



# MINNESOTA BOARD OF TEACHING

March 18, 2009

Legislative Reference Library  
645 State Office Building  
100 Constitution Avenue  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155

**Re: In The Matter of the Proposed Rules Governing Reading Preparation, Elementary and Middle School Licensure, and Technology-Related Licensure for Teachers, Minnesota Rules, 8710; Governor's Tracking #AR 438**

Dear Librarian:

The Minnesota Board of Teaching intends to adopt rules governing reading preparation, elementary and middle school licensure, and technology-related licensure for teachers. We published a Notice of Hearing in the March 16, 2009 State Register.

The Board has prepared a Statement of Need and Reasonableness. As required by Minnesota Statutes, sections 14.131 and 14.23, the Board is sending the Library a copy of the Statement of Need and Reasonableness at the same time we are mailing our Notice of Intent to Adopt Rules.

If you have questions, please contact me at 651.582.8888 or 651.233.0399.

Yours very truly,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Karen Balmer".

Karen Balmer  
Executive Director

Enclosure: Statement of Need and Reasonableness



## MINNESOTA BOARD OF TEACHING

### STATEMENT OF NEED AND REASONABLENESS

#### **Proposed Rules Governing Reading Preparation, Elementary and Middle School Licensure, and Technology-Related Licensure for Teachers, *Minnesota Rules, 8710***

#### **INTRODUCTION**

The Board of Teaching has purview over all teacher preparation and licensure requirements in Minnesota. The proposed rules reflect the work of the Board of Teaching and its stakeholders in three areas:

1. Reading preparation for teachers
2. Middle level licensure requirements
3. Technology-related licensure requirements

These three areas have been rolled into one rulemaking effort because of overlap in a couple of the rules impacted by these three areas. For example, the K-6 Elementary Education rule, MN Rule 8710.3200, is impacted both by the reading proposals and by the middle level proposals. The changes proposed to the Elementary Education rule relating to middle level have a direct impact on the capacity for recommendations regarding reading. Therefore it is critical for these three initiatives to be reviewed and analyzed together.

As mentioned above, for each of the three areas, significant stakeholder input was solicited. It is important to understand the process used for each area, the stakeholder input, and the resulting recommendations for rule changes. Detailed information about each of these initiatives is included in the Rule-By-Rule Analysis portion of the SONAR.

This SONAR addresses 21 licensure rules proposed for revision, one licensure rule proposed for repeal, and seven licensure rules proposed for establishment as new rules. There are also three technical changes proposed. Table 1 below indicates which licensure areas are proposed for revision, repeal, or establishment; it also indicates which initiative area each rule relates to.

**Table 1**

RULE NUMBER	RULE TITLE	BOT INITIATIVE AREA(S)
<b>Proposed Rules for Revision</b>		
8710.0200	Fees	Technical Change Technology, Technical Change
8710.2000	Standards of Effective Practice for Teachers	Reading
8710.3000	Teachers of Early Childhood Education	Reading, Middle Level
8710.3200	Teachers of Elementary Education with a Specialty	

8710.4000	Teachers of Adult Basic Education	Reading
8710.4050	Teachers of Agricultural Education	Reading
8710.4200	Teachers of Business	Reading
8710.4250	Teachers of Communication Arts and Literature	Reading
8710.4450	Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences	Reading
8710.4500	Teachers of Health	Reading
8710.4525	Teachers of Keyboarding for Computer Applications	Technology
8710.4550	Library Media Specialists	Reading, Technology
8710.4600	Teachers of Mathematics	Reading
8710.4650	Teachers of Vocal Music and of Instrumental Music	Reading
8710.4700	Teachers of Physical Education	Reading
8710.4725	Teachers of Reading	Reading
		Reading, Technical
8710.4750	Teachers of Science	Change
8710.4800	Teachers of Social Studies	Reading
8710.4850	Teachers of Technology	Reading
8710.4900	Teachers of Visual Arts	Reading
	Clock Hours; Requirements for Renewal of Professional Licenses	
8710.7200		Technology

<b>Proposed Rule for Repeal</b>
---------------------------------

8710.3300	Middle Level Licensure in Academic Specialty	Middle Level
-----------	--	--------------

<b>Proposed Rules for Establishment</b>
---

	Middle Level Endorsement License in Communication Arts and Literature	
8710.3310		Middle Level, Reading
8710.3320	Middle Level Endorsement License in Mathematics	Middle Level, Reading
8710.3330	Middle Level Endorsement License in Social Studies	Middle Level, Reading
8710.3340	Middle Level Endorsement License in General Science	Middle Level, Reading
8710.3350	Preprimary Endorsement License	Middle Level
8710.3360	K-8 World Language and Culture Endorsement License	Middle Level
8710.XXXX	Reading Leader	Reading

### **ALTERNATIVE FORMAT**

Upon request, this Statement of Need and Reasonableness can be made available in an alternative format, such as large print, Braille, or cassette tape. To make a request, contact Sandy Needham at Minnesota Board of Teaching, 1500 Highway 36 West, Roseville, MN 55113. Phone: 651-582-8833. Fax: 651-582-8872. TTY: 651-582-8201.

### **STATUTORY AUTHORITY**

The Board's statutory authority to adopt the rules is set forth in Minnesota Statutes 122A.09, Subdivision 4, which provides: "The board must adopt rules to license public school teachers and interns subject to chapter 14" and Subdivision 9, which provides: "The Board of Teaching may adopt rules subject to the provisions of chapter 14 to implement sections 122A.05 to 122A.09, 122A.16, 122A.17, 122A.18, 122A.20, 122A.21, and 122A.23."

Under this statute, the Board of Teaching has the necessary statutory authority to adopt the proposed rule.

## **REGULATORY ANALYSIS**

This analysis describes the impact of the proposed rules as a collection of rules. It notes where individual proposed rules will have a unique or specific impact.

### **(1) a description of the classes of persons who probably will be affected by the proposed rule, including classes that will bear the costs of the proposed rule and classes that will benefit from the proposed rule**

- ***Classes of affected persons***
  - **Teacher candidates** – All new teachers will be held to the standards set forth in the proposed rules.
  - **Higher education institutions** – All institutions that prepare teachers will be required to embed the standards and requirements set forth in the proposed rules.
  - **Already licensed teachers**
    - 8710.7200 will add an additional requirement necessary to renew a teaching license.
    - Teachers who wish to add a licensure field or an endorsement will be held to the standards set forth in the proposed rules.
  - **Minnesota students** – MN students will be served by teachers who have met the standards set forth in the proposed rules.
- ***Those that will bear the costs of the proposed rule***
  - **Higher education institutions** – There will likely be costs associated with embedding and implementing changes required by the proposed rules. These costs will include faculty time, and possible resource allocation including funding.
- ***Those that will benefit from the proposed rule***
  - **Teacher candidates** – New teachers will be prepared well to serve their students in the areas addressed by the proposed rules.
  - **Minnesota students** – MN students will be served by teachers who have met the standards set forth in the proposed rules; there will be a greater degree of consistency in preparation of MN teachers, particularly in the area of reading.

### **(2) the probable costs to the agency and to any other agency of the implementation and enforcement of the proposed rule and any anticipated effect on state revenues**

- ***Probable costs to the agency of implementation and enforcement*** – After the rulemaking process is complete, licensure tests will need to be reviewed and aligned as needed to the new standards. The Board of Teaching may incur marginal costs in this process; however, the Board's contracted testing vendor will cover the vast majority of these costs, as per the contract.
- ***Probable costs to any other agency of implementation and enforcement*** – The Educator Licensing division at the MN Department of Education will continue to issue licenses; the proposed rule changes will not impact their staffing or resource allocation.
- ***Any anticipated effect on state revenues*** – None anticipated.

**(3) a determination of whether there are less costly methods or less intrusive methods for achieving the purpose of the proposed rule**

- ***Less costly methods*** – The BOT has no other avenue for effecting these proposed changes other than its rulemaking authority. There are no less costly methods available.
- ***Less intrusive methods*** – The BOT is the appropriate state entity to review and revise licensure requirements for teachers. The BOT’s rulemaking authority is provided to ensure that the preparation and licensure requirements are strong and are serving Minnesota students well. There are no less intrusive methods for achieving the goals of the proposed rules.

**(4) a description of any alternative methods for achieving the purpose of the proposed rule that were seriously considered by the agency and the reasons why they were rejected in favor of the proposed rule**

- ***Any alternative methods for achieving the purpose of the proposed rule that were seriously considered*** – For each of the three initiative areas, the Board of Teaching relied heavily on stakeholder participation and input. In each area, stakeholders analyzed data, considered multiple options, and made recommendations. The rule-by-rule analysis provides additional information regarding each of the specific areas and the resulting recommendations.
- ***Reasons why they were rejected in favor of the proposed rule*** – As noted above, significant stakeholder input was solicited. Board of Teaching members received input and recommendations reflecting the views of diverse groups of stakeholders in each area.

**(5) the probable costs of complying with the proposed rule, including the portion of the total costs that will be borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of governmental units, businesses, or individuals**

- ***Probable costs of complying with the proposed rules***
  - **Teacher candidates** – Teacher candidates already pay for coursework to meet the Board’s licensure requirements; the proposed rules should not have an impact on these costs to candidates.
  - **Higher education institutions** – Faculty time and resources will need to be directed towards embedding and implementing the changes required by the proposed rules.
  - **Already licensed teachers**
    - 8710.7200 will add an additional requirement necessary to renew a teaching license; while it is not uncommon for school districts to provide staff development at no charge relating to the licensure renewal requirements, teachers may have to pay for workshops or coursework to fulfill this additional requirement.

- Teachers who wish to add a licensure field or an endorsement will have to pay for coursework to meet Board’s licensure requirements; the proposed rules should not have an impact on these costs.
- *Portion of costs to be borne by identifiable categories of affected parties* – See comments above.

**(6) the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the proposed rule, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of government units, businesses, or individuals**

- *Probable costs or consequences of not adopting the proposed rules* – In each of the three areas, there was significant history relating to unresolved policy issues. Specifically:
  - **Technology** – The issues addressed by the technology-related licensure proposals are the result of several years of wrestling with unresolved issues. Prior to these rule proposals, two earlier task forces had been convened to discuss these issues, but no action had been taken. The Board determined that these issues must be resolved.
  - **Middle Level** – The Board had been faced for several consecutive years with challenges associated with the current requirements relating to the Elementary Education licensure rule, which required candidates to earn a specialty area endorsement. Simultaneously, questions were raised about the rigor of several of the specialty area endorsement areas (middle level).
  - **Reading** – The Board had been wrestling with a highly controversial issue relating to a licensure test for the reading endorsement. Given the heightened national attention regarding reading preparation for teachers, the Board determined to take a broad look at reading requirements for teachers, including but not limited to testing issues. In the 2008 legislative session, the Minnesota legislature also took an active role in evaluating the reading preparation for Minnesota teachers. If the Board had not moved forward with recommendations, the legislature would likely have intervened in this area.
- *Portion of those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties* – See comments above.

**(7) an assessment of any differences between the proposed rule and existing federal regulations and a specific analysis of the need for and reasonableness of each difference**

- *Differences between the proposed rule and existing federal regulations* – Federal regulations are not a consideration in the proposed rules. While the Board of Teaching is held to certain federal reporting requirements, the authority to determine preparation and licensure requirements for teachers rests with each individual state.
- *Need for and reasonableness of each difference* – N/A

## **PERFORMANCE-BASED RULES**

The Board, in developing the proposed rules, considered and implemented performance-based standards that emphasize superior achievement in meeting the Board's regulatory objectives. The proposed rules will also ensure that teachers licensed in Minnesota are well prepared to meet the needs of the Minnesota students they will teach.

The proposed rules were developed by stakeholders reflecting a diversity of experience and knowledge relating to each of the three areas. This diversity of stakeholder input allowed for a rich exchange of ideas and comprehensive recommendations for rule changes.

## **ADDITIONAL NOTICE**

The Additional Notice Plan was reviewed by the Office of Administrative Hearings and approved in a September 2, 2008 letter by Administrative Law Judge Lipman.

The Additional Notice Plan included stakeholders specific to each of the three initiative areas as well as general Board of Teaching stakeholders, as shown in Table 2 below.

**Table 2**

<b>GENERAL STAKEHOLDERS</b>
Association of Metropolitan School Districts
Board of Teaching Rulemaking List
Board of School Administrators
Education Minnesota
Interfaculty Organization
MN Administrators for Special Education
MN Association of Alternative Programs
MN Association of Charter Schools
MN Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
MN Association of School Administrators
MN Association of School Personnel Administrators
MN Association of Secondary School Principals
MN Department of Education
MN Elementary School Principals Association
MN Independent School Forum
MN Rural Education Association
MN School Boards Association
MN Staff Development Council
Parents United
Schools for Equity in Education

  

<b>STAKEHOLDERS: READING</b>
<i>Note: Task force members and individual participants from stakeholder meetings will be invited.</i>
Dyslexia Institute / Reading Center
Groves Academy
International Dyslexia Association
Literacy Minnesota
MN Academy of Reading

MN Association for Agricultural Educators  
MN Association of Education for Young Children  
MN Association of Family and Consumer Sciences  
MN Association of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance  
MN Business Educators, Inc.  
MN Council for Teachers of English  
MN Council for the Social Studies  
MN Council of Teachers of Mathematics  
MN Department of Education - Content Specialists  
MN Educational Media Organization  
MN Middle School Association  
MN Reading Association  
MN Reading License Coalition  
MN Science Teachers Association  
MN Technical Education Association  
Orton-Gillingham of MN  
Parent Advocacy Group  
Perpich Center for Arts Education  
St. Croix River Education District  
Winsor Learning

**STAKEHOLDERS: MIDDLE SCHOOL \***

*Note: Task force members and individual participants from stakeholder meetings will be invited.*

MN Middle School Association

\* All other stakeholders are reflected in the General Stakeholder list above.

**STAKEHOLDERS: TECHNOLOGY**

*Note: Task force members will be invited.*

MN Business Educators, Inc.  
MN Educational Media Organization  
MN Educational Media Organization - Technology Division  
MN Technology Coordinators  
Perpich Center for Arts Education  
TIES

Our Notice Plan also includes giving notice required by statute. We will mail the Notice of Hearing (including a link to the website containing the rule drafts) to everyone who has registered to be on the Board's rulemaking mailing list under Minnesota Statutes, section 14.14, subdivision 1a. We will also give notice to the Legislature per Minnesota Statutes, section 14.116.

**CONSULT WITH FINANCE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT IMPACT**

As required by Minnesota Statutes, section 14.131, the Board has consulted with the Commissioner of Finance. We did this by sending to the Commissioner of Finance copies of the documents sent to the Governor's Office for review and approval by the Governor's Office prior to the Board publishing the Dual Notice. We sent the copies on November 3, 2008. The documents included:

The Governor's Office Proposed Rule and SONAR Form  
Draft rules  
Draft SONAR

The Department of Finance sent a letter dated December 22, 2008, stating that the proposed rule will have little fiscal impact on local units of government.

**COST OF COMPLYING FOR SMALL BUSINESS OR CITY**

As required by Minnesota Statutes, section 14.127, the Board has considered whether the cost of complying with the proposed rules in the first year after the rules take effect will exceed \$25,000 for any small business or small city. The Board has determined that the cost of complying with the proposed rules in the first year after the rules take effect will not exceed \$25,000 for any small business or small city.

**LIST OF WITNESSES**

In addition to representation from the Board of Teaching, the Board anticipates having the following witnesses testify in support of the need for and reasonableness of the rules:

Potential Non-BOT Witnesses *	Professional Affiliation	BOT Initiative Area
John Melick	Educator Licensing Director, MN Department of Education	All
Terry Wolfson	Administrator, Hopkins Public Schools	Middle Level
Steve Norlin-Weaver	Administrator, Minneapolis Public Schools	Middle Level
Deborah Dillon	Faculty Member, University of Minnesota	Reading
Susan Thomson	Parent Advocate	Reading
Cara Hagen	Former Higher Education Faculty Member	Technology
Greg Utecht	Technology Director, Lakeville Public Schools	Technology

**\* Note: All potential witnesses listed in this table were members of the respective task forces that made recommendations to the Board of Teaching. These witnesses have not been confirmed, and the list is subject to change.**

**RULE-BY-RULE ANALYSIS**

This analysis addresses the rule proposals of each of the three broad initiative areas in the following order, followed by proposals for technical changes.

- Middle Level Licensure* *Pages 9-16*
- Reading Preparation* *Pages 17-26*
- Technology-Related Licensure* *Pages 27-32*

The analysis begins with critical background information for each area. This section is intended to provide the necessary context and history out of which the recommendations and proposed rule changes were developed. The Rule-By-Rule Analysis will follow for each area. Given the large number of proposed rules, the analysis will focus on the portions of the proposed rules that generated the most discussion and where controversy still exists.

### ***Critical Background Information: Middle Level Licensure Proposals***

The licensure structure relating to elementary and middle level was revised in the late 1990's as part of a comprehensive review and revision of all licensure rules, and the new requirements were effective in September, 2001. The Elementary (K-6) licensure rule, MN Rule 8710.3200 is central to the discussion regarding middle level licensure. MN Rule 8710.3300 provides additional important context.

- [8710.3200: Teachers of Elementary Education with a Specialty](#) – This rule requires all K-6 candidates to earn a license in one of six specialty areas in addition to their K-6 license. The rule specifies the standards for each of the specialty areas: Preprimary, K-8 World Language and Culture, 5-8 Mathematics, 5-8 Communication Arts and Literature, 5-8 Social Studies, and 5-8 General Science.
- [8710.3300: Middle Level Licensure in Academic Specialty](#) – This rule provides the pedagogical standards for each of the four middle level specialty areas (i.e.: understanding needs of adolescents, developing curriculum goals, etc.)

Shortly after the first cohorts were completing licensure programs under these new requirements, the Board of Teaching became aware of two issues relating to the licensure requirements, and began using annual resolutions as a way to address the issues.

1. **In-state teacher candidates:** Each year, a number of K-6 candidates successfully completed all K-6 licensure requirements, but were unable to pass the test for their specialty area. As such, they were not eligible to receive a license. Beginning in 2004, the Board authorized a resolution to allow these teachers to teach on a one-year limited license in grades K-6. The resolution required these candidates to demonstrate continued annual efforts to pass the specialty area test. *See Appendix A.*

The Board renewed this resolution each year; however, the complexity of the resolution grew, as the rule authorizing the use of a Temporary Limited License, [MN Rule 8710.1250](#), allows an individual to be granted up to three of these licenses. A Board resolution passed in 2004 allows the Executive Director to grant a fourth Temporary Limited License. *See Appendix B.* (Note: The resolution also allowed for a fourth Personnel Variance to be issued.) The issuance of a fourth Temporary Limited License (or Personnel Variance) is called an “appeal.” So until 2007, there were mechanisms in place to allow candidates who had not passed the specialty area test to teach in a K-6 setting.

However, in 2008, there were candidates who had not been able to pass the specialty area test, and who had been issued four Temporary Limited Licenses. The Board was faced with two options:

1. Provide no further options for candidates who had met the K-6 requirements, but had not passed the specialty area test. These candidates would no longer be able to teach in anything but a substitute teaching position.
2. Waive the Temporary Limited License rule to accommodate candidates who were still unable to pass the test and allow them to teach on a Temporary Limited License for more than four years.

The Board chose to authorize another resolution to allow candidates to continue to teach in a K-6 setting even if they had not yet met the specialty area requirements.

2. **Out-of-state teacher applicants:** Elementary teachers licensed outside of Minnesota were not required to meet the specialty area requirement in MN Rule 8710.3200. In most states, teacher candidates earn K-6 or 1-6 licenses; only a few states require licensure for grades K-8. As such, very few out-of-state applicants met Minnesota's licensure requirements of K-6 and a specialty area. Rather than requiring that these applicants take additional coursework to meet the specialty area requirement, the Board began passing resolutions in 2003 to waive the specialty area requirement for these applicants. As a result, these applicants were issued full K-6 licenses. *See Appendix C.*

*Note: Until the first resolution was passed in 2003 for out-of-state applicants, all candidates (including out-of-state applicants) were held to the specialty requirement. Applicants who did not meet the specialty requirements were issued one-year temporary licenses to allow them to teach in Minnesota while working towards the licensure requirements.*

The disparate treatment of teacher candidates prepared in Minnesota and applicants licensed outside of Minnesota became troubling for Board members and many Board of Teaching stakeholders, including teacher candidates and faculty members at Minnesota colleges and universities.

In addition, there were growing concerns about the depth of preparation that the K-6 candidates were receiving in their preparation programs. They are the only teacher candidates in the current licensure structure who are required to earn two licenses within one program. The K-6 licensure requirements are both numerous and rigorous, and feedback from institutions indicated that it was difficult to fit all of the requirements for the K-6 and specialty area requirements into one program. The consistent message about our current structure from our higher education colleagues was two-fold:

1. There was not enough time within the K-6 portion of the preparation program to address the critical areas of reading preparation, working with English Language Learners, and working with special education students.
2. There was great diversity among institutions in their preparation of their candidates in the specialty areas, particularly in the middle level. Some institutions were able to require more rigorous coursework and clinical experiences, while others were able to fit only a minimal amount of preparation into their programs.

Further, growing national attention to the needs of middle level learners and data indicating that standardized test scores tend to drop in the middle grades indicated to the Board of Teaching that middle level licensure needed to be addressed as a critical policy matter in addition to the existing issues relating to the structure.

Therefore, the Board of Teaching convened a Middle Level Task Force between January – March 2007 (*see Appendix D for the roster of task force members*), followed by three regional dialogues in August 2007 with a number of stakeholders with interest and expertise in middle level licensure. While the most pressing issue for the task force was to determine how best to resolve the annual

requests for resolutions for the K-6 plus 5-8 specialty licensure applications, the conversations quickly expanded to the challenges and complexity of preparing candidates for teaching in grades 5-8. These discussions resulted in a set of *Guiding Principles* which reflect the core beliefs of the task force members. Specifically, they determined that the licensing structure for middle level teachers should:

1. *Provide consistency between requirements for candidates prepared in Minnesota and applicants prepared in other states.*
2. *Maintain the strength of the Minnesota content standards.*
3. *Focus on the middle level learner, with a balance between rigor and relationships.*
4. *Address the current inconsistency of requiring two scopes (K-6 and specialty) for one license.*
5. *Maintain the capacity and opportunity for future innovation.*
6. *Recognize the need for flexibility at the local level.*
7. *Ensure appropriate depth in the preparation of future teachers.*
8. *Maintain the capacity for teachers to teach at a broad range of age levels; not limiting opportunities for teachers.*

These Guiding Principles provided direction to the task force as they considered numerous scenarios and options for middle level licensure. They unanimously agreed that the current K-6 plus Specialty requirement should be changed and that a new licensure structure was needed for grades 5-8. Their work concluded by forwarding three options to the Board of Teaching for consideration. The options were:

**1. 5-8 FULL LICENSE**

- *K-6 becomes a stand-alone license.*
- *5-8 becomes an option as a stand-alone license.*
- *Current 5-12 and 9-12 licenses remain the same.*

**2. 5-8 ENDORSEMENT**

- *K-6 becomes a stand alone.*
- *5-8 becomes an option as an endorsement (to be added to an existing license).*
- *Current 5-12 and 9-12 licenses remain the same.*

**3. 5-8 ENDORSEMENT & SECONDARY SCOPES REDEFINED TO 7-12**

- *K-6 becomes a stand alone license.*
- *5-8 is offered as an endorsement.*
- *Current 5-12 licenses would be changed to 7-12.*

It should be noted that during the regional stakeholder meetings, an option that the task force had rejected was asked to be reconsidered. This option was to continue requiring K-6 candidates to be prepared in a specialty area (as in the current rule), but make the licensure optional.

At the September 2007 Board of Teaching meeting, after receiving a presentation about the work of the task force and the input from the regional stakeholder meetings, the Board asked staff to develop recommendations for action. BOT staff members reviewed and discussed at length all input received from the task force, the regional meetings, and the Board's advisory committee, and

made the following recommendations in November 2007. *See Appendix E for the Guiding Principle(s) addressed by each recommendation, followed by rationale and implications.*

**Recommendation #1:** The current K-6 plus specialty license, MN Rule 8710.3200, should be changed to a K-6 stand alone license without the requirement of a specialty license.

**Recommendation #2:** The four current 5-8 middle level specialty licenses should be changed to endorsements that can be earned in addition to an existing Minnesota license. The new 5-8 endorsements would require candidates to:

1. Complete a minimum of a minor in the field of licensure and demonstrate the standards; and
2. Complete a minimum of a 5 week full time student teaching experience in the content area in grades 5-8.

The Board voted to approve both of the staff recommendations at the November 2007 meeting. However, a rulemaking process was not launched because it was necessary to combine the middle level proposed rule changes for K-6 and middle level with the other Board of Teaching initiatives (reading and technology), and the reading initiative was still underway.

The Board reviewed the 2007 work and recommendations in May 2008, and took the following actions:

- To approve of extracting the specialty requirement from the K-6 license, MN Rule 8710.3200.
- To explicitly state the requirement for 10 weeks of full-time student teaching in MN Rule 8710.3200.
- To approve of eliminating MN Rule 8710.3300.  
*Note: This is the current rule outlining the pedagogy standards for middle level, which have been embedded into each of the four new 5-8 endorsement rules.*
- To approve of adding the following four 5-8 endorsement licenses:  
8710.3310: Communication Arts & Literature  
8710.3320: Mathematics  
8710.3330: Social Studies  
8710.3340: Science
- To require that a candidate must complete a minimum of the equivalent of a minor in the field of licensure and demonstrate competence in the standards for the 5-8 endorsement licenses.
- To approve the requirement for a minimum of a 4-week student teaching experience for the 5-8 endorsement licenses.
- To approve of creating MN Rule 8710.3350.  
*Note: This will maintain the current preprimary endorsement as an option for K-6 candidates.*
- To approve of creating MN Rule 8710.3360  
*Note: This will maintain the current K-8 world language endorsement as an option for K-6 candidates.*

***Rule-By-Rule Analysis: Middle Level Licensure Proposals***

<b>RULE NUMBER</b>	<b>RULE TITLE</b>	<b>BOT INITIATIVE AREA(S)</b>
<b>Proposed Rules for Revision</b>		
8710.3200	Teachers of Elementary Education with a Specialty	Middle Level
<b>Proposed Rule for Repeal</b>		
8710.3300	Middle Level Licensure in Academic Specialty	Middle Level
<b>Proposed Rules for Establishment</b>		
	Middle Level Endorsement License in Communication	
8710.3310	Arts and Literature	Middle Level
8710.3320	Middle Level Endorsement License in Mathematics	Middle Level
8710.3330	Middle Level Endorsement License in Social Studies	Middle Level
8710.3340	Middle Level Endorsement License in General Science	Middle Level
8710.3350	Preprimary Endorsement License	Middle Level
8710.3360	K-8 World Language and Culture Endorsement License	Middle Level

**8710.3200 – Teachers of Elementary Education with a Specialty**

In keeping with the middle level task force, the Board of Teaching believes that the current K-6 plus specialty license, MN Rule 8710.3200, should be changed to a K-6 stand alone license without the requirement of a specialty license. This recommendation was widely supported by additional stakeholders who participated in the discussions.

While the specialty requirement was intended to strengthen the content background of all K-6 teachers and to help prevent a shortage of middle level teachers, the requirement has proven to be problematic. Effective in 2001, the Board has seen that the preparation of K-6 teachers has become too broad, and there is insufficient time in the preparation programs to delve deeply into critical areas such as special education, reading instruction, and the needs of English language learners. At the middle level, there has been a concern that the depth of preparation (both in terms of content knowledge and pedagogy specific to early adolescents) is lacking in this structure. Therefore, there is consensus among board members and stakeholders (including task force members) that the specialty requirement should be extracted from the K-6 license.

This recommendation also alleviates the practical problems raised by the current licensure structure for Minnesota candidates who cannot pass the specialty area test and for out-of-state applicants who hold a license for only grades K-6 or a 1-6.

With the exception of language found in Subpart 3C – 3G, which relates to the proposed reading changes (see discussion in the reading analysis below), all of the proposed language changes reflect this policy direction, resulting in a stand-alone K-6 license. The Board of Teaching believes that this is both needed and reasonable, and will allow for stronger preparation of Minnesota K-6 teachers.

### **8710.3300 – Middle Level Licensure in Academic Specialty**

This rule currently provides the language relating to pedagogy for middle level preparation. The specific content (subject matter) standards are found in other rules:

Communication Arts & Literature	8710.3200: Elementary
Mathematics	8710.3200: Elementary
Science	8710.4750: Science
Social Studies	8710.3200: Elementary

The Board of Teaching determined that there should be a separate rule for each of the newly developed middle level endorsement licensure areas. Each of these rules contains the content-specific language currently required as well as the pedagogy language found in 8710.3300. The Board believes that it is more efficient and understandable to our stakeholders and the public to have one rule governing each area rather than having the content and pedagogy standards in separate rules. The same pedagogy standards are used for each of the four new middle level rules.

Repealing this rule is needed and reasonable to create a more understandable licensure structure for the middle level endorsement licenses.

### **8710.3310 – Middle Level Endorsement License in Communication Arts and Literature**

### **8710.3320 – Middle Level Endorsement License in Mathematics**

### **8710.3330 – Middle Level Endorsement License in Social Studies**

### **8710.3340 – Middle Level Endorsement License in General Science**

As noted above, the Board of Teaching determined that there should be a separate rule for each of the newly developed middle level endorsement licensure areas. Each of these proposed rules contains the content-specific language currently required as well as the pedagogy language found in 8710.3300. (The same pedagogy standards are used for each of the four new middle level rules.) The Board believes that it is more efficient and understandable to our stakeholders and the public to have one rule governing each area rather than having the content and pedagogy standards in separate rules.

It should be noted that, while a full license for each of these middle level areas was considered, the Board determined that they should continue to be endorsements. This means that these licenses cannot be earned as a stand-alone license, but rather can only be earned in addition to an existing Minnesota license.

*Note: The one area that is a bit different than the others is the 5-8 General Science. In each of the other three areas, there is a 5-12 license in the same content area (i.e.; 5-12 Social Studies). In science, however, the only other licensure options are the four 9-12 licenses (physics, chemistry, life science, earth and space science). Typically, candidates earn a 5-8 science in conjunction with one of the 9-12 licenses. However, we have considered the 5-8 as a stand-alone licensure option rather than as an endorsement option only. The intent is to maintain the current interpretation.*

In each of the proposed rules, the language reflects the marriage of the existing content standards and the existing pedagogy standards. With the exception of proposed reading standards found in Subpart 3D in each of the rules (which will be discussed in the reading analysis), no changes have been proposed to these standards; these rules simply bring them together into one content-specific

rule for each area. Specifically:

- Subparts 1 and 2 provide standard language regarding the scope of practice and licensure requirements.
- Subparts 3A and 3B provide the standards relating to the pedagogy of teaching middle level learners.
- Subpart 3C provides the subject matter standards relating to the specific content area.
- Subpart 3D provides new proposed language relating to reading preparation. (See information in the Reading Preparation section below.)
- Subpart 4 provides standard language relating to the professional license.
- Subpart 5 provides an effective date of September 1, 2010.

The Board of Teaching believes that the depth of preparation for middle level teachers must be strengthened. This belief was communicated to the Board widely and consistently by stakeholders and participants in the task force. To that end, the Board has embedded two additional requirements in each of the proposed new rules.

1. **Subpart 2C – Candidates must “demonstrate completion of the equivalent of a college minor” in the content area.** The board believes that this requirement is both needed and reasonable to ensure that candidates are sufficiently prepared to teach the academic content. With increased attention and scrutiny on student achievement, movements towards increasing the academic rigor at all levels, and pressure for more students to pursue and succeed in post-secondary environments, it is critical that our teachers have strong and solid preparation in the content area that they teach.

This requirement has been controversial among higher education faculty members. The argument is that it is difficult to measure a “minor” and that minors do not exist in several of the areas. For example, no college or university offers a minor in social studies. It is for that reason that the Board carefully chose to use the language about the “equivalent of a minor.”

Institutions that choose to offer one or more of these endorsement licenses will have to submit their plans to the Board of Teaching for program approval, which is required by Minnesota Rule 8700.7600. At that time, the Board will review the coursework and materials submitted and determine whether it sufficiently meets the standard of equivalency of a minor.

It could be argued that this affords the Board of Teaching a degree of discretion that is inappropriate. However, the Board believes that we are well within our authority to make these determinations. The use of minors, for example, is a routine and well-established practice on college and university campuses. There is a range of credits that is generally accepted as appropriate for earning a minor. (There may be outliers on either end, but a typical range is 15-20 credits.) The Board would not seek to create a new standard or definition of a minor, but would rely on the current practices of institutions.

The Board is bound to the language of the rules, and could only base approval on the demonstration of the standards, both in pedagogy and content. The Board is not free to require specific coursework or credit hours. Rather, we must rely on evidence that the standards have been embedded into the coursework submitted by each program.

Finally, because the Board did not change any of language of the standards relating to pedagogy, it is important to note that the Board needs a mechanism to ensure that their goal of greater depth is achieved. The requirement of the equivalent of a minor will allow for both institutions to review their programs and the Board to enact a more consistent standard among these endorsement licensure programs.

2. **Subpart 3B (8) – Candidates must complete a minimum of a 4-week full time student teaching experience in the content area in grades 5-8.** The board believes that this requirement is both needed and reasonable to ensure that candidates are sufficiently prepared to teach at the middle level.

Given the unique needs of middle level learners, the Board of Teaching believes that it is critical for teacher candidates to have significant experience with middle level learners prior to becoming licensed. The current structure has vague language about the required clinical experiences for these candidates, and the Board has identified this as a weakness. The student teaching requirement will ensure both consistency across preparation programs and a greater depth of preparation for these teachers.

#### **8710.3350 – Preprimary Endorsement License**

#### **8710.3360 – K-8 World Language and Culture Endorsement License**

There are currently six specialty options set forth in the Elementary Education licensure rule. Four of them relate to the middle level, but there are two additional areas that must be considered. The Board of Teaching convened stakeholder groups in both areas for brief discussions relating to these fields. While significant discussion could continue about each of these areas in response to stakeholder ideas for substantial changes, it was determined that until further work is done in these areas, both fields should be maintained as endorsement options. The proposed rules do not reflect any changes to the existing standards and requirements; they simply maintain the current language as a placeholder until the Board determines to undertake a more concentrated review of these areas.

### ***Critical Background Information: Reading Preparation***

In 2005 and 2006, it became clear that the MN Board of Teaching (BOT) was facing an issue regarding the test for the Teacher of Reading endorsement. Concerns were raised by a number of stakeholders about this test (called the “Reading Specialist” test). Specifically, it was argued that the cut score was inappropriate and that the test itself was not aligned well to the licensure standards.

Given that the area of reading in general is of great importance and has received significant state and national attention in recent years, Board of Teaching staff recommendation to the Board that, rather than focus their discussions on one particular endorsement and one particular test, that they launch a task force to perform a comprehensive analysis of reading instruction in Minnesota. The Board adopted this recommendation in January 2007, and the task force convened in late February. The initial task force members came from the following organizations and institutions:

- Education Minnesota
- MN Department of Education
- MN Association of Colleges of Teacher Education
- MN Academy of Reading
- MN Reading Association
- MN Reading License Coalition
- MN Board of Teaching

This work began independent from any specific legislative action. However, shortly after the initial group was convened, the Board was involved in discussions at the legislature regarding reading. As a result, three additional members were invited to join the task force, representing the following groups:

- International Dyslexia Association
- Parent Advocacy Group
- Groves Academy

The resulting task force was a diverse group of stakeholders reflecting strong views that did not always align. The hope was that the Board of Teaching’s process that was already underway might serve both the Board’s and the Legislature’s purposes; the intent was to ensure a cohesive system rather than have “dual tracks” of reading-related requirements in both legislation and BOT rules that may or may not align.

The task force worked for many months developing a trajectory of preparation that would include pre-service teachers in many licensure fields and that would also provide opportunities for continued development of reading teachers through endorsement options. For all of these areas, they recommended standards in the following five areas:

- Foundational Knowledge
- Instructional Strategies and Materials
- Assessment, Diagnosis, Evaluation and Intervention
- Creating a Literate and Motivating Environment
- Professionalism

The specific licensure areas proposed for new reading standards were clustered into three groups:

- *Early Childhood Education & Elementary Education*
- *Content-Specific*
  - Agriculture (5-12)*
  - Business (5-12)*
  - Communication Arts & Literature (5-12)*
  - Family and Consumer Sciences (5-12)*
  - Health (5-12)*
  - Library Media Specialists (K-12)*
  - Mathematics (5-12)*
  - Middle School (5-8): Communication Arts, Math, Science, Social Studies*
  - Physical Education (K-12)*
  - Science (9-12): Physics, Chemistry, Life Science, or Earth & Space Science*
  - Social Studies (5-12)*
  - Technology (5-12)*
  - Visual Arts (K-12)*
  - Vocal & Instrumental Music (K-12)*
- *Reading Endorsements*
  - Teacher of Reading Endorsement*
  - Reading Leader Endorsement*

The task force rolled out their preliminary ideas and the framework for potential recommendations to stakeholders at meetings held in October and November 2007. The stakeholders at these meetings represented a wide variety of reading groups, teachers, and organizations, and it became clear through these meetings that there were significant concerns on the part of some stakeholders and significant differences in opinion and perspective among the diverse group of stakeholders. The concerns focused primarily on the Early Childhood and Elementary licensure areas.

As a result of the feedback received at these meetings, the task force began to revise their earlier work to reflect concerns that had been raised. This work proved to be very difficult. However, the group persisted, and was able to generate proposed standards that were agreeable to all members of the task force. These proposed standards were again presented to a wide variety of stakeholder groups, teachers, and organizations. This version was called the “Original” proposal. The feedback this time around had less to do with the substance of the proposed standards, and more to do with:

- degree of specificity of the proposed standards
- length and volume of the proposed standards
- precedent for other licensure standards (i.e.; math standards for elementary teachers)
- appropriateness of the standards for a pre-service teacher

As the task force progressed, an attempt was made to address the feedback above and to develop a condensed version, called the “Modified” version, of the proposed rules for Early Childhood Education and Elementary Education. As originally conceptualized, this version was much shorter than the Original version and would have had a companion document that would preserve the standards of the Original version for use in the development of the reading portion of the K-6 and Early Childhood content knowledge tests. After seeking legal counsel, however, it became clear

that the viability of an authoritative companion document was in question. The Modified version was considered by the task force as a stand-alone recommendation, and this discussion resulted in a schism within the task force. Several members of the task force believed that the Modified version provided sufficient language and direction for reading preparation, while other members believed that the document lacked needed specificity and clarity.

A third option was developed as an attempt to bridge the gap between the Original and Modified versions, which was called the Hybrid version. Here again, there was not consensus among task force members in support of the proposal.

Therefore, the final recommendation from the task force was Original version. It was the only version representing unified support from the entire reading task force. Further, it was supported by the MN Department of Education and several legislative leaders who were involved in the reading discussions and deliberations at the legislature. All parties believe that this was the only version that would meet three key objectives and questions:

1. VIABLE – Will this version will be successful in the rulemaking process?
2. SUSTAINABLE – Does this version recognize a diversity of viewpoints and research?
3. MEANINGFUL – Will this version effect positive change for Minnesota teacher candidates, and as a result, Minnesota students?

In July 2008 the Board took the following actions relating to each of the three areas of reading proposals:

#### ***Early Childhood Education and Elementary Education***

- To approve the recommended changes found in the Original version to the following licensure areas:
  - 8710.3000: Teachers of Early Childhood Education
  - 8710.3200: Teachers of Elementary Education
- To approve the requirement of a reading-specific clinical experience as provided under E:14 on page 7 of the Original version:
  - The ability to administer selected assessments and analyze and use of data to plan instruction through a structured clinical experience linked to university reading coursework**

#### ***Content-Specific Licensure***

- To approve the recommended changes to the following licensure areas:
  - 8710.4000: Adult Basic Education (Age 16+)
  - 8710.4050: Agriculture Education (5-12)
  - 8710.4200: Business (5-12)
  - 8710.4250: Communication Arts & Literature (5-12)
  - 8710.4450: Family & Consumer Sciences (5-12)
  - 8710.4500: Health (5-12)
  - 8710.4550: Library Media Specialists (K-12)
  - 8710.4600: Mathematics (5-12)
  - 8710.4650: Vocal & Instrumental Music (K-12)

8710.4700: Physical Education (K-12)

8710.4750: Science (9-12)

8710.4800: Social Studies (5-12)

8710.4850: Technology (5-12)

8710.4900: Visual Arts (K-12)

- To approve embedding the recommended changes from the correlating 5-12 or 9-12 licensure fields to the proposed middle level endorsements:
  - 8710.3310: Communication Arts & Literature
  - 8710.3320: Mathematics
  - 8710.3330: Social Studies
  - 8710.3340: Science

**Reading Endorsements**

- To approve the proposed changes to MN Rule 8710.4725: Teachers of Reading.
- To approve the creation of the Reading Leader endorsement.

**Rule-By-Rule Analysis: Reading Preparation**

<b>RULE NUMBER</b>	<b>RULE TITLE</b>	<b>BOT INITIATIVE AREA(S)</b>
<b>Proposed Rules for Revision</b>		
8710.3000	Teachers of Early Childhood Education	Reading
8710.3200	Teachers of Elementary Education with a Specialty	Reading
8710.4000	Teachers of Adult Basic Education	Reading
8710.4050	Teachers of Agricultural Education	Reading
8710.4200	Teachers of Business	Reading
8710.4250	Teachers of Communication Arts and Literature	Reading
8710.4450	Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences	Reading
8710.4500	Teachers of Health	Reading
8710.4550	Library Media Specialists	Reading
8710.4600	Teachers of Mathematics	Reading
8710.4650	Teachers of Vocal Music and of Instrumental Music	Reading
8710.4700	Teachers of Physical Education	Reading
8710.4725	Teachers of Reading	Reading
8710.4750	Teachers of Science	Reading
8710.4800	Teachers of Social Studies	Reading
8710.4850	Teachers of Technology	Reading
8710.4900	Teachers of Visual Arts	Reading
<b>Proposed Rules for Establishment</b>		
8710.3310	Middle Level Endorsement License in Communication Arts and Literature	Reading
8710.3320	Middle Level Endorsement License in Mathematics	Reading
8710.3330	Middle Level Endorsement License in Social Studies	Reading
8710.3340	Middle Level Endorsement License in General Science	Reading
8710.XXXX	Reading Leader	Reading

### ***Early Childhood Education and Elementary Education***

As noted earlier, these two licensure areas proved to be the most difficult and controversial. The proposed changes reflect a fragile consensus among task force members. While the Board of Teaching recognizes that there may still be stakeholders who believe that the proposed changes are too lengthy or detailed, the Board believes that this is the only viable option for moving forward with changes in how we prepare teachers in the area of reading.

The Elementary Education license spans grades K-6, and the Early Childhood license spans from birth through grade 3. There is a great deal of research and literature suggesting that if a student is not reading at grade level by the end of grade 3, he is at significantly greater risk of falling further behind academically and not completing a full K-12 education. Therefore, teachers of children through grade 3 play a critical role in ensuring that these young children are able to read at grade level, and in cases where they are struggling, are able to administer assessments and provide appropriate interventions. For these reasons, the Elementary and Early Childhood licenses were discussed together and the proposed rule changes are identical for both licensure fields.

### **8710.3000 – Teachers of Early Childhood Education**

- Subparts 3D (4):c and 3D (4):f – This existing language relating to reading preparation is proposed for deletion, as the concepts are covered in the proposed reading standards.
- Subparts 3E, 3F, 3G, 3H, 3I – These are the proposed new standards for reading. While the entire rule provides preparation for teachers of children from birth through grade 3, the new language mirrors other language in the rule where the standards are directed towards the primary grades only.
- Subpart 5 – This part sets an effective date of September 1, 2010.

### **8710.3200 – Teachers of Elementary Education\***

*\* Note: The rule title used in this section reflects the proposed change to extract the specialty requirement.*

- Subparts 3B (3), 3B (5), 3B (11), and 3B (12) – This existing language relating to reading preparation is proposed for deletion, as the concepts are covered in the proposed reading standards.
- Subparts 3C, 3D, 3E, 3F, and 3G – These are the proposed new standards for reading.
- Subpart 5 – This part sets an effective date of September 1, 2010.

*Note: All other proposed changes in this rule relate to the middle level licensure area.*

One final note regarding the Elementary Education rule: It is crucial to remember that it is simultaneously being proposed that the specialty requirement be extracted from this rule. This will create space in the licensure programs for additional time to be spent on reading preparation.

### ***Content-Specific Licensure***

These licensure fields have been clustered together, as they are all content-specific licenses. The intent of these rules is **not** to make these content teachers into reading teachers. However, the Board of Teaching, as informed by the task force and other stakeholders, believes that these teachers must have foundational knowledge and skills in reading, as reading is central to success in

each of these content areas. Success in reading translates into success in these content areas.

The proposed rules would create a common and more specific universe of preparation for pre-service teachers in these fields. Over half of our preparation programs currently require some type of a "Reading in the Content Area" course. The proposed standards are intended to be covered in such a course, which is typically 3 credits. They are not intended to take additional time away from preparation in the specific content area.

In each of the existing content-specific licensure rules, there is one standard that specifically addresses reading preparation. The Board of Teaching believes that this standard is insufficient to prepare these teachers, and that additional depth and clarity is needed. The language of this standard is largely the same in all of these rules, stating that a teacher must:

*“understand the impact of reading ability on student achievement in (content area) studies, recognize the varying reading comprehension and fluency levels represented by students, and possess the strategies to assist students to read (content area) content materials more effectively;”*

While there are similarities in the proposed reading language between licensure rules, each rule has been tailored to the specific needs and particularities of the discipline. Task force members reviewed literature specific to each content area, and input was received from stakeholders with expertise in these areas. The proposed rule changes reflect both the research and input from stakeholders.

*Note: The proposed effective date for all of content-specific rules is September 1, 2010.*

#### **8710.4000 – Teachers of Adult Basic Education**

- Subpart 3C – The existing language relating to reading preparation is proposed for deletion, as the concepts are covered and expanded in the proposed reading standards.
- Subpart 3C – New standards would replace the current language.

#### **8710.4050 – Teachers of Agricultural Education**

- Subpart 3L (8) – The existing language relating to reading preparation is proposed for deletion, as the concepts are covered and expanded in the proposed reading standards.
- Subpart 3M – New proposed standards specific to the content area.

#### **8710.4200 – Teachers of Business**

- Subpart 3E (13) – The existing language relating to reading preparation is proposed for deletion, as the concepts are covered and expanded in the proposed reading standards.
- Subpart 3F – New proposed standards specific to the content area.

#### **8710.4250 – Teachers of Communication Arts and Literature**

- Subpart 3B (1) – The existing language relating to reading preparation is proposed for deletion, as the concepts are covered and expanded in the proposed reading standards.
- Subpart 3B (1) – New proposed standards specific to the content area.

#### **8710.4450 – Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences**

- Subpart 3D (8) – The existing language relating to reading preparation is proposed for deletion, as the concepts are covered and expanded in the proposed reading standards.
- Subpart 3E – New proposed standards specific to the content area.

#### **8710.4500 – Teachers of Health**

- Subpart 3H (8) – The existing language relating to reading preparation is proposed for deletion, as the concepts are covered and expanded in the proposed reading standards.
- Subpart 3I – New proposed standards specific to the content area.

#### **8710.4550 – Library Media Specialists**

- Subpart 3E (8) – The existing language relating to reading preparation is proposed for deletion, as the concepts are covered and expanded in the proposed reading standards.
- Subpart 3F – New proposed standards specific to the content area.

*Note: The other proposed changes to this licensure rule relate to the technology initiative and are discussed in the section below.*

#### **8710.4600 – Teachers of Mathematics**

- Subpart 3I (8) – The existing language relating to reading preparation is proposed for deletion, as the concepts are covered and expanded in the proposed reading standards.
- Subpart 3J – New proposed standards specific to the content area.

#### **8710.4650 – Teachers of Vocal Music and of Instrumental Music**

- Subpart 3D (8) – The existing language relating to reading preparation is proposed for deletion, as the concepts are covered and expanded in the proposed reading standards.
- Subpart 3E – New proposed standards specific to the content area.

#### **8710.4700 – Teachers of Physical Education**

- Subpart 3C (9) – The existing language relating to reading preparation is proposed for deletion, as the concepts are covered and expanded in the proposed reading standards.
- Subpart 3D – New proposed standards specific to the content area.

#### **8710.4750 – Teachers of Science**

- Subpart 3E (10) – The existing language relating to reading preparation is proposed for deletion, as the concepts are covered and expanded in the proposed reading standards.
- Subpart 3F – New proposed standards specific to the content area.

#### **8710.4800 – Teachers of Social Studies**

- Subpart 3K (8) – The existing language relating to reading preparation is proposed for deletion, as the concepts are covered and expanded in the proposed reading standards.
- Subpart 3L – New proposed standards specific to the content area.

#### **8710.4850 – Teachers of Technology**

- Subpart 3C (8) – The existing language relating to reading preparation is proposed for deletion, as the concepts are covered and expanded in the proposed reading standards.

- Subpart 3D – New proposed standards specific to the content area.

**8710.4900 – Teachers of Visual Arts**

- Subpart 3F (8) – The existing language relating to reading preparation is proposed for deletion, as the concepts are covered and expanded in the proposed reading standards.
- Subpart 3G – New proposed standards specific to the content area.

**8710.3310 – Middle Level Endorsement License in Communication Arts and Literature**

**8710.3320 – Middle Level Endorsement License in Mathematics**

**8710.3330 – Middle Level Endorsement License in Social Studies**

**8710.3340 – Middle Level Endorsement License in General Science**

Each of the proposed middle level endorsement licenses for grades 5-8 has a correlating 5-12 or 9-12 licensure field. The Board of Teaching believes that the reading standards should be same within a content area for both the 5-8 rule and the 5-12 or 9-12 rules.

- Subpart 3D in each of the proposed middle level rules provides reading standards; these standards mirror the language found in the correlating 5-12 or 9-12 content area rule.

***Reading Endorsements***

There is currently one reading endorsement option for teachers, MN Rule 8710.4725. The Board is proposing changes to the current endorsement and establishing an additional reading endorsement called a “Reading Leader.” An endorsement cannot be earned as a stand-alone license; rather it can only be earned by an already licensed teacher who is adding this field of licensure. An endorsement licensure program is generally a shorter course of study than a full licensure program.

**8710.4725 – Teachers of Reading**

This endorsement was developed and effective in 2003 in response to a legislative directive. The existing Teacher of Reading endorsement is intended for a site-based individual working with struggling readers.

The proposed changes reflect widespread consensus among task force members and stakeholders.

- Subpart 1 – The current Scope of Practice makes clear that the endorsement is not required for:
  - elementary teachers teaching reading in a self-contained classroom; or
  - special education teachers teaching in their licensure areas.

The rationale for this language is that both groups of teachers should receive preparation specific to reading within their licensure requirements. This endorsement is not intended to be an additional requirement for these teachers; rather it is intended for individuals who will serve struggling readers in a different role. The Board believes that Teachers of English as a Second Language should be treated similarly, which is reflected in the proposed language.

- Subpart 2 – The current rule specifies the individuals who are eligible to earn this endorsement. The Board of Teaching believes that Teachers of English as a Second

Language should be included, as their preparation requirements lay an appropriate foundation that can be built on to serve in this capacity.

- Subpart 3 – The subject matter standards have been revised to better align with the standards proposed in other licensure rules.
- Subpart 4 – No changes are proposed.
- Subpart 5 – An effective date of September 1, 2010 is proposed.

It should be noted that there was discussion about one controversial recommendation from the task force. The scope of the endorsement is K-12, but it is currently required only for teachers in grades 7-12 working in a targeted assignment focusing on reading (ie: remedial reading). The task force recommended requiring the endorsement for teachers in all grades (beyond 7-12) in targeted reading settings. Specifically, this would have required Title I reading teachers to have this endorsement. After discussion and deliberation, the Board of Teaching did not move forward with this recommendation.

### **8710.XXXX – Reading Leader**

In response to a recommendation from the task force, the Board is proposing a new endorsement, called a “Reading Leader.” Unlike the Teacher of Reading endorsement, which is intended for teachers who have direct student contact at the site level, this endorsement is intended for teachers who have district-wide responsibilities (ie: curriculum adoption, staff development planning and training).

The Board is not proposing it as a requirement for any teacher, but believe that it would serve as a valuable tool for those serving in these capacities and that there are substantial numbers of teachers who would pursue such a licensure option.

These changes reflect widespread consensus among task force members and stakeholders.

- Subpart 1 – The scope of practice states the intention of the endorsement, and provides language similar to the Teacher of Reading endorsement to ensure that elementary teachers, special education teachers, and English as a second language teachers are not required to earn this endorsement to fulfill their duties under those licenses.
- Subpart 2 – This language mirrors the licensure requirements set forth in the Teacher of Reading endorsement, and includes the Teacher of Reading endorsement as a prerequisite for earning the Reading Leader endorsement. (Note: The Board discussed whether a Master’s degree should also be a prerequisite for this endorsement, but determined not to include it.)
- Subpart 3 – The subject matter standards have been developed to align with the standards proposed in other licensure rules.
- Subpart 4 – Standard licensure language is proposed.
- Subpart 5 – An effective date of September 1, 2010 is proposed.

In summary, regarding all of the reading proposals, the Board of Teaching’s process has been

inclusive of a wide and vast array of individuals and organizations, and our process has encompassed the many and varied perspectives relating to reading and reading instruction. As a result, it has been a tremendously complex and difficult process. There is great passion around this issue and the passions are not always rooted in the same core beliefs and philosophical underpinnings. The Board believes that the proposed rules not only reflect the complexities of these issues, but will serve us well as a catalyst for meaningful change in the way that we prepare teachers in the area of reading.

### ***Critical Background Information: Technology-Related Licensure***

Beginning in the fall of 2006, a number of issues relating to technology were discussed at the Board table, including the following:

1. Legislation introduced in the 2006 legislative session (HF3307) that would have required a change in licensure rules to “include technology and information literacy standards that are consistent with recommendations from the department's educator licensing and teacher quality division.”
2. At the October and November 2006 Board meetings, members discussed the possibility of including a technology component in the clock hours rule for license renewal. Board members determined to take no action at that time.
3. At the November and December 2006 Board meetings, the Board approved requests for discretionary variances under MS 14.055 and MS 14.056 that related to teachers in technology-related assignments.
4. It was clear that the legislature was interested in matters relating to technology, both as a stand-alone issue and as part of larger discussions about STEM (science, technology, engineering, and math). The Board anticipated continued legislative activity on these fronts.

Prior to these discussions, a task force had been formed and met a number of times between 2003 and 2005 to look at the current licensing structure for teachers of technology. The task force had not met since December 2005, and had not yet provided a report or recommendations to the Board.

Given the unresolved issues from the years prior, in addition to the increased attention at the legislature around technology-related matters, the Board of Teaching authorized a task force to would conduct a comprehensive analysis of the issues relating to technology in terms of both preparation and ongoing support and training. The Board set forth the following charge for the task force:

1. Review all MN rules and standards relating to technology skills and competencies for teachers.
2. Conduct an analysis of all current licensure options relating to technology.
3. Examine and compare preparation and renewal requirements in Minnesota to preparation and renewal requirements in other states.
4. Study best practices and national research.
5. Determine options for consideration and the potential impact on:
  - a. Minnesota students
  - b. Teacher candidates
  - c. Current teachers
  - d. Local school districts and charter schools
  - e. Higher education institutions
6. Develop short-term and long-term goals relating to technology.
7. Develop and present recommendations for the Board of Teaching.

The task force reflected a diverse representation of stakeholders and was convened in March 2007 and met from February through August. See Appendix F for the task force roster.

The task force reviewed and discussed numerous licensure fields. They brought four recommendations for rule changes forward to the Board of Teaching, but in order to understand the scope of their work, it is important to note the areas where they determined that no changes were needed. Specifically, they determined that no changes were needed in the following licensure areas:

- Teachers of Business
- Teachers of Visual Arts
- Teachers of Career and Technical Education
  - Communications Technology Careers
  - Construction Careers
  - Manufacturing Careers
  - Creative Design Careers
  - Transportation Careers
- Teachers of Technology
  - *Note: The “Technology” license was renamed in 2001; it was previously called an Industrial Arts license.*

Additionally, the group discussed at length the idea of developing a Media Arts license. It was determined that the Board should wait until the MN Department of Education had completed their standards revision process relating to the arts before moving forward with a new licensure rule.

The areas where the task force made recommendations for change included the following licensure rules:

- Standards of Effective Practice for Teachers
- Teachers of Keyboarding for Computer Applications
- Library Media Specialists
- Clock Hours; Requirements for Renewal of Professional Licenses

***Rule-By-Rule Analysis: Technology-Related Licensure***

RULE NUMBER	RULE TITLE	BOT INITIATIVE AREA(S)
<b>Proposed Rules for Revision</b>		
8710.2000	Standards of Effective Practice	Technology
8710.4525	Teachers of Keyboarding for Computer Applications	Technology
8710.4550	Library Media Specialists	Technology
8710.7200	Clock Hours; Requirements for Renewal of Professional Licenses	Technology

After receiving recommendations from the task force, the Board of Teaching took action on the four recommended licensure areas.

### **8710.2000: Standards of Effective Practice**

In concurrence with the task force, the Board of Teaching believes that technology must be more clearly articulated in the Standards of Effective Practice, which are embedded into all initial licensure programs. All teachers, regardless of what age or subject matter they are teaching, must be prepared to embed and utilize technology effectively in the classroom. The proposed changes include new standards, changes to existing standards, and elimination of one existing standard.

It should be noted that there was no controversy surrounding the proposed changes to this rule.

### **Proposed New Standards**

All of these standards were adapted from and used with permission from *National Educational Technology Standards for Teachers: Preparing Teachers to Use Technology*, © 2002, ISTE ® (International Society for Technology in Education), [www.iste.org](http://www.iste.org). As such, the Board believes that these proposals reflect best practices and can be supported by research.

- Subpart 3H , relating to student learning
- Subpart 4R, relating to diverse learners
- Subpart 5M, relating to instructional strategies
- Subpart 8I, relating to planning instruction
- Subpart 9N, relating to assessment
- Subpart 10M, relating to reflection and professional development
- Subpart 11L, relating to collaboration, ethics, and relationships

### **Proposed Standard for Elimination**

- Subpart 5D, relating to instructional strategies – The Board believes this is redundant in light of the proposed standard 5M.

### **Proposed Modification to Existing Standards**

- Subpart 7K, relating to communication – The Board believes that updated language is necessary.
- Subpart 9E, relating to assessment – The Board believes that this standard should refer to “technologies” to clarify the meaning.

### **Effective Date**

- Subpart 12 provides an effective date of September 1, 2010 for these standards.

### **8710.4525: Keyboarding for Computer Applications**

This endorsement was originally created in 2003 to respond to a specific need. Business teachers are licensed only in grades 5-12 (or 7-12 under the pre-2001 Business license), so there was a need for more teachers to teach these skills to younger students. While still relatively new, this endorsement has been problematic for the following reasons:

1. The title is both confusing and misleading.

2. The scope of practice and standards does not reflect the actual duties these of teachers in their schools, and does not allow for the kinds of duties that they should be doing in the future.
  3. Some stakeholders have argued that the current scope (grades K-8) is too limiting and that the scope should be broadened to grades K-12.
- Title – In order to better describe the actual role and function of the endorsement, the Board is proposing to change the title from “Teachers of Keyboarding for Computer Applications” to “Teachers of Computer, Keyboarding, and Related Technology Applications.”
  - Subpart 1 – The Board proposes changes to the Scope of Practice to better describe the intent of the endorsement. They also propose expanding the scope of the endorsement from grades K-8 to grades K-12. It is critical to note that this was not a recommendation from the task force; the task force recommendations left the scope of the endorsement unchanged (grades K-8). However, this was a source of significant discussion within the task force. Several members advocated changing the scope to K-12, which would provide opportunities for secondary teachers to expand into these roles. Under the current structure, there are very limited options for licensed teachers to teach a computer-related assignment. Their options include:
    - earning a Business license
    - earning a Technology license
      - *Note: The “Technology” license was renamed in 2001; it was previously called an Industrial Arts license.*
    - earning a Communications Technology Careers license, which is one of the Career and Technical Education (formerly called Vocational Education) licenses
    - teaching on a variance, which allows him to teach out of his licensure field for up to three years

With the growth in demand for computer-related courses and the need to provide students with as many opportunities as possible to access this knowledge and experience, the Board of Teaching believes that there must be another option for teachers to be able to teach in these areas. Both the Business and Technology licenses cover vastly more than computer-related topics, and the Board believes that it is neither practical nor realistic to expect a licensed teacher to earn one of these licenses if their only objective is to teach computer-related courses. The endorsement is designed to be a shorter course of study and targets the skills and knowledge needed for teachers to teach computer-related courses.

This proposal has been highly controversial. The primary opposition has come from Business teachers, who have expressed that this will create a serious problem, as courses that they currently teach may be assigned to teachers who have this endorsement rather than to licensed Business or Technology teachers.

However, the Board maintains that the growing need for more coursework for students in this area, coupled with the limiting nature of our current structure, provides rationale that this change is both needed and reasonable.

- Subpart 2 – No proposed changes except references to the title of the endorsement.
- Subpart 3 – Using the recommended language of the task force, which was rooted in research and professional understanding about best practices in this area, the Board proposes several changes to the subject matter standards.
- Subpart 4 – No proposed changes except references to the title of the endorsement.
- Subpart 5 – The Board proposes an effective date of September 1, 2010 for these changes.

### **8710.4550: Library Media Specialists**

The task force’s original recommendation to the Board was to embed only minor changes in this rule, but as a result of the K-8 Keyboarding recommendations, the recommendations are now more substantive. The rationale behind the more extensive changes is twofold:

1. To better align the standards with the work that is being done by Library Media Specialists. The recommended language changes are not intended to change the profession or their current assignments, but rather to clarify and update the standards to match the work being done in the field.
2. To provide clarity about the role of Library Media Specialists to ensure that the K-8 Keyboarding licenses do not become an easy substitute for the Library Media Specialists.

The Board of Teaching believes that the recommended changes are appropriate, and are proposing them for rule change. The proposed changes were not controversial.

- Subpart 1 – The Board proposes changes to the Scope of Practice to better describe the intent of the license.
- Subpart 2 – No proposed changes.
- Subpart 3 – Using the recommended language of the task force, which was rooted in research and professional understanding about best practices in this area, the Board proposes several changes to the subject matter standards. These changes are intended to update and clarify the role of a Library Media Specialist.
  - *Note: Subpart 3F reflects the work of the reading initiative.*
- Subpart 4 – No proposed changes.
- Subpart 5 – The Board proposes an effective date of September 1, 2010 for these changes.

### **8710.7200: Clock Hours; Requirements for Renewal of Professional Licenses**

In accordance with the guiding principles developed early in the process (see Appendix G), the task force recommended that all teachers must continually invest in developing their technology skills, and as such, recommended requiring a minimum of 10 clock hours within each five-year renewal period to:

*“integrate technology effectively with student learning to increase engagement and student achievement.”*

- Subpart 2 – The Board believes that this requirement relating to technology is appropriate, but not a minimum number of hours for this requirement. They propose an effective date of June 30, 2012, to allow teachers ample time to meet the requirement. Even without the designation of a specific number of clock hours and an effective date set several years out,

this is a source of controversy among our stakeholders.

Many teachers have expressed concern about additional renewal requirements, expressing dismay about having another mandate to adhere to and the lack of individual and local discretion about what professional development should be pursued.

However, the Board believes that the role of technology is central to student learning, and that it is appropriate to require that within each five-year renewal period, there is at least minimal training and development in this area. The Board has proposed language that is specific to the integration of technology for the purpose of student learning and student achievement. Given that this is the core mission of education, they maintain that this requirement is both needed and reasonable for all teachers.

**Rule-By-Rule Analysis: Technical Changes**

<b>RULE NUMBER</b>	<b>RULE TITLE</b>	<b>BOT INITIATIVE AREA(S)</b>
<b>Proposed Rules for Revision</b>		
8710.0200	Fees	Technical Change
8710.2000	Standards of Effective Practice for Teachers	Technical Change
8710.4750	Teachers of Science	Technical Change

**8710.0200 – Fees**

The Board cannot establish or change a fee without legislative authority. Several years ago, the legislature authorized the Board to increase the licensure fee from \$47 to \$57, which is reflected in MS 122A.21:

***122A.21 TEACHERS' AND ADMINISTRATORS' LICENSES; FEES.***

*Each application for the issuance, renewal, or extension of a license to teach must be accompanied by a processing fee of \$57. Each application for issuing, renewing, or extending the license of a school administrator or supervisor must be accompanied by a processing fee in the amount set by the Board of Teaching. The processing fee for a teacher's license and for the licenses of supervisory personnel must be paid to the executive secretary of the appropriate board. The executive secretary of the board shall deposit the fees with the commissioner of finance. The fees as set by the board are nonrefundable for applicants not qualifying for a license. However, a fee must be refunded by the commissioner of finance in any case in which the applicant already holds a valid unexpired license. The board may waive or reduce fees for applicants who apply at the same time for more than one license.*

However, MN Rule 8710.0200 still lists the fee as \$47. Because the fee may change again in the future, the Board believes that it is wise to incorporate language into the rule to reflect the legislative authority at any given time. The Board proposes stating “in compliance with the fee authorized by the legislature” rather than stating a specific dollar figure. This will allow the Board rules to stay current, even if the fee changes.

**8710.2000 – Standards of Effective Practice for Teachers**

The Standards of Effective Practice contain two identical standards found in Subpart 8. The Board proposes keeping Subpart 8C and eliminating Subpart 8E.

Subp. 8. **Standard 7, planning instruction.** A teacher must be able to plan and manage instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals. The teacher must:

- A. understand learning theory, subject matter, curriculum development, and student development and know how to use this knowledge in planning instruction to meet curriculum goals;

B. plan instruction using contextual considerations that bridge curriculum and student experiences;

C. plan instructional programs that accommodate individual student learning styles and performance modes;

D. create short-range and long-range plans that are linked to student needs and performance;

E. plan instructional programs that accommodate individual student learning styles and performance modes;

### **8710.4750 – Teachers of Science**

In the current rule, Subpart 3 provides the standards for grades 5-8, and 3E specifically outlines many pedagogy standards. The Board believes that this language was inadvertently dropped from the four 9-12 licensure areas (physics, chemistry, life science, earth and space science), found in Subparts 4-7. It is and has been the Board's practice to require these standards for the 9-12 fields. All of the 9-12 licensure areas must report these standards for the purposes of both initial and ongoing program approval, so this change simply brings the language into alignment with the Board's practice and expectations.

### **CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing, the proposed rules are both needed and reasonable.

---

March 16, 2009

---

Karen Balmer  
Executive Director

## APPENDIX A



## MINNESOTA BOARD OF TEACHING

### BOARD OF TEACHING RESOLUTION REGARDING THE ISSUANCE OF A LICENSE TO AN APPLICANT WHO HAS FAILED THE SPECIALTY TEST

**WHEREAS**, MN Rule 8710.3200 requires that all candidates for licensure have a specialty; and

**WHEREAS**, MN Rule 8710.0500, subpart 1 (B), requires an applicant for a first professional teaching license in any field to provide evidence of having successfully completed an examination of general teaching knowledge and the examination required for the teaching field for which licensure is applied under this chapter; and

**WHEREAS**, MN Rule 8710.0400, subpart 4, provides:

Subp. 4. Exception for applicants who have not met part [8700.2700](#) or [8710.0500](#). An applicant who has completed a teacher licensure program outside Minnesota, has met the criteria of subpart 3 or 3a, but has not completed the requirements of part [8700.2700](#) or [8710.0500](#), or both, shall be granted a Minnesota temporary limited license based upon the provisions of this part; and

**WHEREAS**, an inequity has been created between MN Rule 8710.0500, subpart 1 (B) and MN Rule 8710.0400, subpart 4; and

**WHEREAS**, MN Rule 8710.1250, subpart 4, allows for only three temporary limited licenses; and

**WHEREAS**, MS 14.055 gives the Board authority to issue a variance to one of its rules;

**THEREFORE**, the Board authorizes its Executive Director to issue a temporary limited license for grades K-6 to the applicant who has failed the specialty test but has met all other standards and conditions of MN Rules 8710.3200 and MN Rule 8710.0400 and who has demonstrated continued attempts to pass the test if the applicant requests a variance from MN Rule 8710.0500, subpart 1(B) and MN Rule 8710.1250, subpart 4. The extension of this resolution which was approved in November of 2004, amended in June of 2005, amended in May of 2006, and amended in April of 2007 will be in effect until June 30, 2009.

*Approved: November 19, 2004*

*Amended: June 10, 2005*

*Amended: May 12, 2006*

*Amended: April 13, 2007*

*Amended: April 11, 2008*

**APPENDIX B**



**MINNESOTA BOARD OF TEACHING**

**BOARD OF TEACHING RESOLUTION REGARDING THE DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY  
TO ITS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO WAIVE APPLICATION OF MINNESOTA RULES  
8710.1400, 8710.1250 AND 8710.4950 UPON APPLICATION FROM LOCAL SCHOOL  
DISTRICTS**

**WHEREAS**, the Minnesota Board of Teaching has authority to issue personnel variances and temporary limited licenses pursuant to MN Rules 8710.1400, 8710.1250, and 8710.4950; and,

**WHEREAS**, school districts or charter schools may need or desire to continue employment of an individual who has been granted a personnel variance or a temporary limited license and is in the process of completing all requirements for a professional license but needs one additional year to meet the standards for the license; and,

**WHEREAS**, school districts or charter schools may need or desire to continue employment of an individual who has been granted a personnel variance World Languages – American Sign Language because there is no program offered in the State; and,

**WHEREAS**, the Board of Teaching has authority to waive its rules pursuant to Minnesota Statutes 14.055; and

**WHEREAS**, school districts or charter schools that have been granted variances for individuals under Minnesota Rule 8710.1400 must request an additional variance to the Board to waive 8710.1400, Subp. 2. (B)(3), Subp. 3, Subp. 3a; and

**WHEREAS**, school districts or charter schools that have been granted temporary limited licenses to individuals under Minnesota Rule 8710.1250 must request an additional variance to the Board to waive 8710.1250 Subp. 2, (B) (2), Subp. 3., Subp. 4.; and.

**WHEREAS**, school districts or charter schools that have been granted variances for individuals under Minnesota Rule 8710.4950 must request an additional variance to the Board to waive 8710.4950 Subp. 5.; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board of Teaching meets only on a monthly basis;

**THEREFORE**, the Minnesota Board of Teaching delegates authority to the Executive Director to grant a one-year extension, upon request from local school districts, to individuals who can provide evidence that one additional year is necessary to complete all requirements for a professional license in that content area. Also, to grant on a yearly basis a request for a variance to teachers until such a time a program is approved to meet licensure requirements.

All requests to waive the rules, as identified above, granted by the Executive Director of the Board of Teaching pursuant to this resolution shall be reported to the Board at the regularly scheduled board meeting.  
*--Adopted by the Minnesota Board of Teaching on March 12, 2004*

## APPENDIX C



## MINNESOTA BOARD OF TEACHING

### **BOARD OF TEACHING RESOLUTION REGARDING VARIANCES TO MINNESOTA RULE 8710.0400, REQUIREMENTS FOR INDIVIDUAL CANDIDATES PREPARED OUT-OF-STATE**

**WHEREAS**, the Minnesota Department of Education has requested the Board of Teaching to grant a variance to Minnesota Rule 8710.0400, subpart 5, for applicants prepared outside of Minnesota whose preparation may qualify them for a K-6 license and are required to complete additional requirements for a specialty license; and

**WHEREAS**, the Minnesota Board of Teaching has the authority to waive its rules pursuant to Minnesota Statutes 14.055; and

**WHEREAS**, the Minnesota Board of Teaching's application of MN Rule 8710.0400 subpart 5 to an out-of-state applicant for a MN teacher license may result in a hardship for the applicant;

**THEREFORE**, the Minnesota Board of Teaching will grant a K-6 license and will waive the specialty requirement until June 30, 2009 to all out-of-state candidates who otherwise meet all other requirements of Rule 8710.0400 for licensure, and that the MN Department of Education, Educator Licensing and Teacher Quality division be authorized to issue out-of-state applicants who are otherwise qualified for a professional license, a K-6 professional license or the corresponding Minnesota nonrenewable license, whichever is applicable.

*Adopted: September 12, 2003*

*Amended: June 11, 2004*

*Amended: June 10, 2005*

*Amended: May 12, 2006*

*Amended: April 13, 2007*

*Amended: April 11, 2008*

## APPENDIX D

### 5-8 TASK FORCE

Education Minnesota (4)	Rob Gardner Nancy Gladson-Houtkooper Julie Jagusch Mary Wherry
MN Assn of Secondary School Principals (3)	Peter Christensen Colleen Wambach Terry Wolfson
MN Elementary School Principals Assn (1)	Jim Hoogheem
MN Middle School Assn (1)	Steve Norlin-Weaver
MN Dept of Education (1)	Daniel Bittman
MN Assn of Colleges of Teacher Education (3)	Bruce Munson Peg Ballard Vicki Olson Lynn Lindow
MN Rural Education Assn (1)	David Pace
MN School Boards Assn (1)	Sandy Gundlach
MN Assn of School Administrators (1)	Tom Westerhaus
MN Assn of Charter Schools (1)	MayChy Vu
MN Board of Teaching (3)	Karen Balmer Richard Simms JoAnn VanAernum

## APPENDIX E

**Recommendation #1:** The current K-6 plus specialty license, MN Rule 8710.3200, should be changed to a K-6 stand alone license without the requirement of a specialty license.

**Guiding Principle #1 - Provide consistency between requirements for candidates prepared in Minnesota and applicants prepared in other states.**

**Guiding Principle #4 – Address the current inconsistency of requiring two scopes (K-6 and grades 5-8) to obtain one license.**

Conversations with stakeholders in both the task force and at the regional meetings universally demonstrated agreement that an inequity exists between the current practice and treatment of K-6 candidates prepared in Minnesota and K-6 applicants prepared in other states. Since 2003, Board resolutions have enforced the following policies:

- Minnesota candidates are granted a temporary K-6 license and have up to three years to meet the requirements of a specialty field before being granted a full professional license.
- Out of state applicants are not required to meet the specialty field requirements and may be granted a K-6 professional license if qualified.

To resolve this inequity, a K-6 stand-alone license should be implemented. A K-6 stand-alone license will allow applicants prepared out of state who typically complete preparation programs for either K-6 or 1-6 to be granted the license for which they were prepared and qualify without having to waive a Board rule. Minnesota candidates will be able to obtain the K-6 stand-alone license for which they qualify, and will not be required to earn a specialty license in addition to the K-6 license.

Additionally, this recommendation will address the current inequity that whereas all other Minnesota teacher candidates must meet the standards and testing requirements for one licensure area, all K-6 candidates are required to meet the standards and testing requirements in two licensure areas.

**Guiding Principle # 3 - Focus on the middle level learner, with a balance between rigor and relationships.**

Stakeholders were troubled by the constraints and limitations of the current system to provide significant depth in the middle level programs in terms of both content rigor and focus on pedagogy and the specific needs of early adolescents. By separating the K-6 from the specialty areas, it will allow the K-6 preparation programs to focus on a more narrow scope – the elementary learner – and will also allow for greater depth in the middle level licensure programs.

### **Implications for Recommendation #1:**

#### ***Minnesota Students***

- K-6 students will have teachers who have been prepared specifically to the needs of K-6 learners.

- K-6 students will not have teachers prepared in one of the existing specialty areas, which has often provided a greater depth of understanding in a content area. However,

***Minnesota Teacher Candidates***

- K-6 teacher candidates will be required to earn one area of licensure, and as such, will be treated the same as all other MN licensure candidates.
- K-6 teacher candidates will be held to the same requirements as out-of-state licensure applicants.
- K-6 teacher candidates will have a more focused course of study, centering on elementary-aged learners.
- K-6 teacher candidates will not have the exposure to teaching in the middle level setting, which has proved to be an effective way of encouraging some K-6 teachers to pursue middle level teaching.
- K-6 teacher candidates will have an opportunity to have increased preparation in critical areas such as reading, special education, and English language learners.

***Minnesota Teachers (already licensed)***

- N/A

***Minnesota Schools***

- Applicants for positions in K-6 settings will have had greater focus on K-6 learners.

***Minnesota Colleges & Universities***

- Without the required coursework and clinical experience for the specialty areas, preparation programs will gain space to increase preparation in areas such as reading, special education, and ELL. K-6 programs may offer candidates additional fields of concentration in these or other areas. These concentrations will not lead to licensure, but can enhance a candidate’s knowledge base and employability.
- Minnesota colleges/universities will redesign their currently approved program to eliminate the required studies for an academic specialty, creating a stand alone K-6 licensure program.
  - Note: Institutions may choose to continue offering an integrated K-6 plus 5-8 program, but all programs will be required to submit a revised program application reflecting the new 5-8 requirements (below).

**Recommendation #2:** The four current 5-8 middle level specialty licenses should be changed to endorsements that can be earned in addition to an existing Minnesota license. The new 5-8 endorsements would require candidates to:

1. Complete a minimum of a minor in the field of licensure and demonstrate the standards; and
2. Complete a minimum of a 5 week full time student teaching experience in the content area in grades 5-8.

**Guiding Principle #2 - Maintain the strength of the Minnesota content standards.**

The initial task force reviewed state and national standards for required knowledge and skills expected of middle level teachers. The content and pedagogical standards for “specialties,” effective September 1, 2001, were developed by field-specific Minnesota licensure teams. Participants in the 2007 task force and subsequent discussions generally concurred that Minnesota

standards for 5-8 middle level licensure in pedagogical, professional and subject matter knowledge/skills are comprehensive and do not need to be changed. The revised structure will allow teacher candidates to engage the current standards at a deeper level.

**Guiding Principle #7 - Ensure appropriate depth in the preparation of future teachers.**

**Guiding Principle #3 - Focus on the middle level learner, with a balance between rigor and relationships**

In the standards-based licensing system, the number of courses and number of credits earned to complete an academic specialty for licensure are determined by the institution. The middle level specialty standards for content and pedagogy established by the Board define the requirements and the knowledge and skills necessary for entering the teaching profession. There exists a wide range in how programs are designed and offered across Minnesota's 29 teacher preparation programs which offer a K-6 and/or 5-8 programs.

The recommendation for requiring a minor in the content area will allow for greater depth and consistency in the content preparation; similarly, the recommendation for a five-week student teaching experience will allow for increased depth and consistency in the pedagogical preparation for middle level teachers.

**Guiding Principle #6 – Recognize the need for flexibility at the local level.**

**Guiding Principle #8 – Maintain the capacity for teachers to teach at a broad range of age levels; not limiting opportunities for teachers.**

While most stakeholders in our discussions agree that requiring either a full license or an endorsement specific to the middle level is ideal, many of the discussions reflected concerns relating to the practical matters of hiring and staffing. It would be unwise to pursue a licensure structure that will make licensure unappealing or unrealistic, resulting in fewer middle level teachers to serve in our schools. The recommendation to create a 5-8 endorsement is less restrictive than a full license, while still increasing the preparation for 5-8 teachers.

We have learned from our current K-6 plus specialty system that some teacher candidates are surprised to learn that they enjoy working with middle level students once they are exposed to them. Therefore, it may be wise to consider embedding some type of a 5-8 exposure requirement within the K-6 licensure rule to continue to draw teachers to the middle level.

### **Implications for Recommendation #2:**

#### ***Minnesota Students***

- Students will have access to teachers who have had a greater depth of preparation specific to middle level content and middle level pedagogy.

#### ***Minnesota Teacher Candidates***

- Teachers will be prepared with a greater depth of content knowledge and increased experience with middle level students.
- Teacher candidates will enter the classroom with significantly greater understanding of and experience with middle level students.

#### ***Minnesota Teachers (already licensed)***

- Licensed teachers in other areas will have an opportunity to earn an endorsement in a 5-8 content area without going through a full licensure program.

### ***Minnesota Schools***

- Applicants for positions in middle level settings will have a greater depth of content knowledge and experience with middle level students.
- Applicants for positions in middle level settings will likely be individuals who truly want to teach in a middle level setting.

### ***Minnesota Colleges & Universities***

- Current “specialty” areas will be called “Endorsements,” which can be added to a Minnesota license. The endorsement areas will remain the same:
  - Communication Arts & Literature, grades 5-8
  - Mathematics, grades 5-8
  - Social Studies, grades 5-8
  - Preprimary, ages 3 and above
  - World Languages, grades K-8
  - Science, grades 5-8
    - *Note: 5-8 Science will continue to be either a stand alone or an endorsement to an existing license.*
- All institutions that wish to offer a 5-8 endorsement program will be required to submit a revised program application for approval (process to be developed).
- Minnesota colleges/universities may also select to offer the currently approved K-6 Elementary licensure program simultaneously with an endorsement, previously called specialty fields.
  - Candidates may select to enroll in programs that will recommend them for a K-6 stand alone license, or a K-6 plus an endorsement (including endorsements in preprimary or K-8 world languages).
  - Candidates completing K-6 and endorsement programs simultaneously are required to meet all program requirements and must take the required examinations for K-6 and the endorsement.
  - A transition period will be provided to allow students enrolled in currently approved programs to complete the prescribed program. The approval status of currently approved programs will continue through the next review cycle with no additional program submission.

## APPENDIX F

### BOARD OF TEACHING TECHNOLOGY TASK FORCE

Education Minnesota	Renee Jesness Mark Bray Jeff Krause Jay Nix Garnet Franklin
MN Dept of Education	Mary Mehsikomer Jean Kyle Dan Smith John Melick
MN Assn of Colleges of Teacher Education	Cara Hagen Scott Page David Ernst
MN Business Educators, Inc.	Denita Clapp Kathryn Larson Judith Lambrecht
MEMO: MN Educational Media Organization	Gina Light Laurie Conzemius
MEMO-Tech: MEMO Technology Division	Gary Ganje Susan Heidt
MN Technology Coordinators	Tim Wilson Greg Utecht
MN Association of School Administrators	Jay Haugen
MN School Boards Association	Sandy Gundlach
MN Rural Education Association	David Pace
MN Association of Charter Schools	
Perpich Center for Arts Education	Mike Hiatt
MN Board of Teaching	Karen Balmer Richard Simms JoAnn VanAernum

## **APPENDIX G**

### **BOARD OF TEACHING TASK FORCE ON TECHNOLOGY**

#### **Guiding Principles**

**May 11, 2007**

- 1.** We realize there are different types of technology definitions, including instructional technology, information technology, and industrial technology. We believe there are different categories for the technology requirements we will be discussing and these definitions can get blended depending on the teachers skill and knowledge. For example, teaching WITH technology is different than teaching ABOUT technology, but sometimes the line between the two gets blurred. In addition, there are times when it is appropriate to teach technology for its own sake and value and other times it is a tool for learning other types of content.
- 2.** We believe that technology skills must be embedded within content area instruction, but that some skills can be taught independently from subject-specific content. We recognize that Minnesota statute requires that information and technology literacy be embedded in content standards, which means these skills will be taught to students in regular classrooms by content or grade-level licensed teachers.
- 3.** We believe in the value of ongoing staff development and training. Ongoing staff development and training is critical to ensure that all teachers who are already certified are continuously updating their technology skills.
- 4.** We believe that technology use as a critical component of instruction is no longer optional.
- 5.** We believe that effective and appropriate technology integration with instruction to improve student learning is an important component of best practice for all teachers.
- 6.** We believe that technology skills, application, and understanding of technology need to be taught and modeled.
- 7.** We recognize that teachers have a finite amount of time to address all the requirements placed upon them.
- 8.** We believe that when technology is effectively integrated with teaching and learning, it can help students build higher level skills such as critical thinking, become discerning users of information, and foster expanded communication and learning.
- 9.** We believe that flexibility in meeting requirements is needed for school boards and administrators because every school district has different resources and needs.
- 10.** We believe that technology-related career exploration is an appropriate and critical role for secondary education.
- 11.** We believe that pre-service licensure requirements must prepare teacher candidates to effectively embed technology into their teaching.
- 12.** We believe the licensing structure should foster a teacher's capacity for professional growth and development into new licensure areas.