



MINNESOTA BOARD OF TEACHING

Team Findings Report and Recommendations

Regarding Institutional Standards 8700.7600

For

College of St. Benedict/St. John's University

Dates of Visit: October 14-17, 2012

TEAM RECOMMENDATION REGARDING APPROVAL STATUS As per MN Rule 8700.7600 subpart 7	
—	INITIAL APPROVAL
<u>X</u>	FULL CONTINUING APPROVAL effective until June 30, 2020 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• contingent upon acceptance of a compliance report on the standards marked as not fully met. Next onsite evaluation: fall 2019
—	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS
—	DISAPPROVAL

REPORT CONTENTS

Team Recommendation	Page 1
Table of Contents	Page 2
Team Membership	Page 3
Background Information on the Unit and Institution	Page 4
➤ Team Findings	Page 9
➤ 8700.7600 Subpart 5A Professional and Pedagogical Studies	Page 10
➤ 8700.7600 Subpart 5B General and Content Studies	Page 10
➤ 8700.7600 Subpart 5C Clinical and Field Experiences	Page 12
➤ 8700.7600 Subpart 5D Candidate Qualifications	Page 13
➤ 8700.7600 Subpart 5E Monitoring and Advising Candidate Progress	Page 13
➤ 8700.7600 Subpart 5F Competence of Candidates	Page 14
➤ 8700.7600 Subpart 5G Qualifications, Composition, and Assignment of Professional Education Faculty	Page 15
➤ 8700.7600 Subpart 5H Institutional Governance	Page 18
Persons Interviewed Appendix A	Page 20
Documents Reviewed Appendix B	Page 20
Rule History and Board Practices Appendix C	Page 20

**BOARD OF TEACHING INSTITUTIONAL EVALUATION
College of St. Benedict
TEAM MEMBERS**

Representing High Education	Representing Elementary/Secondary Education
<p>Joyce A Strand, Ph.D. UMD Education Department Head UMD DGS Teaching and Learning 154 EduE 412 Library Drive Duluth, MN 55812 218-726-8182 jstrand1@d.umn.edu</p>	<p>Greg Anderson, Supervisor Division of Academics and Creative Arts High School St. Paul Public Schools 65 Kellogg Blvd East St. Paul, MN 55101 Greg.anderson@spps.org</p>
<p>Dr. Rhonda Bonnstetter Chair, Education Department Southwest Minnesota State University IL 232, 1501 State St. Marshall, MN 56258 Rhonda.bonnstetter@smsu.edu</p>	
<p>Team Chair:</p> <p>Ms. JoAnn Van Aernum-Board of Teaching Teacher Education Specialist 1500 Highway 36 West Roseville, MN 55113-4266 651-582-8866 joann.vanaernum@state.mn.us</p>	<p>Team Co-Chair:</p> <p>Erin Doan- Board of Teaching Alternative Assessment Specialist 1500 Highway 36 West Roseville, MN 55113-4266 651-582-8383 Erin.doan@state.mn.us</p>

The College of St. Benedict/St. John's University filed application in the fall of 2011 with the Minnesota Board of Teaching (BOT) to undergo an on-site institutional evaluation to demonstrate compliance with standards in Board Rule 8700.7600. An on-site institutional evaluation visit was conducted October 14-17, 2012.

As a result of their review, the BOT evaluation team will recommend to the Board of Teaching that the College of St. Benedict receive full continuing approval to offer teacher licensure programs through June 30, 2020 contingent upon approval of a follow up report addressing compliance to standards identified in the report as not fully met.

Background Information:

The following excerpt is information about the unit and its programs copied from their report submitted to the Board of Teaching October 2012.

The College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University, two liberal arts colleges located within six miles of each other in central Minnesota, draw upon the history and values of the monastic communities that nourish them as they work toward a common educational mission. They trace their origins to separate roots of the same Benedictine monasticism that has flourished for more than 1500 years.

The Saint John's University of today began in 1857 with a charter issued by Minnesota's territorial legislature recognizing what was then known as Saint John's Seminary to be a "scientific, educational, and ecclesiastical institution" with The Order of Saint Benedict as its corporate sponsor. This charter recognized the successful work of Father Demetrius di Maronga and four members of that Order whose log hut on the western bank of the Mississippi at Saint Cloud was the first school in that village.

During its first year Saint John's Seminary enrolled five students. Hoffman (1907) reported that as many as 20 might have been enrolled at one time during the next few years. The growing school moved ten miles west to its present location in 1866, near what would become the settlement of Collegetown. Among those early alumni of Saint John's before 1867, Joseph Duerr and Conrad Marschall served as two of Minnesota's first teachers.

A revised charter issued in 1883 formally established the institution as Saint John's University. Campus buildings, like enrollment, grew slowly. Father Hilary Thimmesch, OSB, a former president of the University, concluded that by 1922...

The college was very small and shared faculty and premises with students in the newly-named preparatory school. Several of the 22 members of the faculty taught prep classes as well as college classes, yet the catalog listed 132 college courses in 25 disciplines ranging from astronomy to speech education. Even though students typically registered for six courses a semester, classes must have been very small and the professors greatly extended if all, or even most, of the advertised offerings were actually taught, but the college was now on track for its surprising development in the next decade (Renner, p.26).

Changes in curriculum and in the leadership of the University would fuel that development. Monks returning from doctoral study shared a renewed vision of a liberal arts college that enriched both the intellectual and liturgical life of Saint John's. As the United States prepared to enter World War II, Thimmesch found that "enrollment had grown to 450 and the faculty to 55, including ten laymen. Saint John's had become an exciting place to work and study" (Renner, p. 26).

From these roots, the University and its monastic community have worked together for 148 years to provide their students with the vision of a liberating education that encouraged its founders and sustained its supporters. Yet today's story of Saint John's is not complete without recalling the formation and growth of its partner in the modern evolution of that vision.

The monastic community that would later found the College of Saint Benedict also traces its beginning to 1857 with the arrival six Benedictine women in the same village of Saint Cloud. They were guided by the vision of Mother Benedicta Riepp, whose passion to serve America's newly arriving Catholic immigrants took them to Minnesota from their home congregation in Pennsylvania. Three of these first Benedictine women, including Mother Willibalda Scherbauer, who would become the first prioress of the new Minnesota foundation, had already made the journey to Pennsylvania from their home at Saint Walburga's Abbey in Eichstatt, Bavaria. Growing with this newly formed territory, these women and the hundreds who would later join them in lives of prayer, work, and service would overcome poverty and sickness in their unsettled new home in the northern wilderness to lay the foundations for educational and health care systems that flourish today. Two hundred of the spiritual descendents of these first Benedictine women now live in the monastery that adjoins the college founded and sustained by their community.

Sister Emmanuel Renner OSB, a past president of the College, recalled that...

The College of Saint Benedict grew out of Saint Benedict's Academy, a Catholic boarding school for girls founded in 1880 by Benedictine sisters who came to Minnesota in 1857. As early as 1905 the Benedictine community began to plan for the establishment of a college to educate the sisters in their own fast-growing community and Catholic girls. The college opened in 1913 with six students in a lower division program. In 1918 it offered its first bachelor's degrees. By 1932 the bulletin listed an impressive number of courses in the departments of religion, philosophy, history and the social sciences, English language and literature, psychology and education, Latin, French, and German, biology, chemistry and physics, mathematics, and music. That year, with 166 students and 40 faculty, the college applied to the North Central Association for accreditation and received it. The NCA report praised Saint Benedict's for its standards of scholarship and its atmosphere of culture and refinement. Sister Claire Lynch, the academic dean from 1932-1940, established a Board of Lay Advisors in 1934, which continued until 1961, when the college was separately incorporated under a predominantly lay Board of Trustees (1997, p. 30-31).

In 1968 that Board elected the College's first lay president. That year marked as well early steps toward institutional cooperation that would continue to evolve toward a unique relationship between the two colleges. Choosing to work closely together without merging into a single institution, Saint Benedict's and Saint John's instead developed a common class schedule and a bus system to encourage students to travel between their campuses and enroll in selected courses. After a brief trial period, both colleges soon opened their campuses and curricula to each other's students. Academic departments began discussions that would lead all to become "joint" within two decades. When the two colleges agreed on 16 November 1986 to set aside their separate general education programs in favor of a newly designed shared core curriculum, full academic partnership was realized.

Recognizing the significance of this curricular evolution, a joint committee of the two colleges' governing boards met to explore other cooperative ventures. Soon thereafter, the presidents of the two institutions began to describe this emerging relationship as one in which their respective "coordinate colleges" were learning to work in "a condition of permanent interdependence." Each institution's governing board affirmed commitment to institutional coordination in 1993 and again in 1996.

When they did so, those board members recognized the success of both the academic and the administrative union initiated by the development of a common library system in 1980 and reflected in an increasing number of joint administrative posts from 1992 onward. Beginning in 1996 these two colleges invited a common chief academic officer to work with their respective academic deans to guide academic programs on both campuses. In 2002 the two institutions moved toward closer academic integration with a shared Provost and an Associate Provost who also served as Dean of the Faculty for both colleges. In 2010 the colleges' shared administrative team included its Provost, Vice Provost, Academic Dean, and Associate Dean who together with each college's President, lead our colleges toward their shared institutional vision.

The late Saint John's University President, Brother Dietrich Reinhart, OSB, recalled the evolution of the unique coordinate relationship that has evolved between Saint John's and the College of Saint Benedict.

The vision guiding coordinate planning does not emerge from a vacuum. Rather, it springs from a thorough understanding and appreciation of a distinctive history, tradition and mission. But, perhaps most importantly, it is embodied in the hearts and minds of the community - faculty, students, administrators, staff and members of the monastery - the very fabric and fiber of these academic institutions.

The academic catalog published jointly by the two colleges informs prospective students that they will find both institutions offer...

a common curriculum, identical degree requirements and a single academic calendar. All academic departments are joint, and classes are offered throughout the day on both campuses. The academic program is coordinated by the Provost, who is assisted by the Associate Provost and the Dean of the Faculty. In addition, there is one admission office, a joint registrar's office, a combined library system, joint academic computing services and a myriad of joint student activities and clubs. The two campuses are linked by free bus service throughout the day and late into the night. (Academic Catalog, Two Colleges, One Education, 2011-2012).

The transformation that began in 1857 in a log cabin school for boys on a Mississippi riverbank and in a drafty frame house in the same little village where German Benedictine sisters taught young girls needlework and music, is nearly complete. MaryAnn Baenninger, Saint Benedict's fourteenth president, observes that...

We are two institutions, yet one; we are a school for women and a school for men, yet we are co-educational. We have two campuses, yet they function in many ways as one. Each institution, however, has its own culture, its own history, its own lineage, and its own roots. We cannot overestimate the amount of institutional energy we invest in maintaining this unique partnership, or the mental and social flexibility required to sustain it. It is a model for the real world where relationships are not simple, where trust is an essential, where openness is required, and reflective negotiation is the currency. Without each other, without understanding each other, without connecting with, inspiring and acting for each other, we would be nothing (2005).

The institutional profile describing characteristics of our students, faculty, and fiscal resources reveals that as colleges we are stronger together than were we to stand apart or to merge as one college. "A needle so fine" weaves our golden thread of shared mission into a future of hand, heart, and mind united by common purpose.

A Sense of Purpose

Saint John's University strives to provide its students with a "liberal arts education in the Catholic university tradition" for all its students.

In reaching for this aim, the University "seeks to preserve the wellsprings of human culture, to deepen understanding of human interdependence, and to prepare students for full, integrated lives of thought, action, and love."

Working toward these *goals* requires that the University "relate teaching, learning, and scholarship to residential life of the campus, community worship, and programs of service.

These mission *activities* are in turn realized through "the Benedictine practices of community life, prayer, hospitality, and the search for wisdom."

They are further sustained by the University's "historic commitments to the well-being of diverse human communities, the formation of leaders in successive generations, and the ongoing renewal of the Church"

(Academic Catalog 2011-2012, SJU Mission).

Unit Mission

Responding to the common mission that guides the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University, Education Department jointly sponsored by these two colleges aims to "prepare exemplary teachers who have a strong liberal arts background, exemplify Benedictine values, and make professional decisions which can help all students achieve their full potential as persons and as responsible world citizens in a democratic society" (Education Department Conceptual Framework, Mission and Aim).

Focused by this aim, the Education Department's mission is...

To provide exemplary teacher preparation within the framework provided by the Minnesota Standards of Effective Practice for Teachers. Mindful of the joint mission of the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University, we seek to provide this preparation within a liberal arts context in ways that are consistent with the Catholic and Benedictine traditions.

Building on our theme of "Teacher as Decision-Maker," we seek to prepare teachers who will make informed, ethical classroom decisions that foster their students' learning.

In doing so, "we seek to prepare teachers who possess a rich and diverse background of coursework and experiences that stress intellectual challenge, open inquiry, collaborative scholarship, and that promote clear thinking."

In addition to a rich, liberal arts experience, it is our mission to provide students with the knowledge and skills necessary to make effective classroom decisions.

Consistent with our Catholic and Benedictine values, we seek to develop teachers who have a commitment to service and to building a classroom community which respects all persons. (Conceptual Framework: Mission and Aim).

Students enrolled by the colleges and prepared for licensure by Minnesota's Board of Teaching reflect this mission and aim as they work toward the Education Department's ten program goals. The knowledge, skills, and values that are acquired and affirmed through candidates' pursuit of

these goals strengthen the decisions they make as they plan and evaluate their teaching (Conceptual Framework; Goals). The department's goals are guided by the Minnesota Standards of Effective Practice for Teachers, a set of licensure standards set by Minnesota's Board of Teaching (1999). The 10 terminal and 136 enabling pedagogical standards in this collection were derived in part from the work of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium.

The following undergraduate licensure programs are offered at the College:

Communication Arts and Literature 5-12

Elementary Education K-6

Middle Level Endorsement in Communication Arts 5-8

English as a Second Language K-12

Instrumental, Vocal, and Classroom Music K-12

Mathematics 5-12

General Science 5-8

Chemistry 9-12

Life Science 9-12

Physics 9-12

Social Studies 5-12

Visual Arts K-12

World Languages: Spanish and German and French K-12 and K-8

TEAM FINDINGS

While on campus the team observed many commendable practices and the following team observations were shared at the oral exit report:

- **The team commends the unit and university for their support of faculty travel and projects, as well as the support for student travel and projects.**
- **Faculty, students, and school staff consistently remarked positively on quality, quantity, and diversity, and breadth of clinical experiences.**
- **Current students and graduates reported time and again that faculty at the institution supported them in all aspects of their personal and professional growth, ensuring their successful transition to roles as classroom teachers**
- **School partners valued the professional development opportunities in the area of emerging technologies that the faculty and candidates share with them.**
- **Current students valued the opportunity to participate in research and professional development activities which were supported in both time and financial backing (research projects and presenting at ACTFL conferences were identified).**
- **Kudos to the Education Department for hosting faculty sharing time for a week every other summer to reflect on and share best practices that faculty use or have observed in area schools .**

TEAM FINDINGS ON SPECIFIC STANDARDS:

8700.7600 Subpart 5. A. IN PROFESSIONAL AND PEDAGOGICAL STUDIES

	Board of Teaching	STANDARD MET	
		YES	NO
A(1)	The institution has high quality professional education programs that are cohesive, comprehensive, and based on research, theory, and accepted practice.	X	
A(2)	The institution requires that candidates in teacher preparation programs complete a professional sequence of courses based on the components under part 8710.2000.	X	
A(3)	Assessment and evaluation are integral components of the professional education sequence and are used to monitor teacher candidate performance and program effectiveness.	X	

8700.7600

Subpart 5. B. IN GENERAL AND CONTENT STUDIES

	Board of Teaching	STANDARD MET	
		YES	NO
B(1)	The institution provides and requires candidates in teacher preparation programs to complete a program of general studies in the liberal arts and sciences equivalent to the requirement for persons enrolled in programs not preparing persons for teacher licensure.	X	
B(2)	The institution provides programs that require candidates in teacher preparation programs to attain academic competence in the content that they plan to teach.	X	
B(3)	The liberal arts curriculum of the institution incorporates multicultural and global perspectives.	X	

B(4)	Teacher candidates can integrate general, content, professional, and pedagogical studies, as measured by teacher performance, and performance of the students they teach.	X	
------	--	---	--

8700.7600			
Subpart 5. C. IN PROVIDING CLINICAL AND FIELD EXPERIENCES			
	Board of Teaching	STANDARD MET	
		YES	NO
C(1)	The teacher licensure programs incorporate a broad range of ongoing clinical and field experiences that provide candidates opportunities to demonstrate the required skills and knowledge under part 8710.2000.	X	
C(2)	Candidates have experiences with diverse populations, students with disabilities, and students of different ages <u>under the direction of teacher education faculty in collaboration with school partners.</u>	X	
C(3)	Candidates work in the field and at the licensure level for which they are to be recommended for licensure.	X	
C(4)	Each program is developed and implemented through collaborative school partnerships in which university faculty and school personnel share responsibility for planning, supervising, evaluating, and implementing the curriculum for candidates.	X	
C(5)	School personnel hold valid Minnesota continuing licenses, or the equivalent, in the fields of specialization, and model good professional practice.	X	

8700.7600			
Subpart 5. D. FOR CANDIDATE QUALIFICATIONS			
	Board of Teaching	STANDARD MET	
		YES	NO
D(1)	The institution recruits, admits, and retains candidates who demonstrate potential for professional success in schools.	X	

D(2)	Multiple criteria and assessments are used to identify candidates for admission who have potential to become successful teachers.	X	
D(3)	The institution has clearly stated and applied assessment procedures for the admission of transfer, nontraditional, and post-baccalaureate candidates into undergraduate and graduate teacher preparation programs.	X	
D(4)	The institution actively recruits and has plans, policies, and practices for admission and retention of a diverse candidate population.	X	
D(5)	The institution assesses and, if appropriate, gives credit to candidates for knowledge and skills acquired through prior academic preparation and teaching experiences that meet licensure requirements.	X	

Subpart 5. E. WHEN MONITORING AND ADVISING ON CANDIDATE PROGRESS			
	Board of Teaching	STANDARD MET	
		YES	NO
E(1)	The institution provides appropriate academic and professional advisement at a candidate's admission and throughout the candidate's professional education.	X	
E(2)	The institution maintains specific criteria for admission and retention, and defined student appeals process.	X	
E(3)	The institution maintains complete, accurate, and current records of candidates in teaching preparation programs.	X	
E(4)	The institution uses authentic performance-based assessments and systematic procedures and timelines to determine whether candidates have the knowledge and skills needed to advance through the program.	X	

E(5)	Criteria consistent with part 8710.2000 are used to determine candidate progress through each program.	X	
E(6)	The institution requires that candidates successfully complete all Board of Teaching licensure assessments before recommending a candidate for teacher licensure.	X	
E(7)	Publication and faculty advising provide candidates with clear information about institutional policies and requirements needed to complete professional education programs, the availability of social and psychological counseling services, and job opportunities.	X	

8700.7600 Subpart 5. F. FOR COMPETENCE OF CANDIDATES			
	Board of Teaching	STANDARD MET	
		YES	NO
F(1)	The unit provides evidence that licensure candidates demonstrate the skills and knowledge required under part 8710.2000.	X	
F(2)	The unit demonstrates a systematic and comprehensive assessment design that is applied to all candidates throughout professional preparation. <i>The team was unable to identify key assessments for <u>content</u> standards for secondary education fields. There was no disaggregated data from key assessments for content fields for review.</i>		X
F(3)	The unit establishes and publishes a set of criteria and outcomes for exit from each professional education program consistent with the standards of the Board of Teaching.	X	
F(4)	The program's stated exit criteria and outcomes are assessed through the use of multiple sources of data, for example a culminating experience, portfolios, interviews, videotaped and observed performance in schools, standardized tests, and course grades.	X	

8700.7600

Subpart 5. G. FOR THE QUALIFICATIONS, COMPOSITION, AND ASSIGNMENT OF THE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION FACULTY

	Board of Teaching	STANDARD MET	
		YES	NO
G(1)	<p>The unit ensures that all education faculty are qualified by academic preparation for the faculty member’s current assignments and are actively engaged in the professional community.</p> <p>Additional related standard: 8700.7600 Subpart D (as per PEPER) (3) faculty assigned to instruct and assess the professional education components shall have both academic preparation and direct experience teaching the content and levels established in the licensure field's scope of practice; (4) program faculty assigned to provide instruction in methods of teaching and to supervise student teaching experiences shall have teaching experience at the licensure level of the licensure program;</p> <hr/> <p>The Team found that some faculty vitae did not evidence their academic preparation to teach the courses they are assigned. In particular, several methods courses are taught by instructors without academic preparation and/or K-12 teaching experiences aligned to the scope of the licensure program.</p> <p>The team found that the vitae for several faculty assigned to teach “reading competencies and pedagogy”, as per statute 122A.18 and 122A.06 subd, 4 did not evidence advanced academic preparation in “reading or literacy” and/or experience teaching “reading” in K-12 settings as required for that assignment.</p> <p>The vitae for instructors identified as teaching the following methods courses did not provide evidence that the instructors had advanced academic preparation to teach the reading pedagogy standards and/or the subject matter content and/or personal teaching experience teaching reading as well as the related subject matter:</p> <p>EDUC 358 Middle Level Literacy and Pedagogy for Social Studies EDUC 318 Social Sciences Pedagogy K-6 EDUC 358 Middle Level Literacy and Pedagogy for Mathematics EDUC 354 Middle Level Literacy and Pedagogy for Art EDUC 358 Middle Level Literacy and Pedagogy for Sciences</p>		X

G(2)	The unit assigns faculty qualified by academic preparation to support the teacher licensure programs.	X					
G(3)	The unit actively recruits and has plans, policies, and practices for hiring diverse faculty.	X					
G(4)	The workload allows the faculty to be involved in teaching, scholarship, service, and schools in monitoring, assessing, and advising candidate progress.	X					
G(5)	<p>The unit ensures that faculty who supervise field experiences are academically prepared and professionally experienced in a school setting.</p> <hr/> <p>The unit reported Exhibit 5.3.b.3 <u>Student Teacher Supervisor Required Qualifications</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Master of Arts or a Master of Science degree • Current license to teach in Minnesota • At least three years of successfully teaching experience • Submitted official transcript • Letter of application • Two letters of recommendation • Interviewed by the Director of Student Teaching and the Education Department Chairperson <p>The team was unable to verify some supervisors' teaching experiences or academic preparation as aligned to their supervision assignments.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="337 1188 1230 1520"> <tr> <td data-bbox="337 1188 732 1335"><i>Supervisor #1 of multiple elementary student teachers</i></td> <td data-bbox="732 1188 1230 1335"><i>Had no elementary teaching experiences other than subbing and six months of preschool experiences</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="337 1335 732 1520"><i>Supervisor #2 of multiple elementary student teachers</i></td> <td data-bbox="732 1335 1230 1520"><i>Could not verify elementary academic preparation nor elementary teaching experiences; (but this instructor did have expertise special education)</i></td> </tr> </table>	<i>Supervisor #1 of multiple elementary student teachers</i>	<i>Had no elementary teaching experiences other than subbing and six months of preschool experiences</i>	<i>Supervisor #2 of multiple elementary student teachers</i>	<i>Could not verify elementary academic preparation nor elementary teaching experiences; (but this instructor did have expertise special education)</i>		X
<i>Supervisor #1 of multiple elementary student teachers</i>	<i>Had no elementary teaching experiences other than subbing and six months of preschool experiences</i>						
<i>Supervisor #2 of multiple elementary student teachers</i>	<i>Could not verify elementary academic preparation nor elementary teaching experiences; (but this instructor did have expertise special education)</i>						

G(6)	Any part-time and adjunct faculty and graduate students in teaching roles provide integrity, quality, and continuity of teacher preparation programs. <i>Some adjuncts' vitae did not evidence their academic preparation and/or teaching experiences as related to their teaching assignments and should be updated.</i>	X Met with comment	
G(7)	Faculty and teaching in the unit are of high quality reflecting current research and best practice consistent with the curriculum goals of the program.	X	
G(8)	Faculty and cooperating school personnel model and reflect the best practice in the delivery of instruction.	X	
G(9)	Faculty use a variety of instructional strategies that reflect an understanding of different models and approaches to learning.	X	
G(10)	Instruction encourages the candidate's development of reflection, critical thinking, problem-solving, and professional dispositions.	X	
G(11)	Teaching in the unit reflects knowledge and experiences with diversity and exceptionalities.	X	
G(12)	The institution systematically evaluates the effect of faculty on candidate performance and fosters faculty professional development.	X	
G(13)	The unit's faculty demonstrates knowledge, skills, and dispositions which model best professional practices, assessment, and scholarship.	X	

Continued:

APPENDIX “A” INTERVIEWEES

A listing of all individuals interviewed is on file with the Board of Teaching
[And hyperlinked here](#)

APPENDIX “B” EXHIBITS REVIEWED

A listing of all exhibits reviewed is on file with the Board of Teaching
[And hyperlinked here](#)

APPENDIX “C” RULE HISTORY and BOARD PRACTICES

8700.7600 Adopted Permanent Rules Relating to Institution and Teacher Preparation Program Approval

Subpart 1. **In general.** Licenses to teach in Minnesota may be granted to persons who complete approved programs leading to teacher licensure in Minnesota institutions approved by the Board of Teaching to prepare persons for teacher licensure according to this part.

Subpart 2a. **Definitions.** For the purpose of this part, the terms in this subpart have the meanings given.

- A. “Teacher preparation program” means a college or university program, approved by the Board of Teaching for the purpose of preparing individuals for a specific teacher licensure field in Minnesota.
- B. “Unit” means an institution or a defined subdivision of the institution, for example a college, department, or division that has primary responsibility for overseeing teacher preparation programs.

Subpart 3. **Evaluation of institutions and programs.** Each Minnesota institution granting baccalaureate degrees, post-baccalaureate degrees, or both, requesting approval to prepare persons for teacher licensure shall be evaluated for both institutional and program approval according to this part.

Subpart 4. **Duration of approval.** The Board of Teaching may approve an institution or a teacher preparation program for a period of up to seven years. At least one year prior to the expiration of the approval period, the institution or preparation program shall submit a request to the Board of Teaching for continuing approval and shall be evaluated in accordance with the provisions of this part.

Subpart 5. **Written application required.** A written application for approval of an institution must demonstrate compliance with 8710.7600, subpart 5 A-H.

The reasonableness of adopted rule 8700.7600 rests in three areas of analysis:

1. A system of quality assurance is reasonable in that it provides assurance that the institution has itself achieved a set of standards that assess the institution's capacity to offer programs leading to teacher licensure;
2. The rules are based on and are consistent with already-adopted rules (8700.7700, Subparts 1-11) that have been determined reasonable in recent rule making actions. The rules for licensure program approval align with program standards adopted by the Board of Teaching in March 1999. These rules further provide verification that a candidate has successfully completed an approved program and can demonstrate effectiveness that is consistent with required knowledge and skills for teacher licensure stated in Minnesota Rule Chapter 8710;
3. The adopted standards (8700.7600) require institutions to demonstrate how they have responded to the redesign effort of teacher preparation that requires programs to be results-oriented, programmatically coherent, research supported, and clinically focused.

ON-SITE EVALUATION PROCESS:

Every Minnesota post-secondary institution approved to prepare candidates for teacher licensure has in accordance with Minnesota Rules, part 8700.7600, undergone review for approval to recommend candidates for Minnesota teacher licensure. To determine approval status: Initial Approval, Continuing Approval, Approval with Conditions, or Disapproval, each institution must undergo an on-site review every 5-7 years.

The institution must prepare a self-study report responding to each of the state institutional standards. During the on-site evaluation visit a team of evaluators is charged to confirm/verify the accuracy and completeness of the written report prepared by the institution. An evaluation team is selected which is as broadly representative of the education profession. The size of the team and the expertise of the members are appropriate for the kinds, size, and complexity of programs. Evaluation team members are selected by Board of Teaching, with approval by the college.

Individual licensure program reports are submitted separately and are reviewed via a separate process. Copies of the approved licensure programs must be available for team reference during the visit.

During the institutional visit, team members review written information and interview persons who have relevant information concerning the institution. Team members meet together to study findings and reach consensus concerning the team report and recommendation. The teams' approval recommendation, along with a summary of the findings, and any additional information presented by the institution are 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 institution to prepare persons for teacher licensure is forwarded

by the Executive Director of the Board of Teaching to the chief administrative officer of the institution with a copy going to the college/department of education.

If an institution is approved with conditions, the Board of Teaching states the conditions and establishes timelines for meeting the stated conditions. Approval status of the institution 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 and, if needed, stipulates a termination date which accommodates persons currently enrolled in teacher licensure programs.

An institution that is denied approval by the Board of Teaching is entitled to a hearing. A written request for a hearing must be filed by the institution with the Board of Teaching within 30 days from the date of the denial. Failure to do so constitutes a waiver of the right to a hearing.

END OF REPORT

I. BOT Institution Approval and NCATE Accreditation

What is this review?

On **14 October 2012** Minnesota's Board of Teaching (BOT) will send a team formed from BOT members, board staff, licensed teachers, and teacher educators to audit our compliance with the standards set by our legislature to guide the preparation of teachers. Approved institutions found to be in compliance with those standards can prepare and recommend candidates for teacher licensure for each of their approved licensure programs. Note that our licensure programs are approved until fall 2014, but our institutional approval ends in fall 2013.

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) will also send a Board of Examiners (BOE) on the same date to verify our compliance with the institutional standards guiding that organization's "continuing accreditation" of a teacher preparation "unit" and its sponsoring institution. Areas of weakness noted during our previous NCATE accreditation review in October of 2005, notably "diversity" and validation of our assessments, will be among the topics explored by the team formed from volunteers who are themselves teacher educators or licensed teachers.

What criteria will be used for this review?

The BOT review will be guided by Minnesota's legislated "standards" for approval of a teacher preparation institution. They will use these eight standards to guide their audit of the information we organize and present to support our request for institutional approval.

8700.7600.5. Rules Relating to Institution and Teacher Preparation Program Approval. In a written application for approval,

5A: The institution (teacher preparation unit) must demonstrate in **professional and pedagogical studies** that

- 1) High quality professional education programs are cohesive, comprehensive, and based on research, theory, and accepted practice;
- 2) Candidates in teacher preparation programs complete a professional sequence of courses based on MSEPT (8710.2000; the "MSEPT");
- 3) Assessment and evaluation are integral components of the professional educational sequence.

5B: In **general and content studies**, the institution (sponsoring colleges)...

- 1) Requires candidates to complete a program of general education in the liberal arts and sciences equivalent to the requirement for those who are not preparing for teacher licensure;
- 2) Requires candidates to attain academic competence in the content they plan to teach;
- 3) Offers a liberal arts curriculum that incorporates multicultural and global perspectives;

4) Verifies that teacher candidates can integrate general, content, professional, and pedagogical studies as measured by teacher performance and the performance of the students they teach.

5C: In **clinical and field experiences**, the institution (unit)...

- 1) Offers programs that incorporate a broad range of clinical and field experiences that provide candidates with opportunities to demonstrate required skills and knowledge in the MSEPT;
- 2) Offers candidates experiences with diverse populations, students with disabilities, and students of different ages under the direction of teacher education faculty in collaboration with school partners;
- 3) Places candidates in field settings where they work at the level for which they are to be licensed;
- 4) Develops and implements each licensure program through collaborative school partnerships in which college faculty and school personnel share responsibility for planning, supervising, evaluating, and implementing the curriculum for candidates;
- 5) Secures school personnel who hold valid Minnesota continuing licenses, or the equivalent, in their fields of specialization and model good professional practice.

5D: With respect to the **qualifications of its candidates**, the institution (unit)...

- 1) Recruits, admits, and retains candidates who demonstrate potential for success in schools;
- 2) Uses multiple criteria and assessments to identify candidates for admission who have the potential to become successful teachers;
- 3) Has clearly stated and applied assessment procedures for the admission of transfer, non-traditional, and post baccalaureate candidates into undergraduate teacher preparation programs;
- 4) Actively recruits and has plans, policies, and practices for the admission and retention of a diverse candidate population;
- 5) Assesses and gives credit to candidates for knowledge and skills acquired through prior academic preparation and teaching experiences that meet licensure requirements.

5E: The institution (unit), when **monitoring and advising on candidate progress**...

- 1) Provides appropriate academic and professional advisement at the candidate's admission and throughout the candidate's professional education program;
- 2) Maintains specific criteria for admission and retention and a defined student appeals process;
- 3) Maintains complete, accurate, and current records of candidates in teaching preparation programs;
- 4) Uses authentic assessments and systemic procedures and timelines to determine whether candidates have the knowledge and skill needed to advance through the program;
- 5) Criteria consistent with the MSEPT are used to determine candidate progress through each program;

- 6) Requires that candidates successfully complete all BOT licensure assessments before recommending a candidate for licensure;
- 7) Uses publications and advising to inform candidates about institutional policies and requirements needed to complete professional education programs, including the availability of social and psychological counseling services and job opportunities.

5F: Concerning the competence of candidates,

- 1) The unit provides evidence that licensure candidates demonstrate the skills and knowledge required by the MSEPT;
- 2) The unit demonstrates a systematic and comprehensive assessment design that is applied to all candidates throughout professional preparation;
- 3) The unit establishes and publishes a set of criteria and outcomes for exit from each professional educational program consistent with the standards of the BOT;
- 4) The program's stated exit criteria and outcomes are assessed through the use of multiple sources of data, for example a culminating experience, portfolios, interviews, videotaped and observed performance in schools, standardized tests, and course grades;

5G: Concerning the qualifications, composition, and assignment of the professional education faculty,

- 1) The unit insures that all education faculty are qualified by academic preparation for the faculty member's current assignments and are actively engaged in the professional community;
- 2) The unit assigns faculty qualified by academic preparation to support the teacher licensure programs;
- 3) The unit actively recruits and has plans, policies, and practices for hiring diverse faculty;
- 4) The workload allows the faculty to be involved in teaching, scholarship, service, and schools in monitoring, assessing, and advising candidate progress;
- 5) The unit insures that faculty who supervise field experiences are academically prepared and professionally experienced in a school setting;
- 6) The unit insures that part-time and adjunct faculty in teaching roles provide integrity, quality, and continuity of teacher preparation programs;
- 7) Faculty and teaching in the unit are of high quality reflecting current research and best practice consistent with the curriculum goal of the program;
- 8) Faculty and cooperating school personnel model and reflect the best practice in the delivery of instruction;
- 9) Faculty use a variety of instructional strategies that reflect an understanding of different models and approaches to learning;
- 10) Instruction encourages the candidate's development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions;
- 11) Teaching in the unit reflects knowledge and experiences with diversity and exceptionalities;
- 12) The institution systematically evaluates the effect of faculty on candidate performance and fosters faculty professional development; and

13) The unit's faculty demonstrates knowledge, skills, and dispositions which model best professional practices, assessment, and scholarship.

5H: Concerning institutional governance,

- 1) The professional education unit is clearly identified and has primary responsibility for all teacher licensure programs offered at the institution;
- 2) Responsibility and authority for teacher preparation programs are exercised by a defined administrative and instructional unit, for example a department, division, school, or college of education;
- 3) The unit is directly involved in the areas of faculty selection, tenure, promotion, and retention decisions as well as recruitment of candidates for licensure and in curriculum decisions, evaluation, revision, and the allocation of resources for institution activities;
- 4) The administrator of the defined unit is authorized to submit licensure program proposals for Board of Teaching approval and is responsible for licensure programs;
- 5) The administrator of the defined unit is authorized to recommend for teacher licensure candidates who have completed the institution's teacher preparation programs;
- 6) School faculty, candidates, and other members of the professional community are actively involved in the unit's policymaking and advisory bodies;
- 7) The unit has a long range planning process that is regularly monitored to ensure that ongoing vitality of the unit and its programs, and the future capacity of its physical facilities;
- 8) The unit has sufficient financial resources and institutional support to sustain teacher preparation programs;
- 9) Facilities, equipment, and budgets are adequate to support the unit's mission and goals;
- 10) Candidates and faculty have access to books, journals, and electronic information to support teaching and scholarship;
- 11) Candidates and faculty have training in and access to current education-related technology; and
- 12) The unit has sufficient faculty and administrative, clerical, and technical staff to ensure the consistent delivery and quality of programs.

Our NCATE reviewers will also use six standards and the characteristics of a useful conceptual framework to guide their audit of our "unit." These familiar characteristics of accredited teacher preparation institutions were the only basis for our April 2001 and October 2005 examinations.

Standard 1: Candidate Performance. Candidates preparing for work in schools as teachers...know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that these candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Standard 2: Assessment Plan. The Unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on the applicant qualifications, the candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs.

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice. The unit and its school partners design, implement and evaluate field experiences (pre-admission and pedagogy/methods course), and clinical practice (student teaching) so that teacher candidates develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. **Note that we have proposed this as our “target” standard for this review.**

Standard 4: Diversity. The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 schools.

Standard 5: Faculty. All faculty are well-qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate (student) performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty and facilitates professional development.

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources. The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Conceptual Framework. The unit has a conceptual framework that establishes the shared vision for a unit’s effort in preparing educators to work effectively in P-12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework is knowledge-based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

How will these reviews be conducted?

The BOT and NCATE teams, guided by their respective standards, will work together and independently to review written documents submitted in advance of their visits, related documents gathered during their visit. They will observe candidates teaching in schools, interview faculty, staff, current students, graduates, school administrators, college administrators and others who might have knowledge and experience with our candidates and programs. Each team will independently report its findings prior to their departure on 16 October. Teams will provide written reports within 60 days of their visit.

What must we do to prepare for the NCATE and BOT visits?

Guidance on preparing for the visit as well as requests for information in response to questions from our NCATE review team prior to their visit will be forthcoming. In the meantime, our experience with past visits suggests the following steps.

1. If not already doing so, frequently weave facets of the department’s conceptual framework into all courses and field or clinical experiences. Candidates will be asked by review team members about the meaning and elements of our “Teacher as Reflective Decision-Maker” framework, seeking to confirm how, and to what extent, we use that model to shape their preparation for licensure. Reviewers will also ask faculty and staff to clarify ways in which the framework shapes their teaching.

In recent years some may have provided candidates with few opportunities to fully understand and employ the framework and its components. When questioned in EDUC 310 or 359, many were unable to recall or employ the framework in their course tasks. Relate course content, activities, and candidates’ experiences to relevant facets of the model. Reference the revised knowledge base where appropriate. Incorporate the conceptual framework in the syllabus and other course materials shared with candidates.

2. Add the revised graphic (yellow and green flying saucer with “reflective” at the core) to the front page of each course syllabus. Describe ways in which the framework, as captured in the graphic, shapes the design of the opportunities provide for candidates to know, practice, and to be assessed on its elements as revealed in standards-based activities.

3. Send an electronic copy of your fall 2012 syllabus to Connie as soon as possible. All syllabi for all courses (spring 2012 if not taught in fall 2012) courses must be available “on line” for review.

4. Review the conceptual framework on the department website at <http://www.csbsju.edu/Education/Teacher-as-Reflective-Decision-Maker.htm>.

5. Read memoranda related to NCATE or BOT reviews. Sharing information via email is a most efficient way to inform and support our preparation for the October visit. While the new NCATE review process discourages preparation of an institutional report in the form we have used in the past, we will share the documents created for the review team with all department members. Review team members will refer to those documents when they seek your responses to their questions. The information gathered for NCATE will be revised to fit Minnesota’s standards and then shared with all department members.

6. Respond to requests for information.

Despite our successful reviews in 2001 and again in 2005, these past reviews do not assure our success for this round. We can expect to receive requests for additional information or clarification of information already provided in the coming month as the NCATE team prepares for its visit. Please give priority to responding to our appeals for the information that will be needed to satisfy such requests.

7. Plan to be on campus during the days when teams will be visiting. Expect team members to slip into our classes. Comply with their requests for interviews. Welcome them to our colleges and department. Provide a positive, affirming image of our program.

II. Review of our licensure programs.

Following institutional review we will begin the next phase of our accreditation, approval of each of our several licensure programs. During the **fall of 2014** The Board of Teaching will receive a recommendation from Board staff to accept, delay, or deny our request for approval of each one of our licensure programs on the basis of our compliance with a set of standards related to those guiding the institutional approval process.

5a: Requirements for each teacher preparation program within an approved institution. An approved institution submits a description of each teacher preparation program with evidence that...

5aA: The rules of the Board of Teaching governing the licensure of teachers for which students in the program are being prepared are met and the program provides curriculum, instruction, and assessment consistent with the content and pedagogical requirements of the licensure field;

5aB: The candidates enrolled in the teacher preparation program are required to complete course work in methods of teaching the content and levels of students for which they are preparing to be licensed;

5aC: The candidates preparing to be recommended for first licensure are required to successfully complete a series of early and ongoing planned, supervised, and evaluated clinical experiences as well as at least ten full weeks of student teaching experiences in the licensure field and at the licensure level for which the candidates are completing teacher preparation programs and are to be recommended for teacher licensure;

5aD: Necessary faculty and physical resources are allocated to implement and maintain the teacher preparation program as follows...

- 1) A professional staff member, qualified by academic preparation, shall provide the instructional leadership for the program and develop the course of study in collaboration with licensed, experienced school personnel in the field;
- 2) Faculty assigned to instruct and assess the subject matter content shall have advanced academic preparation to teach that content;
- 3) Faculty assigned to instruct and assess the professional education components shall have both academic preparation and direct experience teaching the content and levels established in the licensure field's scope of practice;

- 4) Program faculty assigned to provide instruction in the methods of teaching and to supervise student teaching experiences shall have teaching experience at the licensure level of the licensure program; and
- 5) Classroom teachers who supervise student teaching experiences shall hold current, valid licenses in the licensure fields and at the licensure levels they supervise.

5aE: An operating process is in place for assessing attainment of standards by each candidate who is to be recommended for licensure;

5aF: The program requires that candidates attain academic competence in the subjects the candidates will be licensed to teach.

How will the licensure program review be conducted?

Evidence affirming our compliance with these standards must be gathered from faculty in all departments contributing to the preparation of candidates in each licensure program. No one will visit our campus or interview our colleagues in those departments.

All evidence must be provided as **electronic documents** organized and transmitted via internet to the Board's "PEPER" site. We'll begin gathering this information in the fall of 2012 and continue to do so into the spring of 2013. During the summer of 2013 we will organize and encode the information we have to provide BOT staff with the required forms and supporting documents. Volunteers who are expert in each licensure program will examine our documentation and recommend approval or denial on the basis of our compliance with standards for that area. Although the details of the process may change, in the past two experts independently reviewed each program. If they agreed that standards for a licensure area were "delivered" through courses and other experiences, a program could be recommended pending staff confirmation. In the event that their findings should not agree, a third reviewer would examine our documentation to resolve the disagreement. Recent reviews have been conducted by a single auditor.

What must we do to prepare for licensure program review?

As a campus visit is not part of the licensure program review process, the documents we submit to affirm compliance with that process must be clear, concise, and focused on relevant facets of our efforts to prepare teachers for Minnesota's schools. Those teaching in cognate disciplines are often surprised by the depth and breadth of documentation required to satisfy the Board of Teaching's need to confirm that our candidates meet relevant state standards. **Our success depends solely on our ability to convince a reviewer that our candidates have sufficient opportunities to know about, practice using, and to be assessed on each pedagogy and content standard embedded in the courses and experiences they enjoy.**

Prepare comprehensive syllabi. Since the review process depends on the information we are able to share with reviewers, and since the course syllabus is the primary document that must provide that information, developing a clear, complete, and focused syllabus is essential. Fortunately, the syllabi used for our institutional review by NCATE

and BOT teams to support their decisions on institutional review will serve us well during licensure program review. Most of the elements are already present in most of our syllabi, although some might require refurbishing.

Each syllabus for each course in our curriculum must have a set of expected elements.

- a) Descriptive Information: A course title, number, faculty member, location, meeting time, and meeting days.
- b) Explicit Integration of the Unit’s Conceptual Framework. The graphic and a paragraph of two as to how the “Teacher as Reflective Decision-Maker” fits into the course should appear on the first page.
- c) Daily Course Calendar. The calendar must include relevant Minnesota Standards of Effective Practice for Teachers (MSEPT) and licensure content standards embedded in each course and related experiences for each day of instruction.
- d) Course Assignments. Each assignment, project, task, or other requirement must include a reference to the pedagogy and content standards embedded in those assignments.
- e) Standards Grid. Each syllabus must include a “grid” or chart that describes the opportunities to know, to practice, and to be assessed on both content and pedagogy standards enjoyed by candidates. Note the verbs used in the standards and employ them in the description of learning and assessment opportunities. “Knowing” or “understanding” are less demanding tasks that “using” or “applying” a standard. Repeat the language of the standard where possible to help guide the reviewer. Many have found the following format helpful.

8710.2000 Standards of Effective Practice	Know Practice Assess	Learning experiences, assignments, activities, readings, exams, etc. related to this standard.
5.E Understand the principles of effective classroom management and use a range of strategies to promote positive relationships, cooperation, and purposeful learning in the classroom.	<p>Know</p> <p>Practice</p> <p>Assessed</p>	<p>- Instructors model management techniques during the 6th seminar session.</p> <p>- Part 2 of candidates’ management plans offers an opportunity to understand management principles.</p> <p>- Analysis for Part 3 and the rubric used to score that part of candidates’ plans affirms understanding of management principles.</p>

- f) Assessments. What ways are used to confirm candidates’ attainment of pedagogy and content standards? Note those in the syllabus or as supporting documents. Provide rubrics or scoring guides as well as fixed response items or prompts from constructed response tests.
- g) Supporting Documents. Add information that will assure reviewers that the experiences provided candidates will enable them to know, practice, and be assessed on each relevant standard.
- h) Hyper-Link all documents to the Standards Grid. The grid serves as the “table of contents” for the syllabus and supporting documents. “Link” the key words in the grid to the portion of the calendar, assignments, assessments, and supporting documents that form the body of evidence to affirm compliance with the standard.