

**ADMINISTRATIVE LICENSURE PROGRAM
APPROVAL PROCESS**

PROCEDURES AND PROTOCOL
MINNESOTA BOARD OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS
PROGRAM APPROVAL

LICENSURE FIELDS:

K-12 PRINCIPAL
SUPERINTENDENT
DIRECTOR OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION



Revised: October 2009

Table of Contents

Introduction

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

Overview of the Program Approval

- Review Process
- Pre-visit
- Onsite Review
- Report to Board (MBSA)
- Reporting Process
- Budgeting for the Review
- Conflict of Interest
- Roles and Responsibilities
- On-site Schedule Template

Guidelines for Program Approval

- Making Application
- Related Rules
- Timeline for Program Approval Process

Preparing the Written Report

- Section 1: Basic Forms (A-E)
- Section 2: Introduction
- Section 3: Program Requirements
- Section 4: Program Review Prompts and Rubrics
- Section 5: Checklist for Review

Appendix A

- Form A: Institutional Authorization/Application for Program Approval
- Form B: Program Personnel and Partners
- Form C: Program Sequence
- Form D: Matrices aligning courses to competencies
 - Core Competencies for All Licenses
 - Competencies for respective licensure areas
 - Superintendents
 - K-12 Principals
 - Directors of Special Education
 - Directors of Community Education
- Form E: Program Assessment Protocols
- Form F: Summary Report of Program Review

Appendix B

- Annual Report for Continuous Review
- Continuous Review of Licensure 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, and assuring healthy and safe learning environments, 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.

Administering 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 written 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 make a recommendation regarding approval status. The reviewers may 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. Submit a report of their findings indicating whether standards are met or not met.
3. Determine the need and focus of an on-site visit to the institution to verify the accuracy and completeness of the written application prepared by the institution.
4. Meet to confirm findings and make a recommendation of the approval status of the program to the Minnesota Board of School Administrators.

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.

Pre-visit:

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 pre-visit 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. At times it may be necessary to conduct the pre-visit by telephone or other electronic media.

On-site Review:

Program approval on-site visits run for approximate 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 shall 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 licensure program coordinators.

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 thus 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.

Note: 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.

Budgeting for the on-site review:

The institution/program is responsible for the 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.

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 of Liaison, Review Team Chairperson, and Review Team Members:

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, 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 from “Questions 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 before on-site visit

Afternoon	Review Team arrival Institutional Orientation (including workroom/exhibit room)
Evening	Orientation Meeting for the Review Team The chairperson will <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 of on-site visit

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	Available for interviews or discussions
2:00-3:30	Chairperson and Team members collectively complete report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.) Chairperson prepares oral report based on team's collective input.
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 Process For Administrative Licensure Programs

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.

MAKING APPLICATION:

To request approval to offer administrative licensure programs or an alternative preparation program (122A.27), a complete application must be submitted to the Executive Director of the Minnesota Board of School Administrators. 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. Secondly, 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.

Complete an Application for Approval for each program. (Submit 5 copies).

- Letter of Intent to Apply for initial review (Submit by June 1 of the year requesting an initial review).
- Submit a Portfolio for initial review (Submit by October 30 of the year requesting an initial review).
 - Forms:
 - a. Form A - Institutional Authorization/Application for Program Approval
 - b. Form B — Program Personnel and Partners
 - c. Form C — Program Sequence
 - d. Form D — Matrices Aligning Courses to Competencies
 - e. Form E—Program Assessment Protocols
 - Written application:
 - a. Introduction (Institutional Overview)
 - b. Descriptions/Narratives Responding to MN Rule 3512.2500
 - Subpart 2, A-J
 - Subpart 3, A-C
 - c. Complete syllabi
 - d. Appendices (supportive information, include guidelines and rubrics for all field experiences, practica, situational observation components)

Related Rules:

3512.0400 Program Requirements for superintendent, principal and director of special education
3512.0505 Program Requirements for director 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: Onsite Reviews completed and Board recommendation completed.

Applications should be submitted to:

Executive Director
Board of School Administrators
MDE Building
1500 Highway 36 West
Roseville, MN 55113
(651) 582-8754

PREPARING THE WRITTEN REPORT

Each institution shall forward from the administrator of the defined administrative and instructional unit of the institution to the Minnesota Board of School Administrators a program description for each licensure program for which approval is requested (3512.2500, subpart 2).

The written report must state the content of each Program Requirement and clearly describe how the program is in compliance.

Section 1: Basic Forms

- Form A Institutional Authorization/Application for Program Approval
- Form B Program Personnel and Program Partners
- Form C Program Sequence (Courses/Experiences with Descriptions)
- Form D Matrices Aligning Course to Competencies
- Form E Program Assessment Protocols

Additional Forms:

- Questions to Guide Program Review
- Checklist for Program Review

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 |

Section 2: Introduction

In addition to the required reporting forms, 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.

Section 3: Program Requirements—Minn. R 3512.2500

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
- Minnesota Rule 3512.2500, subp. 3, A-C

The written (or electronic) report should provide the reviewers with enough information to support that the program(s) is in compliance with the requirements and competencies. References should be made to specific documents that support the claims made in the report.

Section 4: Program Review Prompts and Rubrics



QUESTIONS TO GUIDE PROGRAM REVIEW

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

Prompts:

1. How does the institution provide adequate financial support for the licensure programs to meet the requirements of MR3512 and the institution's conceptual framework?
2. Is an appropriate human resources plan in place to support the licensure program?
3. How does the university provide for the continuity of the educational administration licensure program?
4. If a licensure program or any component discontinues, is there a plan in place to assure that the past and current students' needs are met into the future?

Rubric

Standard Not Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
	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 the staffing plan.	
	There is a process in place 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.	

Comments:

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

Prompts:

1. Is there evidence that clarifies how decisions are made and how faculty is involved?
2. Is there evidence that clarifies how practitioners are involved in program development and evaluation?
3. Is there evidence of practitioner involvement in assessment of learner preparation?
4. Do organizational and program flow charts exist that support the organization's mission and strategic plan?

Rubric

Standard Not Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
	The decision making processes supports the engagement of 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?	
	There is alignment between the organizational mission and strategic plan, and the organizational and program flow charts?	

Comments:

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

Prompts:

1. Which licenses is the institution currently authorized to prepare?
2. What is the institutions interpretation of the roles for which they are preparing candidates?
3. How does the institution keep its programs up-to-date and aware of current and future trends?
4. What is the institutions’ conceptual and philosophical basis for its program? What informs your program?

Rubric

Standard Not Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
	Are the institutions’ interpretations of each licensure role current and show an awareness of future trends?	
	Do the roles described focus on maximizing children’s learning?	
	Is the institutions’ conceptual and philosophical basis for its program published and plan fully integrated into instruction?	

Comments:

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

Prompts:

1. Is there evidence that all parts of each competency are included in the licensure preparation and exit assessment?
2. Are there additional competencies, beyond those stated in MR3512, that are required in the institution’s licensure program?

Rubric

Standard Not Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
	Completion of Form D showing all competencies in MR3512 are included.	
	There is evidence that there is rational for and evidence that additional institutional requirements are assessed.	

Comments:

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. Is there a description of the major components of your program showing alignment between these components and MR3512?
2. Is there a pre-assessment process to determine the learner’s individual learning plan?

Rubric

Standard Not Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
	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.	

Comments:

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

Prompts:

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

Rubric

Standard Not Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
	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.	
--	--	--

Comments:**Standard 2F2. Assessment of prior preparation and experience****Prompts:**

1. What knowledge, skills, and dispositions does the learner initially bring to the licensure program?
2. Is there evidence of an individual program plan that is based on the assessment of prior knowledge, skills and dispositions?

Rubric

Standard Not Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
	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.	

Comments:**Standard 2F3. Situational observation component****Prompts:**

1. Does the exit evaluation for the learner focus on mastery of knowledge, skills and dispositions evident in the core competencies and those specific to the learner's licensure area?
2. Does the exit evaluation require the learner to demonstrate the integrated application of the competencies?
3. Is there evidence that the exit assessments include representation from university departments involved with the licensure program and licensed practicing superintendents and principals?

Rubric

Standard Not Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
	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 role in the exit evaluation.	

Comments:

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

Prompts:

1. Is there an internal process for systematic evaluation to assure that program meets each of the requirements in MR 3512?
2. What assurances are in place that course content, instruction, and evaluation meet MR 3512.

Rubric

Standard Not Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
	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 an internal process for evaluation of course content, instruction, and evaluation.	

Comments:

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. What is the specific plan for assessment of the performance of each person seeking licensure?
2. What assurances are in place that learners completing a program at different sites are held to the same standard?

Rubric

Standard Not Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
	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.	

Comments:

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. Is there evidence that the university uses advisors from each of the required categories in the development, continuous improvement, and assessment of the licensure program?

Rubric

Standard Not Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
	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.	

Comments:

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

Prompts:

1. Is there an internal process of program evaluation for and proof of efficacy, viability and quality?

Rubric

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

Comments:

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

Prompts:

1. In the university’s program description is there a statement that assures compliance of all requirements in MR3512?

Rubric

Standard Not Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
	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.	

Comments:

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

Prompts:

1. Is there 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. Are physical class meeting areas conducive to learning and accommodate a variety of teaching and learning styles?
3. Are on-line class or off-campus sites conducive to learning. Do they accommodate a variety of teaching and learning styles?

Rubric

Standard Not Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
	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 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.	

Comments:



Section 5: 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	Statement summarizing summative assessments; Form E
	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

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: Instructional Leadership.**
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

Form B

Program Personnel and Partners

Program (please check): <input type="checkbox"/> CE-Director of Community Education <input type="checkbox"/> SPE-Director of Special Education <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; margin-top: 5px;"> <input type="checkbox"/> PR-K-12 Principal <input type="checkbox"/> SU-Superintendent </div>
Name and position of person with responsibility for providing instructional leadership for the program: <hr style="border: 0; border-top: 1px solid black; margin-top: 10px;"/>

Program Personnel

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			
<input type="checkbox"/> CE- <input type="checkbox"/> SPE- <input type="checkbox"/> PR- <input type="checkbox"/> SU			

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			
<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			
<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			

FORM D

Matrix Aligning Courses with PRINCIPALS' Competencies

Courses and/or Experiences Competencies																		
A. Instructional Leadership																		
A1: Demonstrating the ability to understand and apply school-wide literacy and numeracy systems;																		
A2: Demonstrating the ability to understand and apply district wide literacy and numeracy systems.																		
B. Monitor Student Learning																		
B1: Demonstrating the ability to create a culture that fosters a community of learners;																		
B2: Demonstrating an understanding of student guidance systems and auxiliary services;																		
B3: Demonstrating the ability to implement a positive and effective student management system;																		
B4: Demonstrating the ability to develop and implement effective student discipline plans;																		
B5: Demonstrating the ability to develop a master instructional schedule;																		
B6: Demonstrating the ability to meet the enrichment, remediation, and special education needs of all students;																		

Courses and/or Experiences Competencies																	
B7: Demonstrating the ability to understand and support a comprehensive program of student activities.																	
C. K-12 Leadership																	
C1: Demonstrating understanding of the articulation and alignment of curriculum from pre-school through grade 12;																	
C2: Demonstrating understanding of different organizational systems and structures at pre-K, elementary, middle or junior high, and high school levels.																	
C3: Demonstrating the ability to work with children of all ages;																	
C4: Demonstrating the ability to work with parents, teachers and other staff in all levels of schooling;																	
C5: Demonstrating understanding of the characteristics of effective transitions from one level of schooling to the next;																	
C6: Demonstrating understanding of the developmental needs of children of all ages.																	

**FORM D:
Matrix Aligning Courses with DIRECTORS 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 D
Matrix Aligning Courses with DIRECTORS OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION Competencies

Courses and/or Experiences Competencies												
A. Community Education Concepts												
A1 Understand and describe the history and philosophy of community education;												
A2 Demonstrate a knowledge and application of the principles of community education;												
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.												

Courses and/or Experiences Competencies												
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.												

Form E

Program Assessment Protocols

Check Applicable Programs:

- Superintendent
- K-12 Principal
- Director of Special Education
- Director of Community Education Name of Institution:

Please describe assessment processes for licensure candidates.

Please describe assessment processes for determining program efficacy.

Form F

Summary Report of Program Review

Date:

Institution:

Licensure programs reviewed:

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

Chairperson

Position Representing

Team member

Position Representing

Team member

Position Representing

Team member

Position Representing

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

Standard	Standard Not Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
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 the staffing plan.			
There is a process in place 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.			

Comments:

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

Standard	Standard Not Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
The decision making processes supports the engagement of 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?			
There is alignment between the organizational mission and strategic plan, and the organizational and program flow charts?			

Comments:

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

Standard	Standard Not Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
Are the institutions' interpretations of each licensure role current and show an awareness of future trends?			
Do the roles described focus on maximizing children's learning?			
Is the institutions' conceptual and philosophical basis for its program published and planfully integrated into instruction?			

Comments:

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

Standard	Standard Not Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
Completion of Form D showing all competencies in MR3512 are included.			
There is evidence that there is rational for and evidence that additional institutional requirements are assessed.			

Comments:

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;*

Standard	Standard Not Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
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.			

Comments:

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

Standard	Standard Not Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
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.			

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

Standard	Standard Not Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
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.			

Comments:*Standard 2F3. Situational observation component*

Standard	Standard Not Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
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 role in the exit evaluation.			

Comments:

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

Standard	Standard Not Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
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 an internal process for evaluation of course content, instruction, and evaluation.			

Comments:

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*

Standard	Standard Not Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
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.			

Comments:

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.*

Standard	Standard Not Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
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.			

Comments:

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

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

Comments:

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

Standard	Standard Not Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
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.			

Comments:

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

Standard	Standard Not Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
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 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.			

Comments:

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



Requirements for Continuous Review of University Licensure Preparation Programs

Year of initial approval _____
 Superintendent _____
 K-12 Principal _____
 Director of Special Education _____
 Director of Community Education _____
 # of years since previous audit _____

Standard	What is the intent of this standard?	Required evidence	How does the specific University do this?	Quality indicators	Auditors' Column Suggestions, conclusions and comments
2A. a statement which verifies the institutional commitment to the licensure program	◇ To demonstrate a long term commitment ◇ To show the institution's historical and projected resources commitment	Complete forms A–D with appropriate signatures or indicate “No Change”	Provide support and funding. Identify appropriate staffing and a staffing plan. Provide continuity of the plan.	Plan for legacy learners Provisions for adequate record keeping What is your staffing pattern since the last review? Support/funding, Staff appropriate & staffing plan, Continuity plan	___ Standard met ___ Standard not met Comments: ___ Clarification needed Comments:
2B. a description of the organizational structure of the institution and procedures for implementing the licensure program;	<i>Protection of the rights of the students.</i> Quality control is assured through the governance and administrative structure of the organization. Is this a campus based program only or does it include satellites?	A clear description of governance and decision making for implementing the licensure program The university would furnish evidence of provisions for adequate record keeping and protection of legacy learners – description of organizational structure	An organizational chart clarifies decision making. A program flow chart may define procedures for implementation. Job descriptions are provided. Documentation of accreditation are provided & include documentation of administration processes. Processes for course approval & review. Safe guarding of confidentiality (FERPA) Provide a narrative that clarifies how decisions are made and how faculty is involved. FAC Quality Assurance.	Narrative that clarifies how decisions are made, how faculty is involved. Organizational chart, program flow chart.	___ Standard met ___ Standard not met Comments: ___ Clarification needed Comments:

Standard	What is the intent of this standard?	Required evidence	How does the specific University do this?	Quality indicators	Auditors' Column Suggestions, conclusions and comments
2C. a description of the role for which persons who enroll in the licensure program are being prepared	Define which licenses the institution is authorized to prepare learners.	Statement of which licenses you are applying for. (Form A) to have multiple checkboxes)	Narrative job descriptions and like narrative descriptions of the roles. QA: Narrative description informed by professional organizations and practitioners.	Describe institutional interpretations of the role for the individual license area in addition to the state rule	<input type="checkbox"/> Standard met <input type="checkbox"/> Standard not met Comments: <input type="checkbox"/> Clarification needed Comments:
2D. an enumeration of the specific knowledge, skills, and understandings to be achieved by persons completing the licensure program;	Statement of the competencies There is a set of knowledge, skills and abilities in rule that must be measurable.	Statement of the competencies in MR3512 What is the rule?		NA	<input type="checkbox"/> Standard met <input type="checkbox"/> Standard not met Comments: <input type="checkbox"/> Clarification needed Comments:
2E. a description of the licensure program which relates individual program components to the knowledge, skills, and understandings to be achieved by persons completing the licensure program;	To demonstrate how the university delivers the competencies in relation to the university's program components	How do we deliver the rule? Parallel evidence provided to other accrediting bodies, Form D Description of the program components	Identify where opportunities exist within programs to demonstrate the mastery of competencies.	What and where do opportunities exist within the program to master competencies?	<input type="checkbox"/> Standard met <input type="checkbox"/> Standard not met Comments: <input type="checkbox"/> Clarification needed Comments:
2F1. a description of the field-based experience	To ensure that the field based experience meets the rule 0200 subp3B, 0400 subp1, 0700, There must be a quality field work aligned with the competencies.	Describe the field experience (3512.0400 subp1)	Document the relationship of Practicing Administrators to field work. The Field Experience is designed to meet the learner's needs of non-mastered competencies.	Variety of field based exposures and practice sets Field work is designed to address unmet competencies.	<input type="checkbox"/> Standard met <input type="checkbox"/> Standard not met Comments: <input type="checkbox"/> Clarification needed Comments:

Standard	What is the intent of this standard?	Required evidence	How does the specific University do this?	Quality indicators	Auditors' Column Suggestions, conclusions and comments
2F2. assessment of prior preparation and experience	Determine what the learner brings to the program to result in a plan of study (0300 subp2)	Describe the assessment of prior experience (3512.0400 subp2)	Examples of prior assessments. Access to those who do prior assessments.	Examples of prior assessments Alignment of prior assessment and plan of study (Random pull of files of completed students for last two years) Put into the packet a letter addressing confidentiality requirements for the monitoring team.	____ Standard met ____ Standard not met Comments: ____ Clarification needed Comments:
2F3. situational observation component	To provide an opportunity to practice competencies in action	Describe situational observation(s) (3512.0400 subp3)	Visit structure. Provide site advisor requirements and training. Provide narrative description of authentic student experiences.	Structure of visits Narrative description of assessments of authentic student experiences including field experience. Who are the evaluators 3512.0400 Subp. 3?	____ Standard met ____ Standard not met Comments: ____ Clarification needed Comments:
2G. a 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.	What is the internal evaluation process of the program? Quality programs must include ongoing student assessment, trainer assessment and program assessment This item is about the candidate. What assurances do we have that all candidates completing a program at different locations are meeting the same standards?	Internal process for systematic evaluation of meeting requirements for each student (How do ensure that all your students meet all of the standards?) Internal process of evaluation of course content and instruction		<i>Potential indicators:</i> Advisory committees – evidence of input Faculty examination of courses University Assessment Committee – program outcomes assessed, University structure desired Faculty advisories Student advisories Alum advisories Exit advisory Course evaluations Faculty with new and current faculty Site administrator feedback (field experience mentors) (value of program with the students they supervise) University governance Student advisories	____ Standard met ____ Standard not met Comments: ____ Clarification needed Comments:

Standard	What is the intent of this standard?	Required evidence	How does the specific University do this?	Quality indicators	Auditors' Column Suggestions, conclusions and comments
				Faculty advisories Practitioners Accreditation – parallel evidence	
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;	Ensure that the university has an evaluation plan that demonstrates how learners meet the licensure requirements Are you doing what you say you are doing? This item is about the student.	The plan.		Assessments throughout and the summative assessment Forms, checklists, rubrics, portfolios, narratives, describe exit assessment process situational observations, etc.	____ Standard met ____ Standard not met Comments: ____ Clarification needed Comments:
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;	The voices of the constituents are incorporated to inform the design, application and evaluation of programs. The program does not operate in isolation.	Written evidence and description		Minutes Directories Evaluations Feedback notes Curriculum development Blogs Attendance at professional meetings Examples could include: Professional meetings such as national, state, local and institutional Professional development of faculty.	____ Standard met ____ Standard not met Comments: ____ Clarification needed Comments:
2J. a description of the procedures to establish and maintain an internal process for systematic evaluation of the licensure program.	To ensure that there is an ongoing process for evaluating program viability Assessment of the program	Internal process of program evaluation for viability Proof of efficacy, quality and viability		Some examples might be: Calendar of continuous review, Satisfaction surveys Collaborative review of syllabi Advisory groups Data on grads	____ Standard met ____ Standard not met Comments: ____ Clarification needed Comments:

Standard	What is the intent of this standard?	Required evidence	How does the specific University do this?	Quality indicators	Auditors' Column Suggestions, conclusions and comments
<p>3. Evidence required in program description. Each pgm description forwarded to the commissioner by an institution for each licensure program for which approval is requested shall include evidence that:</p>					<p>___ Standard met ___ Standard not met Comments:</p> <p>___ Clarification needed Comments:</p>
<p>3A. Rules of the Department of Education governing the licensure program are met</p>	<p>See all the above completes this item</p>	<p>Create a form Checklist</p> <p>Note: if the rule is not changing it needs to be re-defined "ie" Commissioner is now BOSA.</p>			<p>___ Standard met ___ Standard not met Comments:</p> <p>___ Clarification needed Comments:</p>
<p>3B. necessary faculty and physical resources are allocated to implement and maintain the licensure program; and</p>	<p>Assurance of adequate resources necessary to operate and maintain the program including off-site groups of learners</p>	<p>Who is your faculty, are there adequate resources, vita, Form E</p>		<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Position description • Resources budgeted & allocated • Personnel qualifications • How adjunct faculty are coordinated; in-servicing: • Technology – access, support, response rates to surveys, staff, library, academic records, advisors, access to faculty, technology support. 	<p>___ Standard met ___ Standard not met Comments:</p> <p>___ Clarification needed Comments:</p>

Standard	What is the intent of this standard?	Required evidence	How does the specific University do this?	Quality indicators	Auditors' Column Suggestions, conclusions and comments
3C. adequate supervision for practicum experiences required by individual licensure rules is provided.	There is adequate supervision of the field experience	Internal form or other evidence (see 3512.0400) subp. 1 & 3512.0200 subp. 3b) Description of how practicum experiences are supervised		Licensed site supervisor and a University supervisor. Some examples of feedback may be: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• School visits• Qualifying letters• Correspondence• Verification of field experience• Evidence of individual plan, goals set and met	____ Standard met ____ Standard not met Comments: ____ Clarification needed Comments: