’s Bill of Rights, and the Audio Release Form. Prior to beginning the interview are there any questions concerning the informed consent, if not please sign the Informed Consent and Audi Release Form.

Next, I will begin the audio recorder and ask a list of questions related to the purpose of the study. I may take notes as the interview is being recorded. If you are uncomfortable with me taking notes, please let me know and I will only continue on with the audio recording of the interview. After the interview, I will transcribe the audio recording and you will receive a copy of the complete transcripts to check for accuracy prior to the data being analyzed. Please remember that anytime during this process you have the right to stop the interview. If at any time you do not
understand the questions being asked, please do not hesitate to ask for clarification. Are there any questions or concerns before we begin with the questions?
APPENDIX F

Interview Questions

Brandman’s Doctorate of Education Program in Organizational Leadership

Development and evolution of the program from the Beta cohort of 2013 through the Zeta cohort of 2017.

Background Information

1. What is your professional experience that brought you to Brandman?
   Probe: What are the experiences that you think have been important to the doctoral program? Can you share an example of this?

2. What has been your role in the continued development and change of the doctoral program beginning in 2013 through 2017?

3. What is the most memorable experience you have had in your association with the doctoral program?

4. As a faculty member/administrator, how is this program innovative compared to other programs you have had experiences with?

Innovation Perspective

1. Why was the Brandman doctoral program created?

Political frame. The political frame describes power and gaining access to scarce resources through competition among individuals and groups based on diverse interests, values, beliefs, behaviors, and skills (Bolman & Deal, 2017; Cyert & March, 1963; Gamson, 1986; Pfeffer, 1992).

1. How would you describe the roles of those people responsible for the implementation and evolution of the doctoral program from 2013 to 2017?
   Probe: How have you seen these roles change over time?

2. How have the vision, philosophy and values that guide the doctoral program evolved since implementation?
   Probe: How have you seen that change over time?

3. What have been the barriers that had to be overcome in the continued development of the program?

4. How has politics played a role in decision making and resource allocation in the continued development of the program?

1. How have the original symbols and rituals of the program evolved over time and contributed to the culture?

2. How has your role in developing support and enthusiasm for the doctoral program from university leaders evolved over time?

Human resource frame. *The human resource frame describes understanding people and relationships, including human needs, feelings, fears, skills, biases, development opportunities, and the fit between the individual and the organization (Bolman & Deal, 2017; Cable and DeRue, 2002; Collins & Porras, 1994; Follett, 1918; Mayo, 1945).*

1. What unique skills and experiences of the core faculty have contributed to the development of the program over time?

2. How have people and relationships influenced the development and evolution of the program over time.

Structural frame. *The structural frame describes the architecture of an organization, including goals, strategy, metrics, rubrics, technology, specialized roles, formal relationships, and the coordination of these into a structured organization chart supported with policies, procedures and rules (Argyris 1998; Bolman & Deal, 2017; Helgesen, 1995; Mintzberg, 1979; Thompson, 1967; Weber, 1947).*

1. What is it that distinguishes the Brandman doctoral program from other doctoral programs?

2. What are the unique learning opportunities and practices that students experience in the Brandman doctoral program?

3. In what ways did the program’s structures impact the program’s development and/or evolution over time?

4. The Brandman doctoral program states that transformational change is important to organizational success. How has this been developed as an important element of the doctoral program over time?

5. How would you describe the most successful element of the Brandman doctoral program?

6. How would you describe the most critical barrier to success in the development and evolution of the doctoral program over time?

Closing
1. In considering the structural, human resource, political and symbolic elements of the program, is there one or a combination that you perceive as having the greatest impact on the development and evolution of the Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership?

2. Is there anything that I haven’t asked about that you think has been critical to the development of the program or essential to innovation?

3. Do you have any other thoughts you think are important to understanding the Brandman program?

4. Is there anyone else you think that I should talk to for the purposes of this study?

Probes

1. Can you give me an example?
2. Can you tell me more?
APPENDIX G

National Health of Institutes Course Completion Certificate

Certificate of Completion

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) Office of Extramural Research certifies that **Rebecca Farley** successfully completed the NIH Web-based training course "Protecting Human Research Participants."

**Date of Completion:** 05/21/2018

**Certification Number:** 2824539

[NIH Logo]
APPENDIX H

Field-Test Participant Feedback Questions

While conducting the interview you should take notes of their clarification request or comments about not being clear about the question. After you complete the interview ask your field test interviewee the following clarifying questions. Try not to make it another interview; just have a friendly conversation. Either script or record their feedback so you can compare with the other two members of your team to develop your feedback report on how to improve the interview questions.

1. How did you feel about the interview? Do you think you had ample opportunities to describe the development of the Brandman Doctoral Program?

2. Did you feel the amount of time for the interview was ok?

3. Were the questions by and large clear or were there places where you were uncertain what was being asked?

4. Can you recall any words or terms being asked about during the interview that were confusing?

5. And finally, did I appear comfortable during the interview… (I’m pretty new at this)?

Field-Test Participant Feedback Questions
While conducting the interview you should take notes of their Reflection
APPENDIX I

Interview Feedback Reflection Questions

Conducting interviews is a learned skill set/experience. Gaining valuable insight about your interview skills and affect with the interview will support your data gathering when interviewing the actual participants. As the researcher you should reflect on the questions below after completing the interview. You should also discuss the following reflection questions with your ‘observer’ after completing the interview field test. The questions are written from your perspective as the interviewer. However, you can verbalize your thoughts with the observer, and they can add valuable insight from their observation.

1. How long did the interview take? _____ Did the time seem to be appropriate?

2. How did you feel during the interview? Comfortable? Nervous?

3. Going into it, did you feel prepared to conduct the interview? Is there something you could have done to be better prepared?

4. What parts of the interview went the most smoothly and why do you think that was the case?

5. What parts of the interview seemed to struggle and why do you think that was the case?

6. If you were to change any part of the interview, what would that part be and how would you change it?

7. What suggestions do you have for improving the overall process?
# APPENDIX J

## Zeta Cohort EDD Timeline

### Year I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall I</td>
<td>August 28 – October 22, 2017</td>
<td>700 Transfomational Leadership (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>706 Team and Group Dynamics (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>707 Organizational Theory and Development (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>708 Strategic Thinking (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>709 Communication and Conflict Resolution (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>705 Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>750 Writing for Research I (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>752 Quantitative Research Method I (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>753 Quantitative Research Method II (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>754 Qualitative Research Method I (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>755 Qualitative Research Method II (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>751 Writing for Research II (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Immersion #1 September 24, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Immersion #2 January 13-15, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Immersion #3 June 22-25, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Year II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall II</td>
<td>September 26 – October 23, 2018</td>
<td>720 Creativity, Innovation and Sustainable Change (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>721 The Ethics and Politics of Decision Making (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>790** Developing the Proponent (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>724 The Leader as Change Agent (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>723 Innovation in Resource Management (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>722 Diversity and Intercultural Aspects of Leadership (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>791 Dissertation I (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>792 Dissertation II (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Immersion #4 September 1-3, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Immersion #5 January 19-21, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Immersion #6 June 28-July 1, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bold Camp: 10 Day
**EDD 100 and 110 are block registered for 8 weeks.

Rev12102017
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Immersion Promotional Flyer Highlighting “The Clicker”

FALL IMMERSION

Countdown... 5 Days

Dr. White and Dr. Larick will lead everyone through the TSLi

Marilou Ryder
AUGUST 28, 2017
APPENDIX L

EdDy and BEdDy on Custom Pedestal
APPENDIX M

EdDy and BEdDy – Brandman University Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership Mascots
APPENDIX N

2013 WASC Educational Effectiveness Review Letter
March 7, 2014

Mr. Gary Brahman
Chancellor
Brandman University
16355 Laguna Canyon Road
Irvine, CA 92618

Dear Chancellor Brahman:

At its meeting February 19-21, 2014, the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) considered the report of the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) team that conducted the visit to Brandman University (Brandman) September 20 – October 2, 2013. The Commission also had access to the Educational Effectiveness Review report prepared by Brandman prior to the visit, the institution’s December 5, 2013, response to the visiting team report, and the documents relating to the Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) visit conducted March 21–23, 2012. The Commission appreciated the opportunity to discuss the review with you, Charles A. Bullock, Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and Chief Academic Officer and Provost, and Laurie Dodge, Associate Vice Chancellor of Institutional Assessment and Planning and Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO). Your comments were helpful in informing the Commission’s deliberations.

Brandman’s institutional proposal outlined two themes for this comprehensive review: attaining student success and building a learning community through communication. The two themes were relevant and important, “to the newly structured institution with its unique program mix, delivery model, distributed campus system, and adult-learner student population.” The visiting team concluded that the report was well prepared and organized, clearly written, and easily readable.

The Commission’s action letter of July 3, 2012, highlighted four major issues for special attention during the interval between the CPR and EER visits: 1) faculty workload and engagement; 2) consolidating growth; 3) developing student services; and 4) preparing for the EER. The team concluded that all four areas were addressed in sufficient detail. Brandman used a clear set of strategic plans to address the recommendations and made notable progress since the CPR.

Brandman University is to be commended for nurturing a culture of evidence-based decision-making, integrating its Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) with upper-division programs, and developing signature assignments and rubrics.
Creating and implementing a culture of evidence-based decision-making. As highlighted in the team report, Brandman is to be commended “for its commitment to educational quality through the systematic collection of educational effectiveness data and for creating a culture of evidence-based decision-making. The use of data for decision-making is evident in the development of the curriculum and in the support of student success. The program assessment report and program review process utilizes multiple methods of data collection resulting in meaningful reflection about student learning.”

Integration of institutional learning outcomes. The team also commended Brandman for the integration of the five Institutional Learning Outcomes into all upper-division programs, using standardized ILO rubrics across all programs. The visiting team commended Brandman for its design and successful initial implementation of a formal assessment process for the General Education Degree Qualifications across the university.

Signature assignments and rubrics. The visiting team commended Brandman for the development of signature assignments with rubrics that measure student learning and for the level of faculty involvement in the development and continued improvement of these assessments.

The Commission endorses the commendations and recommendations of the EER team and wishes to emphasize the following areas for further attention and development:

Engagement of and support for adjunct faculty. The challenge for adjunct faculty is having the capacity to engage with the institution and its students while attending to other commitments outside the institution. The Commission expects Brandman to build the capacity to support its adjunct faculty in this changing educational environment. As the team reported, “given the significance of their role with educational effectiveness, adjunct faculty should be supported in their responsibility to engage in reflection and analysis at multiple levels in the institution.” Brandman’s response to the team report indicated that such engagement is “evidenced by their participation in course review, program assessment, and program review.” While the Commission commends Brandman for this engagement, Brandman University should continue to develop an academic model that strives for stability among its adjunct faculty and integrates them into decision-making about program and institutional effectiveness. (CFRs 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.8)

Pace of growth. The volatile economic environment and increasing demands on higher education require higher education institutions to adapt and change. While the team commended Brandman’s “innovativeness and responsiveness to the needs of adult learners,” it also cautioned the institution about the liabilities of rapid growth with specific reference to the institution’s “ability to measure effectiveness and quality.” Brandman University should monitor the growth of its newest degree program, the
Doctor of Education degree, as the first cohort of students completes the program. (CFRs 2.2b, 4.1, 4.2, 4.4)

**Benchmarks for student learning outcomes.** A key component of the assessment of student learning outcomes is determining whether the students’ accomplishments are “good enough.” Identifying benchmarks that represent educational effectiveness can assist in making these judgments. Brandman uses the Lumina Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP) to help establish the university’s Institutional Learning Outcomes. Brandman University should consider benchmarking its student learning outcomes data with other institutions implementing and publishing DQP results.

As Brandman addresses the issues cited above, it should be mindful of the expectations that it will need to meet at the time of its Mid-Cycle Review (see below), Interim Report, and next comprehensive review, which will take place under the Standards of Accreditation and, where relevant, institutional review process in the 2013 Handbook of Accreditation. These expectations build on past practice and will include, for example, student success, quality improvement processes such as assessment and program review, planning, and financial sustainability. The institutional review process delineated in the 2013 Handbook also calls for institutions to address specific foci: the meaning, quality, and integrity of degrees; student performance in core competencies close to the time of graduation; institutional planning with respect to graduation and retention; and institutional anticipation of the changes in the context of higher education. Brandman will be well served to familiarize itself with the 2013 Handbook at an early stage of preparation for the next reviews and reports.

In light of the findings from the Educational Effectiveness Review visit to Brandman University, the Commission acted to:

1. Receive the Educational Effectiveness Review team report and reaffirm the accreditation of Brandman University for a period of eight years.

2. Schedule the next comprehensive review with the Offsite Review (OSR) in spring 2021, the Accreditation Visit (AV) in fall 2021, and the Commission action currently planned for February 2022.


4. Request an Interim Report due November 1, 2018 on the following issues cited in the EER team report: 1) engagement of and support for adjunct faculty, and 2) pace of growth. Progress should be demonstrated, as defined above.

In taking this action to reaffirm accreditation, the Commission confirms that Brandman University has satisfactorily addressed the two Core Commitments to Institutional
Capacity and Educational Effectiveness and has successfully completed each aspect of the review conducted under the 2008 Standards of Accreditation. Between this action and the time of the next review, the institution is encouraged to continue its progress, particularly with respect to student learning and success.

In accordance with Commission policy, a copy of this letter will be sent to the chair of the Brandman University governing board in one week. The Commission expects that the team report and this action letter will be posted in a readily accessible location on the Brandman University website and widely disseminated throughout the institution to promote further engagement and improvement and to support the institution’s response to the specific issues identified in them. The team report and the action letter will also be posted on the WSCUC website. If Brandman University wishes to respond to the Commission action on its own website, WSCUC will post a link to that response.

Finally, the Commission wishes to express its appreciation for the extensive work that Brandman University undertook in preparing for and supporting this accreditation review. WSCUC is committed to an accreditation process that adds value to institutions while assuring public accountability, and we are grateful for your continued support of our process. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions about this letter or the action of the Commission.

Sincerely,

Mary Ellen Petrisko
President and Executive Director

MEP/gc

Cc: Harold Hewitt, WSCUC Chair
    Laurie Dodge, ALO
    David Janes, Board Chair
    Members of the EER team
    Maureen A. Maloney, WSCUC Staff Liaison
APPENDIX O

EDOL 700 - Transformational Change Leaders Portfolio (TCLP) Overview & Transformational Change Project (TCP) Overview

Transformational Change Leaders Portfolio (TCLP)
The TCL Portfolio will be the repository for your Transformational Leadership Development Plans and Progress Reports. You should include your TLSP report, analysis and growth plan. Also include artifacts demonstrating growth in your target areas.

This Portfolio will also be the repository for your Transformational Change Plan, evaluation instruments, next steps, lessons learned, recommendations for further research and implications for practice. Both the TLSP and the TCP should include journals, with personal reflection on your experiences. There are some assignments in EDOL 700 that direct you to upload to Dropbox and then to add to your Portfolio. Keep in mind the portfolio is a collection of documents/reflections/etc. that you will accumulate over your 2 year doctoral journey. It is not the same as turning in an assignment for a particular course into Dropbox.

Throughout your course work during year one you will be asked to save assignments, journals, and other pertinent documents that will become part of your Transformational Change Leader Portfolio during EDOL 780 and 724 in year two of your course work. Attached are the directions for how to set up the LiveText Portfolio. You are encouraged to establish your portfolio in LiveText per the instructions but you do not need to upload documents at this time. The key is to start NOW by saving the documents identified as going in the portfolio in a clear and safe digital filing system.

You will receive more information at our January Immersion.

TCLP Portfolio Instructions:

Transformational Change Leaders Portfolio Instructions

Transformational Change Project (TCP)
To integrate change theory into real world settings and provide an opportunity for clinical practice, each student will design, implement, and assess a Transformational Change Project (TCP), which will be operationalized in a real organization. The Transformational Change Project will be introduced and explored in various courses throughout the program, beginning with the first course. Below is a brief overview of the TCP links per your first year courses:

- In EDOL 700, Transformational Leadership, you will examine your readiness to become a leader of transformational change, and research change drivers that may affect your organization.
- In EDOL 706, Team and Group Dynamics, you will form a Transformational Change Leadership Team (TCLT) to develop a vision and begin the initial planning process for your TCP.
- In EDOL 707, Organizational Theory and Development, you will be looking at the TCP through the lens of organizational development and theory with a goal of developing your TCP Plan to Pilot and finalize your TCP Application.
- In EDOL 708, Strategic Thinking, you will develop a strategic implementation plan for the TCP.
- In EDOL 705, Communications and Conflict Management, you will learn to develop a Communication Plan to facilitate transformational change.
- In EDOL 709 Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, you will develop an evaluation design for this project will be developed.

Over the fall and spring semesters in Year 2, you will implement the TCP as a key focus of EDOL 780. In 780 your field work will be conducted under the guidance of your Cohort Mentor, who will also serve as the instructor for your EDOL 780 course. In EDOL 724, The Leader as Change Agent, you will deconstruct your experience with implementing the Transformational Change Project. You will also reflect on the political dilemmas you encountered and how you might have improved outcomes with ethical political strategies.

At your final Immersion, you will participate in a Transformational Change Symposium, in which you will present lessons learned, recommendations for further research and implications for practice. Faculty, community, and other doctoral students will be invited to this symposium.

At your second Immersion in January, more information will be provided on the Organization of this Portfolio. For the time being, you can divide your portfolio into two sections: Transformational Leadership Development Plan and Transformational Change Project. Assignments that relate to those two areas can be placed in their respective sections.
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TLSi Timeline and Directions

Time Line for TLSI
Fall 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 3</td>
<td>Student complete survey information and take survey Establish personal pass code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 5-8</td>
<td>Confirm respondents’ participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 9-10</td>
<td>Communicate URL and pass code to respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 11-15</td>
<td>Respondents complete on-line TLSi survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 18-21</td>
<td>TLSi reports are prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 21-22</td>
<td>TLSi reports emailed to Cohort Mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 22</td>
<td>TLSi reports emailed to students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: If Cohorts mentors have a compelling reason that the cohort needs to meet prior to September 23rd, they have the responsibility to check with Dr. Larick (Larick@Brandman.edu) to see if it is possible. In these cases it is suggested that students identify participants prior to immersion and no later than September 5th to have enough time for respondents to complete the survey. It is the cohort mentors responsibility to communicate with students regarding these timelines.

TLSI Setup Information

Your responses to these questions will ensure your responses are matched with those who respond to the survey for you. Please carefully record your personal passcode and group names for future reference.

1. Please enter your first and last name. This will only be used for providing a survey report.

2. Please enter a UNIQUE passcode using 6-8 characters. Your passcode must include at least one letter and at least one number. BE SURE TO WRITE DOWN YOUR CODE.

3. Please provide your Brandman email address to receive your report

4. Provide the name of your cohort mentor.

Create TLSi in your phone directory
Personal code

Donna O’neil

Continue to the next page to complete the Transformational Leadership Skills Inventory.
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Fall 2017 Immersion Activity – Developing Your Leadership Vision Statement

Developing Your Leadership Vision Statement

You developed a personal vision and purpose self-introduction (Assignment 1.1) and presented this statement today in your Cohort meeting right after lunch. The personal vision and purpose is focused on self. Assignment 1.3 asks you to now develop a Personal Leadership Vision Statement that focuses on your vision for you as a leader in the future. You may use the “ideal self” information you identified when you completed the “My Noble Purpose” and “My Values” in the Becoming A Resonant Leader text (pgs. 74-76 & 90-91) to help guide the development of your Leadership Vision Statement. The following suggestions are offered to help guide you in the development of Assignment 1.3.

1. Adapt the Circle of Life exercise on page 104 of Becoming A Resonant Leader text to identify your leadership values. You can use a single word or short descriptor. You need to identify at least five of your highest or most important leadership values. Remember, these are your leadership values. They may or may not be the same as personal values.

2. Using the identified leadership values from the Circle of Life activity you will develop a one to two sentence leadership purpose statement.

3. Use the Philosophical Orientation Questionnaire on pages 94 – 103 of the Becoming A Resonant Leader text to develop a deeper understanding of your dominant operating philosophy.

4. Reflecting on your leadership values, purpose statement and the results of the Philosophical Orientation Questionnaire write a 1-2 page Leadership Vision Statement to include:
   - Five highest or most important identified leadership values
   - One to two sentence leadership purpose statement
   - A reflective narrative* to describe the why and how of your leadership and include your personal leadership vision for the future.

* During the process of developing and reflecting on your leadership values, purpose and philosophical orientation you will come up with thoughts, examples, and stories that form your vision and clarify your values.

Immersion Handout – Introduction to EDOL 700 4:10 – 5:00 - Saturday, 2017
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Required Artifacts for Transformational Change Leadership Portfolio (TCLP)

Required Artifacts for the Portfolio

- Journal submissions from EDOL 700, 705, 706, 707, 708, and 721
- EDOL 700: Enterprise Change Needs Assessment and history of the organization (from websites, handbooks, other communications, mission and vision statements)
- EDOL 700 and 780: Assessment results for TCL (both years), Emotional Intelligence assessment and two more assessments.
- EDOL 705: Communication Audit (stakeholder interviews, communication survey, written communication samples), and Communication Plan.
- EDOL 706: Change Leadership Development Team Action Plan. From your efforts with your leadership team provide Leadership Team Agendas, meeting minutes, team building activities, team communications.
- EDOL 707: Plan to Plan.
- EDOL 707: List of stakeholders and list of mandates from the Plan to Plan. (Separate artifacts pulled from the Plan to Plan)
- EDOL 707: Internal Environmental Scan data.
- EDOL 708: External Environmental Scan data.
- EDOL 708: SWOT Analysis assignment 3.1, Parts A and B.
- EDOL 708: Vision Statement.
- EDOL 708: Implementation Plan and TCP Strategic Plan.
- Needed resources identified in EDOL 707 and 708, plus your projection of resources needed going forward e.g. Budgets, Inventory, Staff Listings, etc.
- EDOL 709: Evaluation Design Template.
- EDOL 720: Documents relating to new policies/structures/systems, innovative practices, etc. Also include the work from your Innovation Tournament team Made to Stick Project, if it pertains to your TCP.
- EDOL 721: Making an Ethical Decision in a Politically Charged Situation.

Revised 1/12/2019
• EDOL 721: Personal Code of Ethics.
• EDOL 722: Organizational Chart.
• EDOL 724: Leadership Legacy Paper.
• EDOL 724: Updated Strategic Plan.
• EDOL 724: Change model.
• From EDOL 724: Summative Evaluation and artifacts from your change implementation that relate to the evaluation (instruments used, meeting agendas/minutes/memos/photos/email/correspondence/presentations/evaluation data/etc.).
• EDOL 780: The kick-off Communique and other related communications.
• From EDOL 780: Celebrating Small Wins documents or media (photos, communication, etc.).
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Transformational Change Project Symposium
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Fifty Years of Excellence – Greek Names of Brandman EdD Program Cohorts

50 Year Plan of Excellence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Year</th>
<th>Cohort Name</th>
<th>Greek Symbol</th>
<th>Anniversary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Gamma</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Epsilon</td>
<td>Epsilon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Zeta</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>5 Year Anniversary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Eta</td>
<td>Eta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Theta</td>
<td>Theta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Iota</td>
<td>Iota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>Kappa</td>
<td>Kappa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Lambda</td>
<td>Lambda</td>
<td>10 Year Anniversary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Mu</td>
<td>Mu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>Nu</td>
<td>Nu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>Xi</td>
<td>Xi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>Omicron</td>
<td>Omicron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>Pi</td>
<td>Pi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>Rho</td>
<td>Rho</td>
<td>15 Year Anniversary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>Sigma</td>
<td>Sigma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>Tau</td>
<td>Tau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>Upsilon</td>
<td>Upsilon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032</td>
<td>Phi</td>
<td>Phi</td>
<td>20 Year Anniversary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>Chi</td>
<td>Chi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034</td>
<td>Psi</td>
<td>Psi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>Omega</td>
<td>Omega</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>Alpha Alpha</td>
<td>Alpha Alpha</td>
<td>25 Year Anniversary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2037</td>
<td>Alpha Beta</td>
<td>Alpha Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2038</td>
<td>Alpha Gamma</td>
<td>Alpha Gamma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2039</td>
<td>Alpha Delta</td>
<td>Alpha Delta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>Alpha Epsilon</td>
<td>Alpha Epsilon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2041</td>
<td>Alpha Zeta</td>
<td>Alpha Zeta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2042</td>
<td>Alpha Eta</td>
<td>Alpha Eta</td>
<td>30 Year Anniversary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2043</td>
<td>Alpha Theta</td>
<td>Alpha Theta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2044</td>
<td>Alpha Iota</td>
<td>Alpha Iota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2045</td>
<td>Alpha Kappa</td>
<td>Alpha Kappa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2046</td>
<td>Alpha Lambda</td>
<td>Alpha Lambda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2047</td>
<td>Alpha Mu</td>
<td>Alpha Mu</td>
<td>35 Year Anniversary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2048</td>
<td>Alpha Nu</td>
<td>Alpha Nu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2049</td>
<td>Alpha Xi</td>
<td>Alpha Xi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>Alpha Omicron</td>
<td>Alpha Omicron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2051</td>
<td>Alpha Pi</td>
<td>Alpha Pi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2052</td>
<td>Alpha Rho</td>
<td>Alpha Rho</td>
<td>40 Year Anniversary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2053</td>
<td>Alpha Sigma</td>
<td>Alpha Sigma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2054</td>
<td>Alpha Tau</td>
<td>Alpha Tau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2055</td>
<td>Alpha Upsilon</td>
<td>Alpha Upsilon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2056</td>
<td>Alpha Phi</td>
<td>Alpha Phi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2057</td>
<td>Alpha Chi</td>
<td>Alpha Chi</td>
<td>45 Year Anniversary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2058</td>
<td>Alpha Psi</td>
<td>Alpha Psi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2059</td>
<td>Alpha Omega</td>
<td>Alpha Omega</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2060</td>
<td>Beta Alpha</td>
<td>Beta Alpha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2061</td>
<td>Beta Beta</td>
<td>Beta Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2062</td>
<td>Beta Gamma</td>
<td>Beta Gamma</td>
<td>50 Year Anniversary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spring 2018 Immersion Diversity Lunch and Learn

Deconstructing Diversity: Creating a Dialogue in a Complex World

Item # 2 Lunch Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lunch with Dr. Carlos Guzman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saturday June 23, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-1:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicate Yes or No for Attending Session**

Dr. Carlos Guzman has proposed a pilot Immersion activity. He would like to invite interested students to join him during lunch for a Dialog on Diversity. Lunch will be held in a separate breakout room.

**DECONSTRUCTING DIVERSITY: CREATING DIALOGUE IN A COMPLEX WORLD**

Diversity can be defined as: the condition of having or being composed of differing elements: variety; especially: the inclusion of different types of people (such as people of different races or cultures) in a group or organization. Diversity is a complex construct. When I ask people “what is diversity?” the answer is generally race and/or ethnicity. Diversity is at its core, “difference.” Diversity is part of our everyday life. How we move through the world and express ourselves, and promote and celebrate others is crucial to creating understanding and inclusion. In our session, we will discuss diversity from the perspective of self-awareness, inclusion and equity designed to improve relationships and collaborate harmoniously within any setting.
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Brandman EDD Facebook Page—Celebrating Achievement of Successful Dissertation Defense 2017

CONGRATULATIONS to Dr. Barbara Bartels who did an exceptional job of defending her dissertation. See More

Likes: 113
Comments: 48

Like
Comment
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Cohort Identity Artifacts

Cohort shirts displayed during 2015 community builder with Dr. Pendley’s cohort. Image posted on Brandman EDD Facebook page.

Cohort shirts and hats displayed at September 2017 immersion with Dr. Greenburg’s Epsilon cohort. Image posted on Brandman EDD Facebook page.
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Fall 2017 Immersion – Agenda and Resources: Transition to Digital Commons

Ed.D. 2017 Fall Immersion
Think Green!

The Ed.D. Immersion planning team would like you to join us in going GREEN with electronic handouts beginning with the Fall 2017 Immersion. With the advancement in technology and ease of implementation, it has never been a better time to let the Brandman Green revolution begin!

Beginning with the Fall Immersion all printed workshop handouts will be replaced with electronic copies. We understand that handouts are one of the most valuable takeaways for our participants, so we would like to make them even more impactful by offering electronic copies that offer many benefits of convenience:

- Take notes electronically with Adobe Reader
- Download handouts into theme related digital resource folders for later review
- Experience light weight convenience – no need to carry around stacks of paper

To access the new Immersion Digital Commons Platform bookmark this important link:
http://digitalcommons.brandman.edu/immersion/fall2017/

FALL 2017 IMMERSION
Browse the contents of Fall 2017 Immersion:

- Zetas
  - Zeta Immersion Schedule and Handouts
- Epsilons
  - Epsilon Immersion Schedule and Handouts
- Miniversities
  - Schedule and Handouts

Then after logging onto the main Fall 2017 Immersion click on your class (Zetas/Epsilons). You will find the entire agenda for your review with each scheduled activity. In addition, all Miniversity sessions are contained in their own link. Activities with an (*) denote that inside that activity you will find handouts or PPTs.
You will note in the diagram below that you will find handouts or PPTs in the activity under **REGISTRATION AND BREAKFAST**.

### SESSION HANDOUTS AND POWERPOINTS
- Fall 2017 Immersion Agenda.pdf (383 KB)
- Zeta EdD Timeline.pdf (69 KB)

**Additional Notes:**
- Any handouts labeled with (Required) in the name means that you should have a hardcopy printed out in advance for your use at the immersion.
- **RECOMMENDED:** Try to download anything you intend to use on your laptop before the immersion to avoid internet issues.

While launching anything new has its risks and challenges, we appreciate all that you do to take the highly acclaimed Brandman Ed.D. program to the next level of excellence. Thank you for being eco-friendly and supporting our focus on giving the planet a greener edge!

Ed.D. Core Planning Team
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## Fall 2017 Immersion Agenda

### FALL 2017 Immersion Agenda

#### DAY ONE
**Saturday September 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZETAS</th>
<th>EPSILONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **GRAND BALLROOM**  
Theme: Lead From the Heart  
7:00-8:00 Registration and Breakfast  
8:00-8:30 Welcome & Introductions  
Dr. Patricia Clark White, Associate Dean  
Dr. Christine Zappos, Dean, School of Education  
8:30-8:50 Community Builder: Lacey 3 Epsilons  
8:50-10:30 KEYNOTE SPEAKER: Mark Crowley Lead from the Heart |

**Break 10:30-10:45**

**SALON E**  
10:45-11:45 Brandman EDD Program  
Dr. Zappos

**SALON D**  
10:45-11:45 A Call to Urgency  
Developing a Public Service Message using Animoto  
Dr. Ryder and Dr. Lee

**LUNCH**  
11:45-12:45 Passing 12:45-1:00

**VARIOUS BREAKOUT ROOMS**  
1:00-2:30 Cohort Time  
EDOL 700 Assignments 1.1 Personal Values and Purpose  
and 2.2 Cohort Mentor TCP Discussion

**SALON D**  
1:00-2:30 Politics & Decision Making  
Dr. Highetower

**BREAK**  
2:30-2:45

**SALON E**  
2:45-3:45 Transformational Leadership  
Dr. Larick  
Passing 3:45-4:00

**VARIOUS BREAKOUT ROOMS**  
4:00-5:00 Introduction to EDOL 700  
Assignment 3.1 Personal Leadership Vision Statement  
700 and 700 Instructors

**VARIOUS BREAKOUT ROOMS**  
2:45-3:45 Meet the Instructors  
EDOL 721 Activity led by Instructors  
Passing 3:45-4:00

**SALON D**  
4:00-5:00 Innovation Tournament—Value This!  
EDOL 720 Assignment 3.0  
Dr. Ryder and 720 Instructors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>Zetas</th>
<th>Epsilonss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00-8:00</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00-8:05</td>
<td>SALON E</td>
<td>SALON D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00-8:05</td>
<td>Agenda Review Dr. Lee</td>
<td>Agenda Review Dr. Guzman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:05-9:15</td>
<td>Resonant Leadership from the Inside Out Dr. DeVore</td>
<td>8:05-9:30 Creaivity in the Digital Age Dr. Ryder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:20-10:00</td>
<td>That Used to Be Us Dr. Larick</td>
<td>VARIOUS BREAKOUT ROOMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-10:15</td>
<td>BREAK 10:00-10:15</td>
<td>9:30-10:00 Innovation Hot Team Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15-11:30</td>
<td>SALON E</td>
<td>SALON D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15-11:30</td>
<td>Building Teams Dr. Capellino</td>
<td>10:15-11:30 Navigating EDOL 780 TCP/TLSI/TLDP Dr. White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30-12:30</td>
<td>NETWORKING LUNCH 11:30-12:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30-12:30</td>
<td>Zeta and Epsilon Seating Mixed at Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-12:45</td>
<td>12:30-12:45 Passing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45-1:45</td>
<td>SALON E</td>
<td>VARIOUS BREAKOUT ROOMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45-1:45</td>
<td>TLSI/TLDP Dr. Larick</td>
<td>12:45-2:50 Cohort Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:50-3:05</td>
<td>Transformational Change Dr. White and Dr. Ryder</td>
<td>Launching the TCP Successfully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:50-3:05</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15-4:15</td>
<td>VARIOUS BREAKOUT ROOMS MINIVERSITIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15-4:15</td>
<td>Session 1 3:15-4:15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30-5:30</td>
<td>Session 2 4:30-5:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30-6:30</td>
<td>Assigned Breakout Rooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:30-6:30 (Optional)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Innovation Tournament</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Feedback Sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hot Teams meet with faculty to review Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Sign up in advance at Main Check In Desk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## DAY THREE
**Monday, September 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zetas</th>
<th>Epsilons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00-8:00 Breakfast</td>
<td><strong>GRAND BALLROOM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00-8:20 Breakfast</td>
<td>Agenda Review- Dr. Ryder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:20-8:40 Community Builder - Riverside</td>
<td>2 Epsilons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:40-10:00 Leaders that Make the Heart Sing</td>
<td><em>Dr. Lorick and Dr. Petersen</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BREAK 10:00-10:15</strong></td>
<td><strong>SALON E</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15-11:30 You’re an Ed.D. Student, Now What?</td>
<td><em>Dr. Lee and Dr. Capellino</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SALON D</strong></td>
<td>10:15-11:30 Purpose Statement and Research Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15-11:30 Purpose Statement and Research Questions</td>
<td><em>Dr. Hightower</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUNCH 11:30-12:30</strong></td>
<td><strong>GRAND BALLROOM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passing 12:30-12:45</td>
<td>12:45-2:00 Various Breakout Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45-2:00 Preparing for the Prospectus</td>
<td><em>Dr. Lorick Dr. Lee Dr. Ryder</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-Student Dialog</td>
<td><em>Dr. Hightower Dr. Guzman Dr. Capellino</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose Statement and Research Questions</td>
<td><em>Dr. Enomoto Dr. Pendley Dr. DeVore</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND BALLROOM</strong></td>
<td>2:10-2:30 Video, Closing Remarks and Safe Travels Home!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Fall 2017 Immersion – Welcome Presentation: Dean Zeppos to Incoming Zeta Cohort

Welcome ZETA CLASS!

While we are waiting to begin...

Write down your biggest fear or barrier you see to being successful in this doctoral program.

Brandman Ed.D. Program

Dr. Christine Zeppos, Dean & Professor

September, 2017
History of Brandman Doctorate

• July 26, 2010 – Zeppos starts at Brandman
  • Two Dreams – NCATE & EdD

• October, 2010 – Dr. White hired as Associate Dean

History of Brandman Doctorate

• December 2010 – Advisory Board ½ Day Retreat of Employers
  • They wanted...
    ... leaders who were truly innovative and creative (innovation tournament).

    ... graduates who have planned & executed change (TCP) – no Comps!

    ... leaders who were not only skilled, self reflective, politically astute, and collaborative, but visionary and worth following (TLSi, TLDP).

    ... their current employees cannot miss work (holiday immersions).
History of Brandman Doctorate

• Summer 2011 WASC Approval – High Accolades for Program Design and Development

• Full Year of Advisory Board Recruitment

• September 2012 First Cohort Starts

Ed.D. Culture & Traditions

• CONCEPT: “Visualize the End” the Birth of EdDy – September 2012 – Brandman Designed Regalia

• And then Betas showed up to January 2014 immersion with BEdDy
Ed.D. Culture & Traditions

• Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta, Epsilon, Zeta...WHY?
• Right Side – Left Side of Immersion Ballroom
• Badge Colors – Maroon, Gold, Green, Black
• Clicker – Between Dr. Larick and Dr. White

History of Brandman Ed.D.

• CONCEPT: Rigorous Program, but we are here to support you

  • My Doctoral Program - Look Left, Look Right...One of you will not be here next year!
  • Brandman Doctoral Program - Look Left, Look Right...make sure and follow-up with these people to ensure they reach success.
    • Cohort Format
    • Cohort Mentors (Milt Glick)
    • We only Hire Faculty Experts who want you to succeed!
History of Brandman Ed.D.

- CONCEPT: Networking is important as leader
  
  - Structured
    
    - Cohorts
    
    - In Coursework – Mixing of Cohorts each semester
    
    - Local Campus Activities & University Wide Activities
  
- CONCEPT: Networking is important as leader (continued)
  
  - At Immersions - structured too, but unstructured can be best opportunities for career advancement, dissertation support, and personal growth.
  
  We want to know you – we are at immersion for you! What do you do? What are your goals?
  
  - Sit with us at lunch
  - Breakfast
  - Breaks
  - After hours at hotel
History of Brandman Ed.D.

- **CONCEPT:** Become a Recognized Leader!

  Among those who responded, more than 50% of our Ed.D students (Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta) have received a promotion or have been hired for a new position by the completion of coursework.
  - Tell us about your successes!

  Why? Skills learned in Program & Dispositions
  - Dispositions are important!

---

History of Brandman Ed.D.: Graduation Traditions

- Graduation Pin

- Celebrations:
  - Hooding – 60 seconds to speak
  - Graduation (at Chapman)
  - Dessert & Drinks at the Zeppos House
Visualize & Plan your Path to Graduation with Specificity – what does ABD mean?

• Write down your final defense date – visualize it. (April 26, 1997)

• See yourself in this picture.

Stay Connected to Us!

• Facebook – Brandman EdD
  https://www.facebook.com/groups/BrandmanEdD/

• LinkedIn -
  https://www.linkedin.com/groups?home&gid=6718769

• Twitter - #buedd
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EDD Bootcamp Blackboard Page

Welcome from Dean Zeppos
Posted on: Monday, June 27, 2016 1:27:37 PM PDT

[YouTube Video]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yCXC3pXet_A&feature=youtu.be
Why Brandman?

Our Doctorate of Education in Organizational Leadership provides:

- Hands-on experiences to facilitate learning to lead transformational change through innovation and collaboration
- The ability to complete coursework in two years—begin planning your dissertation from the beginning of your doctoral journey, setting you up for successful dissertation writing in your third year
- Opportunities to work with distinguished leaders as mentors and bond with student peers through monthly cohort meetings
- Face-to-face support and access to instructors through an online program

Learning Outcomes

Designed for busy professionals, the Ed.D. program uses the best of online learning and face-to-face support through local cohort meetings, three immersion sessions a year and synchronous virtual meetings to accomplish rich learning in the following six pillars of the program:

- Transformational Leadership
- Diversity
- Collaborative Relationships
- Political Intelligence
- Strategic Thinking
- Creative and Sustained Innovation

“From the beginning to the completion of my program, every class, every immersion and every cohort meeting continued to prepare me in my role as an organizational leader. All my coursework was applicable to my work and I quickly grew as a professional… Class textbooks were engaging, online and cohort discussions with classmates were stimulating and my professors were all top notch. I can’t speak highly enough about the content and the process for learning in this doctoral program.”

Kristin Erogan-Daraniki, Ed.D.
Superintendent, Santee School District
Brandman Class of 2018
Cohorts

Individual online studies are enhanced through local monthly cohort meetings where students collaboratively develop their leadership competencies. Monthly meetings are under the guidance of distinguished cohort mentors who are experienced leading practitioners. Cohort mentor experts will stay with their students for the entire two years of coursework. They mentor students in their career development, foster dialogue and model best practices. They also guide students as they explore dissertation topics.

“I have quickly become immersed in my Ed.D. program and have met my new lifelong family disguised as my cohort peers.”

Reginald Thompkins
Deputy Superintendent
Oceanside Unified School District
Ed.D. Student - Irvine Zeta Cohort

Welcome

Are you looking for a program that will bring out the best in you as a leader and prepare you to transform your organization and community? Our Doctorate of Education in Organizational Leadership offers the best experience for working professionals. We provide change-driven coursework in the online format alongside crucial cohort meetings and face-to-face immersions with esteemed faculty and highly accomplished cohort mentors. We are proudly one of the few doctoral programs that has students preparing for their dissertation from the very first course. Our unique and rigorous doctoral program cultivates skills which have led to over 50 percent of our students receiving promotions while still in the program.

Tod Bumett, Ed.D.
Interim Dean, School of Education
Executive Vice Chancellor of Advancement & Special Projects
Brandman University

www.brandman.edu/edd
"I don’t think I would have had the foresight to begin a community-wide initiative without the curriculum in the Ed.D. program. Certainly, the focus on what it means to be a visionary leader with aspirational goals, not just managerial goals, made a difference."

Phil Alfano, Ed.D.
Superintendent, Patterson Joint Unified School District
Branding Class of 2016

Immersions

During two years of coursework, students will take part in six immersions. They’ll have the opportunity to meet doctoral students from throughout the world, build extensive relationships with faculty and students from throughout the program; see presentations by expert speakers and participate in hands-on, interactive learning. Immersions will:

- Introduce major themes for the upcoming term
- Review teachings from previous terms
- Include breakout activities
- Provide networking opportunities with faculty members and peers from other cohorts
- Facilitate dialogue with potential dissertation chairs

Immersion:

A gathering of two years of doctoral students in one conference-like setting to further develop instruction, share subject matter content, collaborate on the educational journey and network for deeper relationships with colleagues, faculty and mentors.
"I had been in my job for nearly 10 years when I began the Ed.D. Organizational Leadership program. I quickly realized that this program was going to change my life, and boy did it ever! Thirteen months into the program, I received my first promotion, thanks in large part to my Transformational Change Project."

Olga Spanoudes, Ed.D.
VP Leadership, Learning & Development - CIT Bank
Brandman Class of 2017

Transformational Change Project (TCP)
To practice the theory and demonstrate mastery, each student will design, implement and assess a Transformational Change Project (TCP), which will be used in a real organization. This innovative concept will be introduced and explored in various courses throughout the entire program and has led to numerous candidate/job promotions.

MORE THAN 50%
of Brandman Ed.D. students receive a promotion or new position while in the program*

Brandman University is a two-year recipient of the LEAD Award for the Doctor of Education (Ed.D.), Organizational Leadership. The award recognizes the top practices in leadership development globally. The program emphasizes creating transformational leaders in all fields, not just education.

www.brandman.edu/edd
Traditional or Thematic Dissertation

For the final project of the Ed.D. program, students can either complete a traditional or thematic dissertation. The thematic dissertation is a supportive collaboration between faculty and students that develops research plans around current issues. Each doctoral candidate researches a topic from a different perspective while sharing literature sources, providing feedback and helping peers remain focused and moving forward. A faculty mentor or dissertation chair will guide the group’s thematic direction while students write individual dissertations from their own points of view and investigation.

“The coursework is challenging and relevant. I immediately practiced learned strategies in the workplace.”

82% graduation rate

Our culture of support allows our students to outperform their peers at most 4-year colleges and other nontraditional.

ENROLLMENT PROCESS

Admission may be achieved by fulfilling the graduate admission requirements as stated in the catalog.

Application documents:
- Graduate application
- Official transcripts (stated) from master’s program with a minimum GPA of 3.0

Submit a portfolio that includes:
- Two essays that show graduate level communication and skills
- Resume showing leadership experience, professional development achievements, awards and career recognitions
- Two letters of reference from persons who can attest to the applicant’s ability to do graduate-level work
“Skills I learned come into play every day: being able to relate to people, being able to negotiate, being able to work with people from all walks of life. It really helps you go from one level to the next.”

Melanie Dopson, Ed.D.
Director of Secondary Education, El Grove Unified
Brandman Class of 2016

Interdisciplinary Degree

The Ed.D. program is for students from all career paths: K-12 educators, business executives, organizational development consultants, city and county government employees and community college and university faculty and staff. It integrates the latest theories and best practices from both education and organizational leadership to produce 21st-century leaders. Learning how to lead people through transformational change is woven through the entire program. Students will be immersed in a variety of subjects including transformational leadership, communications and conflict, team and group dynamics, strategic thinking, diversity, creativity and learning how to handle resistance.

☐ If the applicant is not in a leadership position, a letter must be submitted explaining his/her plans for addressing assignments that involve working with groups to develop work products

Intake interview:

☐ Complete intake interview with a doctoral faculty member designated by the associate dean
MISSION

Brandman University’s Ed.D. in Organizational Leadership develops visionary leaders who are creative agents of change in transforming their diverse organizations through collaboration, innovation, positive influence, strategic thinking and a profound commitment to lifelong learning.

Learn More:
brandman.edu/edd
800.581.4100
Zetas: Please use the following information below to help you fill out required survey information for the June 2018 Immersion planning. Thank you.

**Item # 1: Meet the Chairs Activity**
Zetas will participate in the *Meet the Chairs* Activity during the June Immersion. Each student will select (4) four different Chair Teams that they would like to learn more about during this activity. Before selecting your (4) teams, we suggest that you research the chairs who are attending this session by exploring their interests and experiences on the Brandman Dissertation site:

https://my.brandman.edu/future_student/resources/Pages/Dissertation.aspx

Look under the “Chair Directory” to learn more about each dissertation chair who may align with your research needs.

Since not all chairs on this directory will be in attendance during this activity, it will be important for you to become familiar with a variety of chairs before selecting a chair. As you know you will not formally select a chair until you Advance to Candidacy in April 2019. Many students however do form informal partnerships with prospective chairs throughout Year II of the program. You may possibly meet someone during this activity who meets your research needs.

During this Immersion Activity each student will be assigned to four different teams for a period of 20 minutes each. Each chair will provide a brief introduction of their interests and how they prefer to work with students on the dissertation project. Your role will be to share out a one minute “Elevator Speech” of your intended research so that each team can then provide some collective insight into your topic and/or offer suggestions to help you further your research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team #</th>
<th>Dissertation Chair Teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dr. Don Crane               Dr. Pat White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dr. Guadalupe Solis        Dr. Tamerin Capellino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dr. Tod Burnett             Dr. Len Hightower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dr. Carlos Rodriguez       Dr. Phil Pendley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dr. Tim McCarty             Dr. Carol Anderson Woo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dr. Jonathan Greenberg      Dr. Carol Riley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dr. Sam Bresler             Dr. Carlos Guzman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dr. Lisbeth Johnson         Dr. Margaret Moodian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dr. George Giokaris         Dr. Marilou Ryder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dr. Myrna Cote              Dr. Doug DeVore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dr. Bruce Newland           Dr. Patrick Ainsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dr. Nicholas Richter        Dr. Julie Hadden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Shalamon Duke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dr. Linda Williams/Dr. Laurie Goodman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Dr. Shalamon Duke</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Brandman University Board of Regents

Directories

Board of Regents – Brandman University

The Board of Regents, appointed by the Board of Trustees, is composed of eighteen members, one-third of whom are elected annually for a three-year term. The president of Chapman University serves as regent ex-officio.

Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William K. Hood</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Higby</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members of the Board

Stephen G. Austin
Joyce Brandman
Brenda Carver
Irving Chase
Jerome Cwiertnia
Patrick Dirk
John Evans
Ed Grier
Jill Gwallney
Doy B. Henley
Vera M. Martinez
Kevin McGlene
James Rozsak
Ronald E. Soderling
Ralph Stern
Daniele Struppa
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Snowball Sampling List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty/Staff Present from Beginning through 2017</th>
<th>Faculty/Staff Present 2013-2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. C. Zeppos</td>
<td>1. A. Enemoto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. P. White</td>
<td>2. L. Hightower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. M. Ryder</td>
<td>4. J. Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. P. Ainsworth</td>
<td>5. C. Guzman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. C. Froehlich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. C. Osborne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. L. Goodman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. M. Cote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>