

Board of School Administrators COMPREHENSIVE FORM E

University -

Date -

Administrative License(s) -

Required Standard	Comments		
A. The university verified the	Met	Not Met	
institution's commitment to the licensure program			
Description of the institution's commitment to the licensure program. The program may use budget spreadsheets, charts, graphics, and letters from administrators and supporters to indicate its commitment to the program. Description of how the university, department, and/or program budget aligns with the program mission, vision, and values to prepare students to meet all requirements outlined in MN Rule 3512. Description of university and department human resources that ensure the success of the licensure program(s). This may include but is not limited to full-time and part-time faculty, ty; administration, and staff.			
Description of the physical and online resources dedicated to the program's success.			
B. The university described the	Met	Not Met	
institution's organizational structure.			
A description of the changes made in this area since the last five-year review.			
Brief descriptions or titles for individuals listed in the organizational chart (e.g., program chair, department chair, dean, vice presidents, provosts, chief financial officer, or president).			
Agenda and minutes from departmental meetings, Advisory Board meetings, faculty meetings, and decision-making stakeholders.			
C. The university described the process of aligning strategic planning, assessment, and decision-making for implementing or sustaining the licensure program.	Met	Not Met	

A description of the changes made in this	
area since the last five-year review.	
A copy of the strategic plan for the	
university and how the administrative	
preparation program aligns with the	
university's and department's mission,	
vision, and values.	
A description of how the licensure	
program or/or department conducts	
strategic planning. Includes key steps and	
participants.	
A description of the process used to	
conduct short-term and long-term	
departmental planning, including how the	
strategic planning process addresses the	
department in a post-pandemic world,	
prioritization of change initiatives, and	
organizational adaptability.	
A description of the processes used to	
make a program change, improvement,	
strategic planning, etc.	
A description of the decision-making tools	
used by the licensure program and/or	
department (e.g., quality tools such as	
Affinity Diagram, Force Choice,	
Plus/Delta).	
A description of departmental metrics and	
key performance measures or indicators	
used to track the achievement and	
effectiveness of the strategic plan,	
program objectives, and/or action plans.	
A description of the departmental	
assessment and evaluation processes.	
Program may include Gantt Charts,	
,	
Timetable, End-of-Course	
evaluations/student surveys, and action	
plans.	
A description of the university's efforts to	
ensure the program meets all regulatory	
requirements (e.g., program outcome	
assessment, Higher Learning Council,	
BOSA, MN Rule 3512).	
A description of the contingency plan in	
the event the licensure program is	
discontinued.	

D. The university described the	Met	Not Met
anticipated role for persons who		
enroll in the licensure program.		
A description of the changes made in this		
area since the last five-year review		
A description of how the department		
delineates each licensure program and		
how the licensure program prepares		
candidates for effective educational		
leadership as a school administrator. The program may use the university website		
and BOSA Consumer Guide as examples.		
A description of how the department		
prepares candidates for current and		
future trends in educational leadership.		
A copy of the department's self-		
assessment and continual reflection		
processes for candidates.		
A description of the department's		
induction and preparation sessions,		
specifically regarding leadership		
dispositions		
A description of how the department addresses equity, inclusion, and diversity		
in their application and enrollment		
process, preparation, and assessment.		
E. The university listed and described	Met	Not Met
how the licensure program relates		
individual program components to		
the knowledge, skills, and		
dispositions that persons completing		
the licensure program must achieve.		
A description of the changes made in this area since the last five-year review.		
area since the last live-year review.		
Examples of course assignments that are		
application-focused and relevant to the licensure program and educational		
leadership.		
Evaluation, assessment, and reflection		
practices are used to determine whether		
students understand and/or demonstrate		
the competencies outlined in Minnesota Rule 3512. The program may use Form D,		
exit evaluation processes, course		
objectives, and syllabi as examples.		

If in the licensed program there are		
requirements beyond those listed in		
MR3512, include some examples of how		
they are assessed.		
F. The university described the field-	Met	Not Met
based experience, the assessment of		
prior experience and preparation,		
and the situational observation		<u> </u>
component.		
•		
A description of the changes made in this		
area since the last five-year review.		
A description of how the program		
assesses candidates' prior experience and		
preparation.		
A description of a midpoint assessment		
for candidates.		
An explanation of what happens when a		
candidate becomes ineligible or unable to		
move forward in the licensure program.		
Any additional university requirements		
beyond Rule 3512 that candidates must		
meet prior to beginning the required field		
experience and/or situational observation		
component of the licensure program.		
A description of the field experience that		
includes:		
 Licensure program resources 		
available to support licensure		
candidates during the field		
experience.		
Site supervisor roles and		
responsibilities for field		
·		
experience.		
University supervisor roles and		
responsibilities for candidate's		
field experience.		
 How the program ensures 		
internships include relevant		
leadership experiences.		
A record of assessors and roles in		
the exit evaluation		
Program may include the Field Experience Handbook		
and electronic sample portfolios as evidence		

G. The university described the	Met	Not Met
systematic procedure for evaluating		
the licensure program to ensure that		
all persons recommended for		
licensure meet all licensure		
requirements.		
A description of the changes made in this area since the last five-year review.		
A description of processes for how		
licensure program courses, content,		
instruction, and assessment are evaluated		
to ensure they meet all licensure		
requirements outlined in Minnesota Rule 3512.		
Explain how your program utilizes		
individual assessment to ensure students		
meet requirements via student reflection,		
university supervisor, and site supervisor		
evaluations.	Mot	Not Mot
H. The university specifically identified the plans for assessing the	Met	Not Met
performance of each person who		
successfully completed the licensure		
program.		
A description of the changes made in this		
area since the last five-year review.		
A description of the process used by the		
department to determine if candidates		
have met the standards required for		
licensure in Minnesota Rule 3512. The		
program may include self-evaluation,		
mentor evaluation, portfolios, panel		
reviews, and student profile reviews as		
evidence.		
A description of the evaluation tools used		
by the department (e.g., rubric, interview,		
portfolio, etc.) demonstrating the candidate has met the competencies		
under part 3512.0510.		
I. The university listed the college	Met	Not Met
departments involved with the	iviet	140t IVIET
licensure program, licensed practicing		
education personnel, school	Ш	
administrators, and interested		
citizens who participated in		
developing the licensure program		

A description of the changes made in this area since the last five-year review.		
A description of the purpose and membership of the administrator licensing advisory committee(s).		
Specific examples of how committee input is garnered, utilized and implemented as part of the licensure program continuous improvement and continuous improvement process.		
The program may use bylaws, membership, attendance records, procedures, agendas and minutes, and the		
appointing process as evidence.	•••	
J. The university described the	Met	Not Met
procedures to establish and maintain		
an internal process to systematically evaluate the licensure program.		
A description of the changes made in this area since the last five-year review.		
A description of the departmental process of evaluation and continuous improvement of the licensure program. A description of how the systemic evaluation processes address the current and future needs of school administrators in Minnesota. The program may use minutes from faculty meetings, external accreditations, departmental evaluations, course assessments, final projects, candidate exit surveys, course assessments, and employer and graduate surveys as evidence. An internal plan to address barriers that keep students of color and marginalized populations from entering and successfully completing an administrator licensure program.		
K. The university included program	Met	Not Met
review data mandated by the legislature and the board and described how that data is utilized.		

Narrative

Quotes –

Areas of Strength -

Suggestions for Improvement -
Conditions that must be met for approval -



| Executive Director – Karen Schaub | | 400 NE Stinson Blvd. | Minneapolis, MN 55413 | 651-582-8236 | http://bosa.mn.gov |

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

Name	Title	Signature	Date
Name	Title	Signature	Date
Name	Title	Signature	Date
Name	Title	Signature	Date
Name	Title	Signature	Date
Name	Title	Signature	Date
Name	Title	Signature	Date



| Executive Director – Karen Schaub | | 400 NE Stinson Blvd. | Minneapolis, MN 55413 | 651-582-8236 | http://bosa.mn.gov |

Name	Title	Signature	Date
Name	Title	Signature	Date
Name	Title	Signature	Date
Name	Title	Signature	Date
Name	Title	Signature	Date