



A note to reviewers: Please complete all information in brackets and shaded boxes before submitting this document.

AAQEP Quality Review Team Report for Manhattan College – Educational Leadership

Quality Review Team Members

Robert M. Mangione, Ed.D., Executive Director of Educational Programs and Curriculum, Stony Brook University, The State University of New York, Stony Brook, New York

Jackie Nygaard, Ed.D., Associate Dean of Teacher Preparation, Brigham-Young University-Idaho, Rexburg, Idaho

Catherine Salch, MS.Ed, P.D., Local Practitioner/Director of the Liberty Partnerships Program, Iona University, New Rochelle, New York

Review Schedule

Off-Site Review Team Meeting: January 11, 2023 at 1:00PM ET

Off-Site Review Provider Meeting: January 24, 2023 at 1:00 PM ET

On-Site Review: February 26-28, 2023

Member History

Join Date: 05/18/2018

Guide Edition Used: 2021

Purpose and Scope of Review

The AAQEP Quality Review Team listed above conducted a review of the education programs put forward by Manhattan College – Educational Leadership. The team considered the case

presented in the Quality Assurance Report by verifying the claims made in the report and by gathering additional relevant evidence to corroborate the claims.

Report Contents

1. Case Specification	2
2. Summary of the Case	3
3. Summary of Evidence Examined On Site by the Quality Review Team	19
4. Analysis of Evidence by Standard	20
Standard 1: Candidate/Completer Performance	21
Standard 2: Completer Professional Competence and Growth	27
Standard 3: Quality Program Practices	31
Standard 4: Program Engagement in System Improvement	37
5. Evidence of Identified Innovations	44
6. Program Capacity Checks	45
7. Concluding Thoughts or Observations	47
8. Supporting Materials	47

1. Case Specification

The Program Specification Table identifies the specific programs seeking accreditation in the AAQEP review. The table can be copied from the Off-Site Review Report and pasted below.

Program Specification Table for AAQEP Accreditation

Degree or Certificate granted by the institution or organization	State Certificate, License, Endorsement, or Other Credential	Number of Candidates enrolled in current academic year (as of 08/21) ¹	Number of Completers in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 08/21)
Programs that lead to initial teaching credentials			
N/A			
Total for programs that lead to initial credentials			
Programs that lead to additional or advanced credentials for already-licensed educators			
Master of Science in Education degree in School Building Leadership (SBL) – 33 credits and Advanced Certificate in School Building Leadership (SBL) – 24 credits	School Building Leader (SBL)	16	10

¹ Count all candidates enrolled in the listed programs to date for the current academic year (12-month period).

Master of Science in Education degree in Advanced Leadership Studies (ALS) – 30 credits* and Advanced Certificate in Advanced Leadership Studies – 11 credits *No participants to date.	School District Leader (SDL)	8	3
Total for programs that lead to additional/advanced credentials		24	13
<i>Programs that lead to credentials for other school professionals or to no specific credential²</i>			
N/A			
Total for additional programs			
TOTAL enrollment and productivity for all programs		24	13
Unduplicated ³ total of all program candidates and completers		24	13

Program Location and Modality

If any of the above programs are offered at more than one location or via different or multiple modalities, please describe below, and link to any relevant descriptions on your website.

Physical Locations

4513 Manhattan College Parkway, Riverdale, NY 10471

Modalities (face-to-face, online, hybrid)

Face-to-Face, Synchronously Online, and Hybrid

2. Summary of the Case

The Summary of the Case is a concise statement of the Quality Review Team's understanding of the case being made in the QAR by the provider that each AAQEP standard is met. Developed by the team during the off-site review, the final language agreed to by both the Quality Review Team and the provider appears below.

² These programs include noncertificate masters of education, doctoral programs, etc., OR those that lead to a license for noninstructional education staff with no teaching license as a prerequisite (e.g., school nurse, school social worker, school counselor, school business manager)

³ *Unduplicated* refers to a total number of unique candidates or completers. Individuals who are working toward or earned more than one credential may appear in multiple rows above but should be counted only once here.

Manhattan College is a private Lasallian Catholic college in Riverdale, NY with six distinct schools and approximately 3,694 students (528 of which are graduate students). The School of Education and Health offers undergraduate programs in education, kinesiology and health professions, in addition to graduate programs in special education, counseling, school leadership and instructional design.

The focus of this quality review is limited to the Educational Leadership Programs, more specifically two master's degree options with associated post-master's advanced certificates:

1. Master of Science in Education degree in School Building Leadership (SBL) – 33 credits
 - a. Advanced Certificate in School Building Leadership – 24 credits
2. Master of Science in Education degree in Advanced Leadership Studies leading to School District Leadership (SDL) certification – 30 credits.
 - a. Advanced Certificate in Advanced Leadership Studies leading to School District Leadership certification – 11 credits.

In fact, the provider brings forward five lines of evidence in the QAR to support the case that its School Building Leadership and Advanced Leadership Studies programs meet Standards 1 and 2.

- Course Grades – completer grades for the core courses and internship evaluation (GPAs) must meet the college standards for good standing (e.g, GPA of 3.0 or better) leading to program completion.
- License Exam Results – completers qualified for the certification they seek when endorsed must receive a passing score on NYS Assessments (NYSTCE).
 - o School Building Leader (SBL) Assessment
 - § Sub-areas include: (1) Instructional Leadership; (2) School Culture and Learning Environment; (3) Developing Human Capital; (4) Family and Community Engagement; (5) Operational Systems, Data Systems, and Legal Guidelines.
 - o School District Leader (SDL) Assessment
 - § Sub-areas include: (1) Developing, Communicating, and Sustaining an Educational Environment; (2) Supervising Districtwide Change and Accountability; (3) Leading the District Educational Program; (4) Managing District Resources and Compliance.
- Clinical Evaluation – an internship is the capstone course of the educational leadership programs, which includes a mentor evaluation.
 - o This includes mentor observation of candidates in internship clinical settings.
 - o There are six internship evaluation categories: (1) Strategic Decision Making; (2) Caring Leadership; (3) Multicultural Perspective; (4) Technology; (5) Learning to Learn; (6) Internship Improvement Initiative.
 - o Multiple perspectives are sought: (1) P-12 Partner/Employer; (2) Candidate; (3) College faculty member.
- Field Experience – students participate in Course Related Leadership Activities (CRLA) to transfer course work to field placement for employment in areas such as leadership, supervision, evaluation, curriculum, management, and law.
- Dispositions – participants pursuing School Building Leader (SBL) certification demonstrate via a Personal Learning Plan and consistent with the NYS requirement that they can lead themselves to critically reflect upon and transfer what they have learned to new situations while supporting life-long learning.

It is acknowledged that not all completers are certified educational leaders, that access to sufficient and accurate data is needed, and that this gap will be addressed by program faculty and administrators.

The provider's analysis of evidence presented includes the identification of areas for ongoing and planned improvements and innovations.

- While conducting this self-study, it became apparent to faculty at Manhattan College that not all completers are certified educational leaders.
- Some School Building Leader (SBL) completers do not have scores for Course Related Leadership Activities (CRLA) and Personal Learning Plans (PLP) in core courses.
- Although School Building Leader (SBL) completers are meeting the minimum or lowest level of success requirements for SBL NYSTCE 107/109, this is acknowledged as the weakest area of performance.
- Plans exist to improve EDUG 871 – *Quantitative Process Control in Education*, partly through a forum with partners to address ever evolving international and global perspectives as these emerge within districts and schools.

While the Educational Leadership program team at Manhattan College acknowledges a gap in certain available data (e.g., SBL/SDL licensing exam results, Course Related Leadership Activities (CRLAs), and Personal Learning Plans (PLPs)), evidence evaluated in the QAR confirms associated findings regarding programmatic success.

QAR Aspect-Evidence Table for Standards 1 and 2

This table lists the evidence provided in the QAR for Standards 1 and 2. It is copied from the Off-Site Review Report and pasted below. If a measure is used in **both** Standards 1 and 2, please list it separately under each standard.

STANDARD 1										
Measure	Program(s) for which measure is used	1a	1b	1c	1d	1e	1f	Data Scope	Criteria for success	Perspective*
Completer GPA for Core Courses - SBL	SBL	x						AY 2018-2021 n = 21 R = .66 Mean = 3.85 SD = .2	Expectation of Success $\geq$ 3.0	1, 3
Completer GPA for Core Courses - ALS	ALS (or SDL)	x						AY 2013-2021 n = 35 R = .33 Mean = 3.98 SD = .08	Expectation of Success $\geq$ 3.0	1, 3
EDUG 745 GPA	SBL		x					AY 2018-2021 n = 21 R = 1.33 Mean = 3.76 SD = .44	Expectation of Success $\geq$ 3.0	1, 3
EDUG 738 GPA	SBL				x			AY 2018-2021 n = 21 R = 0 Mean = 4.00 SD = 0.00	Expectation of Success $\geq$ 3.0	1, 3

EDUG 871 GPA	ALS (or SDL)				x			AY 2013-2021 n = 35 R = 0 Mean = 4.00 SD = 0.00	Expectation of Success ≥ 3.0	1, 3
EDUG 747 GPA (CRLA)	SBL					x		AY 2018-2021 n = 17 R = 18 Mean = 95.65 SD = 5.93	Expectation of Success ≥ 80.0	1, 3
EDUG 748/889 GPA	SBL						x	AY 2018-2021 n = 21 R = .67 Mean = 3.94 SD = .17	Expectation of Success ≥ 3.0	1, 3
NYSTCE Test Mean Scores for Field 107	SBL	x						AY 2018-2021 n = 11 R = 59 Mean = 547.08 SD = 16.59	Expectation of Success ≥ 520 out of 600	1, 3, 6
NYSTCE Test 107 Part 1 a & b	SBL		x					AY 2018-2021 n = 12 R = 2 Mean = 3.21 SD = .66	Expectation of Success ≥ 3.0	1, 3, 6

NYSTCE 107 – Sub Area 2a & 2c	SBL			x				AY 2018-2021 n = 12 R = 3 Mean = 3.00 SD = .88	Expectation of Success ≥ 3.0	1, 3, 6
NYSTCE Test Mean Scores for Field 108	SBL	x						AY 2018-2021 n = 11 R = 23 Mean = 550.25 SD = 8.64	Expectation of Success ≥ 520 out of 600	6
NYSTCE Test Mean Scores for Field 103	ALS (or SDL)	x					x	AY 2013-2021 n = 16 R = 58 Mean = 239.87 SD = 13.97	Certified test results ≥ 220 out of 300	1, 3, 6
NYSTCE 103 Subarea 2	ALS (or SDL)				x			AY 2013-2021 n = 16 R = 79 Mean = 241.69 SD = 24.67	Certified test results ≥ 220 out of 300	6
NYSTCE 103 Subarea 4	ALS (Or SDL)				x			AY 2013-2021 n = 16 R = 120	Certified test results ≥ 220 out of 300	6

							Mean = 234.38 SD = 40.34		
NYSTCE Test Mean Scores for Field 104	ALS (or SDL)	x					AY 2013- 2021 n = 14* R = 83 Mean = 238.60 SD = 23.83 *One completer passed the second time; other certified completers have no test results.	Certified test results ≥ 220 out of 300	6
NYSTCE 104 Subarea 1	ALS (or SDL)		x	x		x	AY 2013- 2021 n = 15 R = 65 Mean = 232.43 SD = 21.37	Certified test results ≥ 220 out of 300	1, 3, 6
NYSTCE 104 Subareas 4	ALS (or SDL)			x			AY 2013- 2021 n = 15 R = 103 Mean = 255.93 SD = 28.49	Certified test results ≥ 220 out of 300	6

NYSTCE 108 Subarea 1a and 1b	SBL					x		AY 2018-2021 n = 11 R = 1 Mean = 3.41 SD = .50	Expectation of Success ≥ 3.0	1, 3, 6
Internship Evaluation – Section 3 Multicultural Perspective: Knowledge	SBL			x				AY 2018-2021 n = 12 R = 1 Mean = 3.85 SD = .36	Expectation of Success ≥ 3.0	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
Internship Evaluation – Section 3 Multicultural Perspective: Responsibility	SBL			x				AY 2018-2021 n = 12 R = 1 Mean = 3.77 SD = .46	Expectation of Success ≥ 3.0	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
Internship Evaluation – Section 6 Knowledge	SBL				x			AY 2018-2021 n = 60 R = 1 Mean = 3.97 SD = .18	Expectation of Success ≥ 3.0	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
Internship Evaluation – Section 6 Responsibility	SBL				x			AY 2018-2021 n = 60 R = 1 Mean = 3.95 SD = .22	Expectation of Success ≥ 3.0	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
Internship Evaluation Q6	ALS (or SDL)		x		x			AY 2013-2021	Expectation of Success ≥ 3.0	1, 2, 3, 4, 5

								n = 146 R = 25 Mean = 3.57 SD = .54		
Internship Evaluation Q7	SBL					x		AY 2018- 2021 n = 101 R = 11 Mean = 3.79 SD = .41	Expectation of Success ≥ 3.0	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
Internship Evaluation Q8	ALS			x				AY 2013- 2021 n = 135 R = 13 Mean = 3.70 SD = .46	Expectation of Success ≥ 3.0	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
Internship Evaluation Q10	ALS (or SDL)		x				x	AY 2013- 2021 n = 146 R = 23 Mean = 3.77 SD = .42	Expectation of Success ≥ 3.0	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
Cumulative Course Related Leadership Activities (CRLAs)	SBL					x	x	AY 2018- 2021 n = 57 R = 55 Mean = 96.63 SD = 6.29	Expectation of Success ≥ 80.0	1, 3
Cumulative Personal Learning Plan	SBL						x	AY 2018- 2021 n = 40	Expectation of Success ≥ 80.0	1, 3

								R = 15 Mean = 97 SD = 2.54		
STANDARD 2										
Measure	Program(s) for which measure is used	2a	2b	2c	2d	2e	2f	Data Scope	Criteria for success	Perspective*
Cumulative CRLAs	SBL	x						AY 2018-2021 n = 57 R = 55 Mean = 96.63 SD = 6.29	Expectation of Success ≥ 80.0	1, 3
Internship Evaluation - Section 2 Caring: Knowledge	SBL	x						AY 2018-2021 n = 132 R = 1 Mean = 3.83 SD = .37	Expectation of Success ≥ 3.0	1,2,3,4,5
Internship Evaluation - Section 2 Caring: Responsibility	SBL	x						AY 2018-2021 n = 132 R = 1 Mean = 3.83 SD = .37	Expectation of Success ≥ 3.0	1,2,3,4,5
Internship Evaluation Q7 - Caring Leadership	ALS	x						AY 2013-2021 n = 101 R = 11 Mean = 3.79	Expectation of Success ≥ 3.0	1,2,3,4,5

								SD = .41		
NYSTCE Test 103 - Subareas 1	ALS	x			x			AY 2013-2021 n = 16 R = 72 Mean = 238.54 SD = 22.35	Expectation of Success ≥ 220 out of 300	6
NYSTCE Test 103 - Subareas 3	ALS	x			x			AY 2013-2021 n = 16 R = 120 Mean = 240 SD = 36.64	Expectation of Success ≥ 220 out of 300	1,3,6
CRLA EDUG 738	SBL		x		x			AY 2018-2021 n = 8 R = 10 Mean = 98.13 SD = 3.72	Expectation of Success ≥ 80	1,3
Internship Evaluation - Section 3 Multicultural: Knowledge	SBL		x					AY 2018-2021 n = 60 R = 1 Mean = 3.85 SD = .36	Expectation of Success ≥ 3.0	1,2,3,4,5
Internship Evaluation - Section 3 Multicultural: Responsibility	SBL		x					AY 2018-2021 n = 60 R = 2	Expectation of Success ≥ 3.0	1,2,3,4,5

								Mean = 3.77 SD = .46		
Internship Evaluation Q8 - Multicultural Perspective	ALS		x					AY 2013- 2021 n = 135 R = 13 Mean = 3.70 SD = .46	Expectation of Success ≥ 3.0	1,2,3,4,5
CRLA 744 & 745	SBL			x				AY 2018- 2021 n = 13 R = 55 Mean = 90.15 SD = 14.97	Expectation of Success ≥ 80	1,3
Internship Evaluation - Part 6 Internship improvement Initiative: Knowledge	SBL			x				AY 2018- 2021 n = 60 R = 1 Mean = 3.97 SD = .18	Expectation of Success ≥ 3.0	1,2,3,4,5
Internship Evaluation - Part 6 Internship Improvement Initiative Responsibility	SBL			x				AY 2018- 2021 n = 60 R = 1 Mean = 3.95 SD = .22	Expectation of Success ≥ 3.0	1,2,3,4,5
Internship Evaluation - Section 5 Learning to Learn: Knowledge	SBL/ALS					x		AY 2018- 2021 n = 72 R = 1 Mean = 3.86	Expectation of Success ≥ 3.0	1,2,3,4,5

								SD = .35		
Internship Evaluation - Section 5 Learning to Learn: Responsibility	SBL/ALS					x		AY 2018-2021 n = 72 R = 1 Mean = 3.82 SD = .39	Expectation of Success ≥ 3.0	1,2,3,4,5
Internship Evaluation Q11 - Internship Project	ALS			x				AY 2013-2021 n = 120 R = 9 Mean = 3.88 SD = .39	Expectation of Success ≥ 3.0	1,2,3,4,5
CRLA EDUG 345	SBL				x			AY 2018-2021 n = 10 R = 55 Mean = 87.7 SD = 16.37	Expectation of Success ≥ 80	1,3
NYSTCE 104 - Subarea 1	ALS				x			AY 2013-2021 n = 16 R = 72 Mean = 238.54 SD = 22.35	Expectation of Success ≥ 220 out of 300	1,3,6
NYSTCE 104 - Subarea 4	ALS				x			AY 2013-2021 n = 15 R = 65	Expectation of Success ≥ 220 out of 300	1,3,6

								Mean = 232.43 SD = 21.37		
Cumulative PLPs	SBL					x		AY 2018- 2021 n = 40 R = 15 Mean = 97 SD = 2.54	Expectation of Success ≥ 80	1,3
Internship Evaluation Q10 - Learning to Learn	ALS					x		AY 2013- 2021 n = 146 R = 23 Mean = 3.77 SD = .42	Expectation of Success ≥ 3.0	1,2,3,4,5
CRLA 735 & 747	SBL						x	AY 2018- 2021 n = 35 R = 18 Mean = 97.89 SD = 4.63	Expectation of Success ≥ 80	1,3
Internship Evaluation Section 1 Strategic Decision Making: Knowledge	SBL						x	AY 2018- 2021 n = 120 R = 2 Mean = 3.88 SD = .32	Expectation of Success ≥ 3.0	1,2,3,4,5
Internship Evaluation Section 1 Strategic Decision	SBL						x	AY 2018- 2021 n = 120 R = 2	Expectation of Success ≥ 3.0	1,2,3,4,5

Making: Responsibility								Mean = 3.86 SD = .37		
Internship Evaluation Q6 - Strategic Decision Making	ALS						x	AY 2013- 2021 n = 146 R = 25 Mean = 3.57 SD = .54	Expectation of Success ≥ 3.0	1,2,3,4,5
Internship Evaluation Q7 - Caring Leadership	ALS						x	AY 2013- 2021 n = 101 R = 11 Mean = 3.79 SD = .41	Expectation of Success ≥ 3.0	1,2,3,4,5

*Use the key below to identify the perspective(s) or type of evidence each measure represents.

1 = program faculty assessment of candidates
(e.g., dispositions rubric, course assessment)

2 = rating by P-12 partner in clinical setting
(early fieldwork, student teaching, or internship)

3 = information provided by completers
(as in a survey, focus group, other)

4 = information provided by graduates' employers
(as in a survey, focus group, other)

5 = direct performance assessment in the culminating
clinical internship (required for initial licensure programs)

6 = state license test results (for programs leading to
certification or licensure)

If any required perspectives were missing from the evidence set presented in the QAR, then briefly indicate how they were investigated on site. (On-site findings themselves are integrated in Section 4 below.) For Standard 1, the evidence set requires the following perspectives: (1) program faculty, (2) P-12 partners, (3) completers, (4) graduates' employers, and (5) direct measures of performance as appropriate to the program.

This site visit was limited to a review of the Educational Leadership programs. As such, perspectives were sought from the groups referenced above regarding these programs only. Other teacher/educator preparation programs at Manhattan College were already accredited by AAQEP and the QRT was generally made aware of broader perspectives from key stakeholders across the School of Education and Health.

3. Summary of Evidence Examined On Site by the Quality Review Team

List each stakeholder group interviewed and the group's size. Add rows as needed.

Stakeholder group	Size of group
President	1
Education Dean/Department Chair/Program Administrator	3
Chief Financial Officer	2
Full-Time Faculty	2
Part-Time Faculty	3
Cooperating Mentor/Practitioner	2
Field Placement Coordinator/Director of Clinical Experiences	2
University Clinical/Field Placement Supervisors	2
Program Candidates	10
Program Completers/Alumni	8
P-12 Partners/Administrators	2
Advisory Boards/Stakeholders with Whom Data is	2

Shared	
Certification or Licensure Specialist	3

To apprise commissioners of the team's investigations outside the interviews listed above, briefly describe any other data-gathering activities or evidence sets the team reviewed on site. This concise summary may list activities such as reexamination of evidence (listing particular sources) and observations of classes or facilities.

This site visit was limited to a review of the Educational Leadership programs. Other teacher/educator preparation programs in the School of Education and Health at Manhattan College were already accredited by AAQEP. There were no other data-gathering activities or evidence sets reviewed by the team on site beyond what is described above.

4. Analysis of Evidence by Standard

Instructions for completing the aspect-by-aspect documentation for each standard in the following pages:

Summary of evidence presented in the QAR:

Briefly summarize the evidence presented in the QAR related to this aspect (see Column A of the Previsit Worksheet). Describe the evidence as concisely as possible, while taking care to spell out acronyms and define terms for clarity, and indicate clearly the page where it is located. Indicate whether or not the program's criteria for success (or state criteria in the case of license exams) were met.

Summary of evidence collected during the review:

Identify the evidence affirmed, verified, or gathered during the site visit and note its source (stakeholder interview, clarification questions' response, additional documentation).

Observations that may be of interest to the provider:

This box allows team members to provide collegial (not evaluative) observations and comments. Team comments are chiefly directed to the provider, though they may be of interest to the Accreditation Commission. Examples might include notable quotes from a candidate or P-12 partner (or other stakeholder) documented in an interview, or observations such as one colleague might make to another.

This box may be blank in some cases.

Standard 1: Candidate/Completer Performance

Completers perform as professional educators with the capacity to support success for all learners.

Candidates and completers exhibit the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions of competent, caring, and effective professional educators. Successful candidate performance requires knowledge of learners, context, and content. Candidates demonstrate the ability to plan for and enact and/or support instruction and assessment that is differentiated and culturally responsive.

All six aspects of the standard (see table below) must be addressed in the evidence set.

Evidence must include multiple measures, multiple perspectives (program faculty, P-12 partners, program completers, graduates' employers), and direct measures of performance in a program-appropriate field/clinical setting.

Evidence pertaining to aspects of Standard 1: *In the cells below, briefly describe the sampled evidence, observation, or data point that you have verified regarding each aspect of the standard.*

Evidence shows that, by the time of program completion, candidates exhibit knowledge, skills, and abilities of professional educators appropriate to their target credential or degree, including:

Aspect 1a: Content, pedagogical, and/or professional knowledge relevant to the credential or degree sought

Summary of evidence presented in the QAR:

Course grades in core courses and the internship evaluation for completers must meet the college standard for good standing, which is Grade Point Average (GPA) ≥ 3.0 (QAR, p. 20). Individuals in the School Building Leader (SBL) program have earned a mean GPA of 3.85 (QAR, p. 23) and those in the Advanced Leadership Studies (ALS or SDL) program earned a mean GPA of 3.98 (QAR, p. 24).

All participants for certification must meet the New York State (NYS) certification requirements by passing the appropriate New York State Leadership Assessment (NYSLA). SBL program completers earned a mean score of 547 in subarea 107 of the New York State Teacher Certification Examinations (NYSTCE) and 550 in NYSTCE subarea 108, where the minimum passing score was $\geq 520/600$ (QAR, pp. 23-24). ALS or SDL program completers earned a mean score of 238.60 in NYSTCE subarea 103 and 239.87 in NYSTCE subarea 104, where the minimum passing score was $\geq 220/300$ (QAR, p. 24).

Summary of evidence collected during the review:

The curriculum across SBL and ALS or SDL programs is aligned with national professional standards (e.g., Professional Standards for Educational Leaders - PSEL, National Education Leadership Preparation - NELP, etc.). From conversations with faculty and the program director/leadership, there is a regular scholarly review cycle where divisional faculty update materials consistent with emergent literature and best practices. Faculty periodically meet with the dean and other key stakeholders (e.g., PK-12 partners, site supervisors/mentors, School of

Education and Health advisory board, etc.) to discuss teaching and assessment practices. Academic advisors regularly review indicators of student performance (e.g., GPA; coursework completion; exam passage rates inclusive of data tables, descriptive statistics; etc.) with faculty via a checklist in addition to ongoing discussions surrounding the evaluation of students completing methods courses, course related leadership activities (CRLAs), and Personal Learning Plans (PLPs) to ensure all remain in alignment with professional standards and guidance from governing bodies like the New York State Education Department (NYSED). Certification specialists and the program director routinely attend NYSED and other professional meetings (e.g., Metropolitan Council of Educational Administration Programs - MCEAP) where regulatory authorities and peers from other institutions collaborate to discuss best practices and changes to certification requirements. Related, there is evidence of NYSED mandated work already completed and an ability to update program registrations no later than July 2023, consistent with emerging guidance from Office of College and University Evaluation (OCUE). Program alumni/completers commented that “every class [was] preparation for what [they] are doing right now” in their current positions as school leaders. These individuals also expressed a sense of readiness for NYS certification exams. However, there was a general sentiment that, while licensure was recommended by Manhattan College, it was not required for their private school jobs and many opted out of the exams as a result.

Observations that may be of interest to the provider:

Program candidates and alumni/completers acknowledged the increasing importance of completing NYS exams given anticipated changes in the educational environment, particularly as related to private institutions.

Aspect 1b: Learners; learning theory (including social, emotional, and academic dimensions); and application of learning theory

Summary of evidence presented in the QAR:

SBL program students enroll in EDUG 745 – Curriculum Development and Adaptation, where they consider principles, trends, and techniques of curriculum for early childhood through secondary schools; adaptation of curriculum to differentiate instruction, address equity issues for diverse schools and students and address special needs including gifted and talented, as well as those for whom English is a new language. Success is measured as a GPA of ≥ 3.0 , where the mean GPA of course completers is 3.76 (QAR, p. 25).

ALS or SDL program students are evaluated via Internship Evaluation Question 6 – Strategic Decision Making and Question 10 – Learning to Learn (QAR, pp. 26 & 106), where success is measured as a score ≥ 3.0 . The mean score for Question 6 is 3.57 and the mean score for Question 10 is 3.77.

All participants for certification must meet the New York State (NYS) certification requirements by passing the appropriate New York State Leadership Assessment (NYSLA). SBL program completers must answer questions about instructional leadership for student success. Similarly, ALS or SDL completers must answer questions about strategic decision making and learning to learn. The mean score for NYSTCE 107 – Instructional Leadership is 3.21 (where success is measured as ≥ 3.0) and the mean score for NYSTCE 104 Subarea 1 is 232.42 (where success is measured as $\geq 220/300$)(QAR pp. 25-26).

Summary of evidence collected during the review:

From conversations with the program director, faculty, field placement/clinical experience supervisors, candidates, and completers, it was reinforced that educational leadership program candidates learn about rubrics and are able to evaluate as well as apply learning theories. These individuals reported that faculty are present and model learning theories taught in classes through “support for one another.” While in clinical placements, students advise teachers on the differentiation of instruction and related assessments while giving suggestions in conjunction with feedback from their mentors, who are referred to by candidates and completers as supportive. These students also observe teachers and provide specific feedback in response to experiential learning activities. There is emphasis on universal design for learning as well as data informed decision making which considers multiple dimensions (e.g., social, emotional, etc.) to serve unique learning populations in diverse New York City classrooms. This is reflected in Course Related Leadership Activities (CRLAs) and Personal Learning Plans (PLPs). Educational leadership candidates and program completers commented that associated activities helped them to manage expectations in the building and/or district while “managing [the] day down to every five minutes’ and “keeping priorities [for stakeholders] in mind.” They were able to cite various models and strategies while referencing Course Related Leadership Activities (CRLAs) and Personal Learning Plans (PLPs) that allow for meaningful opportunities to apply these “to [the] school environment [and] take [them] out of [their] comfort zone.”

Observations that may be of interest to the provider:

Statements were made by candidates, completers, and PK-12 partners about the emphasis on mental health in the building and district, as well as the importance of guest speakers who have applied related theories in practice.

Aspect 1c: Culturally responsive practice, including intersectionality of race, ethnicity, class, gender identity and expression, sexual identity, and the impact of language acquisition and literacy development on learning

Summary of evidence presented in the QAR:

All participants for certification must meet the New York State (NYS) certification requirements by passing the appropriate New York State Leadership Assessment (NYSLA). SBL program completers must answer questions on school culture and learning environment to promote excellence, equity, and social justice via NYSTCE 107 subarea 2a and 2b. The expectation of success score is measured as ≥ 3.0 and the mean score of SBL completers is 3.0. Similarly, ALS or SDL program completers complete NYSTCE 104 Subarea 1 and Subarea 4 with a mean score of 2.23.42 and 255.93, where the expectation of success is $\geq 220/300$ (QAR pp. 27-28).

SBL program students are evaluated via Internship Evaluation Question 3 – Multicultural Perspectives – Knowledge and Understanding. Where success is defined as a score ≥ 3.0 , the mean score reported for knowledge is 3.85 and the mean score reported for responsibility is 3.77. Similarly, ALS or SDL program students are evaluated via Internship Evaluation Question 8 – Multicultural Perspective with a mean score of 3.70 (QAR, pp. 27-28).

Summary of evidence collected during the review:

Manhattan College is situated in a diverse borough of New York City and students routinely interact with people of different backgrounds. As reinforced in conversations with program leadership, faculty, candidates, partners, and completers/alumni, Manhattan students are able to connect with people who are different from themselves, including United Nations populations and many from African nations as well as the South Bronx (a culturally/ethnically diverse section of New York City). According to multiple stakeholders, “relatability is a prerequisite” to students working in many of the partner school districts, along with a sensitivity to socioeconomic differences and neurodiversity. Interns embrace diversity and often seek opportunities to participate in creative and inclusive programs beyond the minimal requirements of the educational leadership programs. For example, Spanish language is being taught to Kindergarten students and there is a large French speaking population in some of the schools frequented by students enrolled in the educational leadership programs. Educational leadership program students are trained by faculty and clinical/experiential learning administrators to employ equitable grading and practices through interactions that are reinforced by course literature or readings. There is curricular emphasis on transformational leadership, belonging, and culturally responsive pedagogy. Program candidates reported being drawn to the program due to the openness and understanding of the faculty. Completers shared these sentiments and many reported the benefits of working collaboratively with peers from diverse backgrounds.

Observations that may be of interest to the provider:

These individuals acknowledged that, through interactions with program faculty, clinical placements/internships, stakeholders, and curricula, they deepened an understanding of culture and diversity as “much more than [differences in] skin color.”

Aspect 1d: Assessment of and for student learning; assessment and data literacy; use of data to inform practice

Summary of evidence presented in the QAR:

SBL students in EDUG 738 – Evaluating School Effectiveness and ALS or SDL students in EDUG 871 – Quantitative Process must earn a GPA ≥ 3.0 in such classes. The same is required of SBL students in Internship Evaluation – Section 6 – Knowledge and Responsibility and for ALS students in Internship Evaluation Question 6 – Strategic Decision Making. Performance exceeds the expected level with a mean GPA of 3.8 in EDUC 738 and a mean GPA of 4.00 in EDUC 871. Similarly, GPAs of 3.97 and 3.95 were reported for Section 6, whereas a GPA of 3.57 was reported for Question 6 (QAR, pp. 28-29, 106).

All participants for certification must meet the New York State (NYS) certification requirements by passing the appropriate New York State Leadership Assessment (NYSLA). ALS or SDL program completers are evaluated on NYSTCE 103 Subarea 2 and Subarea 4. The mean score for Subarea 2 is 241.69 and the mean score for Subarea 4 is 234.38, where the expectation of success is $\geq 220/300$ (QAR, pp. 28-29).

Summary of evidence collected during the review:

The program faculty, independent of appointment, team teach courses and maintain regular discussions surrounding assessment and instruction. Some of this is through informal conversation, but the faculty receive regular communications from the program director and certification officer regarding opportunities for collaboration and professional growth. Thus, teaching candidates to use data and inform practice is a major topic of the school effectiveness course. The importance of data informed decision making is also reinforced in courses on finance and statistical process control. The faculty help educational leadership students to consider “baseline data as well as finish line data” so that initiatives and outcomes are not determined in “isolation.” Course related leadership activities (CRLAs) require a baseline that justifies measurable improvement and completers must identify how they will measure success, sometimes while “tak[ing] the learning to another initiative.” This can include a review of quantitative and qualitative data, which ultimately should reinforce end of course impact statements as well as Personal Learning Plans (PLPs). Educational leadership program candidates and completers reported looking at various models and strategies in the evaluation of data as related to problem solving and decision making in schools and/or districts. These same individuals explained that, although they felt ready to sit for New York State (NYS) certification exams, the incentive to do so was limited based on their existing leadership positions in non-public schools and despite the encouragement of the educational leadership program at Manhattan College.

Observations that may be of interest to the provider:

They referred to “an emphasis in practical application” and “differentiation rather than a one system fits all” approach to internships, among other experiential learning opportunities, while enhancing educational leadership skills.

Aspect 1e: Creation and development of positive learning and work environments

Summary of evidence presented in the QAR:

All participants for certification must meet the New York State (NYS) certification requirements by passing the appropriate New York State Leadership Assessment (NYSLA). SBL program completers who completed the NYSTCE 108/110 subarea had a mean score of 3.41 where the expectation of success is ≥ 3.0 . ALS or SDL program completers who completed the NYSTCE 104 Subarea 1 and Subarea 4 earned mean scores of 232.43 and 255.93 respectively where the expectation of success was 220/300 (QAR, p. 30).

Individuals in the SBL program have earned a mean score of 95.65 in the SBL Course Related Leadership Activity (CRLA) for EDUG 747, where the expectation of success is ≥ 80.00 (QAR, p. 30).

Individuals in the ALS or SDL program are evaluated under Question 7 – Caring Leadership, where mentors rated completers with a mean score of 3.79 where the expectation of success is ≥ 3.0 (QAR, pp. 30-31).

Summary of evidence collected during the review:

Conversations with the president, dean, and program director, in particular, reinforced that a key goal of the educational leadership programs is to minister to various constituent groups,

primarily within schools of the Archdiocese of New York and Diocese of Brooklyn, where the influence Judeo-Christian and Lasallian Catholic values (e.g., respect for individual dignity, excellence in teaching and learning, etc.) as expressed via curricula as well as educational and professional practice contribute to the creation and development of positive learning and work environments. Dialogue with faculty, candidates, completers, and partners reinforced a culture of remaining open to requests for assistance through connections to schools and other community stakeholders. More so, faculty and clinical/intern supervisors provided mentoring and program leadership is currently working with advisors, partners, and recent graduates to create an alumni association. Candidates reported that all educational leadership program personnel were “very good about communicating” and “willing to go above and beyond in the interest of student success”, as well as particularly “responsive to [workplace] needs.” This sentiment was shared by PK-12 partners and clinical/internship/experiential placement administrators.

Observations that may be of interest to the provider:

Candidates noted that “even if we were in the middle of class [or an internship] and something is not working, [they] can voice that concern right in the moment. There is no reluctance to have direct communication when needed.”

Aspect 1f: Dispositions and behaviors required for successful professional practice

Summary of evidence presented in the QAR:

Individuals in the SBL program complete EDUG 748/889 as a capstone course/internship which requires evidence of successful professional practice. The mean internship evaluation score is 3.94 where the expectation of success is ≥ 3.0 (QAR, p. 31).

Individuals in the SBL program are directly observed via Course Related Leadership Activities (CRLA) with a cumulative mean score of 90.71/100 where the expectation of success is ≥ 80 (QAR, pp. 31-32).

Individuals in the SBL program are directly observed via Personal Learning Plans (PLP) with a cumulative mean score of 94.35/100 where the expectation of success is ≥ 80 (QAR, pp. 31-32).

ALS or SDL program students are evaluated via Internship Evaluation Question 10 – Learning to Learn (QAR, pp. 32 & 106), where success is measured as a score ≥ 3.0 . The mean score for Question 10 is 3.77.

All participants for certification must meet the New York State (NYS) certification requirements by passing the appropriate New York State Leadership Assessment (NYSLA). ALS or SDL program completers who took NYSCTE 103 and 104 earned mean scores of 238.6 and 239.87 respectively, where the expectation of success is $\geq 220/300$ (QAR, pp. 31-32).

Summary of evidence collected during the review:

Following conversations with the president, dean, program director, and PK-12 partners, there is a clear programmatic emphasis on transformational leadership and cooperation among a variety of stakeholders. Faculty conversations reflect dedication to students and leading by example, while students report effective modeling of behavior through in class interactions, Course Related Leadership Activities (CRLAs), Personal Learning Plans (PLPs), and internship

placements. Program candidates and completers referenced a “values driven” approach to educational leadership and professional practice which was echoed by field placement/clinical experience personnel that considers and accepts “all different learners in the school building [where there are] equitable opportunities for all of the students.”

Observations that may be of interest to the provider:

Both candidates and completers referenced practical connections to different lessons and stated that faculty teach that “you are the professional and you should act that way as you go through learning.”

Aspects for which no evidence is available to the Accreditation Commission

In the box below, note any aspects of Standard 1 for which no evidence was provided in the QAR, supplied in response to the team’s clarification questions, or gathered on site. Plans for new or additional evidence should be noted in the appropriate box above, under the relevant aspect.

Not applicable.

Standard 2: Completer Professional Competence and Growth

Program completers adapt to working in a variety of contexts and grow as professionals.

Program completers engage in professional practice in educational settings and show that they have the skills and abilities to do so in a variety of additional settings and community/cultural contexts. For example, candidates must have broad and general knowledge of the impact of culture and language on learning, yet they cannot, within the context of any given program, experience working with the entire diversity of student identities, or in all types of school environments. Candidate preparation includes first-hand professional experience accompanied by reflection that prepares candidates to engage effectively in different contexts they may encounter throughout their careers.

All six aspects of this standard (see table below) must be addressed in the evidence set for the standard.

Evidence for this standard will show both that program completers have engaged successfully in relevant professional practice and that they are equipped with strategies and reflective habits that will enable them to serve effectively in a variety of school placements and educational settings appropriate to the credential or degree sought.

Evidence pertaining to aspects of Standard 2: *In the cells below, briefly describe the sampled evidence, observation, or data point that you have verified regarding each aspect of the standard.*

Evidence shows that completers have the capacity to:

Aspect 2a: Understand and engage local school and cultural communities; communicate and foster relationships with families/guardians/caregivers in a variety of communities

Summary of evidence presented in the QAR:

SBL(p. 37): Course related leadership activities (CRLAs) and internship evaluations indicate that completers exceed the criteria for success.

ALS(p. 37): The internship evaluation and NYSTCE test 103 sub areas 1 and 3 indicate that completers exceed the criteria for success.

Summary of evidence collected during the review:

An interview with a mentor/partner emphasized experiences where Manhattan leadership interns introduced practices engaging with families to create stronger connections through community service. Another example was provided by the faculty supervisors and corroborated with completers regarding a project during covid where candidates saw a problem with parent involvement during the pandemic, so the Manhattan candidates created materials for a parent education support program. The CRLAs were also emphasized as serving to help leadership candidates engage with the community. Current students also discussed how a recent course discussion focused on the importance of engaging different stakeholders.

Observations that may be of interest to the provider:

It was evident that service to the community was a focus of leadership development.

Aspect 2b: Engage in culturally responsive educational practices with diverse learners and do so in diverse cultural and socioeconomic community contexts

Summary of evidence presented in the QAR:

SBL (p. 38): CRLA EDUG 738 & internship evaluation provide evidence that completers exceed the criteria for success.

ALS (p. 38): Internship evaluation & EDUG 840 Field experience artifact (n=12) provide evidence that completers exceed the criteria for success.

Summary of evidence collected during the review:

Faculty and Clinical supervisors described a practice requiring leadership candidates to spend time in schools that are very different from their current assignment. Through this activity candidates are able to better understand differences between Public and Parochial schools or schools serving students with severe disabilities. Candidates also come from a diverse background of teaching experience and students, completers, and faculty alike spoke of the strength that is brought to the program through candidates sharing the unique experiences from their respective schools. Several activities were described that would develop culturally responsive educational practices like inclusion of DEI in an exam, or developing an action plan for underperforming groups.

Observations that may be of interest to the provider: Candidates, mentors, and partners recognized the rich resource that their school communities are both where they work personally and how much they can learn from one another's experiences.

Aspect 2c: Create productive learning environments and use strategies to develop productive learning environments in a variety of school contexts

Summary of evidence presented in the QAR:

SBL(p. 39): CRLA EDUG 744 and 745 and intern evaluation section 6 show completers exceed the criteria for success.

ALS (p. 39): Internship Evaluation Q11 shows completers exceed criteria for success.

Summary of evidence collected during the review:

Supervisors described how leadership candidates learn to evaluate effectiveness in their school. They determine if the program is designed to include all students. They take that experience into their internships asking questions and applying to practice.

Observations that may be of interest to the provider:

Aspect 2d: Support students' growth in international and global perspectives

Summary of evidence presented in the QAR:

SBL (p. 40): CRLAs in EDUG 738 and 745 show completers meet or exceed established criteria for success.

ALS (p. 40): NYSTCE 103 subareas 1 & 3 and NYSTCE 104 subareas 1 & 4 show completers meet or exceed established criteria for success.

Summary of evidence collected during the review:

The mentor/partner described an intern that has engaged in activities to help French students connect with students in a school in the Congo. There is also a strong emphasis on ELLs and ESL programs. Another example was provided of a leader candidate leading an international day that was a huge success. Supervisors described how many students have had experiences teaching in other countries and the culture of sharing, which both the candidates and the completers confirmed.

Observations that may be of interest to the provider:

Aspect 2e: Establish goals for their own professional growth; engage in self-assessment, goal setting, and reflection

Summary of evidence presented in the QAR:

SBL (p. 41): Cumulative PLPs & intern evaluations section 5 provide evidence that completers meet or exceed established criteria for success.

ALS (p. 41): Internship evaluation Q10 provides evidence that completers meet or exceed

established criteria for success.

Summary of evidence collected during the review:

The candidates described the reflection and goal aspect of the CRLA that is due every week. Then at the end of the semester they identify professional growth. Make a game plan moving forward. They also described how the goals are connected to learning standards.

The completers also cited several examples of how the program strengthened their skills and allowed them to not only establish professional goals for their own growth, but shared examples of how those goals have led to new positions and continued growth. Several completers mentioned how their positions did not require them to get the state license, but that they were encouraged through the program to obtain the full license. The completers also had high praise for their professors, “they encouraged us to think bigger and take it to the next level.”

The Faculty/supervisors were able to provide more detail on the PLP and how it serves students in promoting both reflection on what they have done and what more they need to do.

Observations that may be of interest to the provider:

Aspect 2f: Collaborate with colleagues to support professional learning

Summary of evidence presented in the QAR:

SBL (p. 42): CRLAs in EDUG 735 & 747, internship evaluations section 1 provide evidence that completers meet or exceed established criteria for success.

ALS (p. 42): Internship evaluations Q6 & Q7 provide evidence that completers meet or exceed established criteria for success.

Summary of evidence collected during the review:

The evidence from interviews with candidates, completers, faculty/supervisors, and mentor/partners all described a high value on collaborative experience. Candidates described working closely with mentors and faculty as they identified needs, made plans, executed plans, and evaluated success. Multiple examples were provided where candidates had to make decisions based on collaboration with principals and colleagues in their schools.

Observations that may be of interest to the provider:

Aspects for which no evidence is available to the Accreditation Commission

In the box below, note any aspects of Standard 2 for which no evidence was provided in the QAR, supplied in response to the team’s clarification questions, or gathered on site. Plans for new or additional evidence should be noted in the appropriate box above, under the relevant aspect.

Not applicable.

Standard 3: Quality Program Practices

The program has the capacity to ensure that its completers meet Standards 1 and 2.

Preparation programs ensure that candidates, upon completion, are ready to engage in professional practice, to adapt to a variety of professional settings, and to grow throughout their careers. Effective program practices include consistent offering of coherent curricula; high-quality, diverse clinical experiences; dynamic, mutually beneficial partnerships with stakeholders; and comprehensive and transparent quality assurance processes informed by trustworthy evidence. Each aspect of the program is appropriate to its context and to the credential or degree sought.

All six aspects of this standard (see table below) must be addressed in the evidence set for the standard.

Evidence related to this standard will include documentation of program practices and resources as well as the program's rationale for its structure and operation.

Note: Evidence related to Standard 3 will be found in the main body of the Quality Assurance Report and in the following appendices:

- Candidate Recruitment, Selection, and Monitoring (Appendix A)
- Program Capacity and Institutional Commitment (Appendix C)
- Internal Quality Controls (Appendix D)
- Evidence of Data Quality (Appendix E)

Evidence pertaining to aspects of Standard 3: *In the cells below, briefly describe the sampled evidence, observation, or data point that you have verified regarding each aspect of the standard.*

Evidence shows that the program:

Aspect 3a: Offers coherent curricula with clear expectations that are aligned with state and national standards, as applicable (see *Appendix C*)

Summary of evidence presented in the QAR:

Both SBL and ALS or SDL program curricula align with NYS certification requirements and related exam frameworks, as well as national Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL) and the National Educational Leadership Program (NELP) (QAR, pp. 45 & 80).

SBL and ALS or SDL programs are registered with NYSED and reflected in the Inventory of Registered Programs (IRP) (QAR, p. 46), which is a requirement for related licensure.

SBL exam completers have a mean score of 547.08 for Part 1 and 550.25 for Part 2, where the measure of success is 520/600.

ALS or SDL exam completers have a mean score of 239.12 for Part 1 and 238.65 for Part 2, where the measure of success is 220/300.

Summary of evidence collected during the review:

Conversations with faculty were clear and focused on various associated professional standards, especially related exam frameworks such as Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL) and National Educational Leadership Program (NELP). The faculty focus on various aspects by the individual standards and collaboratively revise course syllabi in a strategic order. The program and school administration expressed awareness and readiness to update New York State Education Department (NYSED) program registrations later this year and consistent with emergent guidance from the Office of College and University Evaluation (OCUE). The program faculty, independent of appointment, team teach courses and maintain regular discussions surrounding assessment and instruction. Some of this is through informal conversation, but the faculty receive regular communications from the program director regarding opportunities for collaboration and professional growth. Faculty maintain office hours and remain accessible to students outside of specified periods. Program candidates and alumni/completers expressed that faculty brought diverse perspectives and a “remarkable” wealth of experiences to the classroom. They acknowledged that program faculty prepare them for NYS assessments and strongly recommend pursuing licensure. Program alumni/completers commented that “every class [was] preparation for what [they] are doing right now” in their current positions as school leaders. These individuals also expressed a sense of readiness for NYS certification exams. However, there was a general sentiment that, while licensure was recommended by Manhattan College, it was not required for their private school jobs and many opted out of the exams as a result.

Observations that may be of interest to the provider:

Program candidates expressed that program faculty, administrators, and clinical experience personnel provided open communication, thorough feedback, and a solution oriented approach.

Aspect 3b: Develops and implements quality clinical experiences, where appropriate, in the context of documented and effective partnerships with P-12 schools and districts**Summary of evidence presented in the QAR:**

An internship has been designed as a capstone experience in the educational leadership program. This is a collaborative effort with the intern, site mentor, and college supervisor. Expectations are detailed in a SBL Internship Handbook and ALS or SDL Internship Guide (QAR, pp. 47 & 80).

In response to the 2016 TEAC accreditation process, targeted course related leadership activities (CRLA) were added to each course in the SBL program. The ALS or SDL program also incorporates CRLA (QAR, p. 48).

The results of clinical experiences of the CRLA are evaluated and recorded in the mentor’s SBL Internship Evaluation and ALS Internship Evaluation (QAR, p. 48).

Summary of evidence collected during the review:

From conversations with the clinical director and associated personnel, there are a demonstrated series of formal meetings (e.g., at least three per semester), evaluations, and

surveys which candidates complete throughout the process. Mentors, supervisors, and candidates are most often organic, based on alignment in five key programmatic areas, and remain consistent through the experience, though changes are possible when circumstances dictate. Informal communication is encouraged. Internship evaluations completed by the site mentor (who is typically a building or district leader) and the candidate are closely reviewed by the program director, academic advisors, and faculty to determine areas of strength for the candidate and program alike, along with an impact statement drafted by the intern upon completion of the experiential learning initiative. Course related leadership activities and an e-portfolio is completed as part of this process, along with personal learning plans. The program administrators and certification officer also look at state standardized test scores in each category or sub area. Programmatic changes are made collaboratively in response to areas of strength and weakness. These are coordinated with the Dean's Office, other departments, and internal as well as external partners. Partners and mentors reported a "great relationship" with the educational leadership programs wherein candidates were intentionally placed in a district or building for experiential learning. It was stated that program faculty provide "everything needed for the students to succeed" in the handbook with a "very quick turn around" regarding questions or concerns. This was affirmed by a program completer who was "really impressed with the layout of everything and how informative and easy [the process] was [for them]."

Observations that may be of interest to the provider:

Program completers and candidates "received a lot of support" and benefitted from course related leadership activities, as well as a personal learning plan.

Aspect 3c: Engages multiple stakeholders, including completers, local educators, schools, and districts, in data collection, analysis, planning, improvement, and innovation

Summary of evidence presented in the QAR:

The educational leadership program systematically collaborates with completers, local educators, administrators, employers and employees while acknowledging that additional engagement to collect actionable data may benefit future program improvement (QAR, pp. 48-49).

Principals function as partners in the CRLA and internships, which includes participation in site visits by the college supervisor and the review of actionable data (QAR, p. 49).

Faculty are key stakeholders in coursework and thus plan for and seek actionable data as part of assessments associated (e.g., surveys, quantitative and qualitative instruments, etc.) with internships and CRLA (QAR, p. 49).

Summary of evidence collected during the review:

Faculty periodically meet with the dean and other key stakeholders (e.g., PK-12 partners, site supervisors/mentors, School of Education advisory board, etc.) to discuss teaching and assessment practices. This reinforces the regular review of indicators of student performance (e.g., GPA; coursework completion; exam passage rates inclusive of data tables, descriptive statistics; etc.) via a checklist in addition to ongoing discussions surrounding the evaluation of students completing methods courses, Course Related Leadership Activities (CRLAs), and

Personal Learning Plans (PLPs) to ensure all remain in alignment with professional standards and guidance from governing bodies like the New York State Education Department (NYSED). Program leadership reinforced that no gap exists in the collection of this data. Instead, there may have been a gap in certain other information due to Manhattan College's use of and current transition away from the accountability management system, Taskstream. More specifically, it was explained that, although data was input into the system, the faculty and program leadership have not been able to export the data in a manner consistent with evaluative needs. Moving forward, there is explicit interest in relying more heavily on Title II reports and other sources of information regarding actionable data like New York State exam completion rates that can improve future programmatic changes. Despite this acknowledged gap, the faculty and administrators do regularly review certification qualifications by category to identify "highs and lows" with a desire to do more than just meet the minimum acceptable standard of achievement. There is a deliberate effort to continuously modify curriculum. It was stressed that "students in the program are also stakeholders and so communicating with them is part of the process." Often in informal groups or small cohorts, program candidates are invited to share different projects and initiatives that they are working on in clinical placements and CRLAs relative to PLPs. This provides enhanced opportunities to triangulate with site mentors, who do not currently play a direct role in curriculum augmentation (though the faculty and program administration welcome a more hands on approach, as appropriate). Right now, faculty "definitely take to heart " valuable suggestions and recommendations made by partners, mentors, candidates, and completers, though it is acknowledged that alumni participation is voluntary and inconsistent. As such, program leadership would like to further develop an alumni group. However, it was acknowledged that many program alumni and other key stakeholders currently serve in leadership positions in Archdiocesan and Diocesan schools, which are the primary beneficiaries and partner institutions associated with the educational leadership programs. Although the program faculty and administrators have identified Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) as an area meeting the NYSED and PSEL standards and still worthy of improvement, program candidates and completers reported "remarkable, unique, and diverse" faculty who "provided links to different supports" across public and private school communities in one of the most diverse cities and regions of the world. Candidates and program completers provided examples that included working collaboratively with schools across the country while being encouraged by groups of associated stakeholders to "think bigger and take it to the next level."

Observations that may be of interest to the provider:

Program candidates, completers, and faculty spoke highly of guest speakers who added value to this topic, in particular, and spoke of Manhattan College's flexibility and adaptation regarding the changing needs of P-12 partners, as well as students, with regard to internship/experiential learning and the global pandemic.

Aspect 3d: Enacts admission and monitoring processes linked to candidate success as part of a quality assurance system aligned to state requirements and professional standards (see Appendix A)

Summary of evidence presented in the QAR:

Four checkpoints are used to monitor participants' processes and provide evidence of participant support throughout the program

1. Admission and monitoring processes (teaching experience required, GPA) (p. 50).
2. Progress through coursework (candidates must maintain good academic standing through 6 core courses to be eligible to begin the internship)(p. 51).
3. Eligibility for internship (be in good standing upon completion of 6 core courses and complete 100 hours of clinical experience)(p. 51).
4. Program Completion (forms verifying requirements have been met) (p. 51).

Support is provided to candidates who fall short by faculty meeting individually with suggestions for improvement. Reasons for struggles are documented.

Certification exam competency results are analyzed by faculty and adjustments are made to learning activities accordingly. Goal to review each semester rather than annually as is current practice (pp. 51–52).

Summary of evidence collected during the review:

The advising is primarily done by program leadership. The candidates are closely monitored throughout each semester with 3 advising touchpoints each semester to make sure candidates do not fall through the cracks. For new admissions there was a checklist created to guide students. The checklist is used to identify the students who are not progressing. They are caring enough to make sure that “no one gets lost.” They expressed an attitude of concern for any student that has to leave the program, “How can we help you come back?”

Observations that may be of interest to the provider:

Aspect 3e: Engages in continuous improvement of programs and program components, and investigates opportunities for innovation, through an effective quality assurance system (see *Appendix D as well as Appendix E to ensure the system is informed by trustworthy evidence*)

Summary of evidence presented in the QAR:

The L.E.A.D.E.R. (Look at the problem, Examine what you know, Acquire knowledge, Devise a plan, Execute the plan, Repeat) Framework and action research are cited as guiding both action and research. (p. 52)

Examples of improvements provided:

- CRLAs & alignment with internship
- Course content re-examined regularly and aligned with professional standards
- Improved mentor evaluation form (p. 53)

Table of plans for validity, reliability, and fairness/Trustworthiness provided for evidence. They list and provide explanations of expert validity, construct validity, content validity, and predictive validity (work in progress), interrater reliability, and fairness. (p. 54)

Appendix D included an audit of 6 completers. Checking GPAs for good standing, mentor evaluation of internship, and NYSTCE scores and all data supported the quality of the programs. (pp. 84–87)

Appendix E describes the use of content (alignment with professional standards for school

leaders (PSEL) matrix provided, criterion, and construct validity. It goes on to provide descriptions and some data on validity, reliability, fairness, and trustworthiness. (pp. 88–94)

Summary of evidence collected during the review:

From the candidates perspective, the program leadership and faculty are very responsive and accommodating to continually improve the program citing examples of faculty moving to remote instruction. Faculty discussed the continual collaboration used to introduce new and improve existing practices. It was expressed that communication is frequent and useful. Faculty also receive student course evaluations each semester and they describe reviewing and discussing the responses.

Observations that may be of interest to the provider: Candidates expressed appreciation for the flexibility of faculty. They were most appreciative of how the improvements had the student experience as a focus.

Aspect 3f: Maintains capacity for quality reflected in staffing, resources, operational processes, and institutional commitment (see Appendix C)

Summary of evidence presented in the QAR:

Faculty, supervisor, and mentor qualifications are described (p. 58). Facilities and equipment are described (p. 59). Budget is described and salary parity is shared (p. 60).

Appendix C provides a list of faculty and resources available on campus, and facilities are described, protocols for handling grievances are provided (pp. 80–84).

Summary of evidence collected during the review:

The CFO discussed the use of strategic plans guiding a year long budgeting process that results in funding for department and college priorities. We also learned they are developing a centralized marketing strategy. The provost also reviews faculty FTEs. The institution is financially sound with top of the line facilities and good support from state and donors.

The program has several processes to ensure quality such as the advising process that starts when applications are first received and continues through completion of the program. Candidates also get a **handbook** when completing the internship, and there is a section on the rolls. Mentors sign an agreement of support for the intern. Program leaders orient the mentors and discuss all the responsibilities and expected experiences.

Observations that may be of interest to the provider:

Aspects for which no evidence is available to the Accreditation Commission

In the box below, note any aspects of Standard 3 for which no evidence was provided in the QAR, supplied in response to the team's clarification questions, or gathered on site. Plans for new or additional evidence should be noted in the appropriate box above, under the relevant aspect.

Standard 4: Program Engagement in System Improvement

Program practices strengthen the P-20 education system in light of local needs, in keeping with the program's mission.

The program is committed to and invests in strengthening and improving the education profession and the P-20 education system. Each program's context (or multiple contexts) provides particular opportunities to engage the field's shared challenges and to foster and support innovation. Engagement with critical issues is essential and must be contextualized. Sharing results of contextualized engagement and innovation supports the field's collective effort to address education's most pressing challenges through improvement and innovation.

All six aspects of this standard (see table below) must be addressed in the evidence set for the standard.

Evidence for this standard addresses identified issues in light of local and institutional context.

Note: Evidence related to Standard 4 will be found in the main body of the Quality Assurance Report and in the following appendices:

- Completer Support and Follow-Up Practices (Appendix B)
- Missional Commitments and Distinct Contributions (optional; Appendix F if used)

Evidence pertaining to aspects of Standard 4: *In the cells below, briefly describe the sampled evidence, observation, or data point that you have verified regarding each aspect of the standard.*

The program provides evidence that it:

Aspect 4a: Engages with local partners and stakeholders to support high-need schools and participates in efforts to reduce disparities in educational outcomes

Summary of evidence presented in the QAR:

Program participants are from diverse and high need NYC districts providing opportunities to improve learning for diverse students in high needs schools pg 63

Required leadership activities direct participants to choose an area in need of improvement for more learning for more students thereby supporting high-need schools and reducing disparities in outcomes pg 64

Summary of evidence collected during the review:

The current Leadership candidates we met with, as well as the program completers, all referred to the support the Manhattan College Leadership Program provides for high needs schools with diverse populations. Most of the candidates and many of the completers are currently working in

high need schools and reported that they felt well prepared to work in that environment. Many of the program participants as well as faculty are themselves from diverse backgrounds. As an example, one of the mentors who also attended Manhattan College in the Leadership Program, describes herself as a “first generation” student of Portuguese and Brazilian descent, and referred to the school as a “home to minorities” with a strong focus on helping others. Another completer who is now principal of a high needs elementary school reflected on Manhattan College as being a culture of dignity and belonging for all students. She found the faculty to be intentional in conveying that all students have the right to learn regardless of background, ability or learning style.

Students are required to choose leadership activities for their Course Related Leadership Activities (CRLA’s) and internship projects that specifically focus on an area in need of improvement that will provide better outcomes for all students, thereby reducing disparities. The mission of the leadership program, as referred to by the stakeholders we met with, is “More learning for more learners in more ways more of the time”.

Observations that may be of interest to the provider: The completers we met with who are currently working as administrators, often referred to the sense of community and respect for individual learning that is fostered at Manhattan College and how that helped them to develop their own culturally responsive practices.

Aspect 4b: Seeks to meet state and local educator workforce needs and to diversify participation in the educator workforce through candidate recruitment and support

Summary of evidence presented in the QAR:

Several grants are available to encourage enrollment from diverse NYC public, private, and Catholic schools pg 65

Recruitment efforts are coordinated from the office of Graduate Admissions and include attendance at information sessions, college fairs, and online information sessions pg 70

Summary of evidence collected during the review:

NYC schools are diverse by nature, whether they are public, private, or Catholic institutions. According to President Gardner, program candidates are encouraged to enroll from the NYC schools through various grants, discounts, fee waivers, and Title II free tuition as well as agreements with stakeholders such as the Brooklyn diocese.

The President described how constituent groups such as the Archdiocese of New York are instrumental in informing Manhattan College as to the needs of the local schools. They also help to support compliance with state regulations and curriculum standards. The Director of the program is charged with maintaining communication with public and private constituents as well as the School of Education Advisory Board.

Manhattan College partners with private schools and the Archdiocese to encourage enrollment in the Leadership Program so that qualified staff can prepare for administrative positions and become NY state certified. Certification is not required for private school employees; however, it

is desirable as it elevates the quality of the building leadership which in turn impacts curriculum and instruction for all students.

Observations that may be of interest to the provider: In addition to the usual Graduate Admissions recruitment activities such as College Fairs, and Information sessions, candidates and completers spoke of being attracted to Manhattan College by word of mouth. The school is referred to fondly as being a “special place in the Bronx” and that “once a Jasper always a Jasper”.

Aspect 4c: Supports completers’ entry into and/or continuation in their professional role, as appropriate to the credential or degree being earned (*see Appendix B*)

Summary of evidence presented in the QAR:

Entry into the professional role is supported by participants being monitored at various points of the program to confirm continued eligibility for matriculation, participation in internship, and graduation as per standards set by the institution in order to qualify for city and state requirements leading to certification pg 66

Entry to the profession is supported through the individualized SBL (School Building Leader) and ALS (Advanced Leadership Studies) programs that include specific course work including case studies and simulations that help prepare for certification exams pg 66

Program completers return to Advisory Roles for Internship seminars to share suggestions for programming and to help participants prepare for certification exams pg 66

Program completers are invited to lead seminars for students, faculty, alumni, parents, community schools, and organizations on issues supporting social justice and respect for individual dignity pg 66

Summary of evidence collected during the review:

Faculty and Alumni concur that Completers have been supported for entry into their professional role by being well trained and well prepared. As candidates, they’ve had continuous monitoring of their eligibility for matriculation, have completed a rigorous internship, and are held to standards that meet city and state requirements leading to certification.

Candidates are supported for entry to the profession through coursework focusing on case studies and simulations designed to help prepare for certification exams as well as their future role as administrators. One technique described by faculty to prepare candidates on how to address building issues in the field is the “Harvard Problem Solving Approach” whereby current educational leaders submit real problems that candidates study and develop a plan of action to solve using the Harvard model. Another method used to prepare candidates is to work on teams to develop a 100 day entry plan for use in a future leadership position.

To further support candidates in their future roles as leaders, participants learn about additional resources and are encouraged to join professional organizations and subscribe to journals during their internship seminars.

Candidates are encouraged to develop a “leadership profile” by getting on committees in their current schools and participating in building improvement initiatives and mandates such as Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI), Parent Engagement, Community Outreach, etc.

Leadership program faculty acknowledge that NY state certification is a predictor of success in entering the profession as an administrator and building leader. Every course is geared toward the goal of preparing candidates for future professional roles and certification through Course Related Leadership Activities (CRLA's) and professional knowledge. Candidates are advised on the certification process at multiple intervals throughout the program through direct instruction regarding which exams are required and how to register for them. Candidates are provided with handouts containing contact information as well as the different codes necessary for registration. Degree completion checklists and spreadsheets are created for every student in the program.

The Administrative Assistant for graduate programs described how candidates are required to be endorsed by the college in order to receive state certification. As the expert in NYS requirements, she reviews and endorses candidates 4x/year. In order to encourage more students to graduate and apply for certification, Manhattan College has dropped the graduation fee of \$400 that completers were required to pay in the past. Because private school administrators are not required to be state certified, if the fee is a hardship, completers don't apply for graduation and/or certification if it isn't necessary for employment.

Program completers often continue to participate in the program as Advisors for Internship seminars to help candidates prepare for certification exams and to share suggestions for programming. One internship mentor who was also a program completer, discussed the importance of taking on this role because she “wants her students to be great”, and that it was enriching for her as well and “not at all a burden.

Observations that may be of interest to the provider: Candidates and Completers both referred to the valuable role of reflection, (learned through course required reflective journaling and Personal Learning Plans), and how it contributed to positive experiences and growth during Course Related Leadership Activities (CRLA's), Internship, and current Leadership roles.

Aspect 4d: Investigates available and trustworthy evidence regarding completer placement, effectiveness, and retention in the profession and uses that information to improve programs

Summary of evidence presented in the QAR:

Program improvement is encouraged through faculty participation in various city and state organizations involved in NYS requirements and changes to remain current pg 67

Internship was redesigned to be more congruent with course field experiences and Course Related Leadership Activities (CRLA's) pg 69

Summary of evidence collected during the review:

Program effectiveness is tracked in a variety of ways. According to the Director, program completers provide feedback on Course Related Leadership Activities (CRLA's) and Internship activities in terms of relevance to their roles as Principals and District Administrators. Mentors give final interviews as to the effectiveness and value of the Course Related Leadership Activities (CRLA's) and Internship projects. Candidates provide reflections on all coursework and activities. Program evaluations are shared with faculty and modifications are made accordingly. The Director and faculty are currently looking at methods to evaluate the Course Related Leadership Activities (CRLA's) with hard data that can predict improvement, and prove whether the Course Related Leadership Activity (CRLA) was relevant to improving outcomes for learners, especially those in high need settings.

Several current completers spoke of the Leadership program's commitment to continuous improvement, and how Leadership faculty always want to know how they can make things better.

Another completer we interviewed has organized a formal Alumni Association of Program Completers. It is expected that this group will provide on-going information and suggestions for faculty and program participants regarding professional development to improve programming and increase retention in the field as well as provide support for each other.

Observations that may be of interest to the provider: We consistently heard from Completers and Mentors that they feel valued and supported in sharing their observations and suggestions for programming. They also spoke of how responsive the Director and Faculty have been to them and how appreciative they are to have that kind of professional relationship.

Aspect 4e: Meets obligations and mandates established by the state, states, or jurisdiction within which it operates
(Reviewers: Please note here evidence of state program approval and/or other programmatic accreditor's decisions, if required, presented by the provider.)

Summary of evidence presented in the QAR:

Course Related Leadership Activities (CRLA's) of 100 total hours are required through core courses in order to meet NYS mandate pg 69

Four checkpoint evaluative data confirms candidates have state mandated GPA's, qualify for internships with 100 hours of Course Related Leadership Activities (CRLA's) and are eligible for state certification pg 74

Certification eligibility is confirmed by the Administrative Assistant in the Graduate Education office who is an expert in NYS requirements pg 66

Summary of evidence collected during the review:

The Director described how the specific mandates for NY state certification includes 100 hours of practical leadership experience that are met through the Course Related Leadership Activities (CRLA's). The administrative Assistant for Graduate Education tracks CRLA hours, course progress, GPA's, and eligibility for certification every semester. The administrative assistant shared that students who require additional time to meet program requirements are advised and assisted in developing a prescriptive plan of action to get themselves back on track. Candidates who require more support take an additional course that provides more one on one mentorship. As reported by the Administrative Assistant, "students do not fall through the cracks at Manhattan College" and are given every opportunity to remediate whatever obstacles are impeding their progress. The Director and faculty participate in the review of every candidate and work together to support students with whatever they need to be successful. Assistance is also available through the Counseling Center, Academic Support Center, and the Writing Center.

The Director and the Administrative Assistant report that they continuously participate in NY state meetings regarding certification mandates. Faculty and staff are also encouraged to join city and state professional organizations to remain current regarding methods and curriculum as well as changes to NY state requirements. Revisions are made to the Leadership program and curriculum accordingly to ensure that students continue to meet eligibility requirements.

Observations that may be of interest to the provider: Several of the Internship Mentors commented on how well informed and prepared the candidates were in all aspects of program expectations and state requirements. It was said that they come with a handbook, they have the knowledge, they know the "lingo", they ask questions, and they get involved.

Aspect 4f: Investigates its own effectiveness relative to its institutional and/or programmatic mission and commitments
(Reviewers: Please note this aspect invites providers to identify and document evidence of dimensions of their work that fall outside of or go beyond AAQEP's standards. Providers may or may not choose to provide information regarding this aspect at their sole discretion.)

Summary of evidence presented in the QAR:

Manhattan maintains an Academic Assessment Committee that requires an Outcomes Assessment Report to be reviewed by the Committee in order to evaluate program effectiveness pg 67

Effectiveness, which is also measured by certification test results pg 69

Summary of evidence collected during the review:

The President described how Manhattan College's Office of Assessment and Institutional Research supported Middle States Accreditation and also supports program directors, chairs, and deans with regulatory compliance as well as with program level accreditation self-studies and site visits. Program effectiveness is evaluated through the Outcomes Assessment Report which includes graduation/completion rates and certification test results. However, the School of Education and Health also regularly reviews data in coordination with other academic units. This

process is ongoing and similar historical data has been collected due to the requirements of previous program level accreditors in this space. Despite a temporary problem outputting data from a software tool, the faculty and program director expressed a culture of continuous improvement as supported by periodic review of curricula relative to feedback from candidates, completers, and PK-12 partners. These activities are largely connected to student feedback reported in aggregate at the end of each semester; the dean and a department chair from the teacher preparation area reinforced these sentiments. Through a culture of collegial leadership, all parties appear to update programs in accordance with professional leadership standards (e.g., PSEL, NELP, etc.) and guidance from the New York State Education Department (NYSED) and Office of Teaching Initiatives (OTI).

Observations that may be of interest to the provider:

The Quality Review Team (QRT) had an unexpected opportunity to speak informally with the new Executive Director of the Office of Assessment, who expressed a clear commitment to supporting the collection of data surrounding teacher and leader education as well as a willingness to assist the educational leadership programs and School of Education and Health sustaining and improving educational effectiveness relative to mission and vision.

Aspects for which no evidence is available to the Accreditation Commission

In the box below, note any aspects of Standard 4 for which no evidence was provided in the QAR, supplied in response to the team's clarification questions, or gathered on site. Plans for new or additional evidence should be noted in the appropriate box above, under the relevant aspect.

Not applicable.

5. Evidence of Identified Innovations

Describe any programmatic innovations that fell within the scope of the review. Innovations noted here should be new initiatives for which supporting data is incomplete, emerging, or planned. Please comment on how the program intends to evaluate the effectiveness or success of the innovation. (Note: If no innovations are identified that match this description, this section may be left blank.)

Innovations with partial or planned supporting evidence set	Additional evidence or insights gained on site
NYS exam passage rate reporting, data collection, and review.	The Educational Leadership Program at Manhattan College has acknowledged a gap in data, partly due to transition between software vendors as well as pandemic strain. Importantly, it was explained that although data was input into a software management

	tool, the information was not easily exported consistent with existing assessment practices. Manhattan College is currently investigating alternative collection methods and will rely more on other sources (e.g., Title II Report, NYS databases, etc.) moving forward. The program staff have also acknowledged that, despite the recommendation of faculty and program administration, not all completers seek NYS certification because it is not currently a workplace requirement in private/non-public schools. Nonetheless, the faculty and administration have articulated a plan to better track related outcomes using Title II data and other sources like alumni surveys moving forward.
--	---

6. Program Capacity Checks

AAQEP Standard 3 requires that providers maintain capacity for quality, reflected in staffing, resources, processes, and institutional commitment. In addition to evaluating evidence and documentation in the foregoing section, each review team completes the following checks related to programs' capacity and commitment. Briefly but clearly state how each indicator was checked and identify the relevant sources.

Indicator	QRT Findings
-----------	--------------

Full-Time Faculty Full-time faculty teaching in the program, selected at random, have appropriate degrees and experience for assignments.	While the School of Education and Health at Manhattan College employs many full time faculty across a variety of programs, there are two full-time faculty members associated with the Educational Leadership programs (e.g., SBL and ALS/SDL). The QRT was able to review publicly available curriculum vitae data as published on the Manhattan College website to confirm their credentials as well as CVs attached to the QAR.
Part-Time Faculty Part-time faculty teaching in the program, selected at random, have appropriate degrees and experience for assignments.	Similar to the full-time faculty, the part-time faculty are appropriately credentialed scholar practitioners with considerable academic and professional experience within the discipline. Many are active or recently retired teachers and/or district/building leaders. Although curriculum vitae data for part-time faculty are not necessarily published on the Manhattan College website, the QRT was presented with copies of CVs linked to the QAR.
Facilities The space and other facilities assigned to the preparation program(s) are adequate.	Manhattan College's Educational Leadership programs are mostly situated in Miguel Hall, where the classrooms and offices spaces visited are adequate for educator preparation programs.
Student Feedback Candidates have the opportunity to give feedback on courses and the program (e.g., through course evaluations).	Manhattan College's Educational Leadership programs anonymously survey candidates upon course completion. There are also formal and informal means of communication that are well established. Faculty and program administrators are readily available to students via scheduled and walk-in appointments. Email is also utilized, along with virtual meeting software.
Student Support Services Student support services meet candidate needs, and all candidates have access to services on an equitable basis with others.	Manhattan College's Educational Leadership faculty, administrators, advisors, and certification officer have established various protocols to equitably meet student needs. Academic advisement is offered in a variety of ways, including regular check points

	throughout the program, and the certification officer is available to address related concerns. These services can be offered in person or remotely, depending upon student need.
Policies and Practices Program requirements, academic catalog, student complaint process, and transfer of credit policy are all published and accessible to candidates.	Manhattan College's Educational Leadership programs have clearly documented policies and practices via the website as well as through an academic catalog and internship handbook/manual.
Third-Party Comments — Results Indicate the number and balance (positive or negative) of public comments received and any provider response(s).	There were 17 public comments. Two were from employees. Eight were from completers/alumni and 7 were from candidates/students. These third-party comments were overtly positive, with one dissenting student opinion. The Quality Review Team (QRT) discussed this with the faculty and program administrators. Based on these conversations, the program director was able to identify the previously unhappy individual who has since returned to the program after unsuccessfully attempting to enroll at another institution.

7. Concluding Thoughts or Observations

Keeping in mind that the Quality Review Team's role is to verify evidence presented by the provider and to gather any additional evidence needed to inform the Accreditation Commission in making its decision, please provide any concluding observations regarding the team's findings and the standard(s) or aspect(s) for which the observation applies.

The Manhattan College – Educational Leadership Programs are mission focused and stakeholder driven. The faculty and administrators strive to serve a unique educator population within the diverse City of New York while primarily advancing the tenets and charism of Catholic education through collaboration with the Archdiocese of New York and the Diocese of Brooklyn. However, the School of Education and Health also serves those employed in public schools. The curriculum and teaching methods appear consistent with New York State Education Department (NYSED) guidelines and best practices leading to School Building Leader (SBL) and School District Leader (SDL) professional licenses.

8. Supporting Materials

Please copy the team's clarification questions and the provider's responses in this box and/or other relevant supporting materials.

1. It is acknowledged that not all completers are certified educational leaders, that access to sufficient and accurate data is needed (QAR, p.33), and that this gap will be addressed by program faculty and administrators (QAR, pp. 24-25). What is the historical data flow of this information? Can the educational leadership program team please articulate current and future plans to resolve related data integrity concerns along with goals toward continued systemic process improvement (QAR, pp. 47-49)?

Response: The historical data flow that indicates the need for access to sufficient and accurate data shows that test data is needed for SBL certified participants. Test results are available for

2018-19 Of 5 completers: two are certified, three are not certified; one certified has test scores

2019-20 Of 7 completers: Four are certified; three are not certified; one certified has test scores

2020-21 Of 10 completers: Six are certified; four are not certified; five certified have test scores; one not certified has test scores

2014-17 (ALS) Of 35 completers: 26 are certified; test results are available for 14; 9 do not have test results

Current and future plans to resolve data integrity concerns include the following:

- Track received data reports for NYSTCE from 2014-present; determine missing reports; contact NYS Education Department for access to test data site with test data by institution available for those with a username and password. The holder of access information – locally or at the state level-- is not yet identified. The (optimistic) goal is to have the information for the on-site accreditation visit.
- Pending independent access to certification exam results, scheduled test dates will be requested from candidates as encouragement to sit for the certification exam. Follow up inquiry will be made to completers who are not certified and those for whom test data is not available.

Goals for systemic process improvement include

- Consultation and collaboration with the Director of Institutional Assessment for secure data storage
- The development of a database for certification scores
- The director will seek NYSED personnel with the capability to forward NYSTCE results. The results will be shared with faculty when received
- Request made for copies of test results from candidates
 - Current and future plans to resolve data integrity concerns include the following:
 - Track received data reports for NYSTCE from 2013-present; determine missing reports and contact NYS Education Department for previously released reports
 - Forward NYSTCE results to faculty when received
 - Annual review of certification results
 - Follow up inquiry for completers who are not certified
 - [Semester reporting of CRLA & PLP scores](#) by faculty

2. Although exam passage rate data may not be completely clear at present (QAR, p. 24), it seems that at least 55% of participants are certified as educational leaders by New York State (QAR, p. 32). How will greater data clarity inform coursework and improve test results in future (QAR, pp. 25 & 47)?

Response: Greater data clarity will help us consider ways to inform future coursework and experiential learning. We agree with Schildkamp (2019) that data must measure specific goals. Data for data sake alone must be replaced with actionable data; data put to use to develop and/or improve coursework and course related experiences designed to meet those goals. Professional knowledge, experiential knowledge, decision-making skill, professional dispositions toward caring and life-long learning are important goals of the educational leadership programs.

For example, if pertinent test data available to us, we can Improve test results. Access to 45% of missing data would facilitate determining whether the test results of the 45% match those of the 55% That is, do the additional 45% of the results indicate the same strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and/or threats and match the results for the 55%. Seeing the whole picture would allow faculty to make needed adjustments to the programs.

The emphasis on certification test results will also make our data actionable to measure the degree to which we reach goals for the ed leadership programs. It is essential that completers have increased their professional knowledge and decision making skill. We use the components of the certification exam to measure the accomplishment of those goals: scores on the multiple choice questions of the certification exam are considered measures of professional knowledge; scores on the constructed response are considered measures of decision-making skill. Case studies are selected for their relevance to the course in which they are used and help participants prepare for similar assessments in the certification exams.

Likewise, internship evaluations provide a measure of the experiential knowledge possessed or gained by the intern. The evaluation of the decision-making category and the internship initiative category represent direct observation of the characteristics of informed decision-making, caring, and learning to learn beyond course work. Data gathered from these sources give faculty an “x-ray” view to diagnose the value of the course work and course assignments to produce the data. Faculty reflection and discussion may point to development, selection, and use of course work and program design to help participants reach their goal of certification.

3. Do some individuals pursue educational leadership programs for reasons other than seeking New York State licensure and leadership roles in public schools (e.g., non-public school leadership positions)? If so, what leadership positions do graduates hold at institutions that may not require SBL or SDL certification (QAR, pp. 24, 32-33)?

Response: To date, we have anecdotal data that individuals pursue educational leadership programs for reasons other than assuming a leadership role in NYS public schools. Conversations at the time of the initial interview, during advisement of participants, and in other informal conversations, faculty learn that participants pursue a leadership program for salary increment, on-going professional development, personal development, employment in higher education, and leadership in non-public and charter schools.

Leadership positions that graduates hold that do not require SBL or SDL certification include:

- Superintendents/Associate Superintendents – private, faith-based, charter schools
- Principal/assistant principal/departments chairperson in private, faith-based/ charter schools
- Teaching positions in HE
- Two participants are known to have refused to be certified, even though they completed the program, because they did not want to work at the level of a principal or superintendent.

At present, NYSED is working toward substantial equivalence for all nonpublic schools. One diocese was denied substantial equivalence because school administrators of the submitted sample were not certified. It is incumbent on ed leadership faculty to be sure participants are aware of the need to become certified for the sake of their institutions as well as for their professional goals.

4. School Building Leader (SBL) program Course Related Leadership Activities (CRLA) and internship evaluations indicate that completers exceed the criteria for success, but not everyone has scores (QAR, p. 37). Does this mean enrolled students have not completed the courses or did they not complete the associated CRLAs?

Response: All students complete associated CRLAs or an equivalent assignment designed by an instructor. Grades are listed in Moodle for each assignment of each course. Course requirements indicate the requirements for course completion. All participants complete course requirements as listed in the syllabus designed by the instructor.

In some cases, grades on the Moodle sites are available only to the instructor of the course and not to the Program Director unless and until the instructor provides the grades for the CRLAs to the program director, these grades cannot be accessed. In other cases, the instructor determines that a course related leadership activity is described as an assignment rather than as a CRLA. In that case, there is no grade for the CRLA, but for the assignment instead.

Future planning that follows the accreditation process will include discussion, samples, and assessment of the value of CRLAs to meet NYSED requirements for practical application in advance of the internship. A more consistent description, use, recording, and availability of the CRLA (and PLP) grades will be re-instated.

5. Can the educational leadership program team please provide some examples of how the program helps prepare school leaders to engage with their communities (QAR, p. 37)?

Response: The educational leadership program prepares school leaders to engage with their communities with assignments that offer practical application of course content and the opportunity to lead from the positions they hold. For example, the Course Related Leadership Activities assignment and the internship improvement initiative of the school building program and the internship project of the school district program, the ALS. These activities in SBL and SDL require school leaders to engage with their communities.

For example, in EDUG735, participants interview at least 3 colleagues at different grade levels about how the school mission impacts their teaching. They then engage with their colleagues in revising the school mission statement. Some participants include parents in their examination of the school's mission. Some initiatives included activities that engaged parents in an improvement.

Each CRLA requires participants to consult with colleagues associated with the school (ex. parents, staff, students, faculty, administration, Board members, local community...) when developing the course related activity.

In summarizing the CRLA, participants respond to questions such as:

What data supports your choice?

Do your colleagues agree?

Does the principal/supervisor agree with the area you chose to evaluate and approve?

Who benefits from an evaluation and improvement of the area you chose?

The Internship initiatives in SBL and SDL give clear evidence of preparing school leaders to engage with their communities. In SBL, participants collaborate with administration and faculty in identifying an area in need of improvement for the school. In SDL, participants work within a school district to initiate an improvement project for the district or community.

Recent CRLA initiatives included:

- an [anti-vaping program](#) by Moriarity (SBL)
- Math Game Night for Parents and Students – Fogari (SBL)
- [a Little Free Library](#) – Murray (SBL)
- [Parent Guide to Reentry](#) – Saracino & Cunzio (ALS)
- STEAM District Summer Program – Chambers (ALS)
- Character Development Program Using Military Structure and Values to Promote Positive Behavior – Cabrera – current SBL EDUG 738
- [School Marketing Video](#) – Heal – current SBL EDUG 738

6. Question 10 of the Advanced Leadership Studies (ALS or SDL) program internship evaluation provides evidence that completers meet or exceed the established criteria for success while citing chronological reflective journals as providing additional evidence (QAR, p. 41). Can the educational leadership programs team please elaborate on how reflective journals are used to promote candidate professional growth?

Response: Faculty agree with Stevens & Cooper (2009) that reflective journals promote professional growth as participants reflect on new knowledge they learned in class, solidify their learning by recording new learning from practical application of academic learning, develop awareness of what is still there to learn beyond course work, and to change their minds about their thinking.

Some courses have used the That was Then, This is Now reflection process: I used to think leadership was . . . Now I think leadership is . . .

Other courses have asked for reflection and revision: If you had to do ??? over again, what would you do differently?

The RISC process asks students to put a space between stimulus and response:

Report the behavior, then state the Impact on you, then Specify your preference, finally, report the Consequences of your preference.

The reflection process gives an opportunity to be in the shoes of their future selves when they are in decision-making positions.

7. School Building Leader (SBL) program CRLAs in EDUG 735 and 747, the internship evaluation section 1 provide evidence that completers meet or exceed established

criteria for success (QAR, p. 42). Can the educational leadership programs team please elaborate on how strategic decision making is linked with collaboration?

Response: The CRLA requires the candidate to collaborate with colleagues and administration to decide on an improvement activity for the school. For example, in EDUG735, Leadership for Learning, Decision-making, and Change, participants collaborate with colleagues in reviewing the school mission. If the collaboration suggests any revisions, the decision is to revise the mission. Some changes suggested for the mission have been accepted for the school – a strategic decision is made that the collaborative CRLA process to review and modify the mission is accepted for the school

The CRLA for EDUG747, Supervision for the Improvement of Instruction, requires the candidate to partner with at least one colleague to review the supervision process in the school. Candidates are directed to:

- interview a colleague and supervisor re. Models of Supervision ...
- conduct 3 short walk through visits to that colleague's class...
- design a PD plan of improvement with your colleague

The design of the PD plan is a strategic decision-making process. While the modified design may not be used in the school, it provides strategic thinking to be used when the candidate is in a decision-making position.

8. Both School Building Leader (SBL) and Advanced Leadership Studies (ALS or SDL) program curricula align with NYS certification requirements and related exam frameworks, as well as Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL) and the National Educational Leadership Program (NELP) (QAR, pp. 45 & 80). It appears that some core courses in the alignment matrix still at least partly align with the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC). Can the educational leadership programs team please elaborate on the faculty process of continuing to incorporate the PSEL and NELP standards as appropriate and consistent with New York State Education Department (NYSED) guidance (QAR, pp. 45 & 80)?

Response: The processes used by the faculty to incorporate the PSEL and NELP standards required by the New York State Education Department will culminate in a submission of updated syllabi to NYSED in July 2023.

The process to date has been for faculty to indicate on a matrix which PSEL and NELP standards are used in the courses they teach. The next step in the process will be to add the relevant standards to the syllabi for their courses. Some faculty have already updated their syllabi to the new PSEL and NELP standards.

Currently, the standards used for course work are the 2011 ISLLC standards. The new standards are the ISLLC standards updated to the PSEL standards and adopted by the Regents in 2017. In addition, State Ed requires specific items to be included in the template for the syllabi for graduate education courses. Some faculty have already progressed to including pertinent PSEL and NELP standards in their syllabi for the current semester. All syllabi will be updated to include the PSEL and NELP standards for submission in July 2023. After State review, the modified syllabi will be used for educational leadership courses in Fall 2023.

9. Program participants come from diverse and high need New York City (NYC) school districts, thus providing opportunities to improve learning for individuals across the

socioeconomic spectrum (QAR, p. 63). Are there any partnership agreements or memorandums of understanding with the New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE)? Similarly, are there any collaborations with district superintendents?

Response: Partnership agreements with the schools where our candidates work (including NYC DOE) are in the form of an Agreement of Support. This document is signed by site mentors to indicate their understanding program expectations for the CRLAs leading to the administrative internship. The site mentor becomes, in effect, a partner with the educational leadership program to support and assist the candidate/intern.

The number and location of the schools where internships take place make an MOU impractical. Some interns are from public school districts outside the NYC DOE; some are from nonpublic or charter schools. As a result, an MOU will not satisfy the needs of enrollees in the administrative internship.

Collaboration with District superintendents are also in the form of an Agreement of Support of an ALS intern. Other means of collaboration by the director and faculty are in the form of inviting District Superintendents to make presentations, become instructors in course work for those aspiring to school district positions. The director and faculty also make themselves available to be on district boards, make presentations, participate in employment fairs, conduct workshops.

10. It seems that recruitment efforts are coordinated from the Office of Graduate Admissions and include attendance at information sessions and college fairs (QAR, p. 70). Can the educational leadership programs team please elaborate on future plans to more directly and deliberately collaborate with the Marketing and Communications Department? Where possible, kindly expound upon future planning for recruitment and outreach activities (QAR, p. 68).

Response: Collaboration with the Marketing and Communications department to date has been the recent inquiry of the ed leadership director of the Asst. Vice President of Marketing and Communications, responsible for Manhattan's web presence and collaboration with the consultant company, EAB, if it is feasible to have a member of Marketing and Communication (MarComm) serve as a liaison to the educational leadership program. That type of collaboration could make corrections and updates to the site practicable and timely

The director has also worked with a MarComm member to respond to questions posed by EAB. The plan is to continue that collaboration with the individual member. A future plan to deal with the serious issue of errors on the website is to learn the method by which errors on the website can be corrected. If errors can be corrected by ed leadership personnel, we will take on that responsibility. If corrections must be made through the web manager, the director will schedule time with MarComm to communicate needed corrections.

Future recruitment planning and outreach to date includes working with MarComm and the previous Director of Admissions who now serves in a new position. Arrangements have already been made to meet with that previous director to learn successful means of recruiting used by Admissions. An idea may be to engage graduates and completers to sponsor small get-together activities near their residences or work sites to talk about the program to potential admits.

Another strategy is to maintain contact with graduates who work in district offices. Collaboration with dioceses in Brooklyn and New York will continue with suggestions

for service from the ed leadership department to help those systems meet state requirements for substantial equivalence by offering tuition discounts for courses leading to state certification.

11. It has been shared that program completers are invited to self-initiate deliberate outreach and to lead seminars for students, faculty, alumni, parents, community schools, and other organizations on issues supporting social justice and respect for individual dignity (QAR, p. 66 and p. 77). Can the educational leadership programs team please elaborate on future plans to more proactively support continued professional growth for completers?

Response: Future plans to proactively support completers' professional growth include the re-establishment of the Center for Learning Leaders (CeLL).

Background: When Brother William Harkins did the survey of Catholic School Principals (1993) for the National Catholic Education Association (NCEA), he "met with a group of 30 elementary school principals in a workshop conducted by Sr. Remigia Kushner, [formerly] associate superintendent of schools for the Archdiocese of New York [and currently], director of the Center for Learning Leaders at Manhattan College" [since 1990] (1993, p. 28).

In 2004, the Center for Learning Leaders was the impetus for the Academy for Learning Leaders (A.L.L.) in place in the Yonkers Public Schools to provide on-going professional development for practicing and aspiring principals. Those participating in the internship used the A.L.L. meetings for internship seminars; practicing principals also attended and added their experiential knowledge to the professional knowledge provided to aspiring principals.

The Institute in Catholic Identity (ICI), under the auspices of the CeLL, invited faith-based school leaders to join experienced and nearly new principals to reflect together and discuss pertinent and relevant issues.

In 2005, the NYC DOE made available federal Title IIA funds that provided tuition grants for nonpublic educators in the five boroughs of NYC. Information was sent by the Title IIA office to 900 non-public schools in the city. As a result, the CeLL stopped advertising its faith-based offerings because the Title IIA catalog that could not emphasize faith-based offerings.

Future plans: While the Title IIA program still exists and operates in NYC, ed leadership faculty believe it would be good to reinstate and advertise again the earlier plans that combined practicing and aspiring leaders to consider leadership, teaching, and learning issues together. A step already taken to that end is enlisting the services of a recent graduate to research the procedures for creating an alumni/ae network for MC ed leadership completers.

Future plans also include invitations to internship mentor/partners to participate in internship seminars presentations as presenters, reviewers, and evaluators. In-service principals will be invited to send school-based problems to the interns for suggested solutions. Practicing principals will be asked to comment on the value of the interns' suggestions for improvement.

CeLL presentations by and for in-service leaders will be part of a proposed alumni/ae network of completers. Those with experience will have access to a Mentoring course and will be asked to mentor new and nearly new school leaders.

Finally, a more proactive stance to offer continued, though informal service from current college supervisors or faculty will be offered. The nature of that service is yet to be determined given that there are no funds to support active mentoring by college

personnel. However, engaging more experienced completers, offering workshops in mentoring, may provide the professional collaboration that may be helpful to a completer in a new administrative position.

12. Future improvement plans include developing a data-based evaluation to document evidence of the value of the internship to the internship site as well as formal measurement of the effectiveness of the CRLA's (QAR, p. 70). Given the many variables and subjective nature of leadership sites, activities, and student populations, can the education leadership team please share some thoughts and ideas as to what kinds of hard data would provide evidence of effectiveness, and the best way to document those factors?

Response: Faculty agree with [Paul Bambrick-Santoyo](#) (2019) that data should drive instruction, help improve delivery, content, strategies for engaging participants who are **adult learners**. The hard data, actionable data that we will seek to develop a data-based evaluation of the internship and the CRLA will include data gathered using :

1. [Brookfield's Critical Incident Questionnaire](#). Currently, the CIQ is used informally and infrequently. We will cycle the CIQ on so that instructors of two courses per semester will be asked to collect analyze, and present data from the CIQ. A typical schedule might be:
1st cycle: Fall 735, Spring 745 Summer 744 followed by faculty review
2nd cycle: Fall 747 Spring 738 Summer 744 followed by faculty review
2. Informal semester assessment: Using a similar cycle, an instructor will collect data once a semester to ascertain:
What did we do in class that should be continued?
What could you live without?
What was missing that should be added?
What was done that we should do more of?

The data collected and reviewed will need to be input into a spreadsheet or database so comparisons can be made over time. While data input by hand is tedious, it is also prone to error. At the moment, the only progress that has been made is in the form of consulting with those who gather and use data on a college wide basis. We will continue to examine methods to use Google forms® or Qualtrics® so the responses can be recorded, collated, and represented graphically without the need for entering data by hand.

3. Currently, suggestions for improving the internship are elicited in a discussion with the site mentors (at internship Visit 3). The responses are anecdotal and not recorded anywhere. To use suggestions for improvement as actionable data, we will add questions to the site mentor evaluation form so suggestions can be collected, analyzed, reviewed, and used for improvement of the internship process.

While not yet planned, the same process can be used to ascertain **the value of the CRLAs** to the local site.

4. Also related to the effectiveness of the internship is the improvement initiative that the intern proposes and conducts after consultation with colleagues, the principal, and the college supervisor. Currently, the internship evaluation form asks whether the initiative was done, did the intern seem knowledgeable about the topic, and conducted the initiative. No effort has been made to inquire of the principal/mento/partner whether the initiative produced observable and positive changes.

Even though the intern does an [impact statement](#) detailing differences from baseline measures to endpoint measures, that data is not collected. Future plans include recording the data presented in the internship initiative impact statement. Questions will be added to the site mentor evaluation form asking about the value of the initiative to the school, the observable changes in the intended participants of the initiative, and suggestions for the improvement of the initiative.