

Administrative Licensure Program Approval Process

Handbook of Procedures and Protocol

Minnesota Board of School Administrators

Program Approval

Licensure Fields:

K-12 Principal

Superintendent

Director of Special Education

Director of Community Education



Table of Contents

Introduction

- Minnesota Board of School Administrators
- Licensure Rules and Program Approval

Overview of the Program Approval

- Review Process
- Preparation
- On-site Review
- Report to Board
- Reporting Process
- Budgeting for the Review
- Conflict of Interest and Ethical Guidelines
- Roles and Responsibilities
- On-site Schedule Template

Guidelines for Program Approval

- Timeline for Initial Review Process
- Timeline for Continuous Review Process
- Making Application
- Application Components
- Prompts to Guide Program Review
- Checklist for Review of Administrative Licensing Programs

Appendix

- Form A: Institutional Authorization/Application for Program Approval
- Form B: Program Personnel and Partners
- Form C: Program Sequence
- Form D: Matrices Aligning Courses With Competencies
 - Core Competencies for All Licenses
 - Competencies for Respective Licensure Areas
 - Superintendents
 - K-12 Principals
 - Directors of Community Education
 - Directors of Special Education
- Form E: Summary Report of Program Review
- Annual Report for Continuous Review of University Licensure Preparation Programs

Minnesota Rule 3512

- 3512.2500 Procedures for Approval
- 3512.0400 Program Requirements Superintendents
- 3512.0400 Program Requirements K-12 Principals
- 3512.0400 Program Requirements Superintendents

- 3512.0400 Program Requirements Directors of Special Education
- 3512.0505 Program Requirements Directors of Community Education

Introduction

Minnesota school administrators recognize the importance of their responsibilities. In fulfilling their responsibilities, school administrators in the state of Minnesota understand that they have obligations to students, staff and colleagues, parents and caregivers, the community, and the profession. Obligations to students include affording quality education, promoting academic freedom, assuring healthy and safe learning environments, and creating atmospheres conducive to learning and respectful of the rights and dignity of the individual.

The Minnesota Board of School Administrators

Professionals have a responsibility to set standards and expectations of its members. To provide the leadership in the profession and promote the effective governance of Minnesota school administrators, the 2001 Minnesota legislature established the Minnesota Board of School Administrators (MBSA). Minnesota Statute 122A.12, subdivision 1 established the MBSA as an autonomous licensing board consisting of ten members appointed by the governor with the advice and consent of the senate, and includes:

- one elementary school principal,
- one secondary school principal,
- one higher education faculty member in an educational administration program,
- one higher education administrator for an educational administration program,
- one school superintendent,
- one classroom teacher,
- one community education director,
- one special education director; and
- two members of the public, one of whom must be a present or former school board member.

Licensure Rules and Program Approval:

In 1996, the Minnesota legislature authorized the adoption of new outcome-based licensure rules for school administrators to become effective in 1997. These rules were authorized by Minnesota Statute, Section 125.05, and Laws of Minnesota 1993, Chapter 224, Article 12, Section 34 and Laws of Minnesota 1996, Chapter 412, Article 9, Section 14. The program licensure requirements for K-12 Principals, Superintendents, Directors of Special Education, and Directors of Community Education define the knowledge, skills, and dispositions school administrators must demonstrate for administrative licensure. These requirements identify the competencies for individuals preparing for licensure as superintendents, principals, directors of special education, and directors of community education.

Minnesota Statutes 2001, 122A.14 authorizes the Minnesota Board of School Administrators to license school administrators. The rules shall include the licensing of persons who have successfully completed alternative preparation programs (122A.27) or other alternative competency-based preparation programs. The Board shall review and approve preparation programs for school administrators and alternative preparation programs for administrators (122A.27) and must consider other alternative competency-based preparation programs leading to licensure.

The Minnesota Board of School Administrators was granted full rule writing authority in Minnesota Laws 2006 Chapter 263, Article 2, Section 20. The authority was amended by Minnesota Law 2007, Chapter 146, Article 2, Section 33. The rulemaking authority allows the Board to amend Minn. R. Ch. 3512 to update requirements for school administrator licensure and to comply with requirements in Minnesota Law.

This Handbook is prepared to assist colleges, universities, and other entities in submitting an application for program approval. The Handbook also includes documents for continuous review for approved programs. All users will be notified of revisions.

Overview of the Program Approval Process

Administrative Licensure Program Approval is the process through which a team of educators referred to as program reviewers, appointed by the Minnesota Board of School Administrators (MBSA), conducts an evaluation of professional programs for school administrators. Procedures for approval of licensure programs are identified in Minnesota Rule 3512.2500.

In accordance with Minnesota Rule 3512.2500, subpart 1. The program shall be evaluated for initial approval and thereafter shall be audited for continuing approval....

Program approval is a continuous process of program improvement accompanied by a review every five years. Each program is required to prepare a report that demonstrates the program compliance with Board requirements and competencies.

Before initial approval for the licensure program is granted, Board staff and/or persons designated as program reviewers by the Minnesota Board of School Administrators review the written program report and visit the institution to examine the licensure program for the purpose of verifying the program description and making a recommendation to the Board of School Administrators.

The program approval process focuses on making a determination of the degree to which the institution and its administrative program(s) comply with the Procedures for Approval of Licensure Programs in Minnesota Rule 3512.2500, and program competencies specific to the preparation program.

The following Minnesota rules define the program approval requirements and competencies:

3512.2500	All programs must demonstrate compliance
3512.0400	Program Requirements for K-12 Principals
3512.0400	Program Requirements for Superintendents
3512.0400	Program Requirements for Directors of Special Education
3512.0505	Program Requirements for Directors of Community Education

Review Process:

A review team composed of 2-5 members, depending on the size of the institution and program, and consisting of at least one professional representative from the field, a higher education member, and/or a designated staff person (liaison) performs the following responsibilities:

1. Review the written application submitted by the institution to determine the level of compliance with Board requirements and competencies demonstrated in the program.
2. Conduct an on-site visit to the institution to verify the accuracy and completeness of the written application prepared by the institution.
3. Meet to confirm findings and make a recommendation of the approval status of the program to the Minnesota Board of School Administrators.
4. Submit a report of their findings indicating whether standards are met or not met.

Note: Program reviewers have expertise in the licensure program field. Reviewers may represent either the P-12 or post-secondary levels. The number of programs submitted for approval may increase the number of program reviewers required to conduct the on-site visit. One reviewer will serve as chairperson of the review team.

Thus, the team's role is a combination of auditing, verifying findings and observing actual performance through interviews, and the review of the institutional evidence and individual candidate portfolios. During the institutional visit, team members review written information and interview persons who have relevant information and experiences with the licensure program. Team members meet together to study findings to reach a consensus concerning the team findings and recommendations.

Preparation:

Approximately 60 days prior to the on-site review the liaison will assist with arranging a meeting between the chairperson of the review team and the program's administrator/coordinator to make initial arrangements for the review and on-site visit. The preparation discussion is an important part of the major program approval process. It provides an opportunity for a focused discussion of the Board's expectations and the program's condition of readiness for the activities that will take place during the review.

On-site Review:

Program approval on-site visits run for approximately 2 days beginning with an orientation, team meeting, and reception hosted by the program on the first evening. At the end of the visit an oral exit report is provided. The purpose of the oral report is to highlight the overall findings of the team and to provide the program a sense of what will be submitted to the Minnesota Board of School Administrators.

The program is expected to arrange a hotel and on-campus workrooms for the review team's exclusive use during the on-site visit. A team workroom, including all of the materials the program selects to provide to support program compliance, should be in close proximity of the campus or program administrative office.

Examples of documents that might be collected for the workroom are: minutes from committee meetings, manuals and handbooks, policies and procedures, student program plans, samples of student work, student portfolios, etc. Consideration should be given to the layout of the exhibits to ensure that adequate space is available for reviewing the materials. All exhibits must be coded to state requirements and competencies. A list of the documents in the exhibits shall be compiled (hard copy and electronically). Additional information on arrangements for on-site visits will be provided during a pre-visit meeting between the chairperson and the licensure program coordinator.

Report to Board:

The team's recommendation on approval, along with a written report of the findings, and any additional information presented by the institution is prepared by the chairperson who forwards the report to the Executive Director of the Minnesota Board of School Administrators for Board action.

Reporting Process:

- The chairperson presents an oral summary of the team's findings to the program coordinator and describes the next steps of the reporting process;
- Within 30 days after the on-site visit, (a) the chairperson sends one copy of the final draft of the report to the program coordinator who reviews it for *factual errors only* and communicates any recommended changes to the chairperson *within five days of receipt of the report*. At the chairperson's discretion, corrections identified will be incorporated into the final report; and (b) the chairperson submits one copy of the final report to the Executive Director of the Minnesota Board of School Administrators. The Executive Director will duplicate the report and send a copy to the program coordinator and copies to program committee members of the Board.
- Within 30 days of receipt of the final report, the program coordinator shall acknowledge receipt of the report and has the opportunity to rejoin it. The rejoinder must be received by the Executive Director of the Minnesota Board of School Administrators 30 days after the receipt of the report. The Minnesota Board of School Administrators will determine approval status of the program at the next meeting after receipt of the institutional rejoinder.

As noted in Minnesota Rule 2500, subpart 4, based upon appraisal of the program description prepared by the institution and the written report of the auditors, the Board shall:

- A. grant initial approval;
- B. grant continuing approval;
- C. grant conditional approval, state the conditions, and establish time lines for meeting the stated conditions; or
- D. disapprove the licensure program, state the reasons for disapproval, and, if needed, stipulate a termination date that will accommodate persons enrolled in the program.

The decision of the Board regarding approval status of the licensure program is forwarded by the Executive Director of the Board to the chief administrative officer of the college/university or program.

Budgeting for the Review:

The institution/program is responsible for all costs associated with the preparation of the written report and expenses of the team during an on-site review (food, lodging, mileage and substitute teacher when necessary).

Lodging and food expenses should be calculated not to exceed two full days/nights. (Costs of food and mileage will be determined/limited to state reimbursement amounts paid to state employees). In addition, the costs associated with the chairperson's participation in a pre-visit are the responsibility of the program.

Hotel accommodations, if required, should be planned so that each member of the team has a

separate room. The hotel should also have a workroom large enough to accommodate the team, with additional space for at least two personal computer workstations. This workroom should be available throughout the review. When possible, the program should select a hotel with or near a dining facility. In addition to the obvious meals, the program should budget for refreshments in the hotel workroom and the campus exhibits room.

Transportation of the team members from the hotel to the campus is one final factor that should be considered in preparing the budget. Details of the transportation plan should be discussed at the pre-visit with the chairperson.

The participation of team members in the program approval process is voluntary and reflective of the high level of professional commitment of the team members. Any form of financial payments to team members, other than reimbursement of costs associated with the review, is prohibited.

Conflict of Interest and Ethical Guidelines:

Serving as a Program Reviewer on a Board of School Administrators' team could create situations that may cause conflicts of interest, create questions of ethics, or otherwise raise issues regarding the objectivity and credibility of the program approval process. To avoid these situations, individuals should avoid serving as a reviewer of programs at which they have close personal or professional relationships, including the following:

- Current or former faculty member
- Current or former consultant (over a period of time)
- Current or former member of an advisory committee
- Current or former student
- Other perceived conflicts, such as a family member who is a current or former employee or student at the institution

All elements of the approval process must be treated in the most professional manner. Information acquired through the process must not be used for other purposes. Confidentiality is an integral part of the program approval process and must be protected by those who participate as reviewers. Program reviewers are not to discuss findings with anyone other than team members and Board staff.

Roles and Responsibilities:

The liaison

- Establishes team membership.
- Makes appropriate materials available to the team members.
- Provides orientation and training to team members, shares team objectives and the roles and responsibilities of team members.
- Provides technical and administrative support to the team.
- Provides technical assistance in preparation of the report.
- Secures completed expense reports and critiques of the team visit procedures from team members at the close of the visit.
- Reviews performance and maintains applications of team members and recommendations.

The chairperson

- Makes a preliminary visit to the college to plan for the on-site visit.

- Presides during team meetings and facilitates team discussions regarding standards in order to reach consensus.
- Acts as mediator, if necessary, to resolve differences of opinion through discussion, the gathering of further information, or arrangement of additional interviews.
- Presides during the final reporting session.
- Completes the final written report.

The team members

- Analyze alignment of program information and evidence with standards.
- Use “Prompts to Guide Program Review” to evaluate standards.
- Communicate strengths and areas of concern in relation to the standards to the chairperson.
- Provide objective assessments based on evidence of accepted criteria; avoid personal bias.
- Provide liaison with evaluative feedback on team and visit procedures.

On-site Schedule Template:*Day One*

3:30-4:00 Review Team arrival

4:00-5:30 Institutional orientation (including workroom/exhibit room)

5:30-6:30 Dinner reception (hosted by the program)

7:00-9:00 Orientation meeting for the Review Team

The chairperson will

- Review the Minnesota Board of School Administrators forms, standards, and procedures for the review;
- Review the roles and responsibilities of team members, emphasizing the importance of professionalism and confidentiality;
- Share scheduling and/or other information about the visit.

Team members will

- Review plans for carrying out assignments for the next day;
- Identify documents and/or other forms of evidence not yet shared that should be requested by the chairperson from the program coordinator.

Day Two

8:00-8:30 Chairperson interview/meeting with the School or College Dean or Head

8:00-11:30 Prearranged interviews (determined between chair and coordinator)

Scheduled interviews may include:

- Department chairs and/or coordinators of program areas
- Faculty members/adjunct faculty
- Advisory board members
- Internship supervisors/situational observation reviewers
- Alumni from each of the licensure programs being reviewed
- Current students from each licensure program being reviewed
- Representatives from K-12 partnerships

11:30-1:00 Working lunch for Review Team
Chairperson checks for status of data collection.

1:00-2:00 Prearranged interviews (determined between chair and coordinator)

2:00-3:30 Chairperson and team members collectively complete written report and prepare oral report.

- Determine strengths and areas of concern that should be described in the narrative of the report;
- Determine, by consensus-if possible, the team's recommendation on whether each standard is met or not met. If consensus cannot be reached, the team should vote with the majority prevailing.

3:30-4:00 Exit conference

Chairperson meets with the program coordinator to present summary of team's findings and to describe the next steps of the review process, including the coordinator's review of the draft report for factual errors and submission of rejoinder.

Guidelines for Program Approval

The Minnesota Board of School Administrators applies state adopted standards to the approval of licensure educational administration programs in the following licensure areas: (a) Superintendents, (b) K-12 Principals, (c) Directors of Special Education, (d) Directors of Community Education.

Timeline for Initial Review Process:

- June 1: Submit a letter of intent that the institution will make application.
- June 30: Board Executive Director will furnish requirements for application.
- October 30: Submit a portfolio detailing how program will meet Rule Requirements.
- January 30: Program Review Team will make a visit on-site to evaluate institutional application.
- March 30: Board will file report and recommendation.

No institution may apply to be a licensure-granting institution more than once per calendar year.

Timeline for Continuous Review Process:

- August: Communicate with the Executive Director of the Minnesota Board of School Administrators to initiate time frame for completion of review process.
- May: On-site Review completed and Board recommendation completed.

Making Application:

To request approval to offer administrative licensure programs or an alternative preparation program (122A.27), a complete electronic application must be submitted to the Executive Director of the Minnesota Board of School Administrators. The report must state the content of each Program Requirement and clearly describe how the program is in compliance. These guidelines are intended to provide the program with every opportunity to evidence how the program(s) complies with procedures in Minnesota Rule 3512.2500 and competencies identified for each licensure field. The reporting design is intended to present the information in a clear and focused method for reviewers to meet their responsibilities to the institution/program and the state.

Application Components:

1. Introduction (Institutional Overview)

It is suggested that an Introduction section providing brief historical, geographical, and contextual information of the college/department/program be included. This section is the program's opportunity to set the context of the report for the program auditors. It may also be used to provide the program reviewers with an understanding of changes, developments, activities on the campus, and any state or national initiatives which may influence the mission, directions, and delivery of the licensure program.

2. Form A - Institutional Authorization/Application for Program Approval

3. Form B - Program Personnel and Partners

4. Form C - Program Sequence

5. Form D - Matrices Aligning Courses to Competencies

6. Form E - Summary Report of Program Review

The program must address each REQUIREMENT in the written report and should discuss the types

of evidence that it has amassed to demonstrate that it is meeting each requirement. Each program shall forward from the administrator of the defined instructional unit of the institution or chief executive officer of the program to the Executive Director of the Minnesota Board of School Administrators a program description for each licensure program for which approval is requested. The licensure program description shall include Minnesota Rule 3512.2500, subp. 2, A-J and Minnesota Rule 3512.2500, subp. 3, A-C. The report should provide the reviewers with enough information to support that the program is in compliance with the requirements and competencies. References should be made to specific documents that support the claims made in the report.

7. Complete Syllabi

8. Faculty Vitae

9. Appendices (supportive information, include guidelines and rubrics for all field experiences, practica, situational observation components)

Competencies are identified in the follow Minnesota Rules

3512.0510, subp. 1 and subp. 2	Superintendents
3512.0510, subp.1 and subp. 3	K-12 Principals
3512-0510, subp. 1 and subp. 4	Directors of Special Education
3512.0510, subp.1 and subp. 5	Directors of Community Education

Prompts to Guide Program Review

Standard 2A. *A statement which verified the institutional commitment to the licensure program*

Prompts:

1. Detail how the institution provides adequate financial support for the licensure programs to meet the requirements of MR3512.
2. Identify the policies and procedure in place to support the program.
3. Share how the university supports continuous program review.
4. Describe the plan in place to assure that the past and current students' needs are met into the future if a licensure program or any program component discontinues.

Performance Indicator	Not Met	Met
There is evidence that all of the provisions in MR3512 are accommodated in the budget plan.		
There is evidence that all of the provisions in MR3512 are accommodated in human resources policies and/or procedures.		
There is university support for continuous program review.		
In the face of discontinuation of the licensure program, or any component, there is a plan for continuation of student support services.		

Standard 2B. *A description of the organizational structure of the institution and procedures for implementing the licensure program*

Prompts:

1. Provide organizational and program flow charts that support the organization's mission and strategic plan.
2. Explain how decisions are made and how program faculty is involved.
3. Clarify how practitioners are involved in program development and evaluation.
4. Describe how practitioners are involved in assessment of learner preparation.

Performance Indicator	Not Met	Met
There is alignment between the organizational mission and strategic plan and the organizational and program flow charts.		
The decision making processes support the engagement of program faculty to maximize student learning.		
The decision making processes support the engagement of licensed practitioners to maximize student learning.		
There is evidence that licensed practitioners are members of individual learner assessment teams.		

Standard 2C. *A description of the role for which persons who enroll in the licensure program are being prepared*

Prompts:

1. List the licenses the institution is currently authorized to prepare.
2. Interpret the roles for which the program is preparing candidates.
3. Share how the institution keeps its programs up-to-date and aware of current and future trends.
4. Explain how the institution's conceptual and philosophical basis are integrated into the program.

Performance Indicator	Not Met	Met
The licensure roles described focus on preparing candidates for effective educational leadership.		
The program's interpretation of each licensure role shows an awareness of current and future trends.		
The institution's conceptual and philosophical basis for its program		

are published and planfully integrated into instruction.		
--	--	--

Standard 2D. *An enumeration of the specific knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be achieved by persons completing the licensure program*

Prompts:

1. Provide evidence that all parts of each competency are included in the licensure preparation and exit assessment.
2. Describe how your program meets additional knowledge, skills and dispositions required in MN Rules or Statutes (i.e. Learning for English Academic Proficiency and Success Act).

Performance Indicator	Not Met	Met
Completion of Form D showing all competencies in MR3512 is included.		
There is evidence that additional institutional requirements are assessed.		

Standard 2E. *A description of the licensure program which relates individual program components to the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be achieved by persons completing the licensure program*

Prompts:

1. Explain how the major program components align with MN Administrative Licensure competencies and MR3512.
2. Describe the procedures used to evaluate program components.
3. Share how your program components meet additional requirements for your organization.

Performance Indicator	Not Met	Met
In addition to Form D there is documentation showing evidence of rule requirements beyond the competencies included in the licensure program.		
A pre-assessment process exists to determine the learner's individual learning plan.		

Organizational requirements may be included as Administrative Licensure program requirements.		
---	--	--

Standard 2F. *A description of the field-based experience*

Prompts:

1. Provide evidence that field based exposures meet minimum hour and level requirements and that authentic practice opportunities are included in the 320 hour field experience.
2. Provide evidence that minimum levels and settings are required in the field experience portion of the licensure program for the K-12 principal and director of special education licenses.
3. Provide evidence that university and field mentors regularly engage in mentoring relationships with the learner(s) assigned to them.

Performance Indicator	Not Met	Met
There is evidence of placements at the settings required in MR3512.		
The institution can provide evidence that the activities the licensure candidate participates in during the field experience are authentic to the role of the license area.		
The institution can provide evidence that the university and site mentors play an active role during the field experience and assure a variety of experiences authentic to the license area.		

Standard 2F2. *Assessment of prior preparation and experience*

Prompts:

1. Describe the process for identifying the knowledge, skills, and dispositions the learner initially brings to the licensure program.
2. Explain how an individual student's program plan is based on the assessment of prior knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Performance Indicator	Not Met	Met
There is evidence of individual		

assessment of prior knowledge, skills, and dispositions that guide the student's learning plan.		
There is evidence of a learning plan for each learner.		

Standard 2F3. Situational observation component

Prompts:

1. Describe how the exit evaluation for the learner focuses on mastery of knowledge, skills, and dispositions evident in the core competencies and those specific to the learner's licensure area.
2. Explain how the exit evaluation requires the learner to demonstrate the integrated application of the competencies.
3. Provide evidence that the exit assessment(s) include representation from university departments involved with the licensure program and licensed practicing administrators specific to the learner's licensure area.

Performance Indicator	Not Met	Met
There is record of the learner's mastery of each of the required competencies.		
There is evidence that the learner has demonstrated integration of the competencies.		
There is a record of assessors and roles in the exit evaluation.		

Standard 2G. A description of the systematic procedure for evaluation of the licensure program

Prompts:

1. Describe the internal process for systematic evaluation to assure that the program meets each of the requirements in MR 3512.
2. Describe the procedures to evaluate course content, instruction, and assessment provided by your program.

Performance Indicator	Not Met	Met
There is evidence of an internal process for systematic evaluation to assure that the program meets each		

of the requirements in MR 3512.		
There is evidence of internal procedures for evaluation of course content, instruction, and assessment.		

Standard 2H. *A specific identification of the plans for assessing the performance of each person who is to be judged as having successfully completed the licensure program*

Prompts:

1. Describe the specific plan for assessment of the performance of each person seeking licensure.
2. Identify the assurances in place that learners completing a program at different sites are held to the same standard regarding the Minnesota licensure competencies.

Performance Indicator	Not Met	Met
There is evidence of an internal process for systematic evaluation to assure that the student meets each of the requirements in MR 3512.		
There is evidence of an internal process for evaluation of course content, instruction, and evaluation so that learner outcomes at multiple sites are consistent regarding the Minnesota licensure competencies.		

Standard 2I. *Evidence that the licensure program forwarded for approval has been developed with participation from the college departments involved with the licensure program, licensed practicing educational personnel, school administrators, and interested citizens*

Prompts:

1. Explain how the university uses advisors from each of the required categories in the development, continuous improvement, and assessment of the licensure program (aligns with Form B).

Performance Indicator	Not Met	Met
There is evidence that the university uses advisors from each of the required categories in the development, continuous		

improvement, and assessment of the licensure program.		
---	--	--

Standard 2J. *A description of the procedures to establish and maintain an internal process for systematic evaluation of the licensure program*

Prompts:

1. Describe the internal process of program evaluation for and proof of efficacy, viability and quality.

Performance Indicator	Not Met	Met
There is a description and evidence of application of the internal process for program evaluation.		

Standard 3A. *Rules of the Board of School Administrators governing the licensure program have been met*

Prompts:

1. Share specific documents and/or web links verifying the university's program description includes a statement that assures compliance of all requirements in MR3512.

Performance Indicator	Not Met	Met
There is a statement in the program description that the program complies with all of the Minnesota Board of School Administrators requirements for licensing educational administrators and it is accessible to the public.		

Standard 3B. *Necessary faculty and physical resources are allocated to implement and maintain the licensure program*

Prompts:

1. Provide evidence of the following: position descriptions, personnel qualifications, adjunct faculty coordination, faculty in-service, budgets, technology support, library resources, academic record support, student advisors and access to faculty.

2. Provide evidence that physical class meeting areas are conducive to learning and accommodate a variety of teaching and learning styles.
3. Provide evidence that on-line class or off-campus sites are conducive to learning and accommodate a variety of teaching and learning styles.

Performance Indicator	Not Met	Met
There is evidence of standards for faculty including: qualifications, recruiting, hiring, appraisal, and professional development.		
There is evidence of adequate program support in the categories of practitioner adjuncts, budget, technology, library, academic records, student advisors, and student access to faculty.		
There is evidence of an evaluation of physical facilities and a process to address concerns.		
There is evidence of an evaluation of academic technology and a process to address concerns.		

Standard 3C. *Adequate supervision for practicum experiences required by individual licensure rules is provided*

Prompts:

1. Describe the roles and responsibilities of site internship supervisors.
2. Provide evidence of regular contact between the university program faculty member and the internship site which includes an internship agreement.
3. Describe the strategies used by the program for obtaining other advice and participation from the field (e.g. advisory committee, surveys, program evaluation, collaborative research) to determine what an internship should entail.

Performance Indicator	Not Met	Met
There is evidence of clearly defined responsibilities of internship supervisors.		
There is evidence that one or more		

<p>program faculty members communicate regularly with school and district leader supervisors about the internship.</p>		
<p>There is evidence of practitioner input in the program's internship requirements.</p>		

Checklist for Review of Administrative Licensing Programs

✓	Standard	Required Evidence
	2A	Forms A – D; Budget plan; Staffing plan; Statement of continuous program review
	2B	Narrative clarifying decision making process; Organizational flow chart; Job descriptions; Statement of processes for course reviews and approvals; Strategic plan for program
	2C	Form A; Narrative describing interpretation of role of administrators, etc.
	2D	Statement of any additional competencies to Form D
	2E	Form D; Statement of opportunities to master competencies
	2 F 1	Internship guide and forms; Statement of appropriate placement settings for internships
	2 F 2	Examples of assessments and plans of study; Availability of student files for students completing licensure in the past two years; Letter of confidentiality
	2 F 3	Narrative of assessments of authentic experiences; Statement describing the training of on-site mentors; Pre-assessment plan
	2 G	Narrative focused on students meeting competencies; Portfolio format; Statement of internal evaluation of course content and instruction; Pre-assessment plan
	2 H	Narrative summarizing summative assessments
	2I	Statement of how program developed
	2 J	Narrative of internal process for systemic evaluation of licensure program
	3 A	Completion of this checklist; Statement that the program complies with all MBSA requirements
	3 B	Narrative describing program resources
	3 C	Internship guide

Form A

Institutional Authorization/Application for Program Approval

Check Applicable Programs:

- Superintendent
- K-12 Principal
- Director of Special Education
- Director of Community Education

Name of Institution: _____
 Proposal Prepared By: _____ Telephone No. _____
 Fax No. _____ E-mail: _____

The following application is submitted to the Minnesota Board of School Administrators to evidence institutional capacity to implement the provisions of Minnesota Rules, Part 3512.

Approval requires evidence of the following:

1. Institutional Authorization to Submit. **Complete and attach this Form A: Institutional Authorization.**
2. The institution has designated a faculty member responsible for providing instructional leadership for this licensure program and the course of study established to meet these standards was developed in collaboration with the institution’s education faculty and licensed, practicing K-12 public school administrators.
3. **Complete and attach Form B: Program Personnel and Partners.**
4. The course of study provides candidates for licensure with the knowledge, skills, and understandings required in this licensure rule. **Complete and attach Form C: Program Sequence. Submit syllabi and course description for all courses and experiences used to demonstrate and assess candidate performance of the standards.** Submitted syllabi must include the course number, name, and credits; the course objectives; expected levels of achievement and how achievement will be measured; and required texts and materials.
5. **Complete and attach Form D: Competencies/Course & Experience Matrix.**
6. Faculty responsible for teaching courses aligned to this licensure program are qualified by academic preparation (degrees and major fields of study) and, where applicable, by professional experiences. **Submit Faculty vitae and complete Form B.**

The undersigned affirm that the institution is committed to providing the resources needed to implement and maintain the course of study required to provide licensure candidates with the knowledge, skills, and abilities in the standards of this licensure program, and that the information provided in this proposal is accurate and true.

 Name and Title Chief Academic Officer

 Name and Title School or College Dean or Head

 Name and Title Program Director

 Signature Chief Academic Officer

 Signature School or College Dean or Head

 Signature Program Director

 Signature Date

 Signature Date

 Signature Date

Program	Name	Position or Role (e.g. coordinator, professor)	FT = Full-time PT = Part-time Ad = Adjunct
<input type="checkbox"/> CE- <input type="checkbox"/> SPE- <input type="checkbox"/> PR- <input type="checkbox"/> SU			
<input type="checkbox"/> CE- <input type="checkbox"/> SPE- <input type="checkbox"/> PR- <input type="checkbox"/> SU			
<input type="checkbox"/> CE- <input type="checkbox"/> SPE- <input type="checkbox"/> PR- <input type="checkbox"/> SU			
<input type="checkbox"/> CE- <input type="checkbox"/> SPE- <input type="checkbox"/> PR- <input type="checkbox"/> SU			
<input type="checkbox"/> CE- <input type="checkbox"/> SPE- <input type="checkbox"/> PR- <input type="checkbox"/> SU			
<input type="checkbox"/> CE- <input type="checkbox"/> SPE- <input type="checkbox"/> PR- <input type="checkbox"/> SU			
<input type="checkbox"/> CE- <input type="checkbox"/> SPE- <input type="checkbox"/> PR- <input type="checkbox"/> SU			
<input type="checkbox"/> CE- <input type="checkbox"/> SPE- <input type="checkbox"/> PR- <input type="checkbox"/> SU			
<input type="checkbox"/> CE- <input type="checkbox"/> SPE- <input type="checkbox"/> PR- <input type="checkbox"/> SU			
<input type="checkbox"/> CE- <input type="checkbox"/> SPE- <input type="checkbox"/> PR- <input type="checkbox"/> SU			

**Program Collaborative Field Partners
(advisory board members, professional associations, etc.)**

Program	Name	Position or Role (e.g. coordinator, professor)	FT = Full-time PT = Part-time Ad = Adjunct
<input type="checkbox"/> CE- <input type="checkbox"/> SPE- <input type="checkbox"/> PR- <input type="checkbox"/> SU			
<input type="checkbox"/> CE- <input type="checkbox"/> SPE- <input type="checkbox"/> PR- <input type="checkbox"/> SU			
<input type="checkbox"/> CE- <input type="checkbox"/> SPE- <input type="checkbox"/> PR- <input type="checkbox"/> SU			
<input type="checkbox"/> CE- <input type="checkbox"/> SPE- <input type="checkbox"/> PR- <input type="checkbox"/> SU			
<input type="checkbox"/> CE- <input type="checkbox"/> SPE- <input type="checkbox"/> PR- <input type="checkbox"/> SU			
<input type="checkbox"/> CE- <input type="checkbox"/> SPE- <input type="checkbox"/> PR- <input type="checkbox"/> SU			
<input type="checkbox"/> CE- <input type="checkbox"/> SPE- <input type="checkbox"/> PR- <input type="checkbox"/> SU			
<input type="checkbox"/> CE- <input type="checkbox"/> SPE- <input type="checkbox"/> PR- <input type="checkbox"/> SU			
<input type="checkbox"/> CE- <input type="checkbox"/> SPE- <input type="checkbox"/> PR- <input type="checkbox"/> SU			
<input type="checkbox"/> CE- <input type="checkbox"/> SPE- <input type="checkbox"/> PR- <input type="checkbox"/> SU			

Field Experience and Assessment Courses

Program	Course name and number for field experience, internship, and/or assessment experience(s)	Credits	Description (Catalog/Bulletin)
<input type="checkbox"/> CE- <input type="checkbox"/> SPE- <input type="checkbox"/> PR- <input type="checkbox"/> SU			
<input type="checkbox"/> CE- <input type="checkbox"/> SPE- <input type="checkbox"/> PR- <input type="checkbox"/> SU			
<input type="checkbox"/> CE- <input type="checkbox"/> SPE- <input type="checkbox"/> PR- <input type="checkbox"/> SU			
<input type="checkbox"/> CE- <input type="checkbox"/> SPE- <input type="checkbox"/> PR- <input type="checkbox"/> SU			
<input type="checkbox"/> CE- <input type="checkbox"/> SPE- <input type="checkbox"/> PR- <input type="checkbox"/> SU			
<input type="checkbox"/> CE- <input type="checkbox"/> SPE- <input type="checkbox"/> PR- <input type="checkbox"/> SU			

A3 demonstrate a knowledge of the role of the local school district’s administrative team and the community education director’s place within it;																				
A4 demonstrate, facilitate and lead the integration of community education into the pre-K-12 system;																				
A5 demonstrate the skills necessary to conduct community needs assessments, determine educational objectives, select learning experiences, schedule and promote programs, and establish and implement registration procedures;																				
A6 demonstrate knowledge of the various assessment tools used to effectively evaluate community education programs;																				
A7 demonstrate understanding of the resources available to support learners of all abilities.																				
B. Community Capital																				
B1 demonstrate a knowledge of advisory councils, their role organization, functions, and development;																				
B2 demonstrate the ability to involve advisory councils in addressing community and school issues;																				

B3 demonstrate the ability to build collaborative partnerships in the community;																				
B4 demonstrate the ability to effectively identify the community political structures, both formal and informal;																				
B5 demonstrate the ability to identify and effectively use local, civic, and business resources to enhance the lifelong learning opportunities within the community;																				
B6 demonstrate the knowledge of the techniques used for developing leadership among community members;																				
B7 demonstrate knowledge about sustaining community involvement in the community education process;																				
B8 demonstrate knowledge of factors that affect school finance, including sources of revenue, expenditure classifications, generally acceptable accounting principles, and local, state, and federal finance calculations.																				

DIRECTOR OF SPECIAL EDUCATION COMPETENCIES

Courses and/or Experiences																				
Competencies																				
A. Policy and Law																				

A1 Demonstrate an understanding of state and federal laws, rules, and procedures governing special education finance, budgeting and accounting;																				
A2 Demonstrate an understanding of state and federal regulations governing the monitoring of special education programs.																				
B. Organizational Management																				
B1 Demonstrate an understanding of the role policy and procedure play in school district governance and administration;																				
B2 Demonstrate knowledge of statutory regulations affecting Board meetings, communications, procedures, and practices that affect special education governance;																				
B3 Demonstrate an understanding of special education administrative models used in Minnesota.																				
C. Resource Allocation																				
C1 Demonstrate an understanding of special education program development including needs assessment, design and evaluation;																				

C2 Demonstrate an understanding of the resources available, along with the agencies and organizations that serve students with a disability and their families;																					
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Form E

Summary Report of Program Review

Standard 2A. *A statement which verified the institutional commitment to the licensure program*

Performance Indicator	Not Met	Met	Comments
There is evidence that all of the provisions in MR3512 are accommodated in the budget plan.			
There is evidence that all of the provisions in MR3512 are accommodated in human resources policies and/or procedures.			
There is university support for continuous program review.			
In the face of discontinuation of the licensure program, or any component, there is a plan for continuation of student support services.			

Standard 2B. *A description of the organizational structure of the institution and procedures for implementing the licensure program*

Performance Indicator	Not Met	Met	Comments
There is alignment between the organizational mission and strategic plan and the organizational and program flow charts.			
The decision making processes supports the engagement of program faculty to maximize student learning.			
The decision making processes supports the engagement of licensed practitioners to maximize			

student learning.			
There is evidence that licensed practitioners are members of individual learner assessment teams.			

***Standard 2C.** A description of the role for which persons who enroll in the licensure program are being prepared*

Performance Indicator	Not Met	Met	Comments
The licensure roles described focus on preparing candidates for effective educational leadership.			
The program's interpretation of each licensure role shows an awareness of current and future trends.			
The institution's conceptual and philosophical basis for its program are published and planfully integrated into instruction.			

***Standard 2D.** An enumeration of the specific knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be achieved by persons completing the licensure program*

Performance Indicator	Not Met	Met	Comments
Completion of Form D showing all competencies in MR3512 is included.			
There is evidence that additional institutional requirements are assessed.			

***Standard 2E.** A description of the licensure program which relates individual program components to the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be achieved by persons completing the licensure program*

Performance Indicator	Not Met	Met	Comments
In addition to Form D there is documentation showing evidence of rule requirements beyond the competencies included in the licensure program.			
A pre-assessment process exists to determine the learner's individual learning plan.			
Organizational requirements may be included as Administrative Licensure program requirements.			

Standard 2F. A description of the field-based experience

Performance Indicator	Not Met	Met	Comments
There is evidence of placements at the settings required in MR3512.			
The institution can provide evidence that the activities the licensure candidate participates in during the field experience are authentic to the role of the license area.			
The institution can provide evidence that the university and site mentors play an active role during the field experience and assure a variety of experiences authentic the license area.			

Standard 2F2. Assessment of prior preparation and experience

Performance Indicator	Not Met	Met	Comments
There is evidence of individual assessment of prior knowledge, skills, and dispositions that guide			

the student's learning plan.			
There is evidence of a learning plan for each learner.			

Standard 2F3. Situational observation component

Performance Indicator	Not Met	Met	Comments
There is record of the learner's mastery of each of the required competencies.			
There is evidence that the learner has demonstrated integration of the competencies.			
There is a record of assessors and roles in the exit evaluation.			

Standard 2G. A description of the systematic procedure for evaluation of the licensure program

Performance Indicator	Not Met	Met	Comments
There is evidence of an internal process for systematic evaluation to assure that the program meets each of the requirements in MR 3512.			
There is evidence of internal procedures for evaluation of course content, instruction, and assessment.			

Standard 2H. A specific identification of the plans for assessing the performance of each person who is to be judged as having successfully completed the licensure program

Performance Indicator	Not Met	Met	Comments
There is evidence of an internal process for systematic evaluation to assure that the student meets each of the requirements in MR 3512.			

There is evidence of an internal process for evaluation of course content, instruction, and evaluation so that learner outcomes at multiple sites are consistent regarding the Minnesota licensure competencies.			
--	--	--	--

Standard 2I. *Evidence that the licensure program forwarded for approval has been developed with participation from the college departments involved with the licensure program, licensed practicing educational personnel, school administrators, and interested citizens*

Performance Indicator	Not Met	Met	Comments
There is evidence that the university uses advisors from each of the required categories in the development, continuous improvement, and assessment of the licensure program.			

Standard 2J. *A description of the procedures to establish and maintain an internal process for systematic evaluation of the licensure program*

Performance Indicator	Not Met	Met	Comments
There is a description and evidence of application of the internal process for program evaluation.			

Standard 3A. *Rules of the Board of School Administrators governing the licensure program have been met*

Performance Indicator	Not Met	Met	Comments
There is a statement in the program description that the program complies with all of the Minnesota Board of School Administrators requirements for licensing educational administrators and it is			

accessible to the public.			
---------------------------	--	--	--

Standard 3B. *Necessary faculty and physical resources are allocated to implement and maintain the licensure program*

Performance Indicator	Not Met	Met	Comments
There is evidence of standards for faculty including: qualifications, recruiting, hiring, appraisal, and professional development.			
There is evidence of adequate program support in the categories of practitioner adjuncts, budget, technology, library, academic records, student advisors, and student access to faculty.			
There is evidence of an evaluation of physical facilities and a process to address concerns.			
There is evidence of an evaluation of academic technology and a process to address concerns.			

Standard 3C. *Adequate supervision for practicum experiences required by individual licensure rules is provided*

Performance Indicator	Not Met	Met	Comments
There is evidence of clearly defined responsibilities of internship supervisors.			
There is evidence that one or more program faculty members communicate regularly with school and district leader supervisors about the internship.			
There is evidence of practitioner input in the program's internship			

requirements.			
---------------	--	--	--

Narrative

Identify key characteristics of the program including areas of strength and areas of concern.

Areas of Strength:

Areas of Concern:

Conditions that must be met:

The undersigned affirm that this report represents their recommendations and are based on documented evidence. The undersigned also affirm that the recommendations were determined based on Minnesota Board of School Administrators standards and criteria.

Chairperson

Date

Team member

Date

Team member

Date

Team member

Date



**Continuous Review of University
Licensure Preparation Programs**

**Review for the Years 20__-20__
Due April 30**

Name of Institution _____

Reporting Officer _____

Year of initial approval: _____

Number of years since previous audit: _____

Licensure Areas Approved: CE-Director of Community Education SPE-Director of Special Education
 PR-K-12 Principal SU-Superintendent

Standard	No Change	Changed*
2A. commitment to the licensure program		
2B. organizational structure of the institution and procedures for implementing the licensure program;		
2C. description of the role for which persons who enroll in the licensure program are being prepared		
2D. specific knowledge, skills, and understandings to be achieved by persons completing the licensure program;		
2E. relationship of individual program components to the knowledge, skills, and understandings to be achieved by persons completing the licensure program;		
2F1. description of the field-based experience,		
2F2. assessment of prior experience and preparation		

Standard	No Change	Changed*
2F3. situational observation component		
2G. description of the systematic procedure for evaluation of the licensure program which assures that all requirements for licensure have been met by all persons recommended for licensure;		
2H. assessment process of the performance of each person who is to be judged as having successfully completed the licensure program;		
2I. evidence that the licensure program forwarded for approval has been developed with participation from the college departments involved with the licensure program, licensed practicing education personnel, school administrators, and interested citizens; and		
2J. description of the procedures to establish and maintain an internal process for systematic evaluation of the licensure program.		
3A. rules of the board of School Administrators governing the licensure program are met		
3B. faculty and physical resources allocated to the licensure program; and		
3C. supervision of practicum experiences required by individual licensure.		

*On a separate sheet, please describe any significant program changes that have been initiated in the past academic year, and note for which licensure area these have taken place. Any item that is marked as changed, should contain this explanation.

I certify on behalf of my institution that all of the above is correct.

Print Name Title Signature Date

This document is a shortened version of the Requirements for Continuous Review of University Licensure Preparation Programs document.