



Approval Process for Administrative Licensure Handbook

Principal K-12

Superintendent

Director of Special Education

Community Education Director

Table of Contents

Introduction to BOSA	Page 3
Licensure Rules and Program Approval	Page 4
Overview of the Program Approval Process	Page 5
Review Team	Page 5
Executive Director Responsibilities	Page 6
Review Team Responsibilities	Page 7
On-Site Review	Page 7
Report to the Board	Page 8
Reporting Process	Page 8
Budgeting for the Review	Page 9
Conflict of Interest and Ethical Guidelines	Page 10
On-Site Schedule Template	Page 11
Guidelines for Program Approval	Page 13
Timeline for Continuous Review Process	Page 13
Program Approval Components	Page 14
Essential Program Review Documents	Page 14
Form A	Page 16
Form B	Page 17
Form C	Page 20
Form D	Page 23
Form E	Page 59

Introduction to BOSA

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 (BOSA). Minnesota Statute 122A.12, subdivision 1 established BOSA 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
- One Member of the Public
- One 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 in 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 identified by competencies.

Minnesota Statutes 2001, 122A.14 authorizes BOSA 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.

BOSA 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.

Overview of the Program Approval Process

Administrative Licensure Program Approval is the process through which a team of reviewers is appointed by the Executive Director to conduct 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 the Review Team examines the written program report and visits the institution to examine the licensure program for the purpose of verifying the program description and making a recommendation to BOSA.

The program approval process focuses on determining 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.

Review Team

The Review Team is generally composed of 6-12 members, depending on the number of licensure programs, and must include at least one practicing, licensed administrator from each licensure field being reviewed. The Review Team also includes one member from an approved higher education program, one member of the Board, one member from a local school board, BOSA Licensing Specialist and the Executive Director.

Executive Director Responsibilities

The Executive Director serves as chairperson of the Review Team and performs the following responsibilities:

1. Establishes team membership
2. Assists the institution with suggestions on compliance and upon request from the institution, may conduct a preliminary review of the application.
3. Works with the program's administrator/coordinator to make initial arrangements for the review and on-site visit.
4. Provides orientation and training to team members, shares team objectives and the roles and responsibilities of team members.
5. Gathers and distributes the written application submitted by the institution to the members of the Review Team.
6. Coordinates an on-site visit to the institution to verify the accuracy and completeness of the written application prepared by the institution.
7. Provides technical and administrative support to the team.
8. Presides during team meetings and facilitates team discussions regarding standards to reach consensus.
9. Acts as mediator, if necessary, to resolve differences of opinion through discussion, the gathering of further information, or arrangement of additional interviews.
10. Presides during the final reporting session.
11. Completes the final written report.
12. Secures completed expense reports and critiques of the team visit procedures from team members at the close of the visit.
13. Ensures that the Review Team submits a report of their findings and makes a recommendation indicating whether standards are met or not met to the Professional Development and Program Review Committee of the BOSA.
The Report also includes areas of strength, areas of concern, suggestions, and recommendations for improvement.

Review Team Responsibilities

The Team's role is a combination of auditing and verifying findings of the institutional report, and observing actual compliance through interviews of students, alumni, staff, faculty, administrators and the Advisory Councils/Group Field Partner. During the Review Team visit, team members review written information and interview persons who have relevant information and experiences with the licensure program. Team members meet to study findings to reach a consensus concerning the team's findings and recommendations.

On-Site Review

Program approval on-site visits run for approximately 2 days. The review generally includes a reception hosted by the program at the end of the first full day. At the end of the visit, the Review Team reviews its findings with the institution and shares with the institution a sense of what will be submitted to the BOSA.

The program is required to provide an on-campus workroom for the Review Team's exclusive use during the on-site visit and provide IT support. The team workroom, including all the materials the program selects to provide to support program compliance, should be in proximity of the campus or program administrative office.

Examples of documents that might be kept in the workroom include 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 (one hard copy and electronically). Additional information on arrangements for on-site visits will be provided during a pre-visit meeting between the Executive Director and the licensure Program Coordinator.

Report to the Board

The Team's recommendation on approval/disapproval, along with a written report of the findings, and any additional information presented by the institution is prepared by the executive director who forwards the report to the Professional Development and Program Review Committee of the BOSA for Board action.

Reporting Process

At the conclusion of the visit, the Review Team will present an oral summary of the team's findings to the Program Coordinator and their team. The Executive Director also provides next steps of the reporting process.

Within 30 days after the on-site visit, (a) the Executive Director 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 Executive Director's discretion, corrections identified will be incorporated into the final report.

Within 30 days of receipt of the final report, the Program Coordinator shall acknowledge receipt of the report and can rejoin it. The rejoinder must be received by the Executive Director of the BOSA 30 days after the receipt of the report. BOSA will determine approval status of the program at the next meeting after receipt of the institutional rejoinder.

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 timelines for meeting the stated conditions; or
- D. Disapprove the licensure program, state the reasons for disapproval and 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). If the Review Team arrives the night before the Site Review, the University is responsible for the cost of the meal.

Lodging and food expenses should be calculated not to exceed two full days/nights. Calculating mileage will be limited to state reimbursement amounts paid to state employees. *To the greatest extent possible, the hotel should direct the bill to the college for lodging eliminating the need for Review Team members to use their credit cards for their rooms.* Costs associated with the chairperson's participation in a pre-visit are the responsibility of the program. Costs associated with an accompanying Review Team member's significant other/spouse will be borne by the Review Team member.

Hotel accommodations must allow each member of the team to have a separate room. When possible, the program should select a hotel near the university and/or a dining facility. In addition to meals, the program is to provide refreshments in the campus workroom.

If hotel accommodations are not within walking distance of the campus workroom, the university may be required to provide transportation of the team members from the hotel to the campus workroom. Details of the transportation plan will be determined prior to the visit.

Conflict of Interest and Ethical Guidelines

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.

Maintaining the highest standards of objectivity and credibility of the program approval process is paramount to BOSA. In accordance with board standards, Team members should avoid serving as a reviewer of programs if they:

- Were a former faculty member from the college being reviewed
- Served as a consultant for the college being reviewed
- Served as member of the college's advisory committee
- Was a student in the licensure program being reviewed
- Have/had a son/daughter who is/has attended a licensure program being reviewed

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.

On-Site Schedule Template

DAY 1

8:00 AM - 9:00 AM	Breakfast (Generally, to be held on campus. May even be catered into the meeting room)
9:00 AM - 10:00 AM	Meeting with College Dean and Program Director
10:00 AM - 12:00 PM	Prearranged interviews (determined between chair and coordinator) At a minimum, the scheduled interviews must include: • Advisory Board Members • Internship Supervisors • Alumni from each of the licensure programs being reviewed • Current students from each licensure program being reviewed • Representatives from K-12 partnerships who have hired graduates
12:00 PM -1:00 PM	Working lunch for Review Team
1:00 PM - 3:00 PM	Continued interviews as determined between Chair and Program Director
3:00 PM - 3:30 PM	Break
3:30 PM - 5:30 PM	Worktime
5:30 PM - 7:30 PM	Dinner

DAY 2

8:00 AM - 9:00 AM	Working breakfast for Review Team
9:00 AM - 10:00 AM	Meeting with program faculty
10:00 AM - 12:00 PM	Worktime
12:00 PM - 1:00 PM	Working lunch for Review Team
1:00 PM - 2:00 PM	Exit conference
	Chairperson meets with the college leadership and program faculty to present summary of team's findings and to describe the next steps of the review process

Guidelines for Program Approval

BOSA 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.

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 BOSA. The report must state the content of each Program Requirement and clearly describe how the program is complying. 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.

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

University Programs are reviewed every five years for accreditation. View BOSA's [Schedule for Continuous Program Review](#).

Program Approval Components

Each program shall forward to the Executive Director of BOSA a program description for each licensure program for which approval is requested.

The licensure program description shall include a *written report* addressing Minnesota Rule 3512.2500, subp. 2, A-K and Minnesota Rule 3512.2500, subp. 3, A - C . The report should provide the reviewers with enough information to support that the program follows the requirements and competencies. References should be made to specific documents that support the claims made in the report.

It is suggested that the university provide a brief historical, geographical, and contextual review of the college/department/program. 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.

Essential Program Review Documents

1. Form A: Institutional Authorization. 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.
2. Form B: Program Personnel and Partners. Submit Faculty vitae of those 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. Also include background of program partners.
3. 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.

4. Form D: Competencies/Course & Experience Matrix. Submit how the competencies are met through courses.
5. Form E: Standards. Submit how the university has met the standards within the past five years.

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: _____

We 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

Signature Chief Academic Officer

Signature Date

Name and Title School or College Dean or Head

Signature School or College Dean or Head

Signature Date

Name and Title Program Director

Signature Program Director

Signature Date

Form B

Program Personnel and Partners

Check Applicable Programs

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

Name and position of person with responsibility for providing instructional leadership for the program:

Program Personnel

Program	Name	Position or Role (Example – Coordinator, Professor)	FT = Full Time PT = Part Time Ad = Adjunct
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K – 12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K – 12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K – 12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K – 12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			

☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K – 12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K – 12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K – 12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K – 12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			

Program Collaborative Field Partners

(Advisory Board Members, Professional Associations, etc.)

Program	Name	Position or Role (Example – Coordinator, Professor)	FT = Full Time PT = Part Time Ad = Adjunct
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K – 12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K – 12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K – 12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			

☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K – 12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K – 12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K – 12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K – 12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K – 12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K – 12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K – 12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K – 12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			

Form C

Program Sequence

Check Applicable Programs:

☐ **Director of Community Education**

☐ **Director of Special Education**

☐ **K-12 Principal**

☐ **Superintendent**

Please list all required courses first followed by numbers and descriptions of field experiences, internships, and formal assessments. Add rows as necessary.

Courses other than Field Experiences

Program	Course Number and Title	Credits	Course Description
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K-12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K-12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K-12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K-12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K-12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			

Program	Course Number and Title	Credits	Course Description
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K-12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K-12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K-12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K-12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K-12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K-12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K-12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K-12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			

Field Experience and Assessment Courses

Program	Course Number and Title	Credits	Course Description
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K-12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K-12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K-12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K-12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K-12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K-12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K-12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K-12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K-12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			
☐ Director of Community Education ☐ Director of Special Education ☐ K-12 Principal ☐ Superintendent			



Form D

Matrices Aligning

Courses with Competencies

Core Leadership Competencies

STANDARD A

[illegible]

[illegible]

STANDARD B

[illegible]

STANDARD C

Courses and/or Experiences

Equity and Culturally Responsive Leadership

C1: Ensure that each student is treated fairly, respectfully, and with an understanding of each student's culture and context.

C2: Recognize, respect, and employ each student's strengths, diversity, and culture as assets for teaching and learning.

C3: Ensure that each student has equitable access to effective teachers, learning opportunities, academic and social support, and other resources necessary for success.

[illegible]

STANDARD D

Courses and/or Experiences

Policy and Law

D1: Understand and implement policy to meet local, state and federal requirements and constitutional provisions, standards and regulatory applications so as to promote student success

D2: Recognize and apply standards of care involving civil and criminal liability for negligence, harassment and intentional torts

D3: Demonstrate an understanding of state, federal and case law and rules and regulations governing general education, special education and community education

[illegible]

STANDARD E

Courses and/or Experiences

Political Influence and Governance

E1: Exhibit an understanding of school districts as political systems, including governance models

E2: Demonstrate an understanding of involving stakeholders in the development of educational policy

E3: Understand the role and coordination of social agencies and human services to develop productive relationships and engage resources for the school community

E4: Demonstrate an understanding of processes to align constituencies in support of school and district priorities

STANDARD F

Courses and/or Experiences

Communication

F1: Understand the need to develop shared understanding of and commitment to mission, vision, and core values within the school and the community

F2: Demonstrate individual and team facilitation skills

F3: Recognize and apply an understanding of individual and group behavior in all situations

F4: Demonstrate an understanding of conflict resolution and problem-solving strategies relative to communication

[illegible]

STANDARD G

Courses and/or Experiences

Community Relations

G1: Articulate organizational purpose and advocate publicly for the needs and priorities of students, families, and the community.

G2: Demonstrate the ability to engage the extended community.

G3: Effectively generate and respond to various forms of communication through media

G4: Promote a positive image of schools and the school district

[illegible]

[illegible]

STANDARD H

Courses and/or Experiences

**Curriculum Instruction
and Assessment for the
Success of all Learners**

H1: Implement state academic standards, a coherent system of culturally responsive curriculum, instruction, and assessment that promotes the mission, vision, and core values of the district to embody high expectations for student learning

H2: Develop, assess, and support teachers' and staff members' professional knowledge, skills, and practice through differentiated opportunities and emerging trends for learning and growth, guided by understanding professional and adult learning and development

H3: Apply research and best practices on integrating curriculum, technology, and relevant resources to help all learners achieve at high levels

[illegible]

[illegible]

STANDARD I

Courses and/or Experiences

Human Resource Management

I1: Demonstrate knowledge of effective personnel recruitment, selection and retention

I2: Demonstrate an understanding of staff development to improve the performance of all staff members

I3: Demonstrate the ability to select and apply appropriate models for supervision and evaluation

I4: Describe and demonstrate the ability to apply the legal requirements for personnel selection, development, retention, and dismissal

[illegible]

STANDARD J

[illegible]

STANDARD K

Courses and/or Experiences

Values and Ethics of Leadership

K1: Identify the elements of a problem situation by analyzing relevant information, framing issues, identifying possible causes and reframing possible solutions

K2: Demonstrate adaptability and conceptual flexibility

K3: Reach logical conclusions by making quality, timely decisions based on available information

K4: Identify and give priority to significant issues

K5: Demonstrate an understanding of and utilize appropriate technology in problem analysis

K6: Demonstrate an understanding of different leadership and decision-making strategies, including but not limited to collaborative models and model appropriately their implementation

STANDARD L

Courses and/or Experiences

Safety and Security

L1: Demonstrate the ability to develop and implement policies and procedures for safe and secure educational environments

L2: Demonstrate the means to address emergency and crisis situations

[illegible]

STANDARD M

Courses and/or Experiences

Safety and Security

M1: Demonstrating the ability to develop and implement policies and procedures for safe and secure educational environments.

M2: Demonstrating the ability to formulate safety and security plans to implement security procedures including an articulated emergency chain of command, safety procedures required by law, law enforcement assistance, communication with the public, and evacuation procedures

M3: Demonstrating the ability to identify areas of vulnerability associated with school buses, buildings and grounds and formulate a plan to take corrective action;

M4: Demonstrating understanding of procedural predictabilities and plan variations where possible.

[illegible]

Superintendent Competencies

[illegible]

Superintendent Competencies Continued

Political Influence and Governance

[illegible]

Superintendent Competencies Continued

[illegible]

Superintendent Competencies Continued

[illegible]

Superintendent Competencies Continued

Judgement and Problem Analysis

[illegible]

K-12 Principal Competencies

[illegible]

K-12 Principal Competencies Continued

[illegible]

K-12 Principal Competencies Continued

[illegible]

Director of Special Education Competencies

[illegible]

Director of Special Education Competencies Continued

[illegible]

Director of Special Education Competencies Continued

Resource and Fiscal Management

[illegible]

Director of Community Education Competencies

[illegible]

Director of Community Education Competencies Continued

[illegible]

Community Capital Continued	
-----------------------------	--

[illegible]



Form E

University: _____

Date: _____

Administrative License(s):

- | | |
|--|---|
| ☐ Community Education Director | ☐ Special Education Director |
| ☐ Director of Special Education | ☐ Superintendent |

STANDARD A

The university verified the institution's commitment to the licensure program

Required Standard	Met ☐	Not Met ☐
A1. Description of the institution's commitment to the licensure program. The program may use budget spreadsheets, charts, graphics, and letters from administrators and supporters to indicate its commitment to the program.		
A2. Description of how the university, department, and/or program budget aligns with the program mission, vision, and values to prepare students to meet all requirements outlined in MN Rule 3512.		
A3. Description of university and department human resources that ensure the success of the licensure program(s). This may include but is not limited to full-time and part-time faculty, administration, and staff.		
A4. Description of the physical and online resources dedicated to the program's success.		

STANDARD B

The university described the institution's organizational structure.

Required Standard	Met ☐	Not Met ☐
B1. A description of the changes made in this area since the last five-year review.		
B2. Brief descriptions or titles for individuals listed in the organizational chart (e.g., program chair, department chair, dean, vice presidents, provosts, chief financial officer, or president).		
B3. Agenda and minutes from departmental meetings, Advisory Board meetings, faculty meetings, and decision-making stakeholders.		

STANDARD C

The university described the process of aligning strategic planning, assessment, and decision-making for implementing or sustaining the licensure program.

Required Standard	Met ☐	Not Met ☐
C1. A description of the changes made in this area since the last five-year review.		
C2. A copy of the strategic plan for the university and how the administrative preparation program aligns with the university's and department's mission, vision, and values.		
C3. A description of how the licensure program or/or department conducts strategic planning. Includes key steps and participants.		

C4. A description of the process used to conduct short-term and long-term departmental planning, including how the strategic planning process addresses the department in a post-pandemic world, prioritization of change initiatives, and organizational adaptability.	
C5. A description of the processes used to make a program change, improvement, strategic planning, etc.	
C6. A description of the decision-making tools used by the licensure program and/or department (e.g., quality tools such as Affinity Diagram, Force Choice, Plus/Delta).	

C7. A description of departmental metrics and key performance measures or indicators used to track the achievement and effectiveness of the strategic plan, program objectives, and/or action plans.	
C8. A description of the departmental assessment and evaluation processes. Program may include Gantt Charts, Timetable, End-of-Course evaluations/student surveys, and action plans.	
C9. A description of the university's efforts to ensure the program meets all regulatory requirements (e.g., program outcome assessment, Higher Learning Council, BOSA, MN Rule 3512).	
C10. A description of the contingency plan in the event the licensure program is discontinued.	

STANDARD D

The university described the anticipated role for persons who enroll in the licensure program.

Required Standard	Met ☐	Not Met ☐
D1. A description of the changes made in this area since the last five-year review.		
D2. A description of how the department delineates each licensure program and how the licensure program prepares candidates for effective educational leadership as a school administrator. The program may use the university website and BOSA Consumer Guide as examples.		
D3. A description of how the department prepares candidates for current and future trends in educational leadership.		

D4. A copy of the department's self-assessment and continual reflection processes for candidates.	
D5. A description of the department's induction and preparation sessions, specifically regarding leadership dispositions	
D6. A description of how the department addresses equity, inclusion, and diversity in their application and enrollment process, preparation, and assessment.	

STANDARD E

The university listed and described how the licensure program relates individual program components to the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that persons completing the licensure program must achieve.

Required Standard	Met ☐	Not Met ☐
E1. A description of the changes made in this area since the last five-year review.		
E2. Examples of course assignments that are application-focused and relevant to the licensure program and educational leadership.		
E3. Evaluation, assessment, and reflection practices are used to determine whether students understand and/or demonstrate the competencies outlined in Minnesota Rule 3512. The program may use Form D, exit evaluation processes, course objectives, and syllabi as examples.		

E4. If in the licensed program there are requirements beyond those listed in MR3512, include some examples of how they are assessed.	
--	--

STANDARD F

The university described the field-based experience, the assessment of prior experience and preparation, and the situational observation component.

Required Standard	Met ☐	Not Met ☐
F1. A description of the changes made in this area since the last five-year review.		
F2. A description of how the program assesses candidates' prior experience and preparation.		
F3. A description of a midpoint assessment for candidates.		

F4. An explanation of what happens when a candidate becomes ineligible or unable to move forward in the licensure program.	
F5. Any additional university requirements beyond Rule 3512 that candidates must meet prior to beginning the required field experience and/or situational observation component of the licensure program.	
F6. A description of the field experience that includes: • Licensure program resources available to support licensure candidates during the field experience. • Site supervisor roles and responsibilities for field experience. • University supervisor roles and responsibilities for candidate's field experience. • How the program ensures internships include relevant leadership experiences. • A record of assessors and roles in the exit evaluation Program may include the Field Experience Handbook and electronic sample portfolios as evidence.	

STANDARD G

The university described the systematic procedure for evaluating the licensure program to ensure that all persons recommended for licensure meet all licensure requirements.

Required Standard	Met ☐	Not Met ☐
G1. A description of the changes made in this area since the last five-year review.		
G2. A description of processes for how licensure program courses, content, instruction, and assessment are evaluated to ensure they meet all licensure requirements outlined in Minnesota Rule 3512.		
G3. Explain how your program utilizes individual assessment to ensure students meet requirements via student reflection, university supervisor, and site supervisor evaluations.		

STANDARD H

The university specifically identified the plans for assessing the performance of each person who successfully completed the licensure program.

Required Standard	Met ☐	Not Met ☐
H1. A description of the changes made in this area since the last five-year review.		
H2. A description of the process used by the department to determine if candidates have met the standards required for licensure in Minnesota Rule 3512. The program may include self-evaluation, mentor evaluation, portfolios, panel reviews, and student profile reviews as evidence.		
H3. A description of the evaluation tools used by the department (e.g., rubric, interview, portfolio, etc.) demonstrating the candidate has met the competencies under part 3512.0510.		

STANDARD I

The university listed the college departments involved with the licensure program, licensed practicing education personnel, school administrators, and interested citizens who participated in developing the licensure program

Required Standard	Met ☐	Not Met ☐
I1. A description of the changes made in this area since the last five-year review.		
I2. A description of the purpose and membership of the administrator licensing advisory committee(s).		
I3. Specific examples of how committee input is garnered, utilized and implemented as part of the licensure program continuous improvement and continuous improvement process. The program may use bylaws, membership, attendance records, procedures, agendas and minutes, and the appointing process as evidence.		

STANDARD J

The university described the procedures to establish and maintain an internal process to systematically evaluate the licensure program.

Required Standard	Met ☐	Not Met ☐
J1. A description of the changes made in this area since the last five-year review.		
J2. A description of the departmental process of evaluation and continuous improvement of the licensure program. A description of how the systemic evaluation processes address the current and future needs of school administrators in Minnesota. The program may use minutes from faculty meetings, external accreditations, departmental evaluations, course assessments, final projects, candidate exit surveys, course assessments, and employer and graduate surveys as evidence.		

J3. An internal plan to address barriers that keep students of color and marginalized populations from entering and successfully completing an administrator licensure program.	
--	--

STANDARD K

The university included program review data mandated by the legislature and the board and described how that data is utilized.

Met ☐

Not Met ☐

NARRATIVE

QUOTES

AREAS OF STRENGTH

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

CONDITIONS TO MEET PRIOR TO APPROVAL



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

Name	Title	Signature	Date

Name	Title	Signature	Date

Name	Title	Signature	Date

Name	Title	Signature	Date

Name	Title	Signature	Date

Name	Title	Signature	Date

Name	Title	Signature	Date

Name	Title	Signature	Date

Name	Title	Signature	Date