

Wagner College Self-Study Design

Prepared For the Middle States Commission on Higher Education

September 14, 2026

1. Institutional Overview

Wagner College is undergoing institutional transformation. Its goal is to become a stronger, more outcomes-based, and financially sustainable institution. Wagner is aligning its academic programs, student experience, enrollment strategy, physical assets, operating model, and use of evidence so that each supports student success and the long-term health of the College.

Wagner is a private, coeducational, professions-focused institution offering undergraduate and graduate education in New York City. Its emerging educational identity centers on practice-oriented education, experiential learning, career and life preparation, and academic programs responsive to student and market needs. Wagner no longer defines itself principally as a liberal arts college, no longer operates the Wagner Plan as its organizing educational model, and does not position civic engagement as the center of the student experience.

Three Periods of Institutional Change

Wagner will organize its self-assessment from the prior review cycle through the implementation of its strategic plan, Wagner Forward, in three periods. The prior self-study was prepared for the 2021 review cycle, with the virtual evaluation visit delayed by the pandemic and accreditation reaffirmed in March 2022. The three periods show how Wagner moves from disruption and decline to immediate institutional action and then to a planned transformation extending through 2031.

Starting in the 2025-2026 academic year, Wagner has worked within a leadership structure that is engraining eight connected ways of working: transparency, accountability, common purpose, communication, collaboration, formal and informal assessment, implementation, and data-driven decision-making.

Period One 2021 through 2024: Disruption and Decline

The COVID-19 emergency and its aftermath intensified institutional pressures that had developed over time. Wagner retained distinguished programs and a recognizable brand, but its enrollment goals, understanding of a changing market, academic portfolio, and business model were not sufficiently aligned. Presidential leadership turnover further limited continuity. Enrollment and financial performance declined, demonstrating that the College's longstanding strengths were no longer sufficient to support its future.

Period Two 2024 through 2026: Assessment and Immediate Action

A new president initiated a comprehensive assessment of Wagner's academic and administrative structures, resource commitments, space needs, and operating assumptions. The College acted to stabilize operations and create capacity for renewal. Actions included department decommissioning, reassessment of space requirements, acquisition of a new campus, and establishment of initial strategic outcomes. Beginning in the 2025-2026 academic year, the College also began evaluating and strengthening governance at the faculty and Board levels so that roles, decision-making, and oversight would support the pace and scope of institutional change.

Period Three 2026 through 2031: Wagner Forward

Wagner Forward is the College's 2026–2031 strategic plan and framework for transformation with purpose. The plan is being finalized during the 2026-2027 academic year, building on the strategic outcomes established during the prior period, and implementation begins in that same year. The work includes rewriting the mission and vision to reflect Wagner's new direction. It also continues the evaluation and strengthening of governance at the faculty and Board levels, with attention to clear roles, effective participation, communication, accountability, and oversight. By 2031, the College seeks reasonable and responsible enrollment growth, academic programs aligned with student and market needs, an education that develops professional capabilities and life skills through experiential and practice-oriented learning, and disciplined management of institutional resources. Achieving these goals will require Wagner to make the eight ways of working consistent institutional practices rather than practices that depend on a particular leader, unit, or decision.

Summary of the Institutional Context

The three periods describe a clear institutional progression. From 2021 through 2024, Wagner experienced disruption and decline that exposed weaknesses in enrollment strategy, market alignment, presidential leadership continuity, and the operating model. From 2024 through 2026, new leadership assessed those conditions and took immediate action. From 2026 through 2031, Wagner Forward is being finalized and implemented as the plan, measures, and accountability for sustained transformation.

The self-study will not treat the years since the prior review as a single, uniform period. Doing so would obscure the scale and sequence of the changes now underway. Nor will the study give disproportionate weight to the 2021–2024 period, because many of the conditions and practices of that period no longer describe Wagner. Instead, the self-study will examine the College’s transformation through the nine substantive sections of the Self-Study Report: the Institutional Overview; the seven Standards; and Institutional Priorities, Outcomes, and Recommendations. The three periods will help distinguish historical conditions, immediate actions, current implementation, and emerging results.

Wagner approaches the self-study with a primary focus on outcomes: whether the College’s transformation is producing demonstrable benefits for students and creating a stronger, more outcomes-based, and financially sustainable institution. The College will not equate continuity with effectiveness or preserve inherited structures and processes solely because they are familiar. Instead, Wagner will evaluate whether its policies, governance structures, and operating processes support timely decisions, responsible implementation, and measurable progress toward institutional goals.

This emphasis on outcomes does not diminish Wagner’s responsibility to act through clear authority, appropriate faculty and Board governance, ethical practice, transparent decision-making, and compliance with institutional policies and external requirements. These are essential conditions for sustainable change. When an internal process no longer serves students, institutional effectiveness, or the College’s emerging direction, Wagner’s responsibility is to assess and revise that process through appropriate governance rather than maintain it by default. The self-study will therefore examine both the results of transformation and whether the means used to achieve those results are clear, responsible, evidence-based, and capable of sustaining progress.

Wagner views the timing of the self-study as an institutional advantage. A review conducted during transformation creates a structured, institution-wide evaluation at the midpoint of Wagner Forward, while there is still time to apply what is learned. The process will bring together the College’s formal and informal assessment, engage the community in a common examination of progress, and test whether plans are being implemented as intended. Wagner will also benefit from the questions, observations, and conclusions of the visiting evaluation team and the Commission’s review. These perspectives can challenge assumptions, identify issues the College may not see on its own, recognize progress, and inform decisions through 2031.

Mission and Vision in Transition

The mission and vision reproduced below are the College’s formally adopted statements at the time this design was prepared. They governed the 2021–2024 and 2024–2026 periods and remain important evidence for evaluating decisions made during those years. They describe an earlier institutional identity and educational model and do not fully express Wagner’s present direction. During the 2026-2027 academic year, the College will review and rewrite both statements through its established governance and approval processes. The revised statements will define Wagner’s purpose, educational model, students, aspirations, and commitments. The existing statements are preserved here exactly as adopted.

Wagner’s Mission

Wagner College prepares students for life, as well as for careers, by emphasizing scholarship, achievement, leadership, and citizenship. Wagner offers a comprehensive educational program that is anchored in the liberal arts, experiential and co-curricular learning, interculturalism, interdisciplinary studies, and service to society, and that is cultivated by a faculty dedicated to promoting individual expression, reflective practice, and integrative learning.

Wagner's Vision

Wagner College achieves this mission through the implementation and enhancement of The Wagner Plan for the Practical Liberal Arts, which was formally launched in 1998. This innovative and bold curricular methodology is predicated on a method of integrated learning. It builds upon Wagner's history of combining liberal arts and focused professional programs, coupled with our unique location and requires experiential learning for all students. The Plan has thus ushered in a new vision of engaged student learning that is at once reflective and integrated, theoretical and practical. Our goal has been, and continues to be, to provide a transformative college experience which best prepares our students for positions of effective and responsible leadership and citizenship in their chosen professions, and in their personal and public lives. From the outset, our faculty have eagerly led this learning centered endeavor.

Preparing all students for such leadership requires a coherent, efficient, effective and universal educational program and a focused Faculty and Administration, supported by an equally committed Board of Trustees.

The references in these statements to the liberal arts, the Wagner Plan, and service to society document the framework that was in place during the earlier periods. The self-study will assess how Wagner is managing the transition from that framework to an educational identity centered on experiential, practice-oriented learning and preparation for successful lives and careers.

Institutional Inquiry Framework

Area	Current State to Document	Inquiry During Self Study	Intended Direction
Mission and identity	Legacy mission and vision remain formally in place while the College's operating identity and educational model have changed	Relevance of existing statements; quality and governance of the revision process; alignment of the new mission, vision, goals, and measures	Formally adopted statements that accurately define Wagner's purpose, direction, students, and commitments
Educational model	Current academic portfolio and experiential and practice-oriented learning across programs	Coherence, rigor, market and student relevance, development of life and career capabilities, and student outcomes	A clearly articulated, assessed educational model aligned with the new mission and student and market needs
Student success	Recruitment, advising, support, persistence, completion, and career preparation	Effectiveness across student populations and transition points	A coordinated student success model with measurable outcomes
Institutional capacity	Restructured operations, staffing, systems, facilities, the newly acquired campus, technology, and financial condition	Adequacy, utilization, integration, risk, and ability to support priorities	A sustainable operating model capable of strategy-aligned investment
Planning and assessment	Current planning, budgeting, and assessment practices	Integration, evidence use, accountability, and follow-through	A repeatable cycle linking plans, resources, results, and improvement
Governance	Roles, authorities, communications, and decision processes	Clarity, participation, transparency, effectiveness, and periodic review	Governance and leadership suited to sustained institutional change
Ways of working	Use of transparency, accountability, common purpose, communication, collaboration, assessment, implementation, and data-driven decision-making beginning in 2025-2026	Consistency across leadership, governance, units, and major decisions; effects on results	Shared institutional practices that support timely decisions, coordinated action, learning, and sustained implementation

2. Institutional Priorities to be Addressed in the Self-Study

The following priorities will organize the self-study across the seven Standards. Each working group will address the priorities that intersect with its Standard and will identify evidence of present effectiveness, gaps requiring attention, work underway, and measures by which progress will be judged.

Priority 1: Mission, Educational Identity and Direction

Clarify Wagner's purpose, the education it provides now, and what must distinguish the College through 2031. The inquiry will evaluate the legacy mission and vision in their historical context, the process and evidence used to rewrite them, and the alignment of Wagner Forward with the resulting statements. It will examine the coherence and quality of the academic portfolio; the role and effectiveness of experiential and practice-oriented learning; the development of professional capabilities and life skills; the opportunities of the New York City setting; and the alignment of programs with student and market needs.

Priority 2: Student Success and the Changing Student Population

Determine how Wagner's programs, policies, services, and delivery models must evolve to serve the students the College enrolls today and expects to enroll in the future. The inquiry will examine recruitment and enrollment fit, transition to college, advising, academic support, engagement, retention, persistence, completion, career and life preparation, graduate and professional students, transfer and other entering credit, and outcomes across student populations.

Priority 3: Institutional Sustainability and Capacity for Transformation

Evaluate whether Wagner's financial model, human resources, facilities, technology, information systems, enrollment strategy, academic portfolio, and external relationships are sufficient to fulfill the mission and support responsible transformation. The inquiry will test assumptions, examine multi-year projections and risks, and assess whether resource allocation is disciplined, transparent, evidence-based, and connected to institutional priorities.

Priority 4: Governance Planning and Institutional Effectiveness

Strengthen the structures through which Wagner sets direction, makes decisions, allocates resources, evaluates results, and holds itself accountable. The inquiry will examine governance roles and participation, including the evaluation and strengthening of governance at the faculty and Board levels beginning in the second institutional period and continuing through Wagner Forward. It will also examine the integration of strategic, academic, financial, facilities, technology, and enrollment planning; institutional and unit assessment; communication and transparency; and the use of evidence for continuous improvement. The inquiry will determine whether transparency, accountability, common purpose, communication, collaboration, formal and informal assessment, implementation, and data-driven decision-making are becoming established institutional practices across units and leadership transitions.

Alignment of Priorities and Standards

P indicates primary alignment and S indicates supporting alignment. The matrix guides coordination and does not limit a group's responsibility to address all criteria assigned to its Standard.

Institutional Priority	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
1. Mission educational identity and direction	P	S	P	S	P	S	S
2. Student success and changing population	S	S	P	P	P	S	S
3. Sustainability and capacity	S	S	S	S	S	P	P
4. Governance planning and effectiveness	S	P	S	S	P	P	P

3. Intended Outcomes of the Self-Study

The self-study will help Wagner evaluate its transformation, demonstrate compliance, and identify a limited number of improvements that can be carried into Wagner Forward.

We seek the following specific outcomes from the Self-study process:

1. Demonstrate how the institution currently meets the Commission's Standards for Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation (Fourteenth Edition) and provides evidence by Standard in alignment with the Evidence Expectations by Standard.
2. Leverage periodic assessment through each standard, using assessment results for continuous improvement and innovation to ensure levels of quality for constituents and the attainment of the institution's priorities, mission, and goals.
3. Engage the institutional community in an inclusive and transparent self-appraisal process, including analysis of a range of data, to ensure students are appropriately served and institutional mission and goals are met.
4. Engage the Wagner community in an inclusive and transparent self-appraisal that considers the College's eight ways of working, and to evaluate the initial impacts of the College's transformation.
5. Develop a set of practical recommendations aligned with the institutional priorities and Wagner Forward.

4. Steering Committee and Working Groups

Steering Committee

The Steering Committee provides institutional oversight, assures consistency across working groups, monitors the timetable, resolves gaps or duplication, validates the evidence strategy, and synthesizes the working-group reports into a single narrative. Membership spans academic and administrative functions and includes trustee and student representation. Working-group chairs will report on evidence gaps, emerging findings, risks to completion, and matters requiring institutional action before 2029.

Member	Title
Nick Richardson	Chair Deputy Provost and Accreditation Liaison Officer
Jazzmine Clarke-Glover	Co-chair Executive Vice President and Chief of Staff
Sarah Donovan	Co-chair Associate Provost
Dave Martin	Director of Planned Giving and College Relations
Areti Pino	Registrar
Laurence Nolan	Division Chair Social and Behavioral Sciences
Joe Spina	Chief Information Officer
Lisa Holland	Director of the Horrmann Library
To be appointed	Board of Trustees representative
To be appointed	Student Government Association representative

The Steering Committee will maintain a decision and issue log, master criterion assignment matrix, shared evidence-gap register, and consolidated recommendation register. It will meet at least monthly during active working-group phases and more frequently during drafting and review.

Common Working Group Charge

Every group will address all criteria assigned to its Standard and evaluate whether Wagner’s policies, structures, practices, and results are effective, appropriately assessed, aligned with the institutional priorities, and sufficient to support the College’s anticipated direction through and beyond 2029.

Each group will also consider how Wagner’s eight ways of working—transparency, accountability, common purpose, communication, collaboration, formal and informal assessment, implementation, and data-driven decision-making—have affected the matters within its charge since the 2025-2026 academic year.

Working Group 1: Mission and Goals

The institution's mission defines its purpose within the context of higher education, the students it serves, and what it intends to accomplish. The institution's stated goals are clearly linked to its mission and specify how the institution fulfills its mission.

Nick Richardson, *Deputy Provost*

Nora Lowy, *Executive Director of the Physician Assistant Studies Program*

Mike Driscoll, *Dean of the Nicolais School of Business*

Jim Gibbons, *Assistant Vice President for Admissions*

Jim Chiavelli, *Vice President of External Affairs/Chief Communications Officer*

JoAnn Esposito, *Executive Director of Business & Financial Services*

Lori DeSena, *Assistant Professor Evelyn L. Spiro School of Nursing*

TBA, *BoT Member*

Charge: Provide evidence of meeting the criteria for Standard I. Demonstrate how Wagner's mission and goals define the institution, guide priorities and decisions, and are assessed for continuing relevance and achievability.

Research Questions

- Is Wagner's emerging mission and vision communicated clearly, understood by the College community, and used to guide institutional priorities, planning, and resource allocation?
- Does the process for revising the mission and vision provide appropriate roles for faculty, the Board of Trustees, students, and staff, and does it follow the College's established approval processes?
- Do the approved mission and goals define Wagner's educational purpose, the students it serves, and the outcomes it seeks in ways that can be assessed over time?

Working Group 2: Ethics and Integrity

Ethics and integrity are central, indispensable, and defining hallmarks of effective higher education institutions. In all activities, whether internal or external, an institution must be faithful to its mission, honor its contracts and commitments, adhere to its policies, and represent itself truthfully.

Dave Martin, *Director of Planned Giving and College Relations*

Tonya Weston, *Director of Human Resources*

Sarah Scott, *Professor Theatre & the Arts*

Adrian Ionescu, *Professor Sciences & Math*

Nancy Cherofsky, *Assistant Professor Evelyn L. Spiro School of Nursing*

Nicole Destefano, *Director of External Affairs*

TBA, *BoT Member*

Charge: Provide evidence of meeting the criteria for Standard II. Evaluate the consistency, accessibility, implementation, review, and assessment of the policies and practices through which Wagner demonstrates ethics, integrity, affordability, accessibility, and accurate public representation.

Research Questions

- Have recent institutional changes improved the clarity, accessibility, and consistent application of College policies and the accuracy of Wagner's public representations?
- During periods of rapid change, were decisions communicated transparently, were conflicts of interest and ethical concerns addressed, and could affected constituencies raise questions or concerns?
- Does Wagner regularly review its policies and practices for compliance, affordability, accessibility, fair treatment, and accuracy, and does it correct identified gaps?

Working Group 3: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience

An institution provides students with learning experiences that are characterized by rigor and coherence at all program, certificate, and degree levels, regardless of instructional modality. All learning experiences, regardless of modality, program pace/schedule, level, and setting are consistent with higher education expectations.

Sarah Donovan, *Associate Provost*

Chris Marra, *Assistant Professor Biological Sciences*

Kayhan Koleyni, *Assistant Professor Nicolais School of Business*

Brian Sgambati, *Assistant Professor Theatre & the Arts*

Michelle Romano, *Assistant Professor Evelyn L. Spiro School of Nursing*

Vannessa Smith-Washington, *Associate Professor Education*

TBA, *SGA Member*

Charge: Provide evidence of meeting the criteria for Standard III. Evaluate the rigor, coherence, currency, capacity, and effectiveness of undergraduate, graduate, professional, general education, and experiential learning across modalities and settings.

Research Questions

- Are changes to Wagner's academic portfolio producing coherent programs that respond to student and market needs and support the College's emerging experiential and practice-oriented educational model?
- Through academic restructuring, program development, and program discontinuation, did the faculty retain primary responsibility for curriculum, academic standards, and program quality?
- Do Wagner's programs provide appropriately rigorous and sequenced learning experiences, supported by qualified faculty, sufficient resources, and effective general education across levels, modalities, and locations?

Working Group 4: Support of the Student Experience

Across all educational experiences, settings, levels, and instructional modalities, the institution recruits and admits students whose interests, abilities, experiences, and goals are congruent with its mission and educational offerings. The institution commits to student retention, persistence, completion, and success through a coherent and effective support system sustained by qualified professionals, which enhances the quality of the learning environment, contributes to the educational experience, and fosters student success.

Areti Pino, *Registrar*

Giacomo Di Pasquale, *Assistant Professor, Nicolais School of Business*

Lisa Holland, *Director of the Horrmann Library*

Carolyn Taverner, *Clinical Professor Psychology*

Kaleefa Munroe-Peters, *Director of Academic Advising and Accessibility*

Theresa Weimer, *Director of Financial Aid*

Ariel "AP" Pesante, *Director of Athletics*

TBA, *SGA Member*

Charge: Provide evidence of meeting the criteria for Standard IV. Evaluate the coherence and effectiveness of the student lifecycle from recruitment and admission through persistence, completion, and transition to careers or further education.

Research Questions

- Are changes in recruitment, advising, and student support improving persistence, completion, engagement, and preparation for life after college for the students Wagner now serves?
- Were student data and student feedback used to design these changes, and are responsibilities for implementation and follow-through clear across academic and administrative units?
- Does Wagner provide accessible, coordinated, and regularly assessed services that support students from admission through completion and transition to employment or further education?

Working Group 5: Educational Effectiveness Assessment

Assessment of student learning and achievement demonstrates that the institution's students have accomplished educational goals consistent with their program of study, degree level, the institution's mission, and appropriate expectations for institutions of higher education.

Laurence Nolan, *Division Chair Social and Behavioral Sciences*

Paul Gold, *Clinical Professor Education*

Don Stearns, *Professor Biological Sciences*

Edna Aurelus, *Associate Professor Evelyn L. Spiro School of Nursing*

Theresa McCarthy, *Professor Theatre & the Arts*

Mike Rota, *Assistant Director Physician Assistant Program*

Kaitlyn Nagi, *Dean of Student Success and Life Skills*

TBA, *SGA Member*

Charge: Provide evidence of meeting the criteria for Standard V. Evaluate whether Wagner demonstrates student learning and achievement at institutional, general education, and program levels and uses results systematically for improvement.

Research Questions

- Can Wagner demonstrate that students are achieving the learning, professional capabilities, and life skills promised by their programs and by the College's emerging educational model?
- As programs were reorganized, revised, added, or discontinued, were learning outcomes and assessment practices maintained, and did faculty use the results in curricular decisions?
- Are student learning and achievement assessed regularly with appropriate methods and, where useful, disaggregated data, and are the findings used to improve educational effectiveness?

Working Group 6: Planning Resources and Institutional Improvement

The institution's planning processes, resources, and structures are aligned with each other and are sufficient to fulfill its mission and goals, to continuously assess and improve its programs and services, and to respond effectively to opportunities and challenges.

Jazzmine Clarke-Glover, *Executive Vice President/Chief of Staff*

Stuart Goldberg, *Vice President for Finance and Administration/Chief Financial Officer*

Richard LaRocca, *Professor Nicolais School of Business*

Joe Spina, *Chief Information Officer*

Desiree Braithwaite, *Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Presidential Initiatives*

Dana Internicola, *Assistant Dean Nicolais School of Business*

Jane DeFazio, *Assistant Professor Evelyn L. Spiro School of Nursing*

TBA, *BoT Member*

Charge: Provide evidence of meeting the criteria for Standard VI. Evaluate whether planning, budgeting, resources, facilities, technology, and improvement processes are integrated and sufficient to fulfill the mission and support transformation.

Research Questions

- Are Wagner's recent changes improving financial sustainability and institutional capacity while providing the people, facilities, technology, and other resources needed for educational quality?
- Were major resource decisions based on documented priorities and relevant data, considered through appropriate governance, communicated clearly, and tracked through implementation?
- Are planning, budgeting, resource allocation, and assessment connected through a practical multi-year process that identifies risks and supports the mission and Wagner Forward?

Working Group 7: Governance, Leadership and Administration

The institution is governed and administered in a manner that allows it to realize its stated mission and goals in a way that effectively benefits the institution, its students, and the other constituencies it serves. Even when supported by or affiliated with governmental, corporate, religious, educational system, or other unaccredited organizations, the institution has education as its primary purpose, and it operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy.

Jazzmine Clarke-Glover, *Executive Vice President/Chief of Staff*

Patricia Tooker, *Dean of the Evelyn L. Spiro School of Nursing*

Nicole Destefano, *Director of External Affairs*

Sarah Donovan, *Associate Provost*

Heather Cook, *Professor Biological Sciences*

Joe Spina, *Chief Information Officer*

TBA, *BoT Member*

Charge: Provide evidence of meeting the criteria for Standard VII. Evaluate whether governance, leadership, and administration provide clear authority, appropriate participation, accountability, autonomy, expertise, and capacity to advance Wagner's mission and priorities.

Research Questions

- Have changes in governance, leadership, and administration improved the clarity, timeliness, and accountability of decision-making without weakening the appropriate roles of the faculty or Board of Trustees?
- As governance structures changed, were authority and consultation appropriately maintained, including faculty responsibility for the curriculum and the Board's fiduciary and oversight responsibilities?
- Are governance roles documented and understood, supported by appropriate independence and expertise, and periodically evaluated for their effectiveness?

Working Group 8: Compliance Evidence and Communications

The working group will demonstrate Wagner College's compliance with federal and state regulations with regard to higher education. In addition, the working group will be responsible for implementing the Evidence Inventory and maintaining the repository for all documents used by each of the other working groups, and producing the master list of all documents held in the Evidence Inventory and clearly displaying which documents are referenced by which working groups. This working group will manage the communications plan.

Nick Richardson, *Deputy Provost*

Joe Spina, *Chief Information Officer*

Lisa Holland, *Director of the Horrmann Library*

Charge: Maintain the master assignment of Requirements of Affiliation, Commission policies and procedures, and applicable federal regulatory requirements; coordinate the Evidence Inventory; verify document control and accessibility; monitor evidence gaps; and manage communications and feedback. The group will provide infrastructure and quality control rather than substitute document collection for analysis.

5. Guidelines for Reporting

Each standards group is responsible for assigned criteria and Requirements of Affiliation, aligned institutional priorities, and coordination where inquiry overlaps. Co-chairs will set meetings, maintain assignments and records, report progress and risks, and submit deliverables on schedule.

Common Analytic Method

Working groups will evaluate both the outcomes of institutional change and whether the policies, governance structures, and decision-making processes used to achieve those outcomes are clear, responsible, appropriately authorized, and effective.

1. State the claim about compliance, effectiveness, or institutional direction.
2. Describe the current state only to the extent needed to understand the analysis.
3. Analyze multiple relevant sources, longitudinal information, and disaggregated data where appropriate.
4. Identify the finding as a demonstrated strength, improvement opportunity, evidence gap, implementation gap, or risk.
5. Describe authorized work underway, its owner, intended result, evidence of implementation, and effectiveness measure.
6. Recommend action selectively, specifying accountability, resources, measure, and timing.

Working Group Deliverables

- Criterion and Requirement of Affiliation crosswalk with principal claim and evidence.
- Concise report organized by criteria and priorities, normally 10 to 15 pages excluding appendices.
- Evidence-gap and data-request log.
- Findings register separating strengths, opportunities, and matters requiring action before submission.
- Recommendation register with owner, outcome measure, resource implication, and time horizon.

Reports will use clear headings, concise prose, consistent terminology, and human-readable references. Unsupported assurances, inventories of activity without evaluation, and future intentions presented as completed evidence are not acceptable.

6. Final Self Study Report

The Steering Committee will synthesize the reports into one institutional narrative. The final report will address each Standard holistically, integrate the priorities, identify evidence-supported conclusions, and present a limited set of institution-level recommendations. Repetition will be removed, conflicting findings reconciled, and significant gaps escalated.

1. Table of Contents
2. Executive Summary
3. Institutional Overview
4. Standard I Mission and Goals
5. Standard II Ethics and Integrity including assigned Requirements of Affiliation
6. Standard III Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience
7. Standard IV Support of the Student Experience
8. Standard V Educational Effectiveness Assessment
9. Standard VI Planning Resources and Institutional Improvement
10. Standard VII Governance Leadership and Administration
11. Institutional Priorities Outcomes and Recommendations

7. Self Study Timetable

The timetable uses deliberate phases so evidence development, inquiry, consultation, drafting, and validation occur in sequence. Exact Commission deadlines and visit dates will be confirmed with the MSCHE Vice President liaison.

Period	Phase	Primary Work and Deliverables
Spring 2026	Launch	Self-Study Institute; orient leaders; begin Steering Committee formation; connect self-study planning to the initial strategic goals
Summer 2026	Design	Assemble committee; consult liaison; confirm priorities; draft design; define the three-period analytic framework
September to December 2026	Mobilize and strategic alignment	Announce process; appoint representatives; finalize groups and charges; preparation visit; approve design; coordinate evidence needs with Wagner Forward development and mission and vision review
Fall 2026	Map inventory and baseline	Assign criteria and requirements; build claim-evidence crosswalk; establish baselines for the 2021–2024 and 2024–2026 periods; open gap register
January to June 2027	Historical and baseline analysis	Validate evidence; analyze the causes and effects of the first two periods; establish Wagner Forward measures for learning, achievement, enrollment, finance, resources, and operations; document governance of mission and vision revision
July to December 2027	Inquiry implementation and engagement	Test claims; assess early Wagner Forward implementation; analyze data; engage constituencies; evaluate the alignment of revised mission, vision, goals, plans, and resources; develop findings
January 2028	Pre-draft validation	Confirm coverage, evidence sufficiency, unresolved gaps, and cross-group issues
February 1 2028	First group drafts	Submit reports, crosswalks, gap logs, and preliminary recommendations

Period	Phase	Primary Work and Deliverables
February to March 2028	Steering review	Review rigor, coverage, consistency, and evidence; return feedback by March 1
March to May 2028	Revision	Resolve gaps and overlaps; obtain evidence; submit second drafts by May 1
May to July 2028	Final group reports	Complete validation; groups submit final reports by July 1
July to August 2028	Institutional synthesis	Draft integrated report; consolidate recommendations; quality-check inventory
September 1 2028	Community draft	Release first institutional draft for structured stakeholder review
September to October 2028	Consultation and revision	Analyze feedback; consult Board; revise and document disposition
November 2028	Team Chair preparation	Provide materials; host preliminary visit; confirm logistics and evidence needs
December 2028 to submission	Finalization	Address feedback; complete editorial, compliance, evidence, accessibility, and governance reviews
Spring 2029	Submission and visit	Upload report and inventory by deadline; host team; coordinate response
After visit through June 2029	Response and action	Review report; respond; prepare for Commission action; integrate recommendations

8. Communications Plan

Communications will make the process understandable, create meaningful participation, and show how feedback affects the work. Working Group 8 will coordinate each communication by purpose, audience, method, owner, timing, and feedback disposition.

Audience	Methods	Key Participation Points
Students	Email, SGA presentations, forums, listening sessions, website	Student experience, draft findings, recommendations, visit preparation
Faculty	Faculty meetings, working sessions, email, forums, website	Academic quality, curriculum, assessment, governance, draft review
Staff and administrators	Unit meetings, forums, email, interviews	Operations, services, resources, assessment, evidence validation
Board of Trustees	Committee briefings, full Board updates, working sessions	Mission, strategy, quality, fiduciary oversight, recommendations and approvals
Alumni and partners	Targeted surveys or interviews, alumni communications, website	Educational distinction, experiential learning, engagement, career preparation

Feedback will be logged by date, constituency, topic, disposition, and resulting change. Confidential or sensitive information will be handled under applicable policy and will not be placed in broadly accessible repositories.

9. Evaluation Team Profile

Wagner seeks a team whose collective experience reflects the institution and the principal questions in this self-study: small private, professions-focused institutions; residential undergraduate and graduate education; practice-oriented and experiential learning in an urban setting; mission and identity change; enrollment and student-success strategy; institutional finance and multi-year budgeting; academic restructuring; assessment; governance; campus integration; facilities and technology modernization; and responsible transformation.

The proposed institutions are organized in three groups. Initial peers provide the closest comparison to Wagner's present size, region, and institutional profile. Transformational peers offer relevant examples of enrollment growth, academic repositioning, institutional restructuring, or strength in health and professional education. Aspirational peers represent institutions whose program breadth, market position, student experience, or record of sustained growth may inform Wagner's longer-term direction. The Steering Committee will validate the lists for current comparability, conflicts, and MSCHE requirements before submission.

Initial Peers

Manhattan University

Manhattanville University

Drew University

Fairleigh Dickinson University

Rider University

Saint Peter's University

Muhlenberg College

Transformational Peers

Merrimack College

Sacred Heart University

Champlain College

High Point University

Babson College

Aspirational Peers

Adelphi University

Molloy University

Bentley University

Elon University

Ithaca College

10. Annual Institutional Update Strategy

In accordance with the Middle States Commission on Higher Education's Evidence Expectations by Standard guidelines, Wagner College will incorporate data from the Annual Institutional Update into the Self-Study Report. Information including retention rates, graduation rates, transfer rates, annual enrollment FTE, financial data, annual financial audits, and other IPEDS data will be analyzed. All working group members will be provided access to data from the Annual Institutional Updates within the Evidence Inventory on Google Drive.

11. Evidence Inventory Strategy

The Evidence Inventory will serve as the master list of all documents identified and used by each working group as evidence to support findings in its report. A shared cloud-based system will be used to store documents as they are submitted by the working groups.

Working Group 8 includes an archivist who will inventory the documents using a tabbed Google Sheet. The first tab will list every document, with its title, a link to the document, the working groups that refer to it, and a brief description.

Each working group will have its own tab showing only the documents referenced by that group. As members add documents to their group's tab, those documents will also be added to the master list.

As the self-study is finalized, Working Group 8 will review and update the documents in the Evidence Inventory as necessary.

12. Self Study Site Visits

Wagner College does not have any additional locations that require a Self-Study site visit at the time of the self-study evaluation. As defined in the MSCHE Substantive Change Guidelines, an additional location is "a domestic or international physical facility or location that is geographically separate from the main campus and within the same ownership structure of the institution, at which the institution will offer at least 50 percent of an educational program that is credit-bearing or Title IV eligible."