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# Introduction

The Board of Teaching grants licensure to applicants who have completed approved teacher preparation programs. Before Minnesota teacher preparation programs can be approved, the organizations and institutions themselves must be approved as providers. While “institutional approval” is sought by accredited institutions of higher education, similarly, “organizational approval” must be sought by non-profit organizations, or institutions of higher education that are not regionally accredited. Minnesota Statutes 2011, section 122A.245 (See Appendix ---) established baseline criteria for use in the creation and approval of alternative teacher preparation programs (See Appendix ---).

##### The following entities are eligible to participate under MN Statute 122A.245:

#### “(1) a school district or charter school that forms a partnership with a college or

#### university that has a board-approved alternative teacher preparation program; or

#### (2) a school district or charter school, after consulting with a college or university

#### with a board-approved teacher preparation program, forms a partnership with a nonprofit

#### corporation organized under chapter 317A for an education-related purpose that has a

#### board-approved teacher preparation program.”

##### **A nonprofit organization in partnership with a MN school district, or an institution of higher education that has not received accreditation** should begin by seeking organizational approval, beginning with Phase I of the process outlined in this document (page x).

##### **Accredited institutions of higher education that have previously received institutional approval** to offer teacher preparation programs by the Minnesota Board of Teaching may begin the proposal process for an alternative teacher preparation program with the Request for Initial Program Approval (RIPA). Please contact Minnesota Board of Teaching staff regarding interest in completing this process and see page x of this document.

##### **Accredited institutions of higher education that have not received institutional approval** to offer teacher preparation programs should begin by completing the established Institutional Approval process. Please contact Board of Teaching staff for the appropriate guidelines. Upon receiving institutional approval to offer teacher preparation programs, a Request for Initial Program Approval (RIPA) may be submitted.

##### The standing institutional approval process that has been used for accredited Institutions of Higher Education to date, assumes that a regional accrediting agency has examined the institution and has made a determination that capacity and infrastructure to deliver quality teacher preparation is in place. The process introduced in Phase I of the proposal guidelines, allows the Board of Teaching to make a similar determination, assuring that candidates will receive appropriate preparation and services as proposed by the institution or organization.

##### After a full review of a completed proposal, MN Board of Teaching staff and an evaluation team will complete an onsite evaluation visit (Phase II of the application process) to verify the accuracy of the written proposal and provide an opportunity for clarification regarding any of the proposal components.

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Approval Process for MN Teacher Preparation Programs**

While “institutional approval” is sought by accredited institutions of higher education, similarly, “organizational approval” must be sought by non-profit organizations, or institutions of higher education that are not regionally accredited.

**Core Principles**

* Licensure standards must be met by all program types.
* Delivery method of licensure standards in negotiable.
* Approval processes & reporting requirements are consistent across program & institution types

##### 

# Phase I: Submission of Written Proposal

##### Approval for a non-accredited entity to offer teacher preparation programs begins with a written proposal prepared according to the guidelines that follow and submitted in electronic format. Applicants must also submit a total of eight (8) hard copies of the proposal to the Board of Teaching. There are nine sections of information that are addressed with subparts contained in each. Be sure to address any items that are specified within each category. Links to supporting documentation within your electronic report must be provided to allow reviewers the option to view supporting documentation seamlessly. You will find examples of supporting documentation in Appendix ---.

## Section A. Organizational Authorization

##### Throughout the organizational approval process and continuing into program approval, the MN Board of Teaching staff will need to contact your organization. Provide the following information in section A of your proposal.

##### Primary Contact for Application

##### Mailing Address

##### Email Address

##### Telephone Number

##### Verification of Non-profit Status under MN 317.A

##### Contact Information & Signature of Fiscal Authority

##### Contact Information & Signature of Organizational Leadership

### 

## Section B: Mission and Vision of Organization

##### Outline the mission and vision of your organization detailing information specific to activities in Minnesota. Provide a statement of need that includes a plan for addressing all three of the components as described in 122A.245.

##### 

#### 122A.245 Subdivision 1(a) To improve academic excellence, improve ethnic

#### and cultural diversity in the classroom, and close the academic achievement gap

## Section C: Overview of Program Goals & Objectives

##### Provide an overview of the program. The overview should contain a brief description of the

##### program, including goals of the program and the design to accomplish those goals.

##### The theoretical framework of your program and its defining attributes should be described in detail and must be supported by a description of the research base used to support program design. Address each component of 122A.245 Subd.2 (1-3).

##### Provide sufficient information to enable the evaluators to clearly understand who will be participating in the program and how they will progress through the program. Include services to be delivered, population or district(s) served, and projected number of candidates annually.

##### Discuss the process that will be used by all collaborating partners to improve the programs once implemented.

#### Subd. 2. **Characteristics.** An **alternative teacher preparation program under this**

#### **section must include:**

#### (1) a minimum 200-hour instructional phase that provides intensive preparation and

#### student teaching before the teacher candidate assumes classroom responsibilities;

#### (2) a research-based and results-oriented approach focused on best teaching practices

#### to increase student proficiency and growth measured against state academic standards;

#### explanation of research base. Include appropriate citations.

#### (3) strategies to combine pedagogy and best teaching practices to better inform

#### teacher candidates' classroom instruction;

## Section D: Partnership Agreements

##### Identify and describe school district partnerships and collaborations that are planned or are in place during development and implementation of the proposed program. Discuss collaborative agreements with school districts and/or charter schools providing candidates with the opportunity to be mentored/supervised by highly effective teachers within partner schools and districts. Describe any previous experience in the preparation of teachers including evidence of success and long-term commitment to teacher development. Supporting documentation for this section must include:

##### Copy of Memoranda of Understanding

##### A detailed outline of partner roles

##### Provide proof of consultation with IHE & outline arrangement for consultation going forward

## Section E: Organizational Capacity and Infrastructure

### Business Plan

##### Organizations seeking approval to provide teacher preparation programs in Minnesota must demonstrate financial capacity to offer teacher preparation programs. Submission and review of the following must take place as part of the approval process:

##### A detailed business plan including a copy of the program budget with narrative, revenue & expenses for first two years of operation. Evidence of the ability to meet financial obligations to students, repaying program liabilities, currency in debt payments, and proof of insurance coverage.

##### Detailed information regarding cost to individual program participants and procedures for handling of all fees.

##### Evidence of sustainable resources to provide teacher preparation culminating in MN teacher licensure, as described in all program documentation and publications.

##### Include an independent or state auditor’s report to be reviewed by a MN CPA authorized by the MN Board of Teaching. New organizations may submit a business plan and a letter of credit for at least 50% of the necessary funds to cover costs for the initial year of operation.

### 

### Governance Structure

##### Understanding the capacity of an organization to deliver teacher preparation programs also necessitates understanding of the human resources committed to program development, teacher candidate training, support for candidates and program improvement.

##### 

##### Provide the following information:

##### Membership of Board of Directors & other advisory bodies

##### A copy of the organizational chart & detail regarding staffing structure

##### Verification of qualifications for program leadership & instructors

##### Evidence of necessary infrastructure to provide accurate, timely and secure data

##### (For the purposes of admission, candidate monitoring, testing, background checks, license recommendation, etc.)

##### A copy of procedures and policies for ensuring the security of candidate records (FERPA)

##### A plan for program candidates in the event of program dissolution including a tuition refund policy

##### Ensuring that program participants are not only able to achieve the end goal of obtaining Minnesota licensure, but that they are also able to apply for licensure through credential review in other states, is important to retaining talent in the teaching profession. Provide a description of the documentation provided by the program, for the purposes of helping candidates document their academic and professional work toward licensure.

## Section F: Strategy for Recruitment, Admission & Retention

#### 122A.245 Subdivision 1(b) Before participating in this program, a candidate must:

#### (1) have a bachelor's degree with a 3.0 or higher grade point average unless the

#### board waives the grade point average requirement based on board-adopted criteria;

#### 

#### (2) pass the reading, writing, and mathematics skills examination under section

#### 122A.09, subdivision 4, paragraph (b); and

#### (3) obtain qualifying scores on applicable board-approved rigorous content area and pedagogy examinations under section 122A.09, subdivision 4, paragraph (e).

##### Describe the collaborative process that will be used for the provider and partner districts to work

##### together to recruit, screen and select individuals for the program. Explain how recruitment efforts will reach a diverse pool of candidates as well as how candidate dispositions will be evaluated.

##### Identify the screening tools and the criteria that will be used to place participants in

##### the program for each of the licensure areas. Detail the policies and processes used to ensure candidates meet the minimum requirements for program candidates outlined in 122A. 245 Subdivision 1(b). If credit for prior academic course work and/or experience will be granted to program participants, describe the process and policies in place for evaluating them.

##### Outline the advising plan for candidates, once admitted to the teacher preparation program along with a plan for placing candidates in Minnesota classrooms. Describe supports in place to retain candidates throughout the program.

## 

## 

## Section G: Teacher candidate monitoring, evaluation & support

##### The capacity to monitor candidate progress and support their learning is critical to the success of a program. Outline a plan for using key signature assessments to monitor candidate progress at identified decision points throughout the program timeline. Describe actions that are taken to counsel candidates out of the teacher training program when appropriate. Plans must evidence how data gleaned from signature assessments will be used for the purpose of program efficacy reporting.

#### Subd. 2. **Characteristics.** An alternative teacher preparation program under this

#### section must include:

#### (4) assessment, supervision, and evaluation of teacher candidates to determine

#### their specific needs throughout the program and to support their efforts to successfully

#### complete the program;

#### (5) intensive, ongoing, and multiyear professional learning opportunities that

#### accelerate teacher candidates' professional growth,

#### support student learning, and provide a workplace orientation, professional staff development, and mentoring and peer review focused on standards of professional practice and continuous professional growth;

#### (6) a requirement that teacher candidates demonstrate to the local site team under

#### subdivision 5 satisfactory progress toward acquiring a standard license from the Board of Teaching.

##### Plans must evidence multiyear professional learning opportunities to meet the needs of new teachers, including:

##### -mentorship focused on attainment of the Standards of Effective Practice (8710.2000)

##### - increasing impact on student growth

##### ***Teacher preparation programs including alternative teacher preparation programs***

##### ***under section 122A.245, among other programs, must include a content-specific,***

##### ***board-approved, performance-based assessment that measures teacher candidates in three areas: planning for instruction and assessment; engaging students and supporting learning; and assessing student learning.***

##### The Teacher Performance Assessment (T.P.A.) began implementation in Minnesota teacher preparation programs during the 2011-2012 Academic Year. Provide evidence that this performance-based assessment is integrated into the design of planned teacher preparation programs and that the program will require candidates to successfully complete this assessment. Program data from this assessment will be required for annual reporting to the Board of Teaching. Detailed information and resources for use in program planning can be found in Appendix XX.

## Section H: Local Site Team

#### Subd. 5. **Approval for standard license.** A school board or its designee must

#### appoint members to a local site team that includes teachers, school administrators,

#### and postsecondary faculty under subdivision 1, paragraph (a), clause (1), or staff of a

#### participating nonprofit corporation under subdivision 1, paragraph (a), clause (2), to

#### evaluate the performance of the teacher candidate. The evaluation must be consistent with

#### board-adopted performance measures, use the Minnesota state standards of effective

#### practice and subject matter content standards for teachers established in Minnesota Rules,

#### and include a report to the board recommending whether or not to issue the teacher

#### candidate a standard license.

##### Provide a description of the selection process for creating a local site team. Include detailed information regarding the composition of the local site team and the policies which they will use for evaluation and recommendation of candidates for Minnesota teaching licensure. The criteria upon which each recommendation will be based must be stated explicitly.

## 

## Section I: Acknowledgement of Reporting Requirements

##### As the provider of a teacher preparation program in Minnesota, reporting to the Minnesota Board of Teaching through the PERCA (Program Effectiveness Report for Continuing Approval) process is required yearly for the first three years of operation, and then every two years thereafter. Onsite evaluation visits will take place every 5-7 years, or on an as needed basis based on program data. As part of the reporting process, programs should be prepared to report program data in aggregate, demonstrating pass rates for the MTLE pedagogy and content exams (at the subtest level) as well as task specific aggregate scores for the Teacher Performance Assessment. See the Reporting Requirements Chart in Appendix XX.

##### As required by the U.S. Department of Education, programs should also be prepared to report information about candidates within their programs as well as program completion and testing data on a yearly basis.

##### Provide a brief narrative to discuss procedures, policies and data management practices in place to complete mandatory reporting requirements.

#### Subd. 9. Exchange of best practices. By July 31 in an even-numbered year, a program participant and the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities, the University of Minnesota, the Minnesota Private College Council, and the Department of Education must exchange information about best practices and educational innovations.

In a yet to be determined forum, the Minnesota Board of Teaching will gather approved providers of teacher preparation programs to share data, best practices and educational innovations. Representation and participation by program leaders at these scheduled conversations will be required.

# Phase II: On Site Evaluation Visit

##### Upon receipt & satisfactory review of a written proposal to offer alternative teacher preparation programs, the MN Board of Teaching staff will schedule a site visit to interview leadership and key staff members for all involved partners.

##### A team site visit is conducted to organizations for the following purposes:

##### To verify the accuracy and completeness of the submitted written proposal

##### To write a report of findings

##### To make a recommendation to the Board of Teaching regarding approval status of the organization to prepare persons for teacher licensure.

##### The team chair conducts a previsit to the organization, prior to the onsite visit by the full team. The previsit is usually no longer than 3-4 hours in length. The previsit should include leadership for the program including representatives of key partners.

##### Interviews and visits should be scheduled in consultation with the team chair. Once onsite, the team may need to schedule & conduct follow-up interviews with some individuals to clarify issues and/or concerns raised during the team’s deliberations.

##### During the on-site evaluation visit a team of evaluators will seek to confirm/verify the accuracy and completeness of the written proposal prepared by the organization. An evaluation team is selected whose membership reflects a cross section of education & teacher education professionals. The size of the team and the expertise of the members are appropriate for types of programs offered by the institution. Team members are selected by staff serving the Board of Teaching and the roster is approved by the organization.

##### 

##### Team members meet together to study findings and reach consensus concerning the team report and recommendation. In addition to listing specific findings, the team recommends Initial Approval or Disapproval. A report of the team findings is sent to the named primary contact within thirty days of the onsite review. The organization has thirty days in which to respond or to submit additional information.

##### The teams’ approval recommendation, along with a summary of the findings and any additional information presented by the organization will be forwarded to the Executive Director of the Board of Teaching for Board action. The decision of the Board of Teaching regarding approval status of the organization to prepare persons for teacher licensure is forwarded by the Executive Director of the Board of Teaching to the primary contact for the organization.

##### If an organization is approved with conditions, the Board of Teaching states the conditions and establishes timelines for meeting the stated conditions. The organization will file a formal plan with the Executive Director of the Board of Teaching specifying how the institution proposes to meet the stated conditions. The Executive Director of the Board of Teaching monitors the implementation of the plan and determines when stated conditions have been met. Approval status of the organization will be reconsidered by the Board of Teaching upon verification by the Executive Director that stated conditions have been met. If stated conditions are not met within the established timelines, conditional approval is withdrawn by the Board of Teaching.

##### If an institution is disapproved, the Board of Teaching states the reasons for disapproval.

At the time of the Board of Teaching’s onsite organizational review, the team will confirm that the organization is in compliance with MN Statutes 122A.09 subd. 4 (c) and (f).

1) Organizations must evidence that subd 4 (c) is addressed by having this dispute resolution option published in student handbooks, or advising guides, websites, or similar public postings where students would likely look for such information.

2) To evidence compliance with subd 4 (f) regarding instructor’s recent experiences in public schools, the institution should prepare a chart of education faculty/instructors employed during the last five years which indicates each persons’ experiences working directly with elementary or secondary school teachers in elementary or secondary schools during that time period.

**TIMELINE FOR ON SITE EVALUATION VISIT**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Upon completed review of a submitted written proposal to offer teacher licensure programs in Minnesota** | **Board of Teaching team chair** will contact the organization to set the date for a **previsit**. The previsit should occur a minimum of 1 month before the on-site visit. The previsit provides an opportunity to coordinate expectations and activities of the upcoming evaluation visit. |
| **During the Previsit** | **The Board of Teaching team chair** will share a slate of potential evaluation team members for review and approval. The leadership of the proposed teacher preparation organization and the Board of Teaching staff shall negotiate team membership from a slate of possible evaluators provided by the Board of Teaching. If agreement is not reached regarding team membership, the Board of Teaching shall appoint the slate of team members. The team chair and organizational leadership will set the actual date that the evaluation visit will occur. |
| **Three weeks prior to the evaluation visit** | **The organization** will send to all BOT team members’ information on how to access a copy of their proposal and any other information they wish team members to review. |

# Recommendation to the Board of Teaching

#### 122A.245 Subd. 3. Program approval; disapproval.

#### The Board of Teaching must approve alternative teacher preparation programs under this section based on board-adopted criteria that reflect best practices for alternative teacher preparation programs, consistent with this section. The board must permit teacher candidates to demonstrate mastery of pedagogy and content standards in school-based settings and through other nontraditional means.

#### (b) If the Board of Teaching determines that a teacher preparation program under

#### this section does not meet the requirements of this section, it may revoke its approval

#### of the program after it notifies the program provider of any deficiencies and gives the

#### program provider an opportunity to remedy the deficiencies.

# 

##### Upon receiving feedback and a recommendation for action from the onsite evaluation team, the Board of Teaching will take action to grant organization approval for a provider of alternative teacher preparation programs. In the event that the Board is not able to grant approval for a potential provider, the organization will be asked to wait one calendar year to submit another proposal for review, allowing further time for self- study and planning to take place. Upon receiving organizational approval, providers may submit a Request for Initial Program Approval.

# Phase III: Completing a Request for Initial Program Approval (RIPA)

## Program Approval

##### Beginning in September 2000, the review of individual teacher licensure programs will occur as follows: Board of Teaching Rule 8700.7600, Subpart 6. Evaluation procedures for institutions and programs. Applications submitted for institutional and program approval shall be evaluated as follows:

##### Two or more program evaluators shall be assigned by the Board of Teaching to examine, evaluate, and make recommendations based on the information submitted by the institution for each of the institution’s teacher preparation programs. Program evaluators shall include individuals with both licensure level and post-secondary experience and expertise in the licensure field of the program being evaluated.

##### Individual licensure programs are submitted separately and directly to the staff of the Board of Teaching for dissemination to qualified reviewers. Individual licensure programs are not evaluated by onsite team members during the visit.

##### To begin the RIPA process for program approval, organizations must use the designated forms provided by Board of Teaching Staff upon initial inquiry. The use of RIPA forms will cease upon launch of the Longitudinal Data System Reporting Tool in 2013.

##### Within the RIPA documentation, organizations will provide detailed program information to be reviewed for each individual licensure program offered. Forms (and later screens) will lead applicants through a process to report on the following categories:

##### Program identification

##### Courses and experiences that will be required to allow candidates to attain competency in the Standards of Effective Practice as well as the subject matter content standards.

##### Outline of all field based experiences including internships, residencies, or student teaching

##### Qualifications of supervisors and faculty/instructors.

##### Outline of assessment process detailing key signature assessments that are common across all license programs, demonstrating candidate progress toward attainment of the standards.

##### While all standards for teacher licensure are required to be addressed and met by alternative teacher preparation programs, the means by which providers may address the standards are not restricted to course work. This phase of the application process will provide an opportunity for organizations to request a waiver for particular Board of Teaching requirements and allow for a program defense to be put forward.

##### Both content and pedagogy sections of the RIPA will be sent out for review, to trained Board of Teaching reviewers with expertise in the licensure field proposed. Reviewer feedback will be returned to institutions or organizations regardless of the outcome of their recommendation. Requests for Initial Program Approval may continue to be edited and resubmitted if not initially recommended for approval. Upon recommendation, providers will report annually to the Board of Teaching, and will begin reporting every year for years 1-3 of operation, and then through PERCA (Program Effectiveness Report for Continuing Approval) every 2 years thereafter.

# Continuing Approval – Reporting via PERCA

## Annual Data Collection Requirements - Years 1-3

##### TPA: Teacher Performance Assessment

##### Task 1: Planning Instruction & Assessment

##### Task 2: Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning

##### Task 3: Assessing Student Learning

##### MTLE Scores

##### Content Knowledge tests

##### Pedagogy tests

##### Continuous Improvement & Data-Driven Decision-Making

##### New Teacher Survey

##### Supervisor Survey

##### Title II reporting

##### Local site team evaluation reports

##### Evidence of operational business plan, staffing, and governance structures \*

##### Independent financial audit\*

##### On site team visit/interview \*

## Data Collection Requirements - Beyond Year 3

##### **Annual Requirements**

##### Title II reporting

##### Independent financial audit and financial statements \*

##### Local site team evaluation report\*

##### **Every 2 years**

##### PERCA (Program Effectiveness Report for Continuing Approval)

##### Tier 1: Input Measures

##### Tier 2: Candidate Performance Measures

##### TPA: Teacher Performance Assessment

##### MTLE Pedagogy Exam Results

##### MTLE Content Area Exam Results

##### Tier 3: Program Analysis

##### Continuous Improvement & Data-Driven Decision-Making

##### New Teacher Survey

##### Supervisor Survey

##### Every 5-7 years

##### Onsite team visit

*\* For nonprofit program providers*

### Appendix A - Examples of Exhibits and Supportive Documents

Examples of supporting evidence for applications for organizational approval to offer alternative teacher preparation programs can be found in the list below. In the event that you have exhibits that are not in electronic format, include them among the exhibits available at the time of the onsite visit.

**SAMPLE SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION:**

* Course syllabi for all professional education courses
* Catalogs and other printed documents describing general education, specialty/content studies, and professional studies
* Mission statement of the institution/organization
* Policies on governance and operations of the unit
* Description of the unit, including organizational charts
* Minutes and membership of advisory, policy, and governing groups
* Fiscal records and budgets for the organization/program
* Strategic or long-range plans specific to operations in Minnesota
* Policies, practices, and budgets related to acquisitions for library, media resources, and technology
* Due process policies and practices
* Agenda, participants, and products of meetings, workshops, and/or training sessions related to curriculum
* Program evaluation summaries and actual documents (over time)
* Schedule of classes offered in professional education
* Handbooks or supporting policy documentation for any/all field based experiences
* Instructor/faculty and candidate handbooks
* Descriptions of field based experiences
* Written agreements with local schools for student teaching placement and collaborative projects
* Student teaching placement records
* Descriptions of sites for field-based experiences
* Policies and criteria for admission and retention
* Policies and/or descriptions of advising and monitoring procedures
* Transcripts or other supporting documentation for candidates and recent graduates
* Candidate competencies expected by completion of programs
* Assessment plans and measures used to ensure that candidates are ready to enter the profession
* Summaries of performance based assessments
* Staff/Faculty vitae that includes information on the following:
* Academic degrees
* Professional experiences including teaching in K-12 schools
* Teaching and administrative load for the past two semesters
* Current professional and academic association memberships
* Current professional assignments and activities
* Publications
* Papers presented
* Other scholarly activity
* Qualifications and selection procedures for cooperating teachers and other supervisors
* List of supervisors and assignments, it is helpful if this is in chart format with an indication of the supervisor’s K-12 teaching experience noted for the team’s review.
* Instructor/Faculty handbook
* Policies for faculty evaluation and related instruments
* Organizational directory
* Staffing assignments (including advising, teaching, and supervising)
* Records of faculty involvement in associations, on campus committees, and other professional activities
* Samples of organizational or faculty publications
* Record of meetings, workshops, and/or training sessions for cooperating teachers

A list of all the exhibits that support the proposal to offer teacher licensure programs, is required for the team’s use,

### Appendix B - Laws of MN for 2011; Chapter 5–S.F. No. 40

Other Items for Appendices:

Glossary of Terms

Link to Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act

MN Standards of Effective Practice

Links to rule for each content area

Teacher Performance Assessment information

Resource Links: (i.e. Handbooks)

Program Reporting Requirements Chart