Metropolitan Council of Educational Administration Programs

TO: John D'Agati, Deputy Commissioner, NYSED, and Ken Turner, director, Principal Preparation Project

From: MCEAP executive committee (Terry Orr, Bank Street College; Catherine DiMartino, St. Johns University; Terri Watson, CUNY; Ken Forman, Stonybrook University; and Marcia Knolls, Hunter College)

Date: May 12, 2017

Subject: feedback and recommendations for the NYSED proposed Principal Preparation Project recommendations

For communication: Terry Orr, morr@bankstreet.edu or 212-875-4546

This memo is for the executive committee of the Metropolitan Council of Educational Administration Programs (MCEAP) to provide you with feedback and recommendations for the NYSED proposed Principal Preparation Project recommendations. On May 4, 2017, Ken Turner surveyed the deans of the schools of education in NYS with leadership preparation programs. As a regional association of 20+ leadership preparation programs from the greater NYC metropolitan region, we wanted to have an opportunity to provide qualitative feedback on the recommendations, highlighting areas of ambiguity or confusion and providing suggestions and recommendations.

As a professional association of faculty from leadership preparation programs, we have met, often quarterly, to explore ways to improve the quality and effectiveness of our leadership preparation programs, provide input into NYC and NYS leadership preparation policies and initiatives, and to advocate for ways of improving means for effective leadership preparation. We work closely with CADEA, the statewide association, which typically meets annually, for the same purpose. Because of our regional closeness, representing Long Island, NYC and the lower Hudson Valley, MCEAP members can meet and discuss shared interests more frequently.

Over the past 15 years, we have provided input into various NYS initiatives, particularly through representation on the state's advisory group to create a Cohesive Leadership system. Through that endeavor, we advocated for state adoption of the 2008 ISLLC standards to frame its leadership policies, including preparation. We also promoted the state's adoption of effective program features, as is outline in its TLQP RFP:

> *"The Educational Leadership Program Enhancement Project supports improvements to educational leadership preparation programs so that they are more responsive to regional needs, and develop leaders focused on increasing student achievement. The elements identified below are important quality indicators for effective preparation programs in Educational Leadership. A successful Educational Leadership Program Enhancement Project*:

A. Is focused on high quality teaching and improving student learning that incorporates activities and effective strategies that promote learning and future achievement for all students (Attachment V Goal # 1, 2, 3); and

B. Is aligned with research-based best practices (Attachment V Goal # 2, 4); and

 C. Is aligned with ISLLC Standards as the program foundation (see http://coe.fgcu.edu/faculty/valesky/isllcstandards.htm for ISLLC Standards) (Attachment V Goal # 2, 5); and

D. Is integrated with the systemic reform efforts of New York State's high need schools and school districts (Attachment V Goal # 1, 2, 3, 4, 5); and

E**. Provides for an authentic, rigorous, full-time clinical internship** (Attachment V Goal # 1, 3); and

 F. Integrates theoretical and practical knowledge throughout all learning experiences (Attachment V Goal # 1, 2, 4, 5); and

G. Uses authentic measures to assess program candidates (Attachment V Goal # 3); and

 H. Has faculty committed to and capable of delivering the program (Attachment V Goal # 2, 4, 5); and

I. Includes proactive activities to recruit highly effective certified teachers with leadership potential (Attachment V Goal # 1); and

 J. Bases selection of candidates on demonstrated success (Attachment V Goal # 3); and

K. **Ensures meaningful and active practitioner partnerships working closely with dedicated program facult**y (Attachment V Goal # 3, 4, 5);

L. Plans for sustainability of successful elements (Attachment V Goal # 5); and 5

M. Is evaluated using a variety of performance indicators (Attachment V Goal # 5); and

N. Promotes supportive learning structures for students (Attachment V Goal # 1, 2, 4); and

O. Is committed to sharing best practices with the field.

More important, we strongly support the TLQP grant's overarching purpose as a goal we strive for with all our programs:

The purpose of this Educational Leadership Program Enhancement Project will be to identify, cultivate, train, and support a new generation of educators to lead our schools into the future. Cultivating new, inspiring, and prepared leaders will require a better

understanding of what it means to be an effective school building leader and a fresh approach to support those looking to become educational leaders.

In addition, the TLQP grant reports require documentation on how well the funded projects serve candidates based on racial/ethnic diversity, providing an opportunity for us all to learn different strategies for effectively recruiting and retaining racial/ethnic minority candidates and candidates from low-resource districts. This has been a source of discussion in some of our meetings as we share funded program features and results.

We are pleased that your Principal Preparation Project committee has reinforced many of these features, particularly those in **BOLD**, in the list above. We continue to support these features and strive for them in our own programs, both with and without funding support.

At that the time the TLQP grant was been planned and throughout the formation of the Cohesive Leadership System, we advocated for ways in which school districts could help pay for candidates' internship release time, counting it as professional development and using their CoSer for reimbursement. We had worked with CADEA members from Western New York to share possible funding models with NYSED officials, but without success. We hope that future internship policy planning will revisit this option as part of strengthening preparation throughout NYS.

The TLQP funding, made possible since 2009, has supported only six projects throughout NYS and, while individual projects have shared their results in various professional forums, and MCEAP and CADEA have offered opportunities to share results, there has been no other analysis and dissemination of lessons learned that could improve preparation programs and state policy support. We hope that the TLQP funded projects' experiences can be used systemically and strategically to inform policy here.

In addition to providing input into TLQP funding priorities, we also supported the Cohesive Leadership System policies that emphasize leadership development for new and experienced school leaders. While stressed in the Cohesive Leadership System proposal and proposed principal evaluation policies, this recommendation was never fully developed. We are pleased to see if stressed here and hope that it is more fully enacted than before. But, as noted below, we think all the elements described here (induction, mentoring, portfolio-based leadership development documentation and assessment) should be pulled together into an integrated set of policies, actions and funding.

Finally, we have continuously been committed to quality assessments to determine candidate readiness for initial school and district leadership. Several of our members have served on SBL assessment design committees and as trained scorers. Based on our experiences, we have been concerned about some aspects of the assessment and submitted a written request for validity and reliability information on the test, without response.

Finally, based on our experiences in recruiting, selecting, developing and supporting aspiring school leaders, and based our continued advocacy for high quality leadership preparation, longer more full-time internships that enable independent leadership work, productive district partnerships, better recruitment and support of candidates from under-served populations, and effective assessments, we offer the following

questions, reactions and suggestions on the proposed recommendations. We also list several of our own recommendations for consideration as well. Given the detail of feedback and our additional recommendations, we would like to offer you an opportunity to discuss these with us at more length, possibly through a conference call to be scheduled at your convenience. We strongly support NYSED aims to improve the quality and effectiveness of school leaders statewide and its investments in improving leadership preparation programs and school districts' leadership development toward that end. We believe that working together we can find viable, cost-effective strategies to meet these goals.

Recommendation	Questions	Reaction	Suggestions
NYSED recommendations			
Recommendation #1: Aspiring and current principals demonstrate they have acquired and can apply the knowledge and skill required to meet the learning needs of an increasingly-diverse student population.	The recommendation includes three elements that require clarification. What is meant by: "have acquired," "can apply" and which knowledge and skills? Is it the state's intention to use PSEL for all leadership policies (preparation, certification exam, licensure, and principal evaluation)? If so, are there other policy recommendations that address this? How does the state intend to measure knowledge and skills of sitting administrators that meet the needs of diverse student populations? How will this be used in conjunction with the districts' principal evaluation systems? Why is this limited to just "principals" and not all school building leaders?	We support the intention of this recommendation, particularly emphasizing leadership skills for leading increasingly diverse student populations. The recommendation seems to be overarching for the rest of the recommendations. We do not know which standards are being used for both aspiring and current principals.	This recommendation seems to bridge preparation and post-certification leadership development, linked to specific knowledge and skills. We suggest that the recommendation do the following: a. Clarify that NYS views leadership development as continuous from preparation through initial leadership positions and that preparation programs and districts strive to create a coherent, developmental experience. b. Clarify which standards (PSEL, CAEP or principal evaluation standards) are being applied and if there is an expectation that these be used for both preparation and principal evaluation. c. We recommend that the PSEL standards be used for both

			leadership preparation and leadership practice. d. We recommend that all preparation programs be required to be nationally accredited, which means adhering to the CAEP standards and expectations. e. We recommend that the expectation be broadened to more than "serving" diverse student populations, but "educating effectively and equitably."
Recommendation #2: Going forward, professional development plans that districts prepare and submit to the State Education Department will include annual goals that call for increasing the number and percentage of historically under-represented populations in the ranks of school building leaders employed by the district; districts make public annual reports that describe progress made toward these goals.	Are there benchmarks that the state plans to use and if so, what are these? What would the goals be for districts whose school leaders are predominately nonwhite? Is this goal going to be paired with a similar goal to diversify the teaching ranks from which future leaders are drawn? It is admirable to call for increasing the number and percentage of under-represented subgroups in school building leadership but how can the plethora of small school district across the state manage this effort?	Given the predominance of small districts throughout NYS, we wondered it this recommendation is feasible for all districts and whether the required documentation and reporting was unnecessarily burdensome. This goal could be nested within a larger statewide goal to diverse the teaching population, support the diversity of teaching candidates, and create viable pathways for students from historically under-represented populations to be able to be successful in college and consider the teaching profession. Different types of districts face different challenges in recruiting	We support this recommendation in spirit, strongly agreeing that school and district leaders should be racially/ethnically diverse and reflect their districts racial/ethnic make-up. But we are aware that the teaching force is not. Thus, we suggest that this recommendation include the following: a. Take into account district demographics when setting targets for school leader demographics. b. Add a recommendation for diversifying teacher preparation and teacher pools. c. Consider how to do this without adding documentation requirements.

	What is the success rate of various districts to recruit and retain teachers and leaders from historically-underrepresented populations? What work conditions contribute to better recruitment and retention?	and retaining teachers and leaders from historically-underrepresented populations. More research is needed to understand the trends and issues in order to develop a targeted but differentiated strategy to diversify the teaching and leading staff in all types of districts and communities.	d. Provide funding to research the recruitment and retention of teachers and leaders from historically underrepresented populations, to identified trends and patterns and working conditions that positive influence these goals.
Recommendation #3: Future state approval for university-based School Building Leader (SBL) preparation programs will be predicated on the SBL program setting and reporting publicly on program progress toward annual goals that seek to increase the number and percentage of historically under-represented populations in the ranks of candidates enrolled and those that successfully earn SBL certification.	What would the benchmarks be for program diversity goals? How is historically under-represented defined? How will these benchmarks be set?	This is two goals, over which programs have different controls. The first goal pertains to recruitment, which is dependent upon the pool of applicants and the potential pool based from existing teacher and other professional staff ranks. Programs have only partial control over candidate diversity through recruitment and this varies regionally with some areas having more diverse teacher pools than others. The pool of candidates varies over time, based on demographics and labor market conditions. It appears that in some NYS regions, the potential applicant pool is shrinking generally, while school leadership openings are anticipated to increase in the next few years. Could the state provide data to	We support this recommendation in spirit, strongly agreeing that school and district leaders should be racially/ethnically diverse and reflect their districts racial/ethnic makeup. We do not recommend that there be enrollment goals for SBL program approval, given the fact that programs are dependent upon the diversity of teacher pools in their catchment area. We recommend that any demographically defined enrollment goals be based in part on the demographic population in programs' catchment area's teacher demographics. We propose that this recommendation be coupled with a

		track this and help programs target their recruitment and support? The second goal is related to retention and completion. Programs have more influence over this and should be encouraged to provide supports to enable better program completion rates among students from historically-underrepresented populations.	broader state strategy to support better diversification of its teaching ranks, particularly in recruiting and retaining teachers from historically-under-served populations. We recommend that the state provide scholarships to encourage teachers from historically under-served populations to pursue leadership preparation and school leadership licensure, as a means of supporting program recruitment and retention, particularly in regions most challenged by this goal. We recommend that there be program progress goals on diverse candidate retention, to emphasize how well programs support students of historically underserved populations in program completion.
Recommendation #4: While maintaining a commitment to quality (when it comes to certification, program approval and institutional accreditation), take steps to improve the presence of historically-under-represented populations in the ranks of successful school building leaders by employing multiple pathways to	What is the research evidence that multiple pathways will diversify the leadership pool? Does "multiple pathways" refer to different types of preparation or different types of assessment of readiness?	This recommendation appears to have two parts that should be separated—creating multiple pathways to leadership and diversifying the school leader pool. The latter part of the recommendation was addressed in recommendations #2 and #3 and does not need to be included here.	We cannot provide a recommendation without clarification about whether this is about multiple pathways to licensure or multiple pathways for assessment for licensure. In the absence of clarification, we do not recommend that there be multiple pathways to licensure.

SBL certification that include competency-based demonstrations and peer review of portfolios containing multiple forms of evidence (beyond test-based results).	What are "competency-based demonstrations"? What is "peer reviewed"?		There is no research that supports non-graduate program based preparation and preliminary evidence from Massachusetts that candidates who are prepared through alternative (non-university) pathways are less well prepared and do more poorly on licensure-related performance assessments. We do support the exploration of other forms of assessment that would lead to licensure, but not multiple versions. There should be a common means of assessing readiness, to enable comparison. We propose that any recommendation about assessments for licensure should be posed as a separate, free standing recommendation.
Recommendation #5: Design, implement, and scale up statewide a mechanism that enables State-based incentives to be used to improve the identification, recruitment, selection, placement and development of aspiring school building leaders (especially but not exclusively those from historically-under-represented populations).	What would be the source funding of state-based incentives, given the current federal policy climate and budget cuts? What is meant by "state-based incentives"? Would this be grants for candidates, programs, or partnerships?	This recommendation seems to be like the current TLQP grant program purpose and design. There has been eight years of TLQP funding for 6 projects statewide. These projects were to be designed around program design features that are like the recommendations here. It would be useful to analyze what has been learned from these	We recommend that the state review the funded projects from current TLQP funding to gather the evidence of what worked and what did not in achieving the TLQP goals and objectives and use these to inform the design of a state-based incentive. We recommend that the state providing funding to share findings

	How would this proposed recommendation be different from the TLQP grant program that is currently in place? What type of entities would be eligible to design and implement improvements like this? How would programs learn about these incentives to participate in "scale up"?	projects over the last eight years about the feasibility, innovation and challenges in meeting these goals. We used several CADEA and MCEAP meetings annually to share what programs have learned about their TLQP projects, but no other common dissemination strategy has occurred.	on the design, implementation and outcomes of current TLQP projects for local programs to use for possible replication.
Recommendation #6: Adopt the *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders* for principal preparation and evaluation but add emphasis to Standard 4, Standard 5, and Standard 6 (see underlined passages below).	The standards were amended to add cultural competence. Is this competence should be what leadership candidates demonstrate or should they demonstrate the capacity to foster cultural competence among staff?	This is the recommendation that MCEAP proposed last year in our letter to the Regents.	We agree that the state should adopt the PSEL standards as the foundation for leadership preparation. We recommend that the state also use the PSEL standards as the basis for all its leadership-related policies, including principal evaluation.
Recommendation #7: Institutionalize P-20 partnerships to strengthen the profession.	This recommendation includes several terms that warrant clarification to make the policy intent clearer: "institutionalize" "partnerships" "strengthen the profession". What is meant by these terms in this recommendation? Could NYS do an audit of the school district-leadership preparation	It is not clear what the actual intent of this recommendation is. All preparation programs, because of the internship, already work closely with local schools to support their candidates. Some programs have formalized partnerships to earmark some programs for their staff's leadership preparation. And, some programs have advisory	We recommend that there be clear district-university policy expectations that provide clarity for districts and programs to work closely together, as is feasible, on candidates' leadership preparation. We recommend that NYSED survey districts and programs to identify where leadership preparation partnerships already exist and where gaps for more strategic

		committees or other forms of close working relationships with one or more local districts. If the recommendation's intent is to expand district-university relationships, the form and nature of these relationships should be defined, with flexibility given the different sizes and needs of local districts. It is our understanding that many programs already have one or more formal partnership with local districts to develop aspiring leaders for their school leadership needs. It would be useful to identify the gaps and opportunities for more partnerships.	leadership preparation partnerships. We recommend that the state adopt the UCEA program quality guidelines definition of a partnership and that include at least some of the following: a. District-university advisory committee b. District curriculum review to update topics, tools and expectations. c. Use of school and district leaders as instructors or co-instructors. d. District assistance in recruiting and selecting candidates. e. School and district leader support on ensuring quality internship experiences. f. School and district feedback on candidate skill development.
partnerships that already exist statewide?			
Recommendation #8: Provide on-going, job-embedded professional learning and authentic experiences with diverse student populations (including English language learners, students with disabilities, etc.) during preparation and the first year on the job.	Who would be responsible for this? What kind of experiences are envisioned? What leadership skills are envisioned for this recommendation?	This seems to be two recommendations that should be separated: a. Recommendation for content and field based experiences in leadership preparation b. Recommendation for content and on-the-job	We recommend that this be separated into two separate recommendations and that all recommendations concerning post-preparation be combined. We also recommend that the purpose, content and expected leadership skills be defined further.

	What is "first year on the job"? the first leadership position after program completion? Is the expectation that the professional learning would be articulated between preparation and the first year on the job?	training for new school leaders.	We recommend that the PSEL standards be used to define leadership skills and that expectation levels be established for skill proficiency as beginning (aspiring candidates), developing (for program completers), meeting (for new school leaders) and exemplary (for experienced school leaders)
Recommendation #9: Consider an annotation to the SBL Certification for principal-ship	What does "annotation" mean? Is this a proposal for an SBL certification that is specifically for the principalship, and not just school leadership generally? Does this mean to add an assessment requirement for SBL certification? As part of the PSEL standards, shouldn't candidates demonstrate those qualities without an annotation? What other skills would be assessed?	We would propose that there be a special education annotation for school leader licensure.	We request that there be clarification of this recommendation before we provide feedback.
Recommendation #10: The preparation of school building leaders will: - Be grounded in CAEP or State-adopted standards for programs to prepare school building leaders; - Be competency-based;	Why the CAEP and not the PSEL standards? Is the state adopted CAEP? Which competencies? PSEL or CAEP? What does it mean to be "rooted in district-university partnerships"	The recommendations use several different standards: a. PSEL b. CAEP or state standards for preparation c. District principal evaluation expectations which are currently based on the 2008 ISLLC standards.	We agree with the recommendation that programs should be competency based (using the PSEL standards) We agree with the recommendation that candidates should have a lengthy internship.

- Be rooted in district-university partnerships; - Involve partners from P12 and higher education that play a role in assessment of competency in each standard via clinically-rich micro-credentialing experiences throughout the coursework; - Include an internship component with sustained time in one place; - Take steps to see that the above happens in a pilot initially with voluntary representation of university-district partnerships across the state and a process of learning from the pilot.	and is this different from recommendation #7 and if so how? What is meant by P12 partner? School or district leaders? What is meant by higher education? The school of education or just leadership department or just program faculty? How would P12 and higher education play a role in assessment? Who would determine the assessment and how would this be done? What are "clinically-rich micro-credentialing experiences" and why are these tied to coursework since the clinical part implies field work? What does "an internship component with sustained time in one place" mean? How is this recommendation different from the current state requirement that preparation programs must achieve national accreditation?	The standards to be used be programs needs to be clarified. This recommendation has several components that should be individually spelled out and not lumped together in one recommendation. The assessment component in this recommendation itself has multiple parts: a. That P12 and higher education role in assessment. This needs to be explained further. b. The use of clinically-rich micro-credentialing experiences. Programs currently have course-based assessments and, as required for national accreditation, program assessments. What does it mean that these would be credentialing experiences We have long asked the state for mechanisms to enable better internship design and support.	

	How would extended term internships be funded? School districts? NYSED?	How can CoSer funding be used to help cover districts' in releasing candidates for their internship experiences?	
Recommendation #11: The preparation of school building leaders will create a measurable first-year mentoring requirement that features a full school year of formal mentoring. Structure it so higher education partners with districts (and if desired other organizations with expertise in mentoring) so there is a continuation of formal training received in principal preparation. To allow this, develop a job embedded candidate portfolio process to accompany principal preparation so the portfolio follows candidates into the job. The portfolio contains a competency-based assessment – that includes but is not limited to self-assessment -- that starts in preparation but with a line of sight to on-the-job evaluation and which measures each candidate's strengths and weaknesses in an effort to focus mentoring efforts on target areas of growth and development that are tailored to the strengths and needs of each candidate	Is this being mentored a new requirement for initial school leaders? Is this going to be part of the continued education requirement for new school leaders? What is the definition of mentoring? Who will do the mentoring? How will this be funded? Will new school leaders have to pay for mentoring just as they do for their preparation? Would preparation programs be one type of vendor to provide mentoring? How will candidates' progress be documented and how will this be used? How will this be related to a school district evaluation of the new school leader?	This recommendation combines two parts that should be separately addressed: a. Requirement of full-year mentoring for first year school leaders b. A competency-based portfolio that integrates learning objectives from preparation with learning objectives during the initial school leadership year. Many graduates do not move directly into a school building leadership position upon degree completion. On average, it takes graduates 2 years to advance to an assistant principal position and four years to advance to a principal position (and more in NYC). What continued leadership development is being proposed for those in time between graduation and their first leadership position? Could the state provide more career advancement	We agree with the recommendation that new school leaders be mentored. We are concerned with the logistics, policy challenges, and costs, particularly when aligning mentoring with school districts' initial induction, support and evaluation of initial school leaders.

		documentation for programs' graduates to help in planning for and support graduates over time?	
Recommendation #12: Create incentives to encourage districts and universities (and if desired, Boards of Cooperative Education Services or BOCES) to align and adopt sustainable induction models tied to the principal preparation portfolios to provide continuous ongoing support to educators during the first three years of their educator's careers. The State Education Department will monitor, track, and report outcome gains to document growth and outcomes.	Why is this recommendation focused on "incentives to encourage districts and universities"? How is this recommendation for a three-year induction model different from the one-year mentoring in recommendation #11? How does it become the state education department's responsibility to track new leaders' leadership development and growth? How does this overlap with local districts' evaluation of school leaders?	This recommendation has several components that should be separated and spelled out further: a. A three-year induction program for initial school leaders b. A school leader portfolio that links learning in preparation to learning in the first three years. c. The state's role in monitoring each leader's learning outcomes	We recommend that recommendations 11 and 12 be sorted out further and the purpose, scope and design of new leader mentoring and induction be explained. We recommend that the use of leadership portfolio be a separate recommendation that is explained further. We do not recommend that the state monitor school leaders' learning outcomes.
Recommendation #13: Provide targeted support to train and develop mentors as well as for consideration for mentor placement, including working with professional organization for assistance and guidance from existing models of success, e.g., Committee for Identifying and Developing Educational Leaders in Western New York State (or CIDEL).	Who or what is the focus of the targeted support to train and develop mentors? Is this for organizations and institutions to develop mentor training models? How would the mentor training be conceived of separate from the design and implementation of mentoring and induction?	Based on our local area experiences (particularly with BOCES), we have found that most school districts do not want to pay for outside mentors and prefer to develop their own new principal mentoring and induction programs.	We recommend that mentor training be part of proposed designs for mentoring and induction.
MCEAP RECOMMENDATIONS			

MCEAP recommendation #1—align these recommendations to the CAEP standards when those become available		Programs will have two sets of standards to use as the foundation and structure of their preparation programs. The CAEP standards provide important criteria for preparation program design which should be used for all programs: a. Faculty/adjunct ratios to limit program use of adjuncts. b. Use of performance assessments to evaluate candidates' skills in improving student learning and schools.	We strongly recommend this.
MCEAP recommendation #2—create an integrated data system that links candidates' degree completion, licensure status and employment history that would be available on a restricted basis for program evaluation and research		Presently it is very difficult for programs to track their graduates' post program careers. An integrated data system, as is available in Texas and Tennessee, would be extremely useful and enable research into the priorities included here.	We strongly recommend this.
MCEAP recommendation #3—revising CoSer funding to cover internships as a form of professional development		Presently, school districts and preparation programs are challenged in funding release time for candidates to undertake school leader internship responsibilities. Only candidates in programs with TLQP grants, candidates in well-resourced districts, and candidates who are hired into a leadership position (using the internship	We strongly recommend that there be a funding mechanism created to enable candidates to have reasonable release time for authentic school-based internships.

		certificate) are able to have release time for an internship. This creates an inequitable leadership preparation pathway. Past experiments with CoSer funding for internship experiences enabled districts and preparation programs to: a) fund release time for candidates to have rich, authentic school building internship experiences; and b) enable districts and programs to place candidates in different schools (other than their home schools) for internship experiences, giving candidates better access to quality leader mentoring.	
MCEAP recommendation #4—provide grant funding for preparation programs to collaborate on R& D on program improvement.		It is very challenging for programs to evaluate their own program effectiveness, given the lack of access to career data and lack of funds to conduct a rigorous school leadership study.	We strongly recommend this.
MCEAP recommendation #5—adopt the UCEA program quality criteria as a required program self-evaluation and goal setting.	What program quality criteria does the state propose to use and how will performance benchmarks be used?	UCEA has developed a clear set of preparation program criteria, with effectiveness rating scales that could serve as a model for NYS. These criteria overlap strongly with the NYS-TLQP effective program criteria. See: http://3fl71l2qoj4l3y6ep2tqpwra.wpengine.netdna-cdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/UCEAProgramCriteria.pdf	We strongly recommend that the state adopt a clear set of program standards, with criteria, such as the UCEA program criteria.

MCEAP recommendation #6—Provide additional school leader specialization options for aspiring and current school principals.		Given the persistent achievement gap schools and the state, we see a strong need to offer recognized preparation and specialization for school leaders in leading schools that effectively serve under-served populations. While we can offer coursework and other preparation, there is no formal recognition of such specialization.	We strongly recommend that the state create recognized subspecialties or additional specializations (like annotation) in school leadership effectiveness in promoting cultural competence among staff and fostering inclusion, especially for special education and ELLs, and working to close the achievement among federally designated high need groups based on race/ethnicity, economics, language and special education.