

Minnesota Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board

STATEMENT OF NEED AND REASONABLENESS (SONAR)

Proposed Revisions to Minnesota Rules Chapter 8705, Governing the Approval of Teacher Preparation Providers (Units) and Programs

Revisor's ID 4576



ALTERNATIVE FORMAT

Upon request, this information can be made available in an alternative format, such as large print, braille, or audio. To make a request, contact:

Michelle Hersh Vaught

Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board

1021 Bandana Blvd. E., Suite 222

St. Paul, MN 55108-5111

Phone: (651) 539-4187 | Fax: (651) 642-0708

Email: Michelle.Vaught@state.mn.us

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ALTERNATIVE FORMAT 2

INTRODUCTION 4

STATUTORY AUTHORITY 8

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION 10

REGULATORY ANALYSIS 13

PERFORMANCE-BASED RULES 21

TEACHER SUPPLY AND DEMAND 22

ADDITIONAL NOTICE 23

CONSULTATION WITH MMB ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT IMPACT 24

DETERMINATION ABOUT RULES REQUIRING LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION 25

COST OF COMPLYING FOR SMALL BUSINESS OR CITY 26

LIST OF WITNESSES 27

RULE-BY-RULE ANALYSIS 28

CONCLUSION 90

INTRODUCTION

One pathway to teacher licensure in Minnesota is by completing an approved teacher preparation program. An approved teacher preparation program provides candidates with learning opportunities specific to their field (i.e., courses, discussions, online modules), clinical experiences in the classroom (i.e., student teaching), and ongoing assessments and evaluations to ensure the candidate has the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to teach Minnesota's students. A candidate that completes an approved teacher preparation program is eligible to apply for a professional teaching license in Minnesota.¹

The Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board (PELSB) is responsible for approving and overseeing teacher preparation.² Minnesota Rules, chapter 8705, establishes the requirements and approval processes. PELSB proposes to amend its existing rules governing the approval of teacher preparation providers (often referred to as "units") and programs in Minnesota. The proposed changes are intended to accomplish the following goals:

- To establish a single set of standards that are inclusive of all teacher preparation provider types
- To establish standards and processes for approving providers that offer licensure programs that only meet a subset of standards
- To remove or modify standards that are overly burdensome or hamper innovation
- To update, clarify, and streamline existing standards in an effort to eliminate redundant requirements and enhance transparency
- To separate and reorganize existing multifaceted standards into discrete, measurable standards
- To align rule with shifts in the field of teacher preparation, including the design of high-quality, authentic clinical experiences
- To acknowledge national accreditation in an effort to reduce provider workload and reduce redundancies
- To update and clarify the program approval process (both the initial approval process and the ongoing ("continuing") approval process)
- To encourage continuous improvement while requiring greater accountability
- To establish a clear and transparent discretionary variance process

¹ Candidates with no prior teaching experience are eligible for a Tier 3 license; while candidates with at least 3 years of teaching experience are eligible for a Tier 4 license.

² Minn. Stat. 122A.092 (2019).

Recent statutory changes impacting teacher preparation in Minnesota

Significant statutory changes to teacher licensure, teacher preparation, and board oversight make it necessary to update the rules governing teacher preparation. Without rule changes, the approval process for teacher preparation providers and programs will prove to be overly burdensome for some providers and inconsistent with the state's efforts to expand high quality teacher preparation for Minnesota's teacher candidates.

The Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board was created by the state legislature in 2017, when the legislature combined the work of the Board of Teaching (BOT) and the Minnesota Department of Education's Licensing Division.³ PELSB is governed by an 11-member board and is tasked with:

- Licensing teachers in Minnesota⁴
- Establishing and maintaining teacher licensure standards and requirements⁵
- Establishing and enforcing the Teacher Code of Ethics⁶
- Approving and overseeing teacher preparation providers and programs to prepare candidates in Minnesota.⁷

Prior to 2011, institutions of higher education (IHEs) were the exclusive providers of teacher preparation in the state. As a result, the rules governing teacher preparation providers and programs largely reflect the concepts of conventional teacher preparation (i.e., use of certain terminology, such as courses, campus, faculty, etc.). Additionally, the existing rules do not include many requirements specific to candidate rights because existing state and federal laws or oversight bodies also govern these institutions of higher education (such as the Minnesota Office of Higher Education and the Higher Learning Commission).

In 2011, the state legislature authorized the approval of alternative teacher preparation programs in an effort to expand pathways towards teacher licensure, improve ethnic and cultural diversity in the classroom, and close the achievement gap.⁸ Notably, an alternative teacher preparation program was required to partner or consult with an institution of higher education in order to become approved.

In 2014, the Board of Teaching initiated a rulemaking to update the rules governing the approval of teacher preparation providers and programs in an effort to establish rules more inclusive of alternative teacher preparation.⁹ These rule changes went into effect on January 15, 2016. (Note: Prior to the 2014 rulemaking, the last time the rules governing teacher preparation were modified was in 2000).

³ Laws of Minnesota 2017, 1st Spec. Sess. chapter 5, article 3.

⁴ Minn. Stat. 122A.09, subd. 4 (2019).

⁵ Minn. Stat. 122A.09, subd. 9 (2019).

⁶ Minn. Stat. 122A.09, subd. 1 (2019).

⁷ Minn. Stat. 122A.092 (2019).

⁸ [Minn. Stat. 122A.245\(2011\)](#).

⁹ See R-04186, Teacher Education Programs and Student Teaching and Field Experiences, <https://www.revisor.mn.gov/rules/status/rule/76899>.

During the 2017 First Special Session, the state legislature enacted major reforms to teacher licensure in Minnesota. Notably, the Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board was established and a tiered licensure system was created. The tiered licensure system includes four tiers of licensure and establishes several different avenues by which an individual can become a licensed teacher. Notably, to obtain a Tier 4 license, which is the highest tiered license, a candidate must complete an approved teacher preparation program.

Further, the 2017 state legislature repealed the requirement that “alternative preparation providers” partner or consult with an institution of higher education¹⁰ and directed PELSB to adopt rules to approve all types of teacher preparation providers and programs.¹¹

In October 2018, PELSB adopted the rules necessary to implement the new tiered teacher licensure system in Minnesota.¹² Upon the completion of this extensive rule overhaul, PELSB began gathering input on the rules governing teacher preparation. When PELSB sought feedback from existing teacher preparation providers about whether PELSB should consider changes to the rules governing provider and program approval, there was overwhelming call for modernization and streamlining, with a specific call to establish a uniform set of standards applicable to all provider types. Therefore, in the fall of 2018, the Board opened rulemaking to consider changes to chapter 8705.¹³ In February 2019, PELSB released a first draft of proposed rule changes and published its Request for Comments in the State Register.¹⁴

Approved teacher preparation providers and programs in Minnesota

As of January 1, 2020, there were 35 approved teacher preparation providers in Minnesota. These providers offer over 800 programs that lead to teacher licensure and prepare thousands of teacher candidates for licensure.¹⁵ Additionally, there are 3 approved community college providers that offer a subset of licensure standards to teacher candidates and meet a subset of unit rules.

Approval process

Since the early 1970s, Minnesota institutions of higher education were required to undergo a peer review-like process to demonstrate compliance with state standards.

Under current rule, a teacher preparation provider seeking to prepare candidates for teacher licensure in Minnesota must become approved as a “unit.” In order to initiate the unit approval process, the provider must submit a narrative report to demonstrate how the provider meets the 56 standards set forth in rule part 8705.1000. The standards set forth in 8705.1000 were designed for institutions of higher education and are not inclusive of all of Minnesota’s provider types.

¹⁰ Minn. Stat. 122A.245 was repealed by Laws 2017, First Special Session chapter 5, article 3, section 36, paragraph (b), effective July 1, 2018.

¹¹ Minn. Stat. 122A.092.

¹² See [43 SR 463](#) for PELSB’s Notice of Adoption.

¹³ See [Authorizing Resolution](#) (dated September 14, 2018).

¹⁴ [43 SR 951](#) (February 11, 2019).

¹⁵ During the 2016-2017 school year, approximately 8,200 teacher candidates were enrolled in a teacher preparation program for initial licensure and approximately 3,100 teacher candidates completed a teacher preparation program for initial licensure. See [Minnesota’s Profile on Title2.ed.gov](#).

After the narrative report is submitted, PELSB facilitates a site visit of the provider. While PELSB is responsible for facilitating the site visit, a team of peer volunteers comprise the “evaluation team.” The evaluation team is responsible for verifying that each of the 56 unit standards are “met” as described in the narrative report by conducting interviews of teacher educators, advisory groups, school partners, cooperating teachers, administration, current and former candidates and by reviewing candidate records. At the end of the site visit, the evaluation team is responsible for documenting its findings and providing a recommendation to the Board regarding whether to disapprove or grant initial, conditional, or continuing approval. The provider is given thirty days to respond to factual errors included in the findings or to submit additional information.

The Board is ultimately responsible for reviewing the evaluation team’s report of findings and recommendations. Under current rule, the Board may grant initial or continuing approval for up to 5 years or conditional approval for up to 3 years. If the provider is also has national accreditation, the unit may be approved for up to 7 years.

If standards are found to be “not met,” a unit may receive approval with an interim report. The unit is then responsible for documenting how it is complying with any standards that were found to be “not met” prior to its next formal visit. If there are major concerns regarding the unmet standards, the Board may place a unit on “conditional approval.” If changes are not made to address the concerns, the Board may deny approval or disapprove the unit.

The unit approval process ensures the provider’s ability to provide teacher preparation to candidates seeking teacher licensure in Minnesota. Separately, each approved unit must seek approval of its licensure programs through the Request for Initial Program Approval (RIPA) process. Current rule requires that a provider be approved as a unit prior to submitting a program, but based on the Minnesota Statute 122A.2451, proposed rule would allow a unit to seek unit and program approval concurrently. A major component of the RIPA process is ensuring that the program addresses the license-specific content and pedagogy standards set forth in Minnesota Rules chapter 8710. Current rule identifies the process a unit must take for the RIPA application, which includes many requirements beyond meeting the content and pedagogy standards, including for example, requirements for content methods instructors. Further, many of the requirements set forth in the “RIPA rule” are redundant with requirements set forth in the “Unit Rule,” which has resulted in overlapping and, at times confusing, requirements and processes.¹⁶ The proposed amendments to the unit and program rules seek to eliminate the redundancies in the unit and program approval processes.

Similar to the unit approval process, the RIPA process includes peer reviewers providing findings on whether individual teacher standards are “met.” Current rule establishes a Program Review Panel (PRP) of educators from differing stakeholder groups that meet to review certain RIPA applications and provide recommendations to the Board whether to grant initial program approval. Rule prescribes which RIPA applications go to the PRP for further review. The rule was established under the

¹⁶ For example, both 8705.1000 (Unit Rule) and 8705.2100 (RIPA Rule) set forth the qualifications for a supervisor of student teaching experiences. See 8705.1000, subpart 8(I), which states “the unit ensures that all faculty who supervise student teaching must have a minimum of a master’s degree and have at least one academic year of prekindergarten through grade 12 teaching experience aligned to the scope of the licensure programs they supervise,” and 8705.2100, subpart 2(D)(5)(c), which states “all faculty who supervise student teaching must have advanced academic preparation and have at least one academic year of prekindergarten through grade 12 teaching experience. Teaching experience must be within the scope of the programs they are supervising.”

assumption that any licensure program that did not adhere to a traditional model would need more oversight and review, even if all requirements and standards were deemed “met” by the established external review process. The proposed amendments to the unit and program rules seeks to eliminate extra processes for non-traditional programs in an effort to treat all program models the same in both requirements and processes.

Once a licensure program is approved, rule requires the submission of a biennial report, called the Program Effectiveness Report for Continuing Approval (PERCA), in order to maintain program approval. The requirements of a PERCA include extensive self-reflection on state and unit-identified data points, including survey of completers and their supervisors one year after completion. Given the low enrollment numbers of many of the individual licensure programs and low response rates for these surveys, the resource-intensive effort of this process both from the state and provider perspectives have not resulted in meaningful continuous improvement conversations nor program improvement. Therefore, the proposed amendments seek to evaluate only data that is readily accessible and allows for comparison to a board threshold.

Licensure programs that PELSB staff flag as not meeting the requirements of the PERCA process are also reviewed by the Program Review Panel. This can lead to the board action of “approval with a continuous improvement focus area.” The majority of these focus areas since implementation of this process are either misunderstandings in submissions of the narrative data or external data points indicating concerns. PELSB can take additional action toward specific licensure programs if continuous improvement is not made. This includes placing a program on “probation” or, in extreme cases, the Board can discontinue a program.

PELSB is proposing rule changes to streamline the unit and program approval process in an effort to reduce redundancies, move the review focus to areas of deficiency (i.e., focus on “not met standards”) and continuous improvement.

Decision to pursue rulemaking

Teacher preparation standards and approval processes continue to be in the public interest as the state’s wellbeing is dependent on a thriving education system, including effective, trained teachers. Given the recent statutory changes, which have resulted in a significant change in the types of teacher preparation providers, PELSB believes the proposed changes are needed and reasonable to ensure Minnesota’s teacher preparation providers are able to provide teacher candidates with the learning experiences and training they need in order to be successful in Minnesota’s classrooms.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

The Board's statutory authority to adopt the rules is stated in Minnesota Statutes:

§122A.09, subdivision 9 (a), provides:

The Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board must adopt rules subject to the provisions of chapter 14 to implement sections 120B.363, 122A.05 to 122A.09, 122A.092, 122A.16, 122A.17, 122A.18, 122A.181, 122A.182, 122A.183, 122A.184, 122A.185, 122A.187, 122A.188, 122A.20, 122A.21, 122A.23, 122A.26, 122A.28, and 122A.29.

§122A.092, subdivision 1, provides:

Rules. The board must adopt rules to approve teacher preparation programs, including alternative teacher preparation programs under section 122A.2451, nonconventional programs, and Montessori teacher training programs.

§122A.092, subdivision 4, provides:

Teacher educators. The board must adopt rules requiring teacher educators to work directly with elementary or secondary school teachers in elementary or secondary schools to obtain periodic exposure to the elementary and secondary teaching environments.

§14.055, subdivision 5, provides:

Rules. An agency may adopt rules under section 14.389 establishing general standards for granting mandatory or discretionary variances from its rules. Section 14.389, subdivision 5, applies to these rules. An agency also may grant variances based on standards specified in other law.

Under these statutes, the Board has the necessary statutory authority to adopt the proposed rules.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board sought public participation for this rulemaking through a number of different means. Throughout the course of this rulemaking, PELSB:

- Solicited comments by publishing its request for comments in the State Register (more information below),
- Utilized a webpage to provide updates and share relevant documents, including rule drafts (see <https://mn.gov/pelsb/board/rulemaking/program-unit-rules/>),
- Utilized GovDelivery, an email platform, to share updates and relevant documents with the over 1,600 individuals subscribed to PELSB's rulemaking listserv,
- Provided updates to its board members and the public during each monthly board meeting beginning in September 2018, and
- Facilitated and participated in stakeholder sessions (more information below).

Request for Comments

PELSB published a Request for Comments (RFC) on the standards and approval processes governing teacher preparation providers and programs in the State Register on February 11, 2019.¹⁷ As part of the Additional Notice Plan, approved by Administrative Law Judge Eric L. Lipman on January 10, 2019, the RFC was posted to the PELSB's webpage dedicated to this rulemaking and was sent electronically to all individuals registered to receive rulemaking updates and a number of other individuals and organizations that are potentially impacted by the proposed changes (totaling over 2,000 email recipients). (More information about the Additional Notice Plan available below.)

PELSB chose to leave the comment period open for longer than 60 days in order to gather additional feedback, especially as the Board considered new draft language. On May 18, 2020, PELSB published a notice in the State Register to close the comment period on June 1, 2020.¹⁸ This notice was also posted to PELSB's webpage dedicated to this rulemaking and was sent electronically to all individuals registered to receive rulemaking updates, as well as a number of other individuals and organizations that are potentially impacted by the proposed changes (totaling over 2,800 email recipients).

During this initial comment period, PELSB received 104 written comments.¹⁹ Comments were submitted by a number of stakeholders, including teacher preparation providers, school districts, teachers, and education advocacy organizations.

¹⁷ 43 SR 951, available at https://mn.gov/admin/assets/SR43_33%20-%20Accessible_tcm36-371404.pdf.

¹⁸ 44 SR 1376, available at https://mn.gov/admin/assets/SR44_47%20-%20Accessible_tcm36-432387.pdf.

¹⁹ Please note, several individuals and organizations submitted multiple comments.

Stakeholder engagement

In addition to publishing a RFC, PELSB met with a number of individuals and organizations to obtain feedback regarding the rule development (see Table 1). Further, PELSB held and/or attended a number of public listening sessions, including on:

- December 7, 2018 (facilitated by PELSB),
- March 20, 2019 (facilitated by Education Evolving),
- March 28, 2019 (facilitated by Education Minnesota), and
- July 23, 2019 (facilitated by PELSB).

Table 1: Stakeholder engagement

Organization(s)	Date(s)
Standards & Rules Committee, which is comprised of the Association of Metropolitan School Districts, Board of School Administrators, EdAllies, Education Minnesota, Minnesota Administrators for Special Education, Minnesota Association of Alternative Programs, Minnesota Association of Charter Schools, Minnesota Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Minnesota Association of School Administrators, Minnesota Association of School Personnel Administrators, Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals, Minnesota Coalition to Increase Teachers of Color and American Indian Teachers, Minnesota Department of Education, Minnesota Education Equity Partnership, Minnesota Elementary Schools Principal Association, Minnesota Rural Education Association, and Minnesota School Boards Association. Standards and Rules Committee meets are open to all members of the public.	September 28, 2018 February 15, 2019 April 16, 2019 August 22, 2019 November 21, 2019 February 19, 2020
Minnesota Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (MACTE)	November 6, 2018 February 11, 2019 April 4, 2019 April 26, 2019 (Field Coordinators) May 22, 2019 (Board of Directors) February 7, 2020 (Executive Council) June 3, 2020
Minnesota School Board Association (MSBA)	January 17, 2019 January 17, 2020
Association of Metropolitan School Districts (AMSD)	November 2, 2018 March 6, 2020
Special Education IHE (Institutes of Higher Education) Group	February 15, 2019
University of Minnesota-Twin Cities LPL-O TE Workgroup	March 13, 2019
Bemidji State PEDL faculty team	March 18, 2019
University of St. Thomas	March 18, 2019
Education Evolving, TNTP, Lakes Country Service Cooperative, Minnesota Comeback, EdAllies	May 23, 2019

Organization(s)	Date(s)
St. Paul Public Schools and Minneapolis Public Schools	May 29, 2019
State Field Coordinators	September 27, 2019
Representatives from St. Paul Public Schools, Minneapolis Public Schools, University of Minnesota – Twin Cities, and University of St. Thomas	December 4, 2019

Board participation

On January 11, 2019, the Board established a subcommittee, comprised of three board members, tasked with reviewing stakeholder input and approving changes to draft rule language. This subcommittee met 12 times to review public comments and to approve changes to the draft rule changes. Subcommittee meetings were open to the public and drafts of the proposed rule changes were also made publicly available.

The Board received monthly updates during board meetings on the progress of the rulemaking, including discussions on various rule drafts and areas of stakeholder concerns. During board meetings, members of the public were also given opportunity to provide public comment to the entire board and many took the opportunity to do so each month.

Additionally, during the August 9, 2019 board meeting, board members discussed themes that they wanted to see reflected in the proposed rule changes. First, board members agreed that the rules should have flexibility, such that there are different ways to meet requirements, which is most evident in teacher educator qualifications. Second, board members agreed that the proposed changes should place a greater emphasis on quality clinical experiences for candidates to allow candidates to apply their learning in a classroom setting. Finally, board members wanted to ensure that there was both accountability for compliance and a push towards continuing improvement at both the provider and program level.

On February 14, 2020, the Board reviewed and approved the proposed rule draft dated February 4, 2020 (often referred to as “Draft 7”) for the next phase of the rulemaking process, including authorizing and directing PELSB’s Executive Director to give notice of the Board’s intent to adopt rules.

REGULATORY ANALYSIS

Minnesota Statutes, section 14.131, sets out eight factors for a regulatory analysis that must be included in the SONAR. Paragraphs (1) through (8) below quote these factors and then give the Board's response.

(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 most likely to be affected by the proposed rule changes are:

- Teacher preparation providers:
 - Providers will be impacted as they will be required to meet the standards and requirements set forth in the proposed rules.
- Teacher candidates:
 - Teacher candidates enrolled in a Minnesota teacher preparation program will be impacted, as the providers and programs will be held to the standards set forth in the proposed rules.
- School districts:
 - Districts will be impacted as they collaborate with teacher preparation programs to provide clinical experiences for teacher candidates. Districts may allot more time to working with preparation providers in anticipation of having teachers better prepared to meet the districts' needs.
- Students and their families in Minnesota:
 - Students and their families will be better served by teachers prepared in programs held to the high standards set forth in the proposed rules.

Classes that will bear the costs of the proposed rule changes:

- Teacher preparation providers:
 - While many of the new rules align with current standards or simplify the approval processes, there are new standards that providers will need to meet that will likely require staff time.
 - While proposed rule adds new options to meet the proposed teacher educator qualifications (e.g., teaching experience), some providers may experience challenges in meeting the increase in the number of years of teaching experience proposed for methods instructors.
- School districts:
 - Districts and schools that serve as the designated school partner have additional responsibilities. However, districts and schools are not required to act as designated school partners.

Classes that will benefit from the proposed rule changes:

- Teacher preparation providers:

- Rules reduce duplication in reporting and self-study requirements. Through the approval processes, providers will be encouraged to use their data for continuous improvement. Standards were reduced in number and focused on key elements aligned to statute and effective preparation.
- Providers will benefit from the longer “unit approval period” (6 years or up to 10 years if accredited by a board-approved national education accreditation agency).
- Acknowledging the role of national accreditation removes duplicative processes and requirements for many providers. Specifically, providers that are accredited by a board-approved national education accreditation agency will benefit from the 10-year approval cycle and reduced number of unit standards.
- All providers will benefit from the longer program review cycle (3 years rather than 2 years) and from the streamlined PERCA process.
- Community colleges that provide transfer pathways programs will benefit from a clear process for unit and program approval.
- Units that accept candidates from an approved transfer pathways program will benefit from the assurance of that transfer pathway’s unit and program approval (i.e., these candidates have been standards).
- Teacher candidates:
 - With higher quality learning experiences, candidates will be better prepared. As providers are held more accountable for their data and use of data for continuous improvement, candidates will reap those benefits.
 - Candidates of all program and provider types will have the same fundamental protections. Specifically, all programs will be required to share basic information with candidates regarding the program, including entry and exit requirements, which will allow candidates to make more informed decisions when choosing a program and as they proceed through a program.
 - Candidates will benefit from the proposed amendments, specifically the proposed amendments will result in new nontraditional pathways, increase program accountability, and place an emphasis on high quality teacher educators and programs.
- Schools/school districts:
 - The unit standards greatly increase the collaboration between schools/school districts and providers, allowing schools/school districts more input in the type of preparation provided by local preparation providers. With high functioning partnerships, new teachers will be prepared to meet district needs.
 - Under the proposed rule amendments, schools/school districts would be able to become their own preparation provider. This opens up additional opportunities for school/school districts to recruit and retain teachers.
- Minnesota students and their families:
 - The push to align theory and practice with the designated partnership is based on meeting student needs. As candidates are better prepared to meet students’ needs and work with students’ families, students and their families benefit.
 - Teacher quality is the most important school-related factor in student achievement.

(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

While PELSB does not anticipate that other agencies will have costs associated with the implementation and/or enforcement of the proposed rule changes, PELSB anticipates that there will be costs and anticipated effects on state revenue for PELSB, itself.

Table 2: Probable costs to PELSB

Proposed rule change	Anticipated effect on state revenues
<p>Site visits:</p> <p>Conducting a site visit every 6 years (under current rule, site visits occur every 5 years)</p> <p>Conducting a site visit at least every 10 years for units with board-approved national accreditation (under current rule, a provider receives a site visit every 7 years if the provider has national accreditation from the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation)</p> <p>Conducting a site visit for units seeking to move from “conditional approval” to full continuing approval</p>	<p>Conducting a site visit every 6 years, instead of every 5 years, will result in a reduction in state expense.</p> <p>Of the 35 approved providers, 30 have continuing unit approval. Of those 30, 11 are currently CAEP-accredited and receive a unit site visit every 7 years, while the remaining 19 receive a site visit every 5 years. Therefore, the proposed change to allow for an approval cycle of up to ten years to align with the approval cycle of the board-approved national accrediting agency, for providers with board-approved national accreditation, will likely result in a reduction in state expenses.</p> <p>Requiring a site visit for units seeking to obtain full continuing approval after having conditional approval will likely result in an increase in state expenses as this would be a new step in the approval process. However, PELSB believes this new process is necessary to ensuring the efficacy of the provider.</p>
<p>Midcycle reviews:</p> <p>PELSB is proposing a new process for continuing unit approval. Specifically, PELSB is proposing that units submit a self-study midcycle (i.e., midway between site visits). Units with board-approved national accreditation and restricted units would be exempt from this new process.</p>	<p>This new requirement will require a reallocation of state expenses but still a net positive in state resources. PELSB will review one report with aggregated data from each of the approved units (34) on a six year cycle in place of one report from each program (800+) biennially.</p>
<p>Restricted units:</p> <p>Current rule does not establish requirements or processes for a provider that provides programs that meet only a</p>	<p>As of 2/13/2020, there are 3 approved providers that would fall into the classification of a “restricted unit.” Additionally, 13 providers are in the process of seeking to provide this type of programming.</p>

Proposed rule change	Anticipated effect on state revenues
subset of licensure standards. These programs must seek and obtain discretionary variances. Therefore, the proposed rule amendments seeks to create requirements and processes so that PELSB can approve providers as “restricted units” (for example, community colleges providing Transfer Pathways programs).	This proposed rule would take away the need for providers of transfer pathway programs or programs that only meet a subset of standards to request discretionary variances.
<p>Program review:</p> <p>Reviewing programs every 3 years (instead of every 2 years) and reducing the content of the narrative report required for continuing program approval.</p>	There are over 800 approved programs in Minnesota. Moving the review cycle from once every two years to once every three years will likely result in a reduction in state expenses.
Staff time to update resources, guidance documents, and website information	The implementation of new rules and processes will likely result in a one-time increase in expenditures.
IT costs to make updates to the online educator preparation provider application system (EPPAS)	The implementation of new rules and processes will have IT/systems implications and, therefore, likely result in a one-time increase in expenditures.

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

Many states require their teacher preparation programs to be accredited by a national accrediting organization, such as the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), the Association for Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation (AAQEP), or World Indigenous Nations Higher Education Consortium (WINHEC) in place of meeting comprehensive state requirements. While 12 of Minnesota’s 35 approved teacher preparation providers are currently accredited by CAEP and/or AAQEP, a significant number are not. PELSB leaves the possibility open in rule that the Board may approve a national education accreditation agency as it would significantly reduce costs for preparation providers (for those meeting both state and national accreditation) and PELSB while accomplishing the purpose of rule. These national accreditors are significantly much more expensive for providers than state approval.

(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

Many states require their teacher preparation providers to be nationally accredited (rather than establishing state-specific requirements and review processes). While Minnesota has not required national accreditation, 12 of the 35 approved providers have voluntarily sought and received national

education accreditation. While it would be less costly for PELSB to recognize national accreditation in lieu of conducting its own site visits as part of the unit approval process, national accreditation does not address many of the requirements set forth in state statute or rule, such as training in reading and the state’s student teaching requirements.

Stakeholders have also expressed serious concerns about the criteria of different accrediting bodies and urge caution to the Board as it considers accepting a national education accreditation agency in lieu of state approval. There are concerns that there could be different tiers of providers if providers can choose different requirements.

To address these concerns, the new rule proposes to establish a subset of standards to be met by units with national accreditation from a board-approved national education accreditation agency. By requiring PELSB to approve the national education accreditation agency, PELSB can verify the accreditation process and standards prior to permitting a streamlined process for these units. Additionally, by establishing a separate process and subset of standards for these units, PELSB will acknowledge the work and effort already in place to obtain national accreditation while still verifying and overseeing compliance with specific state requirements. Please see the Rule-by-Rule Analysis for more information about the proposed rule implications below.

(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

Table 3: Probable costs of complying with the proposed rule for affected parties

Affected party	Reason	Probable cost
Preparation providers	Instead of submitting a narrative report every two years associated with each program, each provider submits a shorter report every three years. Additionally, providers must submit one midcycle self-study every six years.	PELSB anticipates that this change would amount to a serious reduction of time providers spend entering narratives into EPPAS. Overall, this change would likely amount to a reduction in costs, especially for providers with more programs.
Preparation providers	Instead of two triad conferences including the candidate, supervisor, and cooperating teacher, there are three triad meetings for initial licensure candidates seeking one license and four for candidates seeking more than one license.	As this is an increase in required time, it would likely amount to an increased cost for some providers. Note: PELSB is aware of several providers already implementing three or more triad conferences during student teaching experiences.

Affected party	Reason	Probable cost
Preparation providers	Whereas current rule states that candidates must be evaluated, proposed rule requires that candidates be evaluated and the number of observations required.	As the number of observations could be an increase for some providers, it would likely be an increased cost.
Preparation providers	Currently employed teacher educators could be deemed unqualified based on proposed rules.	Providers may have to invest time in seeking waivers or may have to hire new teacher educators if those waivers are not granted.
Teacher candidates	Rule defines the criteria and formalizes the process for a candidate to complete student teaching while working as a teacher of record.	A candidate working as a teacher of record in the licensure field sought may not need to leave the position in order to student teach, which would reduce costs.
Districts	To be a designated partner, the district would need to meet with the provider two times a year. However, the aim of the partnership is to be mutually beneficial with candidates completing ready to meet district needs. If a partnership is not meeting the school or district's needs, the school or district can opt out of the partnership.	While there may some costs to the establishing a more formal partnership, PELSB anticipates the districts will break even as the enhanced emphasis on communication and collaboration will support long-term efficiencies and higher quality clinical experiences, which in turn will support and strengthen student outcomes.

(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

Table 4: Probable costs of not adopting the proposed rule on affected parties

Affected party	Reason	Probable cost
Teacher candidates	Current rule falls short in ensuring preparation is aligned with the rigors of day-to-day teaching.	If candidates are not prepared for the day-to-day rigors of teaching, such as through high quality clinical

Affected party	Reason	Probable cost
	Current rule falls short in ensuring methods instructors have had a proper amount of actual teaching experience.	<p>experiences, there may continue to be high rates to teacher attrition.</p> <p>Candidates may receive lower quality instruction by methods instructors who lack time in the classroom with Minnesota’s birth through age 21 students.</p>
Minnesota’s students	Current rule lacks a focus on certain elements within teacher preparation, including standards related to equity, quality district partnerships, and robust assessment systems to support continuous improvement.	High quality teacher preparation is key to effective teachers, which is the primary indicator of student success.
Alternative preparation providers	The terminology and some of the requirements of current rules do not align well to alternative preparation.	Alternative providers struggle to demonstrate compliance to current rules. This requires an increase of time and money for alternative providers.
Providers that seek to provide programs to candidates that only meet a subset of licensure standards.	Current rule does not include requirements or approval processes for providers that would like to provide only a subset of licensure standards. This is most commonly seen in community college that have programs that lead to an Associate’s Degree, which a candidate can then use to “transfer” into a bachelor’s program at a 4-year institution.	<p>These providers will need to seek and obtain discretionary variances to provide programs specific to only a subset of licensure standards.</p> <p>Without rule changes, PELSB believes it would be eliminating a formal pathway for getting many diverse, first generation college students into the teacher pipeline.</p>

(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

Federal regulations require providers to evidence completion rates for “graduates” as well as different assessment data for each candidate.

Proposed rule also requires providers to track and submit data for “program completers” and other assessment points (such as pass rates for the board-adopted performance assessment, pedagogy tests, and content tests). One distinction is the proposed rule defines “program completer” more broadly than federal regulations. Specifically, proposed rule includes completes of “additional licensure

programs” in addition to “initial licensure programs.” This different is needed and reasonable to ensure adequate data is being collected from all of Minnesota’s approved programs.

(8) An assessment of the cumulative effect of the rule with other federal and state regulations related to the specific purpose of the rule..... ‘[C]umulative effect’ means the impact that results from incremental impact of the proposed rule in addition to other rules, regardless of what state or federal agency has adopted the other rules. Cumulative effects can result from individually minor but collectively significant rules adopted over a period of time.

Teacher preparation providers are required to meet federal Title II regulations. Institutions of higher education (the majority of teacher preparation in Minnesota) must also meet the Higher Learning Commission standards. Specifically in the area of assessment systems and accountability, there is concern that the cumulative effect of these regulations is burdensome. When possible, alignment to these were made and flexibility was provided in how state standards were met to allow the provider to make their own alignment.

PERFORMANCE-BASED RULES

Minnesota Statutes, sections 14.002 and 14.131, require that the SONAR describe how the agency, in developing the rules, considered and implemented performance-based standards that emphasize superior achievement in meeting the agency’s regulatory objectives and maximum flexibility for the regulated party and the agency in meeting those goals.

For 8705.1010, Subpart 1. B. Standard 2, the word “effective” allows flexibility for providers to show the impact of each program element. Similarly, 8705.1010, Subpart 4. A. Standard 17 and 8705.1010, Subpart 5. A. Standard 22 require that the data-informed strategy be “effective.”

For continuing program approval, programs have flexibility to determine which key assessments to implement to demonstrate program efficacy. The standards require an assessment system that includes state requirements, but does not dictate the analysis and evaluation process for preparation providers.

In addition, part 8705.1300 was added, knowing that a significant portion (about a third) of current preparation providers maintain national accreditation with robust standards. Exempting those providers from the majority of state unit standards provides preparation providers with more flexibility in choice of accreditation without lowering expectations.

TEACHER SUPPLY AND DEMAND

Minnesota Statutes, section 122A.09, subdivision 9 (e) requires the Board to include a description of a proposed rule's probable effect on teacher supply and demand in the statement of need and reasonableness.

In creating these proposed standards, PELSB aimed to write a single set of standards that would serve different preparation models and create more pathways to teaching. Based on initial program submissions and discussions with alternative providers and community colleges, these new alternative providers and potential providers have shown interest in addressing some of the shortage areas identified in PELSB's 2019 Supply and Demand report, including special education, early childhood, and career and technical education. Typically, community colleges and alternative providers attract more diverse candidates, which is another identified shortage area.

Additionally, "Standard 16" requires that all providers effectively recruit and retain teacher candidates to address the state and district's shortage areas. Providers will be required to show evidence of how they are supporting these state needs.

Furthermore, "Standard 14" allows teacher candidates to work as the teacher of record while completing a teacher preparation program for an initial professional license. This language allows Tier 2 licensed teachers to fill a demand while working toward Tier 3 licenses and building the supply of teachers with professional licenses.

The proposed unit rule also removes a current requirement that can be a barrier for post baccalaureate candidates seeking initial licensure, including the requirement that candidates have completed a "program of general studies in the liberal arts and sciences equivalent to the requirement for persons enrolled in programs at their institutions not preparing persons for teacher licensure."

Rule part 8705.2200 heavily revised the process for maintaining program approval, removing reporting requirements that were overly burdensome. This will help ensure smaller and alternative preparation pathways will be able to maintain their licensure programs.

ADDITIONAL NOTICE

This Additional Notice Plan was reviewed by the Office of Administrative Hearings and approved in a letter by Administrative Law Judge Eric L. Lipman on January 10, 2019.

PELSB's Additional Notice Plan includes:

- Electronic notice: PELSB will electronically provide notice to the following individuals and/or organizations:
 - PELSB's rulemaking email list (containing over 1,160 interested individuals)
 - Approved teacher preparation providers in Minnesota, including all licensing officers and field directors
 - The organizations that have applied for or indicated intent to apply for alternative teacher preparation approval, including:
 - Teach For America
 - Southwest West Central Service Cooperative
 - LDA Minnesota
 - TNTP
 - Lakes Country Service Cooperative
 - PELSB's Standards and Rules Advisory Committee
 - School district administrators
 - Minnesota Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
 - Montessori Accreditation Council for Teacher Education
 - Education Minnesota
 - Educators 4 Excellence
 - EdAllies
 - Minnesota Education Equity Partnership
 - The Coalition to Increase Teachers of Color and American Indian Teachers
 - Minnesota Rural Educator Association
 - Association of Metro School Districts
 - Minnesota Association of Elementary School Principals
 - Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals
 - Commissioner of the Department of Education
 - Commissioner of the Office of Higher Education
- Webpage dedicated to rulemaking project: PELSB will post notice and updates related to this rulemaking on the following webpage <https://mn.gov/pelsb/board/rulemaking/program-unit-rules/>.

PELSB's Notice Plan also includes giving notice required by statute. We will electronically mail the rules and Notice of Intent to Adopt to everyone who has registered to be on the 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.

Finally, PELSB's Notice Plan did not include notifying the Commissioner of Agriculture because the rules do not affect farming operations per Minnesota Statutes, section 14.111.

CONSULTATION WITH MMB ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT IMPACT

As required by Minnesota Statutes, section 14.131, PELSB consulted with Minnesota Management and Budget (MMB). PELSB sent MMB copies of the documents that were sent to the Governor's Office for review and approval on the same day that the documents were sent to the Governor's Office. This was done prior to PELSB's publishing the Notice of Intent to Adopt. The documents sent to MMB included: the Governor's Office Proposed Rule and SONAR Form; the proposed rules; and the SONAR. PELSB will submit a copy of the cover correspondence and any response received from Minnesota Management and Budget to OAH at the hearing or with the documents it submits for ALJ review.

PELSB received a memorandum detailing the review from MMB on June 19, 2020. MMB made the following determination:

The proposed rules may impact Minnesotan teacher candidates, teacher educators, school districts, charter schools, and teacher preparation programs. Of these entities, only school districts could be considered a local unit of government, however, the definition of local government under M.S. 14.128 does not include school districts. School districts may experience increased costs to comply with these rules if they choose to participate in teacher preparation programs.

In summary, these proposed rules are not anticipated to cause a fiscal impact on local units of government.

DETERMINATION ABOUT RULES REQUIRING LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION

As required by Minnesota Statutes, section 14.128, subdivision 1, PELSB has considered whether these proposed rules will require a local government to adopt or amend any ordinance or other regulation in order to comply with these rules. PELSB has determined that they do not, because the proposed rules pertain to teacher preparation providers approved or seeking approval and do not pertain to local governments. Compliance with these rules falls solely on those teacher preparation providers approved or seeking approval. Enforcement of these rules falls solely on the Board.

COST OF COMPLYING FOR SMALL BUSINESS OR CITY

Agency Determination of Cost

As required by Minnesota Statutes, section 14.127, PELSB 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. PELSB 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 city or small business.

LIST OF WITNESSES

The Board anticipates that the following organizations will have one or more representatives testify on the proposed rules during the rules hearing:

1. Minnesota Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (MACTE)

PELSB anticipates that a representative from the Minnesota Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (MACTE) will testify during the rules hearing to express concerns with the proposed changes to the qualifications for methods instructors. Specifically, MACTE has expressed concerns with the proposed requirement for methods instructors to have three years of teaching experience (note: under current rule, methods instructors are only required to have one year of teaching experience).

2. EdAllies, Education Evolving, Great MN Schools, and Teach For America

PELSB anticipates that a representative from EdAllies, Education Evolving, Great MN Schools, and/or Teach For America will testify during the rules hearing to recommend and encourage the Board to consider additional nontraditional criteria to determine qualifications for teacher educators. Additionally, the Board anticipates that a representative will testify to express concerns with the use of the edTPA, the board-adopted teacher performance assessment, as a measure of program effectiveness.

(Note: These organizations are addressed together as they submitted several joint comments throughout the public comment period.)

3. University of Minnesota – Twin Cities

PELSB anticipates that a representative from the University of Minnesota – Twin Cities will testify during the rules hearing to express concerns about the definition of “teacher educator.” Specifically, that the definition is overly broad. Additionally, the Board anticipates that a representative will testify to express concerns about changes to the triggers requiring a program to be reviewed by the Program Review Panel.

Please note, PELSB does not plan to call any non-agency witnesses to testify as part of PELSB’s panel presentation at the rules hearing.

RULE-BY-RULE ANALYSIS

This section describes each proposed rule change or proposed repeal of obsolete, unnecessary, or duplicative rules.

8705.0100. Purpose.

According to Minn. Stat. 122A.184, a teacher must have completed an “approved” teacher preparation program to be eligible for a Tier 4 teaching license. PELSB is responsible for approving providers in Minnesota to prepare candidates for teacher licensure.

Minn. R. 8705.0100 establishes the foundational requirement for unit and program approval – a provider must be approved in order to prepare candidates for teacher licensure in Minnesota. PELSB proposes to replace the existing rule language with new rule language that aligns with recent statutory changes to teacher preparation and teacher licensure.

Specifically, PELSB proposes to add new rule language that explicitly states which teacher preparation providers may be approved in order to prepare candidates for teacher licensure in Minnesota. Prior to 2011, institutions of higher education were the only teacher preparation providers permitted under state law. Following statutory changes in 2011, state law permitted alternative providers to offer teacher preparation programs with the requirement that they consult or partner with a college or university with a board-approved program.¹⁸ However, in 2017, state law was amended to allow school districts, charter schools, and nonprofit corporations organized under chapter 317A for an education-related purpose to become approved to prepare candidates for teacher licensure without a partnership with higher education.¹⁹

These changes are needed and reasonable to ensure the rules governing teacher preparation align with state statute.

8705.0200. Definitions.

Minn. R. 8705.0200 establishes definitions for terms and phrases used throughout chapter 8705. PELSB proposes to repeal and modify several subparts, as well as establish several new subparts.

The proposed changes to part 8705.0200 are needed and reasonable to ensure the terms and phrases used throughout chapter 8705 are clear and consistent.

Subpart 2. Advanced academic preparation (repeal).

PELSB proposes to repeal this subpart because the phrase “advanced academic preparation” is no longer the main qualification for teacher educators. Additionally, the term “Advanced academic preparation” has been a source of confusion for providers in the past. Therefore, PELSB proposes to repeal this term

¹⁸ Minn. Stat. 122A.245, subd. 1.

¹⁹ Minn. Stat. 122A.2451, subd. 3.

and replace the concept of teacher educator qualifications with multiple pathways by which an instructor can be qualified to teach a particular course or learning opportunity to teacher candidates.

Subpart 4a. Candidate.

PELSB proposes to add a definition for the term “candidate,” which is used throughout chapter 8705 to describe an individual enrolled in an approved teacher preparation program. The term “candidate” is distinct from the term “student,” which is used when referring to a child or young adult (age birth through age 21) that is receiving instruction in some type of school setting.

Many of the requirements for teacher preparation providers is related to candidate protections and program efficacy to ensure that a candidate that completes an approved teacher preparation program is prepared to teach Minnesota’s students.

Subpart 4b. Clinical experiences.

There are many terms used in the teaching profession to describe the experience of teacher candidates to gain real classroom experience prior to program completion and licensure. These “clinical experiences” are a fundamental component of a teacher preparation program. PELSB proposes defining “clinical experiences” as the umbrella phrase used to describe all placement types, including field experiences, student teaching, and practicum, that a candidate is required to complete during the course of the teacher preparation program. PELSB proposes to add the definition for “clinical experiences” in order to clarify the terminology and the requirements for when a candidate is placed in a classroom.

Subpart 4c. Cooperating teacher.

PELSB proposes to add the definition for “cooperating teacher” to provide clarity for teacher preparation providers in differentiating clinical placements for teacher candidates. The differentiation between field experiences, practicum experiences, and student teaching has meant providers use “cooperating teacher” in different settings. This definition standardizes the term.

Subpart 4d. Culturally responsive teaching.

PELSB proposes to add a definition for the phrase “culturally responsive teaching.” This definition builds off national definitions of culturally responsive teaching and culturally responsive pedagogy from Geneva Gay and Gloria Ladson-Billings. It ensures teachers understand the diverse ways culture can impact learning, and the broader impacts of systemic issues on learning. The definition acknowledges that this level of understanding is needed to ensure relevant and effective education for students of all cultural backgrounds. The definition does not promote a particular lifestyle or culture and does not impose a victim-mentality of students. Instead, the definition acknowledges that for a teacher to effectively engage all students in learning, they must know and be able to understand the individual lived experiences of their students and the historical issues that have impacted these lived experiences.

Subpart 4e. Designated school partner.

PELSB is proposing to strengthen existing standards related to school partnerships (i.e., the partnership between the teacher preparation provider and the school or school district which hosts candidates for clinical experiences).

PELSB is proposing to add definitions for “school partnership” and “designated partnership” to distinguish between requirements for all school partnership versus the select few requirements that are just applicable to the designated school partnership.

Subpart 6. Field experience.

PELSB proposes to modify the definition of “field experience” to differentiate between clinical experiences that require formal observation and evaluation (i.e., student teaching and practicum), and clinical experiences that are less formal (i.e., field experiences). This definition will support clarity with how preparation providers place candidates aligned to unit standards.

Subpart 6a. Initial licensure program.

There are different requirements for providers offering programs to candidates seeking an initial professional license in comparison to candidates seeking to “add” a professional license. PELSB proposes to add the definition of “initial licensure program” to ensure the requirements and expectation for each program type are clear.

Subpart 7. Institutions of Higher Education (repeal).

As mentioned throughout the SONAR, institutions of higher education are no longer the sole provider of teacher preparation in Minnesota. Therefore, PELSB proposes to repeal this subpart because the institutions of higher education are no longer the sole teacher preparation providers in Minnesota.²⁰ (Note, PELSB proposes to remove the term “institution” throughout chapter 8705 to allow for application of the rule requirements to all provider types.)

Subpart 7a. Practicum.

PELSB proposes to add the definition of “practicum” because teacher preparation providers have needed clarity in what type of clinical experiences is needed for candidates who already hold a professional license. Field experiences, which do not require formal evaluation processes, are insufficient to ensuring competency in the new licensure area. Student teaching, which includes robust time and evaluation procedures, can prove to be overly burdensome for teachers who already have completed teacher preparation, a student teaching experience, and/or are currently working. Therefore, PELSB proposes to define practicum as a type of experience where an individual takes on teacher of record duties while still being observed and evaluated by the recommending provider.

²⁰ Minn. Stat. 122A.2451, subdivision 3.

Subpart 7b. Professional dispositions.

PELSB proposes to add the definition of “professional dispositions” to provide clarity for providers who, under current rule, have been required to monitor professional dispositions without a standard definition. This will allow a common understanding of the requirements specific to professional dispositions set forth throughout the proposed rules.

Subpart 7c. Professional license.

PELSB proposes adding a definition of “professional license” to distinguish between licenses that are emergency in-nature and licenses that represent a demonstrated competence in a particular subject matter and scope.

In 2017, the state legislature overhauled the teacher licensure framework in Minnesota, replacing it with a tiered licensure system comprised of four tiers. To obtain a Tier 1 or Tier 2 license, an applicant must have a job offer from a school district. Tier 1 and Tier 2 licenses are considered “emergency licenses” and are only valid for one to two years (depending on the license) and are non-transferable (a teacher holding a Tier 1 or Tier 2 license can only teach in the hiring district that co-signed the licensure application).

Tier 3 and Tier 4 licenses do not have the same limitations as a Tier 1 or Tier 2 license. Given the qualifications needed to obtain a Tier 3 or Tier 4 license, such as completion of an approved teacher preparation program, these licenses are tied exclusively to the teacher holding the license.

Prior to the 2017 legislative changes, the Minnesota Department of Education issued five-year full professional licenses. These licenses are very similar to today’s Tier 3 and Tier 4 licenses. Note: all active five-year full professional licenses were converted to a Tier 4 license on January 1, 2018.

Finally, in 2018, PELSB adopted the definition of “professional license from another state.”²¹ These licenses are also distinguished from emergency licenses.

Subpart 8. Program completer.

PELSB proposes to modify the definition of “program completer.” The current definition of “program completer,” in large part, aligns with the federal definition of “program completer” set forth in Title II of the Higher Education Act (HEA). Notably, the federal definition is applicable only to candidates completing initial teacher preparation programs. PELSB proposes to modify the definition of “program completer” in order to explicitly include candidates completing both initial and additional licensure programs, which will allow PELSB to obtain data from all approved licensure programs for the purposes of evaluating program effectiveness. Similar to the current definition, whether a candidate is ultimately

²¹ Minn. R. 8710.310, subpart 1 (K). . "Professional license from another state" means a professional teaching license issued by the responsible state agency of another state and required by the law of that state for an individual to teach in a public school, but does not include an emergency, temporary, or substitute teaching license.

recommended for licensure by the provider does not impact the candidate’s status as a “program completer.”

Subpart 9. Related services (repeal).

Subpart 9. Related services. PELS B proposes that the phrase “related services” be repealed because the phrase is not used in chapter 8705.

Subpart 9a. School partner.

PELS B is proposing to strengthen existing standards related to school partnerships (i.e., the partnership between the teacher preparation provider and the school or school district which hosts candidates for clinical experiences).

PELS B is proposing to add definitions for “school partnership” and “designated partnership” to distinguish between requirements for all school partnership versus the select few requirements that are just applicable to the designated school partnership.

Subpart 10. Scope.

Each license authorizes a teacher to provide instruction on a particular topic to students of a certain age or grade range. The particular student age or grade space of the licensure field is called the “scope.” PELS B proposes to modify the definition of “scope” to remove a specific range not needed in this overall definition of the term.

Subpart 10a. Student teaching.

PELS B proposes to add the definition of “student teaching” to clearly differentiate this experience and required components from other clinical experiences. The requirements for student teaching are identified within part 8705.1010.

Subpart 10b. Supervisor.

PELS B proposes to add the definition of “supervisor” to clearly identify the individual responsible for overseeing candidates’ clinical experiences. Historically, teacher preparation providers have used this term in varied applications within teacher preparation. Providing a standard definition ensures that use of the term within this rule is clear and consistent.

Subpart 10c. Teacher educator; instructor.

PELS B proposes to add the definition of “teacher educator; instructor.” Under current rule, the term “faculty” is used. Now that teacher preparation providers do not need to be Institutions of Higher Education, the term faculty is no longer appropriate (though, many teacher educators will continue to be faculty). Additionally, “facilitating a candidate’s learning opportunities and assessments” is language specifically moving away from traditional models of “teaching a course” to include a broad range of models for teacher preparation.

Subpart 10d. Teacher of record.

PELSB proposes to add the definition of “teacher of record” in order to align the definition created under the implementation of tiered licensure with the application within teacher preparation.

Subpart 11. Teacher preparation program; program.

The definition of “teacher preparation program” was modified to eliminate language associated with higher education and ensure the term is inclusive of various models of teacher preparation.

Subpart 12. Unit; teacher preparation program provider.

In 2017, the state legislature defined “teacher preparation program” or “unit” as “an entity that has primary responsibility in overseeing and delivering a teacher preparation program.” This definition is considerably broader than the existing definition set forth in rule, which narrowly defines a unit as an “institution.” Again, a teacher preparation program can now be provided by an organization not explicitly tied to an institution of higher education, such as a school district, charter school, or nonprofit organization organized under 317A for an education-related purpose. Therefore, PELSB proposes to modify the definition of “unit; teacher preparation provider” to align directly with state statute.

8705.0300 – Evaluation of a Teacher Preparation Unit within an Institution of Higher Education (repeal).

PELSB proposes this rule part be repealed. The proposed repeal is needed and reasonable because the language set forth in part 8705.0300 is repetitive with part 8705.0100, which applies to all types of teacher preparation providers in Minnesota that prepare candidates for teacher licensure.

8705.1000 – Unit Approval for Teacher Preparation (repeal).

PELSB proposes repealing part 8705.1000, which contains the existing 54 unit standards. Please note, while PELSB proposes to eliminate many existing standards, PELSB maintains that most of the standards are needed and reasonable and therefore are included in parts 8705.1010 (Unit Standards), 8705.1500 (Midcycle Review), 8705.2100 (Request for Initial Program Approval (RIPA)), and 8710.2200 (Program Effectiveness Report for Continuing Approval (PERCA)).

PELSB proposes to eliminate the following standards entirely:

Table 5: Existing unit standards eliminated from proposed rules

Existing rule (8705.1000)	Why needed and reasonable to eliminate standard
<p>Subpart 2 (C). The unit provides and requires candidates in teacher preparation programs to have completed a program of general studies in the liberal arts and sciences equivalent to the requirement for persons enrolled in programs at their institution not preparing persons for teacher licensure</p>	<p>PELSB proposes removing this requirement as it can be a barrier to entry for many teacher candidates.</p>
<p>Subpart 2 (G). The unit requires that teacher candidates demonstrate the ability to use prekindergarten through grade 12 student performance data to make instructional decisions.</p>	<p>PELSB proposes to repeal this requirement because it is redundant with other standards set forth in 8710.2000 (the Standards of Effective Practice), specifically assessment standards set forth in subpart 9.</p>
<p>Subpart 3 (H). Related services licensure programs incorporate a range of planned and supervised field experiences providing opportunities to demonstrate the required skills and knowledge of their specific field under parts 8710.6000 to 8710.6400.</p>	<p>PELSB proposes to remove this requirement as all related services (with the exception of school counseling) are required to follow the student teaching requirements set forth by their national accrediting body. The proposed rules would require school counseling programs to provide their candidates with at clinical experiences as set forth in Standard 12.</p>
<p>Subpart 5 (D). The unit must demonstrate a candidate advising process that: ensures that candidates are provided information on resources available for personal, professional, and career counseling as well as academic support services.</p>	<p>While PELSB encourages all providers to provide candidates with information about resources and support services available, PELSB proposes to repeal this requirement.</p>
<p>Subpart 9 (C). The unit leader facilitates ongoing communication and collaboration with unit and arts and sciences faculty members for developing, implementing, and maintaining continuity of licensure programs to ensure that</p>	<p>While PELSB maintains the requirement that units provide evidence of content-specific learning opportunities, which will require communication and collaboration if the learning opportunities are being provided by instructors</p>

Existing rule (8705.1000)	Why needed and reasonable to eliminate standard
content standards are being taught and assessed as approved.	from outside the unit, PELSB proposes to eliminate this unit standard as it is specific to institutions of higher education and the intent of the standard can be assessed in other ways.
Subpart 10 (G). Candidates and faculty have access to current books, journals, and electronic information that support teaching, learning, and scholarship.	While PELSB encourages all providers to have provide access to different resources for candidates and teacher educators, PELSB believes this rule can prove overly burdensome, especially as some providers will no longer be directly connected to an institute of higher education.

Given the magnitude of statutory changes to teacher preparation over the last several years, PELSB believes it is needed and reasonable to eliminate several existing unit standards. Please see the rule-by-rule analysis below for more information about how the remainder of the unit standards were modified or kept as is.

8705.1010. Unit Standards.

PELSB proposes creating a new rule part that includes all the fundamental standards governing approved teacher preparation providers and programs in Minnesota (referred to as “unit standards”). While these standards will be verified at site visits at least once every six years, providers are responsible for maintaining compliance throughout their approval period.

Many of the proposed standards are based in entirety or in part off existing rule language. Other sources for proposed standards include:

- The Higher Learning Commission²² and
- The Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation.²³

Subpart 1. Standards for program design and improvement.

Subpart 1 contains all the proposed standards specific to program design (Standards 1 and 2) and continuous improvement (Standards 3 – 5). Standards 1 and 2 remain similar to current program design

²² The Higher Learning Commission is responsible for accrediting degree-granting post-secondary educational institutions in 19 states, including Minnesota. HLC Policies can be found at <https://www.hlcommission.org/Policies/policy-index.html>.

²³ The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation is responsible for accrediting teacher preparation programs. CAEP’s standards can be found at <http://www.ncate.org/standards/introduction>.

standards set forth in part 8705.1000. Similarly, Standards 3, 4, and 5 reflect current rules specific to gathering and reviewing data, engaging stakeholders in evaluation of this data, and making programmatic design changes based on what is found in the evaluation of the data. These are key elements to ensure ongoing program efficacy and hold to a principle that unit standards and requirements are both regulatory in nature and embedded with continuous improvement practices from the units themselves. Therefore, these standards require self-assessment and self-evaluation, as well as meaningful inclusion of external stakeholders who have essential perspectives on the work.

Standard 1

PELSB proposes the following:

Standard 1. The unit must ensure each program has a clear and consistent conceptual framework threaded throughout the program that is research-based, results-oriented, and focused on the skills teachers need to be effective.

Standard 1 is based on a program design requirement set forth in Minnesota Statutes, section 122A.092, and an existing unit standard set forth in Minn. R. 8705.1000.

Minn. Stat. 122A.092, subdivision 2, clause (1). Teacher preparation programs must demonstrate the following to obtain board approval: (1) the program has implemented a research-based, results-oriented curriculum that focuses on the skills teachers need in order to be effective.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 2 (A). The unit provides professional education programs with a clear and consistent conceptual framework threaded throughout the instructional program based on research, theory, and accepted practice.

This standard is needed and reasonable to ensure each unit is developing programs in alignment with state statutory requirements.

Standard 2

PELSB proposes the following:

Standard 2. The unit must ensure each program provides effective instruction on:

- (1) content-specific methods that meet the scope of the licensure area;
- (2) the teacher Code of Ethics;
- (3) lesson planning, including the use of Minnesota academic standards, or, if unavailable, national discipline-specific standards;
- (4) the knowledge and skills needed to provide appropriate instruction to multilingual learners to support and accelerate academic literacy, including oral academic language and achievement in content areas in a regular classroom setting;

(5) the knowledge and skills needed to implement culturally responsive teaching and instructional strategies, including incorporating opportunities for candidates to learn about the role of teachers to disrupt patterns and systems of racism, privilege, and oppression;

(6) research-based practices in reading that enable the candidate to teach reading in the candidate's licensure field;

(7) using a student's native language as a resource in creating effective differentiated instructional strategies for multilingual learners developing literacy skills; and

(8) the knowledge and skills needed to engage students with technology and deliver digital and blended learning and curriculum.

Standard 2 is based on several program design requirements set forth in state statute and existing unit standards set forth in Minn. R. 8705.1000.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 2 (I). The unit's programs require candidates to complete coursework in methods of teaching the content and scope for which they are preparing to be licensed.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 2 (K). The unit's programs evidence direct training in the expectations published in the Minnesota Code of Ethics for professional practice and related Minnesota Statutes.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 2 (F). The unit's programs instruct candidates to use Minnesota kindergarten through grade 12 student academic standards, or, if unavailable, national discipline-specific standards for lesson planning and teaching.

Minn. Stat. 122A.092, subdivision 2, clause (5). Requirements for board approval. Teacher preparation programs must demonstrate the following to obtain board approval: (5) the program includes instruction on the knowledge and skills needed to provide appropriate instruction to English learners to support and accelerate their academic literacy, including oral academic language and achievement in content areas in a regular classroom setting.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 2 (J). The unit's programs evidence culturally responsive curricula.

Minn. Stat. 122A.092, subdivision 2, clause (6). Requirements for board approval. Teacher preparation programs must demonstrate the following to obtain board approval: (6) the program includes culturally competent training in instructional strategies consistent with section 120B.30, subdivision 1, paragraph (q).

Minn. Stat. 122A.092, subdivision 5. Reading strategies. (a) A teacher preparation provider approved by the Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board to prepare persons for classroom teacher licensure must include in its teacher preparation programs research-based best practices in reading, consistent with section 122A.06, subdivision 4, that enable the licensure candidate to teach reading in the candidate's content areas. Teacher candidates must

be instructed in using students' native languages as a resource in creating effective differentiated instructional strategies for English learners developing literacy skills.

Minn. Stat. 122A.092, subdivision 6. Technology strategies. All preparation providers approved by the Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board to prepare persons for classroom teacher licensure must include in their teacher preparation programs the knowledge and skills teacher candidates need to engage students with technology and deliver digital and blended learning and curriculum.

Standard 2 is needed and reasonable to establish the essential components for each program.

Standard 3

PELSB proposes the following:

Standard 3. The unit must implement an assessment system with a process for annually collecting and reviewing data from:

- (1) surveys, including those from:
 - (a) initial licensure program completers at the time of program completion;
 - (b) initial licensure program completers one year after completion; and
 - (c) initial licensure program completers' supervisors one year after completion;
- (2) clinical experiences;
- (3) multiple assessments as required by Standard 19; and
- (4) candidate scores on state-required examinations and board-adopted performance assessments.

Current rule establishes a number of assessment standards, which have been difficult for some providers to understand and implement. These assessment standards were difficult to align and tease apart. The data outlined as required aligns to current rule or current statute. The goal of this standard is to require units maintain a consistent and clear set of data to be used for continuous improvement conversations, while also providing flexibility to allow the system for managing the data and analysis process to be created by the preparation provider.

This proposed standard aligns to Minnesota Statute 122A.091, subdivision 1, as well as other standards both within proposed unit rule and proposed program rule.

Minn. Stat. 122A.091, subdivision 1. Teacher and administrator preparation and performance data; report. (a) The Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board and the Board of School Administrators, in cooperation with board-adopted teacher or administrator preparation programs, annually must collect and report summary data on teacher and administrator preparation and performance outcomes, consistent with this subdivision....

(b) Publicly reported summary data on teacher preparation programs must include:

(7) students' pass rates on skills and subject matter exams required for graduation in each program and licensure area in the preceding school year;

(8) survey results measuring student and graduate satisfaction with the program in the preceding school year disaggregated by race, except when disaggregation would not yield statistically reliable results or would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 7 (A). The unit collects, aggregates, analyzes, and uses aggregated data from its key assessments to evaluate program effectiveness and to make program improvement changes.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 7 (C). The unit has an operational process to obtain feedback from graduates and employers of graduates on the performance of graduates for use in program evaluation.

Standard 4

PELSB proposes the following:

Standard 4. The unit's assessment system must include a process to engage its stakeholders, including candidates, program completers, school partners, teacher educators, and representatives from the community to:

- (1) systematically review data collected under Standard 3;
- (2) provide feedback and recommendations on unit-wide strengths and areas of improvement, which can include program-specific feedback and recommendations; and
- (3) provide feedback and recommendations on long-term plans specific to the unit's program offerings.

Standard 4 is based on the existing standard that requires the unit have an advisory group to assist the unit with monitoring program effectiveness.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 7 (D). The unit has an advisory group with external members including cooperating teachers, other school partners, and graduates that regularly assists with the ongoing evaluation and improvement of programs.

Continuous improvement through stakeholder engagement continues to be an essential component of unit and program approval. This standard is needed and reasonable to ensure stakeholders are engaged with key data points collected by each unit and that there is a clear process for seeking feedback and recommendations from those stakeholders.

Standard 5

PELSB proposes the following:

Standard 5. The unit must implement a formal process for using the assessment system and stakeholder feedback to inform unit and program improvement.

According to the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation, “a robust quality assurance system ensure continuous improvement by relying on a variety of measures, establishing performance benchmarks for those measures, seeking the views of all relevant stakeholders, sharing evidence widely with both internal and external audiences, and using results to improve policies and practices in consultation with partners and stakeholders.”²⁴ This standard provides flexibility in how providers structure continuous improvement conversations, while ensuring a formal process is in place that utilizes multiple data points and diverse stakeholder feedback.

Collecting and reviewing data and engaging with stakeholders are merely steps towards continuous improvement. The unit must use this information to inform unit and program changes. This standard is needed and reasonable to ensure the continuous improvement process is stemming from data and stakeholders.

Subpart 2. Standards for designated school partnerships.

Subpart 2 contains the standards specific to the designated school partnership. The current standards governing clinical placements often result in a one-directional relationship, where the provider is required to have oversight of school cooperating teachers and school supervisors. While much of that is kept in proposed rule, the aspect of a “partnership” was added.

As schools emphasize the need for teachers prepared for today’s students and today’s classrooms, this strengthened partnership helps bridge the divide between preparation and practice.

The proposed standards for the designated school partnership has received a number of comments concerned with the time needed to maintain the designated school partnership and the burden on the school when multiple providers seek to partner with them. In Standard 8 the number of minimum meetings was lowered (PELSB’s initial rule draft required each provider to meet with a designated school partner at least monthly). Additionally, the proposed standards were revised to clarify the difference between a single designated partner and other partners (outlined in Subpart 3). While there is certainly an increase in data sharing and collective analysis, the investment is small compared to the benefits of having preparation that fully aligns with the needs of area schools and the schools’ ability to shape preparation.

Standard 6

PELSB proposes the following:

²⁴ See <http://caepnet.org/standards/standard-5>.

Standard 6. The unit must have at least one designated school partnership with a school or district that works collaboratively to align theory and practice and that meets the standards in this subpart. The unit may have additional partnerships with districts or schools to place candidates in clinical experiences according to the standards in subpart 3.

Standard 6 establishes the basic requirement that a provider must partner with a district, school, or consortium of schools. A school or district may accept or reject being a designated partner, without consequences to still accepting candidates for placements. Understanding that this partnership will be more time-consuming than under current rule, only one “designated” school partner is required. This delineates between the partner in which the school will have a much deeper relationship versus the many and varied schools where the provider will simply send their teacher candidates for placements.

Standard 7

PELSB proposes the following:

Standard 7. For the purpose of continuous improvement and shared accountability, the unit and designated school partner must maintain an agreement that addresses:

- (1) the type of student data that the designated school partner is authorized and willing to share with the candidate and unit regarding student achievement and progress under Minnesota Statutes, section 13.05, subdivision 7;
- (2) the type of aggregated candidate data that the unit will share with the designated school partner regarding candidate efficacy and survey data under Minnesota Statutes, section 13.05, subdivision 7; and
- (3) how the unit will solicit feedback and recommendations from candidates, supervisors, and cooperating teachers about clinical experiences with the designated school partner.

Standard 7 establishes a requirement specific to the sharing of data between the provider and school for continuous improvement. The sharing and use of this data will support conversations about program design impacts on student learning. For teacher candidates, having data on student growth, when possible, can prepare them for revising lessons to improve student learning. For districts, having data on candidate efficacy can help guide conversations for continuous improvement to better prepare teachers for their classrooms.

Standard 8

PELSB proposes the following:

Standard 8. The unit must meet a minimum of two times per year with the designated school partner. The unit must engage in ongoing collaboration with the designated partner to:

- (1) review data including but not limited to data collected under Standards 3 and 7;

- (2) assess feedback from candidates, supervisors, and cooperating teachers;
- (3) evaluate the effectiveness of the partnership to meet mutually beneficial short-term and long-term goals; and
- (4) engage in decision-making processes regarding changes to design and implementation of teacher preparation programs.

Units are already required to communicate and collaborate with school partners to ensure quality clinical experiences for all candidates.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 9 (D). The unit leader facilitates ongoing communication and collaboration with prekindergarten through grade 12 school partners to ensure quality field placements and to maintain the integrity of programs.

Standard 8 seeks to strengthen this requirement by placing an emphasis on collaboration and continuous improvement. Standard 8 identifies the ways in which the sharing of data should be used to collaborate for efficacy of program design.

Standard 8 is based, in part, off of standards set forth by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP).

CAEP Standard 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements [] for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation. Partnerships for clinical preparation can follow a range of forms, participants, and functions. They establish mutually agreeable expectations for candidate entry, preparation, and exit; ensure that theory and practice are linked; maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation; and share accountability for candidate outcomes.

CAEP Standard 2.3. The provider works with partners to design clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration to ensure that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning and development...

Standard 7 and Standard 8 require the provider to engage with at least one school partner at a deeper level to more completely understand how the partner views the qualities of its candidates and be able to engage in meaningful decision-making conversation about how the preparation provider develops and alters its program design to improve the quality of its candidates. These components are needed and reasonable to enhance one partnership to ensure teacher preparation providers have a thorough understanding of the needs of today's students, classrooms, and schools.

Subpart 3. Standards for clinical experiences.

Subpart 3 contains all the standards specific to clinical experience requirements to ensure all teacher candidates prepared by teacher preparation providers are prepared to teach. Each requirement is

needed as an element to support a high-quality clinical experience. Notably, in Minnesota, the requirements for clinical experiences, including student teaching, are established through rule.²⁵

Several stakeholders encouraged PELSB to consider rule changes that would clarify requirements so that it is clear how to meet a particular standard. Therefore, PELSB proposes establishing clear criteria for school partnerships, which are an integral component of a candidate's teacher preparation experience. PELSB proposes that the unit have at least one designated school partnership, which is held to a heightened standard specific to collaboration and continuous improvement, while also setting minimum standards, set forth in subpart 3, for other school partnerships, to provide flexibility for units to partner with other school sites to meet any additional candidate or program needs.

Standard 9

PELSB proposes the following:

Standard 9. The unit and each school partner must maintain an agreement that addresses:

- (1) the responsibilities held by the candidate during a clinical experience;
- (2) the responsibilities held by the school partner during a clinical experience;
- (3) the grounds for removing a candidate from a clinical experience and a process for the removal; and
- (4) the process for identifying cooperating teachers who model:
 - (a) effective instruction, including the use of state academic standards or, if unavailable, national discipline-specific standards; and
 - (b) culturally responsive teaching.

Standard 9 establishes the requirement that the unit must maintain an agreement with each school partner for which a candidate is placed for clinical experiences that addresses the roles and responsibilities of the provider, school, and candidate, including the process for identifying cooperating teachers who model effective instruction and culturally responsive teaching. These agreements are needed to set clear expectations for the parties involved in clinical experiences. This requirement is modeled off language from the Higher Learning Commission and Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation, as well as current rule language that requires the unit to have a process and criteria for identifying cooperating teachers that model effective instructional practices.

HLC CRRT.B.10.020 (C)(3). The institution has formal and current written agreements for managing any internships and clinical placements included in its programs.

²⁵ While Minn. Stat. 122A.092, subdivision 2, clause (2), requires "Teacher preparation programs must demonstrate the following to obtain board approval: (2) the program provides a student teaching program," Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 3, establishes the requirements for field experiences and student teaching.

CAEP Standard 2.1. Partners [] establish mutually agreeable expectations for candidate entry, preparation, and exit; ensure that theory and practice are linked; maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation; and share accountability for candidate outcomes.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 3 (D). The unit has a process for and establishes collaborative school partnerships for field experience placements.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 3 (F). The unit has an established process and criteria for the selection of school-based partner sites and cooperating teachers to assure that partners model effective instructional practices, and that the cooperating teachers model the incorporation of state prekindergarten through grade 12 student academic standards in their teaching.

The proposed requirement that the unit and each school partner maintain an agreement that addresses the process for identifying cooperating teachers who model “culturally responsive teaching” would be a new requirement for units, though, not necessary a new concept. Under existing rule, units are required to themselves have implemented culturally responsive curricula in each program provided to candidates.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 2 (J). The unit's programs evidence culturally responsive curricula.

It is essential that each candidate have the opportunity to observe and work with cooperating teachers who model culturally responsive teaching practices, especially as these candidates will go on to teach Minnesota’s most racially, ethnically, and culturally diverse population to date.

Standard 10

PELSB proposes the following:

Standard 10. The unit must collaborate with each school partner to ensure that:

(1) each cooperating teacher paired with a candidate during student teaching and practicum:

(a) has at least three years of teaching experience as a teacher of record in the licensure area;

(b) holds a professional license aligned to the assignment;

(c) is not on an improvement plan; and

(d) has completed professional development in coaching strategies for adult learners;

(2) each cooperating teacher paired with a candidate during field experiences:

(a) has at least two years of teaching experience;

(b) holds a Tier 2 license or professional license aligned to the assignment; and

(c) is not on an improvement plan; and

(3) each cooperating teacher receives training that addresses the cooperating teacher's role, program expectations, candidate assessments, procedures, and timelines.

For candidates to have high-quality clinical experiences, they need the support and mentorship of experienced teachers who are able to provide them with effective feedback. This standard differentiates for type of placement, increasing requirements for the cooperating teacher of student teaching and practicum experiences. Aspects of this standard are similar to existing rule, but items 1(b) and 2(b) are reflective of Minnesota's tiered licensure structure while still accommodating to clinical experiences in other states.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 3 (E). The unit has a process to verify that school personnel who host teacher candidates or supervise related services candidates hold a valid Minnesota license, or the equivalent, for their assignments.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 3 (F). The unit has an established process and criteria for the selection of school-based partner sites and cooperating teachers to assure that partners model effective instructional practices, and that the cooperating teachers model the incorporation of state prekindergarten through grade 12 student academic standards in their teaching.

This proposed rule language is also in alignment with state statute that establishes minimum qualifications of cooperating teachers hosting student teachers.

Minn. Stat. 122A.68. The Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board may, by agreements with teacher preparation institutions, arrange for classroom experience in the district for practice or student teachers who have completed at least two years of an approved teacher preparation program. Such practice and student teachers must be appropriately supervised by a fully qualified teacher under rules adopted by the board. A practice or student teacher must be placed with a cooperating licensed teacher who has at least three years of teaching experience and is not in the improvement process under section 122A.40, subdivision 8, paragraph (b), clause (12), or 122A.41, subdivision 5, paragraph (b), clause (12). [].

Teacher preparation providers would have flexibility in monitoring the professional development in coaching strategies. Item (3) aligns to current rule in requiring the provider to train cooperating teachers prior to overseeing candidates.

Standard 11

PELSB proposes the following:

Standard 11. For candidates seeking an initial professional license, the unit must:

(1) provide a minimum of 100 field experience hours prior to student teaching that includes:

(a) at least 60 field experience hours that are aligned to the scope and content of the licensure field sought;

(b) experience with students who differ in race, ethnicity, home language, and socioeconomic status; and

(c) experience with students with a range of exceptionalities, including students on an individualized education plan; and

(2) provide a minimum of 12 weeks of face-to-face student teaching that:

(a) is aligned to the scope and content of the licensure field sought;

(b) is split into no more than two placements where each placement is with a continuous group of students and for continuous weeks in alignment with the school calendar and day;

(c) includes at least 80 percent of the contracted school week of face-to-face student contact time;

(d) includes ongoing observations with actionable feedback to ensure growth and attainment of standards with a minimum of four observations conducted by the cooperating teacher;

(e) includes ongoing observations with actionable feedback to ensure growth and attainment of standards with a minimum of four observations conducted by the supervisor;

(f) includes a minimum of three triad meetings with the cooperating teacher, the supervisor, and the candidate for clear and consistent communication; and

(g) includes a written evaluation by the supervisor that addresses the candidate's ability to meet the standards in parts 8710.2000 to 8710.8080 and the candidate's professional dispositions.

PELSB proposes to consolidate all the requirements for clinical experiences for a candidate seeking initial licensure into a single standard.

While the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation establishes key concepts for meaningful clinical experiences, Standard 11 sets forth the minimum requirements to ensure experiences are of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration.

CAEP Standard 2.3. The provider works with partners to design clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration to ensure that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning and development. Clinical experiences, including technology-enhanced learning opportunities, are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates' development of the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, as delineated in Standard 1, that are associated with a positive impact on the learning and development of all P-12 students.

Field experiences are defined as school-based opportunities during which candidates observe teachers and students, assist, tutor, instruct, or conduct research. During field experiences, the candidate does not take on full teacher responsibilities. These experiences are key learning opportunities for the candidate; opportunity to explore different school environments and licensure areas and to be exposed to different schools, communities, and students.

Standard 11 (1)(a) is new requirement and ensures there is exposure to the licensure area sought, while also providing flexibility to explore other licensure areas.

Standard 11 (1)(b) and (c) are based on existing rule language.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 3 (C). The unit has a process to assure that all candidates have experiences with diverse populations, including students with a range of exceptionalities, and students representing a diversity of socioeconomic, linguistic, cultural, ethnic, and racial backgrounds.

Student teaching is the capstone experience for teacher candidates, during which they are evaluated on their ability to implement subject-matter expertise, curriculum development, student assessment, and other skills necessary to serving as an effective teacher.

Existing unit rule language establishes the minimum requirements for student teaching. Each licensure rule, in chapter 8710, includes additional requirements about student teaching placements.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 3 (G). For initial licensure, each program requires a student teaching period of a minimum of 12 continuous weeks, full time, face-to-face, which could be split into two placements, and in compliance with program-specific field experience and student teaching requirements set forth in parts 8705.2000 to 8705.2600 and parts 8710.3000 to 8710.8080; and

Standard 11 (2) (a) – (b) reiterates existing rule language.

Standard 11 (2)(c) seeks to clarify the existing requirement that student teaching be "full time" by clarifying that a candidate must student teach for at least 80 percent of the scheduled school week.

PELSB worked with stakeholders to prepare language that would allow for flexibility in both school models (i.e., if a school were to hold classes 4-days per week) or for candidate schedules (i.e., a candidate leaves the school during the last hour of each day in order to attend lecture). A candidate can meet this requirement by teaching, preparing for class, grading or reviewing student assessments, and participating in school-lead professional development.

Standard 11 (2) (d) – (g) formalize the observation, evaluation, and feedback process to standardize the support and continuous growth necessary for all student teachers. Feedback from the supervisor and cooperating teacher, in both writing and during triad meetings, are key for a candidate to understand areas of weakness and strength. Student teaching time is a unique opportunity to continue hone skills with intensive support prior to licensure and employment by a school district.

Clinical experiences are critical to exposing candidates to the alignment of theory and practice. This standard is reasonable and necessary to ensure a minimum standard for all teacher candidates is established that focuses on exposure to different schools, students, and teaching styles, includes a meaningful feedback loop from supervisors and cooperating teachers, and helps candidates to prepare to transition to employment as a licensed teacher in Minnesota.

Standard 12

PELSB proposes the following:

Standard 12. For candidates seeking more than one professional license, the unit must:

- (1) provide a minimum of 100 field experience hours prior to student teaching that include:
 - (a) at least 30 field experience hours that are aligned to the scope and content of each license and endorsement sought;
 - (b) experience with students who differ in race, ethnicity, home language, and socioeconomic status; and
 - (c) experience with students with a range of exceptionalities, including students on an individualized education plan; and
- (2) provide a minimum of 14 weeks of face-to-face student teaching that:
 - (a) includes a placement aligned to the scope and content of each license and endorsement sought;
 - (b) is split into no more than two placements, where each placement is a minimum of two weeks or the equivalent, with a continuous group of students and for continuous weeks in alignment with the school calendar and day;
 - (c) includes at least 80 percent of the contracted school week of face-to-face student contact time;

(d) includes observations with actionable feedback to ensure growth and attainment of standards with a minimum of five observations, with at least one observation per placement, conducted by the cooperating teacher;

(e) includes observations with actionable feedback to ensure growth and attainment of standards with a minimum of five observations, with at least one observation per placement, conducted by the supervisor;

(f) includes a minimum of four triad meetings, with at least one triad meeting per placement with the cooperating teacher, the supervisor, and the candidate; and

(g) includes a written evaluation by the supervisor that addresses the candidate's ability to meet the applicable standards in parts 8710.2000 to 8710.8080 and the candidate's professional dispositions

Standard 12 establishes the requirements for clinical experiences for a candidate completing preparation to obtain more than one professional teaching license (such as, physical education and health). Current rule does not establish minimum requirements for a these types of programs. Standard 12 builds off requirements in Standard 11 to ensure each candidate receives adequate field experiences aligned to each license sought as well as additional observations and opportunities for feedback.

Standard 13

PELSB proposes the following:

Standard 13. For candidates who have completed licensure via portfolio, have completed or are in the process of completing a state-approved initial licensure teacher preparation program, and are seeking an additional license or endorsement, the unit must:

(1) have a documented process for evaluating a candidate's prior clinical experiences including:

(a) experience aligned to the scope and content of the license or endorsement sought;

(b) experience with students who differ in race, ethnicity, home language, and socioeconomic status; and

(c) experience with students with a range of exceptionalities, including students on an individualized education plan; and

(2) design a practicum experience that addresses any gaps in prior experience listed in subitem (1) and that:

(a) aligns to the scope and content of the license or endorsement sought;

- (b) is a minimum of 80 hours with a continuous group of students and consecutive days aligned with the school calendar;
- (c) provides observations with actionable feedback to ensure growth and attainment of standards with a minimum of two observations by the cooperating teacher;
- (d) provides observations with actionable feedback to ensure growth and attainment of standards with a minimum of two observations by the supervisor;
- (e) includes a minimum of one triad meeting with the cooperating teacher, the supervisor, and the candidate for clear and consistent communication; and
- (f) includes a written evaluation by the supervisor that addresses the candidate's ability to meet the standards in parts 8710.2000 to 8710.8080 and the candidate's professional dispositions

Once a teacher is licensed, one way to obtain additional licensure is by completing an additional licensure teacher preparation program. Current rule permits the provider to determine the length of the clinical experience (i.e., the practicum), requires the experience to be aligned to the scope of the license sought and requires a written evaluation by a supervisor.

Minn. R. 8705.2100, subpart 2 (D)(4)(f). For licenses added to an initial license, the program may determine the length of field experiences needed for each candidate to demonstrate program standards necessary to be recommended for an additional license as follows: i. the program must provide field experiences aligned to the scope of the licensure sought; ii. the length of field experience may vary depending on the prior academic preparation and experiences of each candidate; and iii. a written evaluation by a supervisor is required.

Standard 13 seeks to establish a minimum set of requirements for all practicum experiences. Standard 13 requires the provider to have a documented process for evaluating a candidate's prior clinical experiences and to design a practicum, of at least 80 hours, that addresses any gaps in prior experience. Standard 13 places the emphasis on developing practicum experiences that meet the candidates' unique and personal needs, while also establishing a clear minimum number of hours applicable to candidates across the state.

Standard 14

PELSB proposes the following:

Standard 14. For a candidate working as a teacher of record while completing a teacher preparation program to obtain an initial professional license, the unit must ensure:

- (1) the candidate completes the requirements in Standard 12;
- (2) a cooperating teacher holding a professional license in the licensure area sought is available to work with the candidate throughout the course of the student teaching experience; and
- (3) a cooperating teacher holding a professional license aligned to the licensure area or scope of the license sought is available in the school to work with the candidate to model effective practices and provide feedback throughout the course of the student teaching experience.

The creation of a Tier 2 license in statute has resulted in the need for a standard that describes the type of support necessary for candidates completing clinical experiences while also serving in a school as a “teacher of record.” This standard ensures high-quality support with an understanding of the various flexible needs of placements in shortage areas or licensure areas with only one position in a district.

Standard 15

PELSB proposes the following:

Standard 15. The unit must ensure each supervisor:

- (1) is qualified by one of the following:
 - (a) holding or having held a professional license aligned to the licensure field or scope of the license sought by the candidate and at least three years of experience as a teacher of record;
 - (b) being a current or former licensed E-12 administrator with oversight of teacher evaluation; or
 - (c) being a current or former E-12 administrator with documented experience in teacher evaluation;
- (2) completes professional development in coaching strategies for adult learners; and
- (3) completes training on the program requirements and evaluation procedures for candidates

Standard 15 is based on an existing “unit standard.”

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 8 (I). The unit ensures that all faculty who supervise student teaching must have a minimum of a master's degree and have at least one academic year of

prekindergarten through grade 12 teaching experience aligned to the scope of the licensure programs they supervise.

Stakeholders urged PELSB to consider building in additional flexibility to the qualifications to eliminate existing challenges to finding supervisors that fit the needs of each program. Under Minn. R. 8705.1000, many individuals are deemed “unqualified” due to a lack of master’s degree or higher (despite having years of teaching experience). The proposed rule change the focus of supervisor qualifications from academic credentials to experience teaching and/or providing teacher evaluation.

Subpart 4. Standards for candidates.

Subpart 4 contains all the requirements specific to candidate recruitment, records, advisement, and monitoring. Many of the standards in subpart 4 contain foundational protections for candidates (at admission, throughout the program, and after program completion).

Standard 16

PELSB proposes the following:

Standard 16. The unit must implement an effective strategy for recruiting and retaining candidates to address state and district teacher shortage areas, including racial and ethnic diversity.

According to the *2019 Minnesota Teacher Supply and Demand Report*:

- Minnesota’s school districts continue to report a perception of “difficult” and “very difficult” to fill teaching positions.
- The percentage of teachers of color remain stagnant while the percentage of students of color continues to grow in Minnesota.²⁶

To ensure teacher preparation providers play an intentional role in recruiting candidates that reflect Minnesota’s students and to help support efforts to address state and district shortage areas, PELSB proposes Standard 16, which requires teacher preparation providers to implement an effective strategy for recruiting and retaining candidates to address state and district teacher shortages, including racial and ethnic diversity.

The language and concepts of Standard 16 come, in part, from existing rule.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 4 (B). The unit must demonstrate a candidate selection process that includes plans, policies, and practices for admission and retention of a diverse candidate pool.

²⁶ *2019 Biennial Minnesota Teacher Supply and Demand*, prepared for the Minnesota Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board by Wilder Research (January 2019), available at https://mn.gov/pelsb/assets/2019%20Supply%20and%20Demand%20Report_tcm1113-370206.pdf.

Some stakeholders have indicated that this requirement can be confusing (specifically, whether the unit need several “plans,” “policies,” and “practices” to be in compliance). Therefore, the Board proposes clarifying and simplifying this standard such that a unit have a strategy in place for recruitment addressing teacher shortage areas and racial and ethnic diversity. A provider can demonstrate their strategy through “plans” and “policies” or in other ways.

The language and concepts of Standard 16 also come, in part, from the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) Standard 3.1, which states “...The admitted pool of candidates reflects the diversity of America’s P-12 students. The provider demonstrates efforts to know and address community, state, national, regional, or local needs for hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields, currently, STEM, English-language learning, and students with disabilities.”

Additionally, the Board received recommendations that the rules should more explicitly address how teacher preparation providers and programs should be considering teacher shortage areas (such as part of their continuous improvement efforts). Standard 16 would require providers to develop and implement a strategy for recruiting and retaining candidates that addresses state and district teacher shortage areas (including, but not limited to, candidates from different regions of the state and/or country, racially and/or ethnically diverse candidates, providing licensure programs in high demand or need, etc.).

Finally, it is worth noting that the Board’s mission is to ensure each of Minnesota’s students has high-quality teachers in their schools and the Board is dedicated to increasing the racial and ethnic diversity of the educator workforce throughout all regions of Minnesota. PELSB maintains Standard 16 is reasonable and absolutely necessary to ensure these statements become reality.

Standard 17

PELSB proposes the following:

Standard 17. The unit must maintain accurate records of candidate progress through the program, including applicable learning opportunities and coursework, clinical experiences, and all program requirements.

Standard 17 is based on an existing unit standard, which requires that the unit maintain complete, accurate, consistent, and current records of candidate progress through the programs, including coursework, field experiences, and other program requirements. Additionally, Standard 17 is aligned to the Higher Learning Commission assumed practice that requires the institution to maintain “timely and accurate transcript and record services.”

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 6 (A). The unit must have a defined process to monitor candidate progress and demonstration of standards that includes the following: A. maintaining complete, accurate, consistent, and current records of candidate progress through the programs, including coursework, field experiences, and other program requirements.

HLC Policy CRRT.B.10.020 (B)(3)(b). The institution maintains timely and accurate transcript and records services.

This standard continues to be needed and reasonable as it protects candidate rights by ensuring key components of candidate progress is documented and maintained.

Standard 18

PELSB proposes the following:

Standard 18. The unit must make available to candidates, online or in print, the following information:

- (1) a description of the requirements for admission into each program;
- (2) a description of the completion requirements for each program;
- (3) a description of the state requirements for licensure, including information about the completion of a board-adopted performance assessment;
- (4) the unit's procedures for receiving and responding to complaints and grievances from candidates and other constituencies;
- (5) the unit's policy for substituting program requirements for prior learning experiences, coursework, teaching experience, and credit by examination. The policy must make clear that the unit will not substitute prior experience for student teaching or practicum requirements set forth in Standard 12, subitem (2), Standard 13, subitem (2), and Standard 14;
- (6) a description of the candidate's appeal process if not recommended for licensure;
- (7) cost information, including information about financial aid; and
- (8) unit and program accreditation status.

Existing rule establishes a number of requirements specific to candidate advising.

PELSB proposes to clarify several existing requirements and to adopt several concepts from the Higher Learning Commission to establish clear candidate protections centered around transparency. Standard 18 (1) – (4) and (6) are vital to a candidate's understanding of what is required to successfully complete the teacher preparation program and become a licensed teacher.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 5. The unit must demonstrate a candidate advising process that:

- A. provides appropriate and accurate academic and professional advisement at a candidate's admission and throughout the candidate's professional education program;
- B. assures that candidates have access to accurate published information describing the teacher preparation programs' requirements, including information about state-required teacher licensure examinations;
- C. has a defined student appeals process including a published reference to Minnesota Statutes, section 122A.09, subdivision 4, paragraph (c).

HLC CRRT B.10.020 (A)(5)(b) – (c). The institution makes readily available to students and to the general public clear and complete information including:

(b) full descriptions of the requirements for its programs, including all pre-requisite courses; and

(c) requirements for admission both to the institution and to particular programs or majors.

HLC CRRT B.10.020 (A)(4). The institution provides clear information regarding its procedures for receiving complaints and grievances from students and other constituencies, responds to them in a timely manner, and analyzes them to improve its processes.

Standard 18 (5) aligns to current rule requiring providers to have a process for transferring in coursework and/or experiences. It adds much clarity and detail to the process to ensure consistent application in how providers ensure an individual is prepared to teach while also honoring prior work. This proposed standard is also aligned Higher Learning Commission policies.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 4 (C). The unit must demonstrate a candidate selection process that includes the following: a plan for uniformly assessing and, as appropriate, giving credit to candidates, including out-of-state, transfer, nontraditional, or postbaccalaureate, for knowledge and skills acquired through prior academic preparation and teaching experiences that meet licensure requirements, and must maintain records to support decisions made.

HLC Policy CRRT.B.10.020 (B)(1)(f). The institution has a process for ensuring that all courses transferred and applied toward degree requirements demonstrate equivalence with its own courses required for that degree or are of equivalent rigor.

HLC Policy CRRT.B.10.020 (B)(1)(g). The institution has a clear policy on the maximum allowable credit for prior learning as a reasonable proportion of the credits required to complete the student's program. Credit awarded for prior learning is documented, evaluated, and appropriate for the level of degree awarded. (Note that this requirement does not apply to courses transferred from other institutions.).

Standard 18 (7) is specific to general transparency about the costs associated with the unit. This components seek to enhance transparency for candidates seeking out preparation programs. This language is also aligned to HLC policy.

HLC CRRT B.10.020 (A)(5)(e). The institution makes readily available to students and to the general public clear and complete information including:

(e) all student costs, including tuition, fees, training, and incidentals; its financial aid policies, practices, and requirements; and its policy on refunds.

Finally, PELSB proposes Standard 18(8) to require units to disclose their program and unit accreditation status. There are certain protections that are explicitly tied to regional accreditation and it is important that candidates can easily access this information.

Standard 19

PELSB proposes the following:

Standard 19. The unit must monitor each candidate's attainment of content and pedagogical knowledge and skills as required by parts 8710.2000 to 8710.8080, enactment of professional dispositions, and progress toward completing the program by assessing each candidate:

- (1) at a minimum of three identified checkpoints, including at entry, midpoint through the program, and at exit; and
- (2) through multiple assessments implemented throughout the program.

Standard 19 is based on existing unit standards, state statute, as well as Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation Standard 3.4.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 6 (B) – (D). The unit must have a defined process to monitor candidate progress and demonstration of standards that includes the following:

- B. monitoring and assessing candidates' attainment of standards of parts 8710.2000 to 8710.8080 at a minimum of three identified checkpoints after admission throughout the professional education sequence;
- C. a uniform, operational assessment system applied to candidates in all licensure programs which identifies key assessments, including performance assessments;
- D. evidence that multiple assessments are used to demonstrate candidates' academic competence in the content they plan to teach.

Minn. Stat. 122A.2451, subdivision 5. Program approval. The board must approve programs offered by approved providers based on nontraditional criteria. An approved program must have the following characteristics:

- (4) provide assessment, supervision, and evaluation of teacher candidates to determine their specific needs throughout the program, and to support efforts to successfully complete the program;
- (6) a process to review a candidate's final proficiency of required licensure content standards that leads to potential candidate recommendation by the provider to the board for a Tier 3 teaching license under subdivision 8.

CAEP Standard 3.4. The provider creates criteria for program progression and monitors candidates' achievement from admissions through completion. All candidates demonstrate the ability to teach college- and career-ready standards. Providers present multiple forms of evidence to indicate candidates' developing content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and the integration of technology in all of these domains.

This standard ensures that the provider monitors individual candidates, including at least three checkpoints and with multiple assessments, to guide candidates in their progress toward program completion. This standard continues to be needed and reasonable as it protects candidate rights by

requiring teacher preparation providers to ensure that candidates are monitored and assessed throughout the course of the program.

Standard 20

PELSB proposes the following:

Standard 20. The unit must provide each candidate with individualized advising, which includes:

- (1) prior to student teaching or practicum, discussing the candidate's attainment of content and pedagogical knowledge and skills as required by parts 8710.2000 to 8710.8080, enactment of professional dispositions, and progress toward completing the program;
- (2) counseling a candidate out of the program who is failing to evidence the necessary content and pedagogical knowledge and skills or professional dispositions to be an effective teacher; and
- (3) documenting program completion.

Standard 20 ensures that the monitoring of individual candidates from Standard 19 is communicated to each student to assist toward program completion, including providing opportunities to counsel students out of the program that are not making progress or do not show necessary professional dispositions for teachers.

Standard 21

PELSB proposes the following:

Standard 21. The unit must ensure each candidate seeking an initial professional license completes a board-adopted teacher performance assessment if an assessment exists that is aligned with the license sought.

Standard 21 is based off a current program requirement.

Minn. R. 8705.2100, subpart 2 (D)(4)(e) The application [for initial program approval] must provide evidence of the following field experiences and student teaching standards: evaluation of candidates seeking an initial teaching license includes the completion of the state-approved teacher performance assessment during the student teaching placement.

Standard 21 creates additional flexibility to an existing requirement by permitting the candidate to complete the teacher performance assessment at any point during the initial licensure program. Additionally, Standard 21 acknowledges that candidates do not need to complete a performance assessment if one does not exist specific to the licensure field being sought.

Subpart 5. Standards for teacher educators.

Subpart 5 contains all the requirements specific to teacher educators (also referred to as “instructors”). These standards have been greatly modified from current rule. The modification include removing the differentiation between content and pedagogy instructors, removing language specific to institutes of higher education (i.e. “faculty), and expanding requirement options for becoming a teacher educator to include options that value extensive experience alongside options that value advanced academic degrees. This flexibility allows teacher preparation providers to consider the type of teacher educators that fit their program models and also be able to expand hiring opportunities to communities traditionally underrepresented in advanced academic degrees.

Standard 22

PELSB proposes the following:

Standard 22. The unit must implement an effective strategy for recruiting and retaining teacher educators with diverse backgrounds and experiences, including racially and ethnically diverse teacher educators.

Standard 22 is based an existing unit standard

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 8 (C). The unit must actively recruit and have plans, policies, and practices for hiring diverse faculty.

Language changed from the undefined “plans,” “policies,” and “practices” in current rule to “implement an effective strategy to clarify and simplify this standard such that a unit have a strategy in place for recruiting and retraining diverse teacher educators. A unit can demonstrate their strategy through “plans” and “policies” or in other ways.

As there are there is a severe shortage of teachers and teacher educators of color, this rule specifically names “racially and ethnically diverse.” This proposed rule has the addition of “effective” to hold units accountable for outcomes.

This standard continues to be needed and reasonable.

Standard 23

PELSB proposes the following:

Standard 23. The unit must ensure each teacher educator is able to show expertise for teaching assignments and one of the following:

(1) a master's degree or higher in any field and:

(a) at least 18 graduate credits in the teacher educator's area of instruction; or

(b) dissertation or published research in the teacher educator's area of instruction;

(2) a bachelor's degree and at least five years of experience as a teacher of record with a professional license and:

(a) national board certification; or

(b) participation in at least 125 hours of instructional leadership activities, such as serving as a cooperating teacher of candidates during student teaching or practicum, facilitating professional development for other teachers, mentoring teachers, or peer coaching; or

(3) for teacher educators of career and technical education or the visual or performing arts, a bachelor's degree in any field and at least five years of relevant professional work experience aligned to the teacher educator's area of instruction.

PELSB proposes to adopt Standard 23 to replace an existing standard that establishes faculty qualification.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 8 (A). The unit must demonstrate qualifications and assignment of the professional education faculty that include the following: (A) the unit ensures that all education faculty are qualified by advanced academic preparation for the faculty member's current assignments.

Minn. R. 8705.0200, subpart 2. "Advanced academic preparation" means a minimum of a master's degree and content expertise in the licensure subject to be taught.

Standard 23 seeks to provide several pathways by which a teacher educator may be qualified to teach, such as by considering prior teaching experience and one's educational background. Standard 23 (1) is largely in alignment with Higher Learning Commission requirements by which institutions of higher learning must abide.

HLC Policy CRRT.B.10.020 (B)(2)(b). Instructors teaching in graduate programs should hold the terminal degree determined by the discipline and have a record of research, scholarship or achievement appropriate for the graduate program.

State statute authorizes the board to use nontraditional criteria to determine qualifications for alternative teacher preparation providers.

Minn. Stat. 122A.245a, subdivision 6 (b). The board must use nontraditional criteria to determine qualifications of program instructors, including permitting instructors to hold a baccalaureate degree only.

PELSB seeks to adopt a set of criteria that includes teaching experience as a recognized qualification. Therefore, Standard 23 (2) acknowledges prior teaching experience as one means to be qualified as a teacher educator.

Finally, it is worth noting that all units can seek a discretionary variance if and when they identify a teacher educator that does not meet these established qualifications, but the unit believes the teacher educator meets the intent of the requirement in a manner other than as set forth by this standard.

PELSB's proposed teacher educator qualifications are reasonable and necessary to ensure a minimum set of criteria for Minnesota's teacher educators. The qualifications are more expansive than current rule and there continues to be opportunities to evidence non-traditional criteria through the discretionary variance process.

Standard 24

PELSB proposes the following:

Standard 24. The unit must ensure each teacher educator of field-specific methods instruction, including reading methods, is able to show expertise for teaching assignments and:

- (1) is qualified as a teacher educator under Standard 23, subitem (1), and:
 - (a) has completed a state-approved teacher preparation program;
 - (b) has three years of experience as a teacher of record; and
 - (c) holds or held a professional license aligned to the scope and content area of instruction;
- (2) is qualified as a teacher educator under Standard 23, subitem (2), and:
 - (a) has completed a state-approved teacher preparation program;
 - (b) has seven years of experience as a teacher of record; and
 - (c) holds or held a professional license aligned to the scope and content area of instruction; or
- (3) is qualified as a teacher educator under Standard 23, subitem (3), and:
 - (a) has completed a state-approved teacher preparation program;
 - (b) has five years of experience as a teacher of record; and
 - (c) holds or held a professional license aligned to the scope and content area of instruction

Standard 24 is based on existing rule language and builds off of proposed Standard 23.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 8 (H). The unit ensures that all faculty who are assigned to teach content-specific methods courses have advanced academic preparation, and have at least one academic year of prekindergarten through grade 12 teaching experience in that content area and scope.

Methods instruction is key to teacher preparation and includes learning opportunities and assessments on how to teach a particular content area. The qualifications for methods instructors ensure these instructors have subject matter expertise as well as a deep understanding of the necessary pedagogical framework to support effective teaching.²⁷

PELSB adopted the current qualifications for methods instructors in 2014 in order to ensure these teacher educators had classroom experience. Unfortunately, the intent of this requirement has been worked around and many methods instructors have not had real experience in a classroom. Therefore, PELSB proposes to strengthen this unit standard by requiring completion of a state-approved teacher preparation program, a minimum number of years or experience as a teacher of record, and that the educator hold or held a professional license aligned to the scope and content area of instruction.

A number of stakeholders have raised concerns about the impact of this proposed standard on existing faculty in Institutes of Higher Education, who will not meet the three-years of teaching experience requirement (set forth in Standard 24(1)). Most notably, the Minnesota Association of Colleges for Teacher Education surveyed deans of its membership, which found 24% of current methods instructors do not have three years of teaching experience and would be negatively impacted by the proposed standards. Due to concerns regarding current methods instructors, an effective date of “three years after the date of adoption” was added to allow current methods instructors time to meet the new qualifications.

Finally, it is worth noting that all units can seek a discretionary variance if and when they identify a methods instructor who does not meet these established qualifications, but the unit believes the instructor’s background and experience meets the intent of the requirement in a manner other than as set forth by this standard.

PELSB’s proposed qualifications are reasonable and necessary to ensure Minnesota’s methods instructors have experience teaching in the classroom.

Standard 25

PELSB proposes the following:

Standard 25. The unit must monitor and assess each teacher educator at least once every three years using a teacher educator framework that models continuous improvement practices and includes observations and candidate feedback.

²⁷ It is important to understand the difference between content instruction and methods instruction and why methods instruction is pivotal to teacher preparation. A candidate preparing to become a high school math teacher must have subject matter expertise (and therefore may complete courses in calculus, actuarial science, algebra, geometry, etc.). This same candidate would also need to be able to “teach mathematics;” which is provided through methods instruction. This framework is not dissimilar from other professional preparation programs. For example, law students often complete “subject matter” courses, such as constitutional law, contracts, and property law, as well as courses specific to serving as an attorney, such as legal research and writing, conflict resolution, and moot court.

Standard 25 is based on an existing unit standard.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 8 (F). The unit has a system to provide feedback to faculty based on candidate evaluation of faculty effectiveness and candidate data.

Standard 25 aligns the three year evaluation cycle to the unit review and midcycle review timeline. This ensures both continued accountability for teacher educator evaluation while also providing flexibility within providers without the resources for annual evaluation.

This standard also adds the concept of using a teacher educator framework, aligning to national dialogue stemming from TeacherSquared, the Massachusetts Department of Education, and TeachingWorks of the education department at the University of Michigan.

The proposed standard ensures that the unit monitors and assesses the teacher educators. It does not require the unit review team or board staff to review individual evaluations or any personnel data.

Current teacher preparation providers continue to share concerns that language in the standard may violate current union contracts in some sectors of teacher preparation. PELSB continues to work with these stakeholders to find solutions that do not require changing the reasonable requirements of this standard.

Standard 26

PELSB proposes the following:

Standard 26. The unit must require and document for each teacher educator:

- (1) completion of ongoing professional development opportunities, including professional development specific to the field of education focusing on research-based best practices;
- (2) completion of 30 hours in a three-year period of professional involvement in an early childhood, elementary, or secondary school setting aligned to the area of instruction that must include at least one of the following: teaching, tutoring, supervising candidates in the field, completing observations, school-level consulting, or engaging with a professional learning community; and
- (3) completion of periodic orientation on requirements in chapters 8705 and 8710 and Minnesota Statutes, chapter 122A.

In order to ensure teacher educators remain familiar with (1) the teaching practices and theories being used throughout Minnesota's schools and (2) the laws and rules governing teacher preparation, providers have been required to ensure teacher educators are engaged in P-12 schools and provide teacher educators with professional development and training on standards.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 8 (B). The unit verifies that faculty assigned to teach in the education program are actively engaged in professional organizations, other education-related

endeavors at the local, state, or national levels, and ongoing involvement in prekindergarten through grade 12 schools in accordance with Minnesota Statutes, section 122A.09, subdivision 4, paragraph (f).

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 8 (E). The unit provides support for faculty to engage in professional development to enhance intellectual and professional vitality to ensure that they model effective delivery of instruction.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 9 (F). The unit leader provides periodic orientation to board standards, both unit and program-specific, to all unit faculty, including adjuncts and part-time instructors, to ensure program integrity and consistency.

Standard 26 combines and clarifies current rule, as well as aligns to statutory requirements specific to teacher educators in order to ensure providers continue to support and train their teacher educators, and to require exposure to elementary and secondary schools as intended by the state legislature.

Minn. Stat. 122A.092, subdivision 4. Teacher educators. The board must adopt rules requiring teacher educators to work directly with elementary or secondary school teachers in elementary or secondary schools to obtain periodic exposure to the elementary and secondary teaching environments.

Subpart 6. Standards for unit and program oversight.

Subpart 6 contains all the requirements specific to unit and program oversight. Current rule outlined detailed requirements for a “unit leader” in addition to many governing standards aligned to institutes of higher education. These proposed rules simplify, combine, and clarify these rules into only the necessary standards for unit efficacy and sustainability.

Standard 27

PELSB proposes the following:

Standard 27. The unit must:

- (1) meet the applicable requirements in this chapter, chapter 8710, and Minnesota Statutes, chapter 122A;
- (2) administer all licensure programs as approved;
- (3) ensure information submitted to the board as part of the unit approval process and program approval process is not misleading, false, or fraudulent;
- (4) comply with state and federal data practices laws; and
- (5) maintain an assessment system that enables storing, tracking, and reporting to meet state and federal annual data submission requirements.

Standard 27 outlines the fundamental responsibilities of the provider. Many of the items in Standard 27 are based on existing “unit standards” or requirements set forth in chapter 8705.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 9 (A). The unit leader has responsibility for implementing current Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board requirements and approval processes.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 9 (I). The unit leader is responsible for administering all licensure programs as approved and for notifying the board of any changes to approved programs through the biennial program reporting process.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 9 (H). The unit leader is responsible for submitting licensure program proposal applications and program effectiveness reports to the board for approval.

Minn. Stat. 122A.2451, subdivision 4. Provider approval. An eligible entity must be approved as a provider before being approved to provide programs towards licensure. The Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board must approve eligible entities under subdivision 3 that meet the following requirements: (2) has evidence of necessary infrastructure to provide accurate, timely, and secure data for the purposes of admission, candidate monitoring, testing, background checks, and license recommendations; [and] (3) has policies and procedures in place ensuring the security of candidate records under the federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act.

Notably, Standard 27 (4) was added to address recent concerns regarding how providers manage state and federal data practice laws.

Standard 28

PELSB proposes the following:

Standard 28. The unit must designate a leader responsible for:

- (1) recommending candidates for licensure upon completion of the teacher preparation program; and
- (2) communicating with the board, including notifying the board of changes to approved programs through the program reporting process and submitting licensure program proposal applications and program effectiveness reports.

Standard 28 simplifies the prior “unit leader” standards in the two key areas where some representative of the unit must be responsible: candidate recommendation and communication with PELSB regarding programmatic changes.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 9 (J). The unit leader is authorized to recommend for teacher licensure candidates who have completed the unit’s teacher preparation programs.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 9 (I). The unit leader is responsible for administering all licensure programs as approved and for notifying the board of any changes to approved programs through the biennial program reporting process.

Standard 29

PELSB proposes the following:

Standard 29. The unit must have financial and physical resources to maintain licensure programs, support teacher educators, provide administrative support, and meet all unit and program standards, including the ability to collect and analyze data for continuous improvement.

Standard 29 is based on a current unit standard as well as language set forth in state statute.

Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 10 (D). The unit has sufficient financial and physical resources and institutional support to sustain teacher preparation programs including adequate budgets, classroom and office space, technology support and equipment, supplies, and materials.

Minn. Stat. 122A.2451, subdivision 4. Provider approval. An eligible entity must be approved as a provider before being approved to provide programs towards licensure. The Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board must approve eligible entities under subdivision 3 that meet the following requirements: (1) has evidence and history of fiscal solvency, capacity, and operation.

Notably, PELSB proposes modifying this standard to focus less on physical supplies and spaces, and to instead, focus on the ability of the provider to administer each licensure program as approved.

Subpart 7. Standards for school counseling programs.

Standard 30

PELSB proposes the following:

Standard 30. For a school counseling program approved by the board, the unit must demonstrate compliance with all applicable entry-level Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Program (CACREP) standards for a school counseling program including:

- A. the learning environment;
- B. a professional counseling identity;
- C. professional practice;
- D. program evaluation; and
- E. school counseling standards.

PELSB proposes Standard 30 in order to establish a common set of requirements for all school counseling programs in Minnesota. School counseling programs may be approved by PELSB or by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Program (CACREP).²⁸ CACREP has its own unit and program standards. While school counseling program standards are already in Minn. R. 8710.6400, current unit rules do not align to the level of CACREP unit standards. For example, CACREP requires that “core counselor education program faculty have earned doctoral degrees in counselor education, preferably from a CACREP accredited program;” whereas current PELSB rules requires only a master’s degree.²⁹ Additionally, CACREP has specific requirements for field experience including a minimum of 10 weeks of practicum experience that includes 40 clock hours of direct service and weekly interaction with supervisors plus a 600 hour of supervised internship that includes 240 clock hours of direct service and weekly interaction with supervisors whereas current PELSB rules are not as specific for related services.³⁰ CACREP has specific rules for the nature of supervision, including faculty student ratios for which there is no clear equivalent in PELSB unit rule.

Of the eight school counselor programs currently operating in the state, two are approved by PELSB and six are approved by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Program (CACREP).

When the Board of Teaching updated the related services rules set forth in parts 8710.6000-8710.6400 in the early 2000s, it proposed to have other accrediting bodies oversee all related services. School counseling was the only related service where providers had the option of an external accrediting body or the Board of Teaching, now PELSB. This proposed change would not only bring alignment to all school counseling programs in the state, but also alignment to the process and standards for all related services.

8705.1100. Unit Approval.

8705.1100 establishes the processes and procedures for obtaining initial and continuing unit approval.

Subpart 1. Evaluation procedures (repeal).

PELSB proposes to repeal subpart 1, which governs the initial unit approval process, and replace it with subpart 1a.

Subpart 1a. Initial unit approval.

²⁸ Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 3(E) and (H), which establishes field experience requirements for related services.

²⁹ Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 8(A), which requires “advanced preparation for the faculty member’s current assignments.” Minn. R. 8705.02000 defines “advanced academic preparation” as “a minimum of a master’s degree and content expertise in the licensure subject to be taught.”

³⁰ Minn. R. 8705.1000, subpart 3(H), which requires “a range of planned and supervised experiences providing opportunities to demonstrate the required skills and knowledge of their specific field under parts 8710.6000 to 8710.6400.”

Subpart 1a establishes the processes for a provider to obtain “initial unit approval.” Again, a teacher preparation provider based in a Minnesota institute of higher education, school district, charter school, or nonprofit corporation organized under chapter 317A must be approved as a unit in order to prepare candidates for teacher licensure in Minnesota.³¹

Initial unit approval is an extensive process during which PELSB verifies that a provider is able to prepare candidates for teacher licensure in Minnesota. PELSB is seeking to enhance this process by establishing more meaningful checkpoints prior to the site visit.

Table 6: Description of the differences between proposed rule and current rule and why the proposed change is needed and reasonable

Proposed rule process (8705.1100, subpart 1a)	Current rule process (8705.1100, subpart 1)	Why proposed rule is needed and reasonable
A. The provider must submit a notice of intent to apply for initial unit approval.	No comparable rule language.	The proposed rule seeks to formalize an existing practice to trigger the beginning of the unit approval process.
B. Within one month of the receipt of the notice of intent, board staff must schedule an informational meeting with the provider to review the approval process and jointly agree upon dates for the site visit.	A. The dates of the on-site evaluation will be jointly agreed upon approximately 12 to 18 months prior to the unit's approval expiration date.	The proposed rule places the burden on PELSB staff to schedule an informational meeting, during which the provider can learn more about the unit approval process and agree upon dates for the site visit.
C. At least 12 months prior to the site visit, the provider must provide a self-study, including supplemental evidence, for review.	B. A written compliance report must be received by the Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board 60 days prior to the scheduled on-site evaluation.	PELSB seeks to enhance the quality of a provider’s initial “self-study” (formerly referred to as a “compliance report”) by requiring the self-study be submitted at least 12 months prior to the scheduled site visit so that the review team has time to review the materials and

³¹ Minn. Stat. 122A.2451, subdivision 3, authorizes school district, charter school, or nonprofit corporation organized under chapter 317A, to apply for unit and program approval.

Proposed rule process (8705.1100, subpart 1a)	Current rule process (8705.1100, subpart 1)	Why proposed rule is needed and reasonable
		provide formal feedback (see more details below). This process is in alignment with other national education accrediting bodies. ³²
D. At least one month prior to the site visit, the provider must submit an interview schedule to board staff.	No comparable rule language.	The proposed rule seeks to formalize an existing practice to allow board staff to provide feedback and ensure necessary stakeholders are included and given sufficient times for interviews.
E. The review team must review the submitted self-study and supplemental evidence and provide feedback on areas of deficit at least six months prior to the site visit.	No comparable language.	By requiring the provider to submit its self-study and supplemental evidence one year prior to a site visit, it provides the review team time to provide feedback and gives the provider an opportunity to make changes to address areas of need. PELSB believes this back-and-forth exchange will streamline the process overall. Of the four providers that sought initial approval between the summer of 2018 and present, all of them have had to provide additional information following the site visit to demonstrate to

³² The Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) requires the provider to submit a self-study report at least nine months prior to the scheduled site visit. The Association for Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation (AAQEP) recommends providers submit their “Accreditation Proposal” to AAQEP two-to-three years prior to the site visit. The “Quality Assurance Report” (i.e., self-study) is required at least six months prior to the site visit.

Proposed rule process (8705.1100, subpart 1a)	Current rule process (8705.1100, subpart 1)	Why proposed rule is needed and reasonable
		reviewers how standards were being met.
F. The provider may provide a supplemental narrative and additional evidence to address deficit areas at least one month prior to the site visit and may not provide additional evidence after this time.	No comparable language.	The proposed language establishes a clear timeline to provide additional information in preparation for the site visit.
G. The review team must conduct a site visit to verify evidence of the standards in this chapter, report their findings, and make a recommendation to the board regarding approval status of the unit.	E. A team of evaluators designated by the Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board shall visit the unit to verify evidence of the board standards as set forth in the compliance report, report their findings, and make a recommendation to the board regarding approval status of the unit.	PELSB proposes to simplify the language requiring the review team (formally “a team of evaluators”) to verify compliance with standards in chapter 8705, report its findings, and make a recommendation to the board about whether the provider should be granted initial unit approval.
H. Within the written report of findings and recommendations, the review team must identify each standard under part 8705.1010, as: (1) Met: when the substance of a standard is evidenced through narrative, supplemental evidence, and interviews; (2) Met with Concern: when the substance of a standard is evidenced through narrative, supplemental evidence, or interviews, but the team is	No comparable language.	While it is current practice to identify each of the standards in the report of findings and recommendations as “met,” “met with comment,” and “not met,” the terms and definitions are not in current rule. Item H adds both the terms and definitions to rule. It also changes the term “met with comment” to “met with concern” to highlight an area of weakness. Proposed rule adds the finding “met as planned” for providers

Proposed rule process (8705.1100, subpart 1a)	Current rule process (8705.1100, subpart 1)	Why proposed rule is needed and reasonable
<p>concerned with the level of depth the standard is met. The review team must provide a comment on each gap;</p> <p>(3) Met as Planned: when the substance of a standard is currently not met, but clear and convincing evidence of plans to meet the standard prior to enrolling candidates is provided; or</p> <p>(4) Not Met: when all or part of a standard is not evidenced.</p>		<p>seeking initial approval as it would be impossible to fully meet some of the standards without enrolled candidates engaged in the preparation. For example, proposed Standard 8 requires meeting and reviewing data that would not exist until candidates were enrolled in a program. However, a provider could have a plan of how they would meet that standard.</p>
<p>I. Within one month of the site visit, board staff must provide the written report of findings and recommendations to the unit leader. Within one month of receipt of the review team's report and recommendations, the provider may respond to factual errors.</p>	<p>G. The written report of findings and the recommendations of the on-site evaluation team shall be provided to the unit leader and to the Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board. Within 30 days from receipt of the evaluators' report and prior to board action, the institution may submit to the board a written addendum containing corrections to factual errors.</p>	<p>Item I is in line with current practice but is not set forth in current rule. By adding this in rule, it provides some assurances to new providers of when the Board will act on a recommendation.</p>

Subpart 1b. Board determinations for initial approval.

PELSB proposes to modify the board determination for initial approval (formerly subpart 2) in order to clarify the types of determinations the board can take and the implications of each determination.

Table 7: Description of the differences between proposed rule and current rule and why the proposed change is needed and reasonable

Proposed rule (8705.1100, subpart 1b)	Current rule (8705.1100, subpart 2)	Why proposed rule is needed and reasonable
<p>A. The board may grant initial unit approval for a duration of two years to newly approved program providers to launch approved licensure programs and begin collecting candidate and program data. The board may require the unit to submit an interim report during the approval period to demonstrate compliance with standards identified as "Met as Planned" and "Not Met" in the review team's written report.</p> <p>(1) Upon written request by the unit, initial unit approval may be extended for an additional two years.</p>	<p>A. The board may grant initial unit approval for a duration of two years to newly approved program providers to launch identified licensure programs and begin collecting candidate and program data. No additional licensure program applications may be submitted until the unit achieves continuing unit approval status.</p>	<p>Initial approval is set for two years in line with current unit rule.</p> <p>While it is current practice, the proposed rule establishes that a provider may be required to submit an interim report to demonstrate compliance with standards identified as "Met as Planned" or "Not Met" in the review team's written report.</p> <p>Considering that it may take a provider time to obtain program approval and to recruit and enroll candidates, the proposed rule language would permit initial approval to be extended.</p>
<p>(2) A unit with initial unit approval may seek continuing approval by submitting a self-study once the unit has launched one or more approved programs for at least 24 months. A review team must conduct a site visit to verify evidence of the standards in this chapter, report the findings, and make a recommendation to the board regarding continuing approval status. The review team must identify each standard according</p>	<p>B. The board may grant continuing unit approval for five or seven years to already approved program providers. Institutions with full national accreditation from the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation may be granted a seven-year approval duration. Institutions without full national accreditation from the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation shall be granted a five-year approval duration.</p>	<p>Proposed rule seeks to clarify how a unit with initial approval can seek "continuing approval."</p>

Proposed rule (8705.1100, subpart 1b)	Current rule (8705.1100, subpart 2)	Why proposed rule is needed and reasonable
to the procedures in part 8705.1100, subpart 1a, item H.		
B. The board may grant conditional unit approval for a duration not to exceed two years when the nature and severity of "Not Met" standards threaten the viability of the unit to prepare candidates for licensure. The board must identify standards that must be met in order for the unit to achieve initial approval pursuant to item A.	C. The board may grant conditional unit approval for up to three years, contingent upon approval of annual compliance reports with supporting evidence addressing identified standards.	PELSB proposes to modify the length of time that the Board may grant conditional unit approval from three years to two years. This would align with the length of time that the Board may grant initial approval.
B. ... A unit with conditional approval may not submit requests for initial program approval (RIPA). If the unit has already submitted one or more RIPA, the review process must be paused until the unit is granted initial approval pursuant to item A. A unit with conditional approval may not enroll candidates.	C. ...While on conditional unit approval status, the unit may not submit requests for approval of new licensure programs (RIPA).	While under current rule there are some limitations put on units with conditional approval (i.e., the unit may not submit RIPA), PELSB proposes to add the limitation that a unit on conditional approval may not enroll candidates. Units with conditional approval, by definition, are not able to prepare candidates for licensure, so it is reasonable that they cannot enroll candidates. Further, the unit's resources need to be directed towards establishing a plan that will enable them to prepare candidates for licensure instead of getting programs approved.
B ... (1) Prior to the expiration of the unit's conditional approval,	C. ... If acceptable progress is not evidenced by the reports, the	Proposed rule establishes clear procedures for: (1) obtaining

Proposed rule (8705.1100, subpart 1b)	Current rule (8705.1100, subpart 2)	Why proposed rule is needed and reasonable
<p>the unit must evidence meeting the identified standards, which must be reviewed at a focused site visit specific to those standards.</p> <p>(2) If, after two years of conditional approval, standards remain unmet, the board must act to disapprove the unit and discontinue its programs.</p>	<p>board may act to disapprove the unit. If after three years of conditional approval standards remain unmet, the board must act to disapprove the unit and its programs.</p>	<p>“initial approval” (i.e., the unit must demonstrate that it has met specific standards) or (2) being disapproved after failing to meet standards after two years of conditional approval.</p>
<p>C. The board must deny unit approval when the provider's failure to meet the requirements set forth and standards in part 8705.1000 and this part this chapter, chapter 8710, or Minnesota Statutes, chapter 122A, results in an inability to prepare candidates for licensure. The denial action must state the reasons for the denial. The provider may not enroll candidates. The provider may resubmit a notice of intent to apply for unit approval when at least six months have passed since the date of the denial action.</p>	<p>D. The board may disapprove the unit. The board shall disapprove a unit that does not meet the requirements set forth in part 8705.1000 and this part. The disapproval action must state the reasons for disapproval and stipulate a termination date which shall accommodate persons currently enrolled in licensure programs within the unit.</p>	<p>PELSB proposes to establish clear criteria for denying unit approval (i.e., when a provider's failure to meet requirements results in an inability to prepare candidates for licensure).</p> <p>Additionally, PELSB proposes to add a timeframe (six months), during which a provider that has been denied unit approval must wait to submit a notice of intent to apply for unit approval, to ensure the provider has adequate time to make changes before beginning the time- and resource-consuming process for seeking unit approval.</p>

Subpart 2a. Continuing unit approval.

Subpart 2a establishes the process for a unit to obtain continuing approval. Under current rule, continuing approval is valid for five years (or seven years for units with full national accreditation from the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation). PELSB seeks to extend continuing approval from five to six years. While the more extensive “site review” process would take place less frequently, the implementation of the Midcycle Review (more information below), would allow the providers to report every three years about larger continuous improvement and compliance efforts.

The informational meeting and joint setting of board dates is the same as current rule, but the process as described under initial approval is new. Even with continuing units, PELSB review teams find that the provider sometimes scrambles at the last minute to get the team evidence needed. By adding time to the review process, review teams can have greater confidence in their findings.

The review team findings are the same for continuing as for initial with the exception of “met as planned.” As a continuing unit has enrolled candidates, “met as planned” is no longer needed and providers should be fully addressing all standards.

Subpart 2b. Board determinations for continuing approval

Subpart 2b establishes clear criteria for different approval statutes, which will allow for consistency and transparency.

The Board expressed a need to hold units accountable for “not met” standards, which the “continuing approval with focus area” does as providers with this status are required to respond to the “not met” standards in the Midcycle Report.

Given the potential harm to candidates (and by extension to harm Minnesota’s students), a unit may only be on “probation” for a maximum duration of two years. Accordingly, the restriction of not being able to enroll candidates is for the purpose of protecting candidates from enrolling in a program that may not be able to recommend them for licensure. Additionally, if a provider is in danger of losing approval, then that provider’s energy should not be directed at how to start new programs, rather how to enhance and strengthen existing programs and unit-wide issues.

PELSB proposes to establish clear criteria for disapproving a unit (i.e., when a provider’s failure to meet requirements results in an inability to prepare candidates for licensure). Notably, the processes for disapproving the unit remain the same as current rule (i.e., the board must issue a disapproval action that state the reasons for disapproval and stipulate a termination date).

Subpart 3. Interim conditional approval (repeal).

Chapter 8705 contains two subparts with language about when the Board “may” or “must” grant interim conditional approval to a provider or program - Minn. R. 8705.1100, subpart 3 and Minn R. 8705.2600, subpart 1.

Minn. R. 8705.1100, subpart 3. Interim conditional approval. When amendments or additions to Minnesota Statutes or to Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board rules regarding teacher licensure requirements necessitate substantial unit or program revisions, the board *may* grant interim conditional approval to any currently approved unit and its currently approved teacher preparation programs upon receipt of official institutional assurances on a form established by the board that the new requirements will be met by their effective date. The unit or program shall be returned to initial or continuing approval upon full compliance with new requirements on a schedule determined by the board.

Minn R. 8705.2600, subpart 1. Interim conditional approval. When amendments or additions to Minnesota Statutes or to Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board rules regarding teacher licensure requirements necessitate substantial unit or preparation program revisions, the board *shall* grant interim conditional approval to any currently approved unit and its currently approved teacher preparation programs upon receipt of official institutional assurances on a form established by the board that the new requirements will be met by their effective date. The unit or program shall be returned to its former status upon full compliance with new requirements on a schedule determined by the board.

These two subparts contradict each other, specifically regarding the board's authority to grant interim conditional approval. Therefore, PELSB seeks to clarify when "interim conditional approval" may be granted by repealing the subpart 3 in 8705.1100, so that there is only one subpart addressing the applicability of this provision. See below for more information about the proposed changes to Minn. R. 8705.2600, subpart 1.

Subpart 4. Revocation or suspension of approval (repeal).

Chapter 8705 contains two rule parts about "revoking" or "suspending" approval.

Minn. R. 8705.1100, subpart 4. Revocation or suspension of approval. The Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board may revoke or suspend the approval of a teacher preparation unit when the board determines that an approved institution or unit has clearly violated ethical or legal practices or board rules.

Minn. R. 8705.2600, subpart 2. Revocation or suspension of approval. The board may revoke or suspend the approval of a teacher preparation unit or program when the board determines that an approved institution or unit has clearly violated ethical or legal practices or board rules.

PELSB proposes to repeal Minn. R. 8705.1100, subpart 4, and proposes to make several modifications to Minn. R. 8705.2600, subpart 2.

See below for more information about the proposed changes to Minn. R. 8705.2600, subpart 2.

Subpart 5. Appeal of board decision (repeal).

Chapter 8705 contains two rule parts specific to "appealing board decisions."

8705.1100, subpart 5. Appeal of board decision. Decisions by the Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board regarding approval status of a unit to prepare persons for teacher licensure may be appealed by the unit pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, chapter 14.

8705.2600, subpart 3. Appeal of board decision. Decisions by the board regarding approval status of an institution or preparation program to prepare persons for teacher licensure may be appealed by the institution pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, chapter 14.

PELSB proposes to repeal 8705.1100, subpart 5, so that there is only one rule part specific to appeal rights. See more information about 8705.2600, subpart 3, below.

Subpart 6. Unit review teams and expenses.

Subpart 6 establishes the makeup of the review team for site visits. Additionally, subpart 6 addresses which expenses for site visits will be reimbursed.

Table 8: Description of the differences between proposed rule and current rule and why the proposed change is needed and reasonable

Proposed rule process (8705.1100, subpart 6)	Current rule process (8705.1100, subpart 1)	Why proposed rule is needed and reasonable
<p>A. The review team for site visits must be comprised of at least three representatives for units and two reviewers for restricted units. The review team may include active or former teacher educators, active or former teachers, and active or former school administrators. The unit leader must provide input to board staff regarding the review team membership. If agreement is not reached regarding review team membership, the board staff shall appoint the review team members.</p>	<p>E. ... The visiting evaluation team, chaired by a board staff person, shall include representatives from teacher preparation programs and licensed and practicing teachers, and may also include a board member. The size of the team will be determined relative to the size of the unit and its programs. The unit leader shall provide input to board staff regarding the team membership. If agreement is not reached regarding visiting team membership, the board shall appoint the slate of team members.</p>	<p>PELSB proposes to codify existing practice of comprising the review team for site visits with three members.</p> <p>For units with or seeking restricted approval, PELSB proposes requiring a minimum of two members, as there are fewer applicable standards to review and assess.</p>
<p>B. Expenses of the review team members shall be reimbursed by</p>	<p>F. Expenses of evaluators shall be reimbursed by the</p>	<p>PELSB proposes to use terminology inclusive of all</p>

Proposed rule process (8705.1100, subpart 6)	Current rule process (8705.1100, subpart 1)	Why proposed rule is needed and reasonable
the Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board as permitted under state law or rule. Other incidental expenses incurred by the provider, such as those related to preparing reports, arranging meetings, and providing workrooms, supplies, and hospitality for the review team while on site are the responsibility of the provider.	Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board as permitted under state law or rule. Other incidental expenses incurred by the unit, such as those relating to preparing reports; arranging meetings; and providing workrooms, supplies, and hospitality for the team while on campus, shall be the responsibility of the institution.	provider types (i.e., use “provider” instead of “institution”).

PELSB believes the proposed changes to the unit approval process are needed and reasonable to ensure consistency and transparency in the approval process and the implications of each approval statutes.

8705.1200. Alternative Route Providers (repeal).

PELSB recommends this rule be repealed because it is no longer necessary. PELSB is proposing to modify the rules in chapter 8705 so that providers are not categorized as “alternative” or “institution of higher education.”

8705.1300. Units with Board-Approved National Accreditation.

For decades, national accreditation agencies have attempted to standardize the evaluation of teacher preparation providers in the United States. These have varied over time between organizations and the level of rigor of the accreditation. Each state has chosen a different relationship with accreditation. Some states rely solely on an external accreditation process for approving preparation providers. While others, including Minnesota, do not require providers to obtain national accreditation, and instead, rely on a state-specific approval process.

Accreditation acts as a form of recognition. In order to obtain accreditation from certain national education accreditation agencies, a provider must undergo an extensive review and self-assessment process. This can be time consuming and resource intensive.

Minn. R. 8705.1100, subpart 2 (B) allows the Board to grant unit approval for seven years to institutions with CAEP accreditation in comparison to the five year approval to institutions without CAEP accreditation.

PELSB proposes to build off this recognition of national accreditation by creating a new rule part to standardize and streamline the approval process for units with national accreditation.

Subpart 1. Initial approval.

Subpart 1 explains that if the Board approves a national accrediting agency, a provider may use that national accreditation in place of the state review process, with exceptions listed in subpart 2.

Subpart 2. Standards.

Subpart 2 outlines a subset of unit standards that units with accreditation from a board-approved national education agency will be required to meet in order to maintain unit approval. Many of these requirements are set forth in state statute or rule and would not be overseen or reviewed by a national accreditation agency.

Subpart 3. Approval process for units with board-approved national education accreditation.

Subpart 3 outlines the process for a provider to communicate with the state regarding national accreditation, including the process for taking this route to approval and for ending this route for approval. Board staff will still engage in the review process but there will be no review team as outlined in 8705.1100.

Subpart 4. Board determinations for continuing approval.

Upon receipt of the report of findings and recommendations, the Board must take an action regarding a unit's continuing approval status. There are four determinations the Board may take:

- (1) grant "continuing approval,"
- (2) grant "continuing approval with focus areas,"
- (3) place a unit on probation, or
- (4) disapprove the unit.

These approval determination are in alignment with 8705.1100, subpart 2b. One distinction is that subpart 4 authorizes the Board to grant continuing approval for a period of up to ten years in order to align the board's approval cycle with the approval cycle of the board-approved national accrediting agency.

PELSB believes it is needed and reasonable to establish a different set of processes and requirements for units with accreditation from a board-approved national education accreditation agency in order to remove disincentives from pursuing national accreditation, which is in itself an extensive and rigorous commitment to heightened standards and additional monitoring.

8705.1400. Units with Restricted Approval.

Since the early 2000s, community colleges have been offering education courses to individuals who intend to prepare for teacher licensure by first completing an associate's degree. In 2014, the state legislature directed the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities to develop a plan to address certain transfer problems through a series of articulation agreements that would permit individuals who

transfer with associates' degrees to complete baccalaureate degrees without accumulating excess course credits.³³

While the articulation agreements helped formalize a process for individuals to begin their pathway to teacher licensure at a community college, there was no formal oversight by PELSB to ensure the courses met applicable teacher preparation standards set forth in Minnesota Rules, chapters 8705 and 8710. This has resulted in confusion and hardship for individuals transferring into an approved teacher preparation program as well as the teacher preparation programs enrolling these individuals.

To date, discretionary variances have been used to establish the applicable processes and requirements for community colleges. PELSB is proposing to establish requirements and processes in rule for providers, such as community colleges, to become approved as a teacher preparation provider to offer transfer programs, which meet a subset of teacher licensure standards.

Subpart 1. Restricted approval.

Subpart 1 authorizes a provider to apply for restricted approval to provide one or more programs designed to meet a subset of licensure standards.

Subpart 2. Limitations.

Subpart 2 establishes the limitation or restriction that units with restricted approval are not permitted to recommend candidates for licensure. This is needed and reasonable because units with restricted approval would be providing courses that only meet a subset of standards; therefore, they would be unable to verify a candidate has met all the required standards necessary for recommendation.

Subpart 3. Standards.

Subpart 3 establishes the subset of "unit standards" that a provider must meet in order to be approved as a restricted unit. That is, units with restricted approval would not be required to meet all unit standards, as many are not applicable to non-recommending units. Therefore, PELSB proposes the units with restricted approval be subject to the following standards set forth in Minn. R. 8705.1010:

- Standard 3, subitems (2) and (3);
- Standard 4; subitems (2) and (3);
- Standard 5;
- Standard 9;
- Standard 10, subitems (2) and (3);
- Standard 16;
- Standard 17;
- Standard 18;
- Standard 20;

³³ Laws of Minnesota 2014, chapter 312, art. 1, sec. 12, *available at* <https://www.revisor.mn.gov/laws/2014/0/Session+Law/Chapter/312/>.

- Standard 22;
- Standard 23;
- Standard 25;
- Standard 26;
- Standard 27;
- Standard 28, subitem (2); and
- Standard 29.

These subset of standards are essential to ensuring the learning opportunities and assessments provided to candidates are of the same standard of those offered by other units.

Subpart 4. Candidate tracking.

Subpart 4 establishes the requirements specific to candidate tracking. It is especially critical for units with restricted approval to track candidates as many of these candidates will go on to “transfer” into a four-year program in order to obtain a bachelor’s degree, complete teacher preparation, including student teaching, and be recommended for licensure.

Subpart 5. Initial approval process.

Subpart 5 establishes the process for obtaining initial approval. This process largely aligns with the review process for initial unit approval set forth in 8705.1100, subpart 1a.

Subpart 6. Board determinations for initial approval.

Subpart 6 establishes the board determinations for initial approval.

Subpart 7. Continuing unit approval.

Subpart 7 establishes the process for obtaining continuing approval.

Subpart 8. Board determinations for continuing approval.

Subpart 8 establishes the board determination for continuing approval.

PELSB believes it is needed and reasonable to establish a different set of processes and to identify a specific subset of “unit standards” for providers seeking to provide programs that meet a subset of licensure standards in order to ensure these providers and programs have the infrastructure and programming in place to ensure these candidates can successfully transfer into a baccalaureate program to complete their teacher preparation, obtain a bachelor’s degree, and be recommended for teacher licensure.

8705.1500. Midcycle Unit Review.

The current requirements for continuing program approval (by submitting a Program Effectiveness Reports for Continuing Approval (PERCA)) has proven to be burdensome for PELSB and providers with a

limited impact on continuous improvement for licensure programs. Additionally, the lengthy gap between unit reviews has allowed providers to disengage with unit standards until the year or two prior to a board review. Therefore, PELSB proposes to make substantial changes to the PERCA process (to reduce requirements), while establishing a new process – the midcycle review – in order to more explicitly focus on continuous improvement and to add a layer of accountability during the course of unit approval.

Subpart 1. Submission required.

Subpart 1 establishes the requirement that units must submit a midcycle review in order to maintain continuing unit approval.

Subpart 2. Midcycle self-study.

Subpart 2 outlines the requirements of the self-study required for the midcycle review. This aligns with data collected as part of unit standards.

Subpart 3. Midcycle self-study review procedures and board determinations.

Subpart 3 outlines the process for evaluating midcycle self-studies. The focus of the evaluation is continuous improvement and compliance with unmet standards.

Subpart 4. Exemptions.

Subpart 4 would exempt certain provider types from the requirements of this rule part. PELSB proposes to exempt units with accreditation from a board-approved national education accreditation agency because many national accreditation models include an annual or regular “self-assessment” as part of the ongoing accreditation status. Additionally, PELSB proposes to exempt restricted units from this rule part because restricted units have limited data tracking requirements in the first place.

8705.2000. Program Review Panel (PRP).

PELSB is required to establish a program review panel (PRP), which is responsible for assisting with program review and approval. The PRP consists of a number of different stakeholders that review new and existing programs and make recommendations to the Board regarding the program’s approval status.

PELSB proposes that the membership of the PRP be modified. Specifically, PELSB proposes to remove the Minnesota Department of Education as a required member. Prior to the creation of PELSB, a member of MDE’s licensing division participated at the PRP meetings in a voting capacity. When PELSB was created, MDE’s licensing division became a part of PELSB. Therefore, PELSB proposes that MDE be removed from the PRP membership and, instead, a member of PELSB’s licensing division will attend and serve in a nonvoting capacity.

Additionally, PELSB proposes that a representative of “approved alternative preparation providers” be included as part of PRP’s membership. Because teacher preparation can be offered outside of an

institution of higher education, it is important that those alternative providers serve on the PRP moving forward.

Finally, PELSB proposes that the following programs be reviewed by the PRP:

- All new programs (RIPAs) with standards identified as “Met with Concern” or “Not Met” and
- All existing programs (PERCAs) that:
 - have program changes to learning opportunities or assessments have been made and applicable standards are found to be “Met with Concern” or “Not Met;”
 - are out of compliance with one or more of the requirements set forth in chapter 8705, chapter 8710, or Minnesota Statutes 122A;
 - have an existing status of “approval with a focus area” and has failed to fully address its continuous focus area;
 - have an existing status of “probationary;” and/or
 - have failed to fully meet the requirements set forth by a required interim report.

PELSB proposes that whether a new program or existing program be reviewed by the PRP be included in Minn. R. 8705.2100 (regarding new program approval) and Minn. R. 8705.2200 (regarding existing program approval) rather than within Minn. R. 8710.2000, which is focused on PRP membership, duties, and voting capabilities. (More information about program review and approval included below.)

8705.2100. Request for Initial Program Approval (RIPA).

Minn. R. 8705.2100 establishes the initial program approval process, including the required components of the application, review procedures, and board determinations. PELSB is proposing rule changes to clarify and streamline this process.

Subpart 1.

PELSB is not proposing changes to subpart 1.

Subpart 2. Request for initial program approval (RIPA).

PELSB proposes to make changes to subpart 2 to clarify the submission and review process for new programs.

PELSB proposes to add language to paragraph A to authorize a designee to submit the RIPA application, such as the program leader, and to clarify that the RIPA application must be submitted through the online educator preparation provider application system (EPPAS).

PELSB proposes to add language to paragraph B to clarify that programs cannot begin enrolling candidates until they have received approval by the Board.

PELSB proposes to modify language in paragraph C to replace language used to describe Institutes of Higher Education with language that is inclusive of all of Minnesota’s provider types.

Paragraph D contains the required components of the application. PELSB proposes to clarify components within subitem (1), to ensure program applications include a summary of the program development process. Additionally, PELSB proposes to change the qualifications for the designated program leader by replacing the qualification that the leader be qualified through “academic preparation in the content” with “qualified as a methods instructor” (Standard 24 establishes the qualifications for a methods instructor and acknowledges years of teaching experience as well as academic credentials as evidence of one’s qualifications).

PELSB proposes to clarify subitems (2) and (3) by adding language to indicate whether the subitem applies to “initial licensure programs” or “initial and additional licensure programs;” replacing terminology with more inclusive language (i.e., replace “course” with “learning opportunities”); and eliminating language that is no longer required of all program types (i.e., PELSB proposes to strike “consistent with credit requirements of existing board-approved programs” because some programs will not be offering credits or degrees at the conclusion of the program). Additionally, PELSB seeks to clarify application requirements, including the need to provide evidence of field specific methods instruction and reading methods.³⁴

PELSB proposes to clarify the language in subitem 4(b) to align with the terminology used in the unit standards (i.e., Minn. R. 8705.1000).

PELSB proposes to strike subitem 4(a), 4(c) through 4(h), and subitem 5, because the language is repetitious with another requirement or in opposition to new unit standards.

PELSB proposes to add new language for subitem (5) to provide clarity on types of licensure programs. This language replaces the broad categorization under current rule of “conventional,” “non-conventional,” and “alternative” with detailed program types that provide more public transparency for the type of licensure programs available.

Finally, PELSB proposes to replace subitem 6 with new language to clarify the minimum requirements for continuous improvement using candidate data.

Subpart 3. Initial review procedures.

PELSB proposes to clarify the review process for new programs and to clearly set forth the instances where the Program Review Panel will need to review a new program application. These changes already reflect current practice and provide clarity for providers.

³⁴ Note: This application requirement is duplicative with the existing unit standard set forth in Minn. R. 8705.1000, Subpart 2 (B) (The unit provides and assures that candidates complete a professional sequence of courses based on the standards for both pedagogy and subject matter under parts 8710.2000 to 8710.8080 directly aligns to 8705.2100, subpart 2 (D) (2) and (3)). While PELSB proposes to repeal this “unit standard,” PELSB seeks to maintain this concept as a “program requirement” that is monitored and assessed during initial program approval.

Subpart 4. Board determinations.

PELSB proposes to clarify the actions the Board can take when reviewing a new program (i.e., grant or deny initial approval). Additionally, PELSB proposes language to clarify the process for obtaining continuing approval as well as instances that would require peer review by the Program Review Panel. Finally, PELSB seeks to expand the length of time a program can initially hold “initial program approval” (from two to three years), which will result in more time for providers to collect meaningful data to identify strengths and concerns with candidate data, as well as better align with the six-year unit review cycle.

8705.2200. Program Effectiveness Report for Continuing Approval (PERCA).

Minn. R. 8705.2200 establishes the continuing approval process for programs, including the required components of the application (referred to as the PERCA), review procedures, and board determinations. PELSB is proposing rule changes to clarify and streamline this process.

Subpart 1.

PELSB is not proposing changes to subpart 1.

Subpart 2. Program effectiveness report for continuing approval (PERCA).

PELSB proposes changes to the required components of the PERCA. Current rule requires continuous improvement data and analysis be included in the PERCA that was not aligned to data required in unit rule and can be overly burdensome on board staff and teacher preparation providers. The proposed changes to subpart 2 aligns continuing program approval with data required in statute and unit standards.

PELSB also proposes to require PERCA reporting every three years instead of every two years to allow more time for providers to collect meaningful and identify strengths and concerns with candidate data, as well as better align with the six-year unit review cycle.

More clarity is also provided for when an approved program has made significant changes and needs to be reviewed as a new program (RIPA). The proposed language aligns with the Office of Higher Education requirements for program changes.

Subpart 3. Program effectiveness reports for continuing approval (PERCA); review procedures.

After five years of the program review panel in operation, the proposed changes to subpart 3 seeks to clarify the instances when approved programs would need to be reviewed by the panel in order to make a recommendation to the full board.

Subpart 3a. Board determinations.

PELSB proposes to add a new subpart to address the actions the Board must take when a program seeks to obtain continuing approval. Additionally, subpart 3a aligns board determinations with the proposed three year cycle as well as seeks to codify board-adopted thresholds for evaluated data in the process.

Specifically, the Board may take one of the following actions:

- Grant continuing approval;
- Grant continuing approval with focus areas;
- Place a program on probation; and
- Discontinue a program.

PELSB proposes to add clear criteria for when the Board must take each of these actions to ensure consistent actions and to provide additional transparency about the meaning of each determination. Additionally, Subpart 3a aligns board determinations with federal Title II reporting classifications for better clarity to the public and providers.

These proposed changes are needed and reasonable to ensure Board determinations and ramifications of each determination is clear and consistent for all providers seeking continuing approval as well as members of the public and future teacher candidates seeking to learn more about the status of various teacher preparation programs across the state.

Subpart 4. Voluntary discontinuation (repeal).

PELSB recommends that this subpart regarding voluntary discontinuation be repealed and reinstated in 8705.2600, which contains other relevant processes and rights for providers. While the language in the subpart remains relevant, necessary, and reasonable, it does not make sense for information about voluntary discontinuation to be imbedded in rule part 8705.2200, which is specific to a program maintaining approval.

8705.2300. Nonconventional Program Approval (Formerly “Experimental”) (repeal).

PELSB recommends this rule be repealed because it is no longer necessary. PELSB is proposing to modify the rules in chapter 8705 to require that all program types, including “nonconventional” and “experimental” programs, are held to the same standards and approval processes. Note: PELSB is proposing new “program types,” which a program would have to identify itself during the initial program approval process. These new program types are intended to offer more information to aspiring teachers so they have a more comprehensive understanding of the program’s type and offerings (see 8705.2100, subpart 2 (D)(5) for more information).

8705.2400. Alternative Program Approval (repeal).

PELSB recommends this rule be repealed because it is no longer necessary. PELSB is proposing to modify the rules in chapter 8705 so that “alternative programs” can seek approval through the same process as all other program types.

8705.2600. Board actions, discretionary variances, and appeals.

Subpart 1. Interim conditional approval.

Chapter 8705 contains two subparts with language specifying when the Board “may” or “must” grant interim conditional approval to a provider or program.

Minn. R. 8705.1100, subpart 3. Interim conditional approval. When amendments or additions to Minnesota Statutes or to Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board rules regarding teacher licensure requirements necessitate substantial unit or program revisions, the board *may* grant interim conditional approval to any currently approved unit and its currently approved teacher preparation programs upon receipt of official institutional assurances on a form established by the board that the new requirements will be met by their effective date. The unit or program shall be returned to initial or continuing approval upon full compliance with new requirements on a schedule determined by the board.

Minn R. 8705.2600, subpart 1. Interim conditional approval. When amendments or additions to Minnesota Statutes or to Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board rules regarding teacher licensure requirements necessitate substantial unit or preparation program revisions, the board *shall* grant interim conditional approval to any currently approved unit and its currently approved teacher preparation programs upon receipt of official institutional assurances on a form established by the board that the new requirements will be met by their effective date. The unit or program shall be returned to its former status upon full compliance with new requirements on a schedule determined by the board.

These two subparts contradict each other, specifically regarding the board’s authority to grant interim conditional approval. Therefore, PELSB seeks to clarify when “interim conditional approval” may be granted by repealing the subpart 3 in 8705.1100, so that there is only one subpart addressing the applicability of this provision. Additionally, PELSB seeks to modify the language in 8705.2600, subpart 1, to give PELSB the discretion to determine when “interim conditional approval” should be granted.

Subpart 2. Revocation or suspension of approval.

Chapter 8705 contains two rule parts about “revoking” or “suspending” approval.

Minn. R. 8705.1100, subpart 4. Revocation or suspension of approval. The Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board may revoke or suspend the approval of a teacher preparation unit when the board determines that an approved institution or unit has clearly violated ethical or legal practices or board rules.

Minn. R. 8705.2600, subpart 2. Revocation or suspension of approval. The board may revoke or suspend the approval of a teacher preparation unit or program when the board determines that an approved institution or unit has clearly violated ethical or legal practices or board rules.

PELSB proposes to repeal Minn. R. 8705.1100, subpart 4, and proposes to make several modifications to Minn. R. 8705.2600, subpart 2. While many of the changes are technical in nature (i.e., clarifying the language of the rule), PELSB proposes to add rule language that would require a provider to wait to reapply for approval for at least a period of two years following a board's action to revoke the approval.

Unit or program approval can only be revoked when the provider's failure to meet the requirements and standards results in an inability to prepare teacher candidates for licensure. This is a serious determination by the Board. The Board and the provider will have spent significant resources making this determination (i.e., staff time to obtain additional information about the provider's ability meet different requirements). Therefore, it is needed and reasonable to establish a timeframe during which a provider is barred from reapplying for approval.

Subpart 3. Appeal of board decision.

Chapter 8705 contains two rule parts specific to "appealing board decisions."

8705.1100, subpart 5. Appeal of board decision. Decisions by the Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board regarding approval status of a unit to prepare persons for teacher licensure may be appealed by the unit pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, chapter 14.

8705.2600, subpart 3. Appeal of board decision. Decisions by the board regarding approval status of an institution or preparation program to prepare persons for teacher licensure may be appealed by the institution pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, chapter 14.

PELSB proposes to repeal 8705.1100, subpart 5, so that there is only one rule part specific to appeal rights. Additionally, PELSB proposes to several changes to 8705.2600, subpart 3, in order to be more inclusive of different types of teacher preparation providers (i.e., teacher preparation providers not based in an institute of higher education).

Subpart 4. Voluntary discontinuation.

PELSB proposes to move existing rule language regarding "voluntary discontinuation" from 8705.22000, subpart 4 ("PERCA rule"), to 8705.2600, subpart 4. The provision about voluntary discontinuation should be contained with the other miscellaneous provisions about board actions, appeal rights, and variances, rather than within the section on "continuing program approval."

Notably, PELSB proposes to add a new notification requirement, requiring providers to notify all enrolled candidates in writing of the program's discontinuation and program completion options. This language is needed and reasonable to ensure enrolled candidates are not harmed by the program's discontinuation.

Subpart 5. Discretionary variance.

The board has authority to grant a discretionary variance when the application of a rule requirement would create an undue burden or hardship for the applicant or unit.³⁵ The board is authorized to adopt rules establishing general standards for granting discretionary variances.³⁶ Therefore, PELSB proposes to adopt rules establishing general standards for granting discretionary variances. This language is needed and reasonable so that every provider and program understands the process by which they can seek a discretionary variance.

Subpart 6. Interim reports.

Not all compliance issues result in a board action against a provider or program. For example, when there are new or repeat violations that do not rise to a board action, PELSB may still require the provider to submit an interim report to address how the provider will remediate the violations.

PELSB proposes to adopt rule language establishing requirements and processes for when PELSB requires a provider to submit an interim report to address compliance concerns (i.e., standards identified as “Not Met” or violations to rule or statute). The use of interim reports is not new to PELSB. However, PELSB believes that there should be clear and transparent requirements and processes for submitting interim reports and the implications of failing to address compliance issues. PELSB used the Higher Learning Commission’s procedure on “Interim Reports” as a basis for developing rule language.³⁷ This subpart is needed and reasonable to ensure compliance issues are resolved in a timely manner.

EFFECTIVE DATE.

PELSB proposes several effective dates, which vary in order to ensure providers and programs have the necessary time to meet the new standards and requirements.

(a) Initial unit approval and initial program approval.

PELSB proposes that for a provider seeking initial unit approval or initial program approval, the provider must meet applicable standards beginning January 1, 2021. Though, a provider could choose to come into compliance sooner. (Note: Unit Standard 24 in part 8705.1010, subpart 5, has its own effective date. See more details below).

³⁵ Minn. Stat. 14.055, subd. 4.

³⁶ Minn. Stat. 14.055, subd. 5.

³⁷ Official HLC Procedure, Higher Learning Commission (July 2018), http://download.hlcommission.org/InterimReports_PRC.pdf.

(b) Continuing unit approval.

PELSB proposes that approved units must meet the standards and processes set forth in 8705.1010 and 8705.1100 before the date of the unit's first site visit occurring on or after July 1, 2022. Though, a provider could choose to come into compliance sooner.

(c) Continuing program approval.

PELSB proposes that approved programs must meet the standards and processes set forth in 8705.2000 through 8705.2200 by the date of the program's first PERCA submission occurring on or after July 1, 2020.

(d) Unit Standard 24 (Qualifications for Methods Instructors).

PELSB proposes that Standard 24 in part 8705.1010, subpart 5, is effective three years after the date of adoption. This will allow existing methods instructors who do not meet the requirements to obtain additional teaching experience.

PELSB believes these timelines are needed and reasonable to ensure providers and program can transition to the new standards and new approval processes.

CONCLUSION

Current unit and program rules provide a robust evaluation and continuous improvement model for teacher preparation in Minnesota. However, after more than five years of implementation of these standards, much feedback has been gathered regarding standards and processes that are duplicative and unnecessarily burdensome. These proposed rules remove, combine, or clarify these standards and processes for improved accountability, review, and impact on program efficacy.

Additionally, with many recent statutory changes to teacher licensure and teacher preparation, there is a clear need for teacher preparation standards to accurately reflect the broad scope of potential teacher preparation providers and programs. These proposed rules remove language specific to institutes of higher education and increase options and flexibility in requirements and the manner in which standards are met.

Finally, with continued reflection on teacher preparation aligning with best practice, including increased focus on practice-based preparation, culturally relevant pedagogy, and partnerships with districts, these rules add reasonable rules to enhance focus in teacher preparation on these key areas to improve the quality of teacher preparation in Minnesota.

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

June 19, 2020

Date



Alex Liuzzi, Executive Director

Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board