



MAINE EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS

HANDBOOK FOR STATE PROGRAM APPROVAL

Ángel Martínez Loredó

Higher Education Specialist
23 State House Station
Augusta, Maine 04333-0023
Phone: 207-624-6846
Fax: 207-624-6841



Table of Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	3
PART ONE: Introduction to Chapter 114	3
Vision for Teaching and Learning in Maine	3
Chapter 114, Section 2.2 – 2.6: Evaluation Standards	4
Unit Standard One	
Pre-Service Candidate, In-Service Teacher, School Building Administrator, and District Level Administrator: Performance, Knowledge, and Disposition Standards	5
School Building Leader and School District Leader Performance and Knowledge Indicators	7
Technology Standards for Administrators	8
Educator Preparation Course Delivery Standards	9
PART TWO: The State Board Program Approval Review Components	9
Initial Teacher Preparation and Advanced Programs	10
Changes in the Unit	10
Eligibility for Program Approval	11
The Coordinator	11
Letter of Intent to Seek Program Approval	11
Requests for Extension of Existing Approval	12
The Self-Study	12
Indicators Accompanying Each Standard	13
Charts, Graphs and/or Tables	13
Program Descriptions	13
Choosing the Dates	13
Selection of the Review Team	14
Planning the Pre-visit	14
Logistical Arrangements	14
Budgeting for the Visit	14
Conduct of the On-Site Review	15
Interviews Conducted by the Review Team	15
Organizing the Exhibit Room	15
Guidance for Organizing a Web-Based Exhibit Room	16
The Exit Conference	18
The Review Team Report	18
Appeals	19
Program Approval Decisions	20
Action by the State Board of Education	20
Requests for Extension of Existing Approval	21
National Accreditation	21
Affirmative Action	21

Introduction¹

Whether a professional education unit is preparing for its first program approval review visit or preparing for renewal visit, the purpose of this handbook is to assist Maine institutions with educator preparation programs seeking state approval. The manual is divided into three parts; the first is a summary description of Chapter 114, the second contains the components of an onsite visit, and the third offers links to resources.

The Maine Department of Education (Maine DOE) has adopted the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO); Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) Common Core Teaching Standards; the National Educational Technology Standards for Teachers (NETS•T); the six (6) Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) administrator candidate standards for both school building leaders and for school district leaders; administrator candidate internship standards; the National Educational Technology Standards for Administrators (NETS•A); the standards for alternate route candidates; the standards for educator preparation course delivery (face-to-face, hybrid blended, online and/or dual method delivery modes); the standards for advanced programs; and the standards for advanced study in specialty areas.

PART ONE Introduction to Chapter 114

Vision for Teaching and Learning in Maine²

The Maine State Board of Education has formally adopted and recognizes that the Maine Learning Standards are built on the following Guiding Principles.

Each student must leave school as:

- A clear and effective communicator
- A self-directed and lifelong learner
- A creative and practical problem solver
- A responsible and involved citizen
- An integrative and informed thinker

The Maine State Board of Education's vision for schools in Maine includes:

- **Personal learning plans** that target each student's individual and common learning goals that will, throughout his or her school career, lead toward Maine's Guiding Principles and the goals that are built around Maine's Learning Standards following a timeline for learning that is individualized.
- **Processes in place** which allow students to reach the goals identified in the personal learning plan; teams of teachers, at all levels, who have sufficient time and resources to learn, to plan, and to confer with individual students, colleagues and families.
- **Creating assessments** of individual student progress based on multiple measures using both formative and summative assessments.

¹ Refer to Standard 1, in Maine State Board of Education and Maine Department of Education rule Chapter 114: Purpose, Standards and Procedures for the Review and Approval of Preparation Programs for Education Personnel

² Derived from 05-071, Chapter 114

- **Resources**, after-school programs, technology resources and training every student and educator, professional learning communities, professional development, rubrics to establish shared expectations, and ongoing collaborations between parents and educators.
- **School environments** where learning governs the allocation of time, space, facilities, services, and individual timelines.

The State Board of Education and the Department of Education are committed to promoting the development of innovative and collaborative practices in educator preparation programs. The six program approval standards encourage innovations and interactive practices in preparing education personnel in such areas as gender equity, cultural diversity, and the involvement of parents and community. The Board and the Department support innovation in unit/school relationships in areas such as collaborative program development and school-and classroom-based research. These innovative and collaborative approaches must be evident in unit policies and practices.

An educator preparation program must meet the state adopted standards and be authorized as an accredited degree-granting unit to recommend its graduates for certification. Successful completion of an approved program entitles an individual to be recommended for certification in the appropriate categories for which the unit is approved. Following a unit's initial approval to offer educator preparation programs, approval must be reaffirmed every seven (7) years (if nationally accredited), or every five (5) years so long as a unit continues to satisfy the standards and requirements as established by the State Board of Education.

Chapter 114, Section 2.1 Summary³

The Unit Program Approval is used to analyze the unit's self-study and supporting evidence as well as other relevant information gathered during the site visit.

Chapter 114, Section 2.2 – 2.6: Evaluation Standards

2.2 Unit Standard Two: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The unit has assessment system that collects and analyzes data on the qualifications of applicants, performance of candidates and graduates, and on unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs.

2.3 Unit Standard Three: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice⁴

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that candidates and other school personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to help all students learn.

2.4 Unit Standard Four: Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge and skills necessary to help all students learn. These

³ All candidate standards are contained within Standard 2.1; All Unit standards are contained within Standards 2.2 through 2.6.

⁴ In the redesign of educator preparation programs, there is the expectation that an early, expanded, and on-going emphasis will be placed upon clinical practice experiences and that these experiences will become the norm.

experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in PK-12 schools.

2.5 Unit Standard Five: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

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

2.6 Unit Standard Six: Unit Governance and Resources

The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and unit standards.

Section 2, Standards 2 through 6, have been adapted from the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) unit standards. Collectively, all the standards and indicators provide the basis for a review team to recommend program approval to the Maine State Board of Education.

Conceptual Framework

Each educator preparation program seeking initial program approval or renewal of prior program approval must submit its conceptual framework in the preliminary section of its application prior to offering responses to each of the six (6) standards. In the preliminary section of the application, an overview of the unit's conceptual framework is provided.

The description of the framework should address the areas of:

- shared vision
- coherence
- professional commitments and attitudes
- commitment to diversity
- effective uses of technology

Evidence concerning each of these areas, as well as documentation clearly indicating that the framework is knowledge-based, will be sought by review team members. Evidence should represent the established and implemented policies, procedures, activities, assessment instruments, and the like of the unit and its programs.

2.1.1-11 Unit Standard One: Pre-Service Candidate, In-Service Teacher, School Building Administrator, and District Level Administrator: Performance, Knowledge, and Disposition Standards

The curriculum for educators must prepare candidates for the areas in which they will seek certificates in accordance with the requirements specified in Maine Department of Education Regulation Chapter 115: Certification of Education Personnel: Standards and Procedures. The

curriculum must be informed by the standards and guidelines of the respective professional societies, both for initial and advanced programs.

Standard 1: Learner Development

The teacher understands how students learn and develop designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences. The teacher also recognizes that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas.

Standard 2: Learning Differences

The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that allow each learner to reach his/her full potential.

Standard 3: Learning Environments

The teacher works with learners to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, encouraging positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

Standard 4: Content Knowledge

The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners.

Standard 5: Innovative Applications of Content

The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical/creative thinking and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.

Standard 6: Assessment

The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to document learner progress, and to guide the teacher's on-going planning and instruction.

Standard 7: Planning for Instruction

The teacher draws upon knowledge of content areas, cross-disciplinary skills, learners, the community, and pedagogy to plan instruction that supports students in meeting learning goals.

Standard 8: Instructional Strategies

The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections and to build skills to access and appropriately apply information.

Standard 9: Reflection and Continuous Growth

The teacher is a reflective practitioner who uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (students, families, and other professionals in the learning community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.

Standard 10: Collaboration

The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession.

Standard 11: Technology Standard

Effective teachers model and apply the National Educational Technology Standards for Students (NETS•S) as they design, implement, and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning; enrich professional practice; and provide positive models for students, colleagues, and the community.

2.1. 12 -18 Unit Standard One: School Building Leader and School District Leader Performance and Knowledge Indicators

The field of school leadership has coalesced around the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards. The ISLLC Standards were developed by a national body of state departments of education and national leadership organizations, including the National Policy Board for Educational Administration, the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), the National Association of Secondary School Principals, and the American Association of School Administrators.

Standard 12: Vision, Mission, and Goals

The achievement of all students occurs by guiding the development and implementation of a shared vision of learning, strong organizational mission, and high expectations for every student.

Standard 13: Teaching and Learning

Education leaders promote achievement and success of all students by monitoring and continuously improving teaching and learning.

Standard 14: Managing Organizational Systems and Safety

Education leaders promote the success of all students by managing organizational systems and resources for a safe, high performing learning environment.

Standard 15: Collaboration with Families and Stakeholders

Collaboration with families and stakeholders representing diverse community interests and needs and mobilizing community resources improves teaching and learning.

Standard 16: Ethics and Integrity

Education leaders promote the success of all students by being ethical and acting with integrity.

Standard 17: The Education System

Education leaders promote the success of all students by influencing interrelated systems of political, social, economic, legal, and cultural contexts affecting education to advocate for the needs of teachers and students alike.

Standard 18 - The Internship

The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in the ISSLC Standards 1-6 through authentic experiences that are field-based, standards-based, sustained, and guided by qualified on-site mentors for graduate credit.

2.1.19 Unit Standard One: Technology Standards for Administrators**Standard 19 - Technology Standards for Administrators - (NETS.A)⁵**

Effective educational administrators model and apply the National Educational Technology Standards for Administrators (NETS.A).

2.1.20 Unit Standard One: Advanced Programs

The curriculum for advanced programs must prepare candidates for the areas in which they will seek certification in accordance with the requirements specified in Maine Department of Education Regulation Chapter 115: Certification of Educational Personnel: Standards and Procedures. Advanced program designs are planned for individuals who have already successfully completed basic programs qualifying them for initial certification.

2.1.21 Unit Standard One: Advanced Study in Specialty Areas

The program's content area specialization calls for a detailed study of one or more specialized aspects of the field and for access to new research, knowledge and developments. The program uses a variety of assessments of candidates' understanding and ability to apply that knowledge. Mastery of this standard can be demonstrated by the ability to:

- a. Demonstrate specialized disciplinary knowledge through performance assessments aligned with professional expectations associated with the field of study.
- b. Explore specialized aspects of their field through examination of current professional research and identify areas of study with potential to develop the critical, analytical and performance capacities of their students.

2.1.22 Unit Standard One: Alternate Route Program Options

Alternate route programs are organized, performance-and-standards-based professional preparation and support systems delivered through units leading to initial teacher certification. Participants in such programs have appropriate undergraduate degrees. Alternate route programs prepare candidates for the areas in which they will seek certificates in accordance with the requirements specified in Maine Department of Education Regulation Chapter 115: Standards and Procedures. These programs are designed to prepare new teachers in grades 7-12 schools that have a degree but lack the prerequisites for initial educator certification.

Non-Traditional Teacher Preparation Paths

⁵ The Performance Indicators for each of the preceding technology standards for administrators (NETS.A) are specified in Chapter 114.

- A. Adjunct Teaching Path** is designed for candidates with content-specific knowledge and skills such as experienced instructors in the military, institutions of higher education, business/industry/arts professionals who can provide instruction in secondary education teaching fields in grades 7-12.
- B. Advanced Degree Alternative Path** provides grades 7-12 pedagogical preparation for individuals who hold advanced degrees in content areas for which the state issues renewable teacher certification.
- C. Core Academic Preparation Path**⁶ is designed for teacher candidates in Secondary grades 7-12 math, science, all subjects comprising social studies, English, world language, art, and music who have demonstrated content knowledge in their content fields and can demonstrate the appropriate depth of pedagogical knowledge and skills necessary for successful teaching.
- D. Clinical Practice Path** is designed for individuals who have successfully completed all coursework associated with an educator preparation program and are eligible for, but did not attempt⁷ student teaching.
- E. One-Year Supervised Practicum Path** is designed to provide pedagogical preparation for individuals seeking initial teacher certification who have demonstrated content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and have had experience teaching students in a private school, a college or university, a corporate setting, or a military setting.

2.1. 23 Unit Standard One: Educator Preparation Course Delivery Standards⁸

For programs that are state approved for the preparation of educator personnel the following quality standards are applicable to course delivery whether such courses are offered in a face-to-face, a hybrid/blended, an online, or a dual method mode. These standards focus upon quality assurance measures to be employed by Maine's higher learning institutions with educator preparation programs.

All courses need to incorporate a series of academic requirements or benchmarks that are designed to ensure that one has acquired the necessary skills, knowledge, and abilities to become an effective or a more effective educator. At each benchmark, one's progress within a program leading to teacher certification will need to be evaluated using assessments that align with adopted national and state professional standards. To guide the mastery and evaluation of core professional concepts and principles, educator preparation course standards have been established for face-to-face, hybrid blended, online and dual method modes of instruction. These standards are expected to be met by the unit.

PART TWO

The State Board Program Approval Review Components

⁶ The CAP path has been available as a non-traditional teacher preparation path to certification candidates for several years. However, having been expanded upon, it is included in this section of rule to make clear that it remains a viable option, among others, for eligible individuals seeking initial teacher certification.

⁷ The reason(s) for not attempting student teaching will need to be documented and evaluated by the Local Support Team prior to an individual being accepted to pursue this alternate route path.

⁸ Chapter 114 specifies the standards to be met by the unit for face-to-face, hybrid blended, online, and dual method modes of instruction.

Introduction to the Unit

The program approval process focuses on the professional education unit, which is defined as the administrative body at a college or university that has primary responsibility for the preparation of school personnel. Units are administrative entities that design, manage, revise, and sometimes discontinue programs.

The unit is expected to coordinate all programs for the initial and continuing preparation of school personnel, no matter where they are housed on campus. In many institutions, specialty or academic subjects are offered primarily in units other than education (for example, in Arts and Sciences, Schools of Agriculture, Business, or Family Sciences). The education unit is expected to coordinate these programs and the education unit is held accountable for the quality of these programs as well as those offered within the unit itself.

The review must include all programs designed for education personnel at both the initial teacher preparation level and the advanced levels that are offered by the institution. The unit is held responsible for ensuring that all programs are aligned with the standards for program approval, no matter where they are administratively housed or geographically located, and that they are of the quality expected by the State Board of Education.

The review team applies the standards to units, as well as to specific programs. The Review Team determines whether units effectively carry out these responsibilities. In preparing the self-study report for the site visit, the unit should focus on programs that illustrate how the unit carries out its activities.

Applicants must develop and provide, for analysis by Department certification staff, a detailed description of each program offered for certification. These descriptions are to be directed to the Maine Department of Education Certification Office at least 60 days before the on-site visit is to be conducted.

1. Initial Teacher Preparation and Advanced Programs

Advanced programs award post-baccalaureate degrees to candidates who have completed their initial teacher preparation, as well as degrees that lead to other careers in PK-12 professional education (e.g. school psychology, reading specialist, educational administration, and/or school counseling). Advanced programs lead to a master's, specialist or doctoral degree, as well as non-degree licensure.

It is possible for institutions to receive different program approval decisions following a program review. For example, an institution could receive approval of the Elementary Education Program that is offered but be denied approval or granted conditional approval of its Secondary Mathematics Program. Similarly, all programs offered at the initial level might receive approval while no programs at the advanced level receive approval.

2. Changes in the Unit

The Maine State Board of Education and the Maine Department of Education recognize that units and programs undergo regular change. The Board and the Department especially encourage innovations that respond to the changing needs of education and educational reform. Units

should not suspend change because a program review visit is imminent. In fact, the standards require serious self-study that should lead to ongoing change in how the unit prepares school personnel. Consequently, it is expected that some candidates will be entering new programs while others are completing programs that are being phased out.

Review teams will examine established programs, as well as programs admitting their first candidates. While review teams will have an interest in learning about programs in the planning stage, the team's report of findings will be limited to discussion and recommendation concerning the programs in existence at the time of the site visit. Continual evaluation and improvement of unit programs is a key principle of the program approval process. Review teams will view systematic evaluation and change as evidence of the growth and vitality of the unit.

3. Eligibility for Program Approval⁹

Any baccalaureate or graduate degree-granting institution offering programs for the preparation of classroom teachers and/or other professional school personnel may establish eligibility for a program approval evaluation by the Maine Department of Education on behalf of the Maine State Board of Education. To establish eligibility for the initial program approval review, an institution must submit a letter of intent to seek program approval to the Commissioner of Education. The letter will need to provide basic information about the institution and its professional education unit.

4. The Coordinator

Before filing a letter of intent to seek program approval, the professional education unit should designate a coordinator who will coordinate the program approval efforts on campus. Although the head of the professional education unit frequently serves as the coordinator for the visit, another faculty member may serve in this capacity. The designated coordinator, as well as the unit head, will be the contact persons for the Maine Department of Education staff, the review team chair, and all other individuals involved in the program approval review.¹⁰

5. Letter of Intent to Seek Program Approval

Applicants should refer to Addressing Program Standards in section 3.3 of Chapter 114: Purpose, Standards and Procedures for the Review and Approval of Educational Personnel Preparation Programs. The letter of intent to seek program approval must be signed by both the chief executive officer of the institution and the head of the education unit.

The following information, as applicable, is to be provided:

- Name and address of the institution, the professional education unit, and contact people
- Non-traditional teacher education programs offered by the unit
- Definition of the unit
- Professional development schools operated by the unit

⁹ An education unit is not eligible for program approval review until it is established, has syllabi, has faculty, has admitted students, and it is operational.

¹⁰ The most desirable situation is to have an internal person, rather than an external consultant, to guide the program approval process on campus.

The request for program approval should be directed to the Commissioner, who in turn will notify the State Board of Education and other appropriate Department of Education personnel of the intent to seek approval of a new or existing program. The request shall be made at least six months prior to the proposed on site team visit.

The request shall contain a brief and explicit description of the program and identify the unit involved. Such signatures shall be the assurance that the governance body of the applicant unit has approved the request for program approval. In the case of a consortium, the governance body of each unit through the Chief Executive Officer shall indicate its approval of the program approval request. The request shall identify the coordinator who will serve as the liaison on behalf of the program.

6. Requests for Extension of Existing Approval

A request for extension of existing approval, due to extraordinary circumstances, may be granted by the State Board of Education. However, the State Board has made it clear that such circumstances must be of an emergency in nature. If such a request is granted, it will be for no more than one year in length and it will result in the reduction, by one year, in the period of subsequent state program approval.

7. The Self-Study

As an integral part of its program approval process, the Maine Department of Education requires that an institution seeking program approval complete a self-study report prior to the visit of the review team to the campus. The content of the self-study report must respond to the standards and expectations found in the Maine State Board of Education and Maine Department of Education Rule Chapter 114: Purpose, Standards and Procedures for the Review and Approval of Preparation Programs for Education Personnel.

Ideally, the professional education unit is continually engaged in self-evaluation to improve its programs. The evaluation process and resulting changes are recorded in the self-study report, which is the major resource document for the program approval review as well as the unit's documentation reflecting its mission, purpose, and process. One electronic copy (in a flash drive) of the unit's self-study report must be submitted to the Maine Department of Education. The documentation must be submitted two months prior to the scheduled review team visit.

The self-study should include the assessment of strengths and weaknesses of the ability of the unit to carry out its responsibilities and ensure the quality of all programs offered by the institution for the initial and continuing preparation of school personnel.

The Maine Department of Education recommends a template to be used by applicants as they prepare their unit's self-study report. The unit's self-study report must be submitted in a narrative form. The professional education unit should indicate the mission of the institution, special characteristics, and other information that will help the reader understand the institution and how it meets each of the six standards. The focus will be on the professional education unit and the programs it offers.

Usually institutions appoint a coordinator for the review and a steering committee to oversee development of the self-study. The involvement of the faculty with responsibility for the professional education core, including those who teach methods courses, should be part of the development of the self-study. Faculty and other support units (i.e., the teaching specialty areas) as well as with practitioners serving as supervisors in field experiences, and clinical practice should also collaborate in the development of the self-study.

9. Indicators Accompanying Each Standard

The indicators that accompany each standard are designed to explicate the meaning and content of the standard. For renewal of prior program approval, the unit may choose to write holistic responses to each of the standards by clustering and need not refer to specific indicators in its explanation of how it meets a particular standard. When differences exist between how the unit applies a standard to initial teacher preparation and advanced programs, those differences should be clearly indicated. However, by doing so, a separate response to the standard does not have to be prepared for each level of the unit. The unit must address those indicators that have been affected by change since the previous visit. Evidence not suggested by the indicators may be provided to show how the unit meets standards. However, the indicators provide the unit with guides as to the kind of evidence that would demonstrate to a review team that the standard is met.

10. Charts, Graphs and/or Tables

If a unit believes that charts, graphs or tables may help to clarify data, it is encouraged to include such information.

11. Program Descriptions

This section of the self-study report should include detailed two-page presentations of the professional education programs offered by the unit leading to certification. Programs can be grouped together when appropriate (e.g., all secondary education programs).

Program descriptions must demonstrate alignment with current certification requirements and the conceptual framework on which the program is based. The unit's program descriptions will undergo an alignment check by the Department's certification office prior to the review team visit. Any discrepancies that may exist will be reported to the unit coordinator for resolution. Any discrepancies that cannot be resolved prior to the team visit will be included in the team report as a finding necessitating immediate action. Course syllabi must be available to team members as well.

12. Choosing the Dates

The review begins at noon time on a Sunday and finishes by the following Wednesday noon. In some cases, a visit may be extended or begin a day earlier because of unique circumstances. A visit may be extended if agreed upon in advance by the institution and the Maine Department of Education. The unit coordinator should submit the desired dates to the Maine Department of Education at least three months before the visit.

A visit must be scheduled during a time when students and faculty are on campus and participating schools are in session. Do not pick a date that could be in conflict with national

professional meetings or secular and religious holidays. Review team members will arrive on Sunday to begin the review of documentation and must have access to the exhibit room.

13. Selection of the Review Team

The Maine Department of Education staff has responsibility for identifying members for the review team including designation of a team chair. A six person review team will conduct the program approval review. In most cases, a review team includes faculty, postsecondary administrators, and/or DOE education specialists. Every effort is made to include at least one member from an institution that is similar in type to the institution being visited. The list of proposed review team members will be sent to the unit coordinator prior to the scheduled visit. Institutions are asked to review the names of nominated review team members to ensure that there will be no potential conflict of interest. The roster of proposed team members will then be presented to the State Board of Education for approval.

The team chair will have overall responsibility for the conduct of the site visit. The State Board will designate a member of the Board to serve as an Observer.

14. Planning the Pre-visit

The review team chair along with the Higher Education Specialist will conduct the pre-visit at the institution. The purpose of the visit is to meet with the unit head and the unit's coordinator one or two months before the scheduled review to finalize preparation for the visit. The following items will be confirmed during this meeting:

1. The nature of program approval and the Maine DOE's expectations for continuing program approval.
2. Roles of review team members.
3. Organization and contents of the virtual exhibit room.
4. Interviews, class observations, school visits, and off-campus visits to be scheduled.
5. Template for the conduct of the visit, including organization of a meeting with institutional representatives at the start of the visit and the exit conference.
6. Supplementary materials to be sent to the review team before the visit.
7. Logistical arrangements for travel, hotel requirements, meals and refreshments, and the review team workroom on campus.

15. Logistical Arrangements

One month before the scheduled visit, the unit's coordinator, faculty, and administrators should begin making logistical arrangements to ensure that the review team's visit runs smoothly. A checklist for the coordinator in making the necessary arrangements is available.

17. Budgeting for the Visit

The unit is responsible for all costs associated with State Program Approval visit. Units are expected to arrange for the payment of the hotel bill so that review team members do not have to incur out-of-pocket expenses. Other expenses related to the on-site review include:

- copying the self-study report and supporting exhibits on electronic media,
- the first day morning breakfast meeting,
- refreshments provided to the review team members in their work room, and

- overhead such as: faculty release time, secretarial support, costs of gathering data, and special equipment, as needed.

In addition, the unit is responsible for the preparing, copying, and mailing of review materials. The State Board of Education will pay the expenses of the Board Observer.

18. Conduct of the On-Site Review

During the on-site visit, review team members will likely interview faculty, administrators, teacher education candidates, cooperating teachers, alumni, cooperating school principals, and other involved persons. If the unit wants particular individuals to be interviewed, that information should be conveyed to the review team chair. In addition, the review team may interview individuals who are not on the unit's list of interviewees.

Written documentation is also reviewed and field sites are visited during the on-site visit. The unit must organize its supporting documents in an exhibit room for use by the review team. The field sites to be visited should be determined by the review team chair and scheduled by the unit coordinator, during or soon after the pre-visit. The unit coordinator is responsible for notifying the cooperating schools that are scheduled for a visit by the visiting review team.

19. Interviews Conducted by the Review Team

Much of the review team's time on Monday and Tuesday of the visit is spent interviewing individuals and groups. The list of individuals with whom the review team would like to meet is outlined in the linked template. Specific interviews should be arranged by the review team chair prior to the on-site visit. The review team members may also need to conduct follow-up interviews to clarify concerns raised during deliberations. Faculty and administrators plan to be flexible in their scheduling throughout the duration of the review. Review team members talk with candidates, cooperating teachers, principals, advisory committee members, and others involved in the unit and its programs. Opportunities for the review team to interview groups of these individuals should be arranged. A cross-section of the population should be asked to participate in these group interviews.

Review team members should visit two to four (2-4) schools to which student teachers are assigned and with whom collaborative efforts toward improving education have been initiated. Review team members also will observe a sample of professional education classes that are in session during the review period. The review team will determine the classes to visit. The unit coordinator should prepare faculty to expect visitors if their class is scheduled for Monday or Tuesday of the visit.

20. Organizing the Exhibit Room

Evidence in the exhibit room should include unit and program assessments of candidate proficiencies and the effectiveness of the unit. Evidence includes, but is not limited to, end-of-course assessments, internship assessments, candidate portfolios, candidate, projects/artifacts, and results of state certification exams, follow-up studies, and program evaluations.

- The unit should also include as exhibits details about its assessment system and assessment instruments being implemented as part of that system.

- The unit should compile a list of all evidence in the exhibit room to distribute to the team.
- The unit should clearly label and key to the program review standards all evidence in an electronic exhibit room.
- If evidence is located somewhere other than the electronic exhibit room, the list should indicate where to find that evidence.
- The unit should clearly mark evidence that demonstrates the correction of previously cited areas for improvement to facilitate the work of the review team.
- Electronic exhibits should be designed to facilitate team members moving easily through exhibits without scrolling through large documents.
- The unit should compile, aggregate, and summarize candidate performance data for review by team members. Much of the candidate data will have already been compiled for various other purposes.
- Assessments, scoring rubrics/criteria, and samples of candidate work should be available to the team during the on-site visit.

The unit should select samples of candidate work (e.g., portfolios) that demonstrate proficiencies at different levels. Generally, such samples will be sufficient to augment the summarized data, but the team chair may request additional materials prior to and during the on-site review. These additional materials could also be tables, charts or graphs.

21. Guidance for Organizing a Web-Based Exhibit Room¹¹

The Maine Department of Education strongly suggests the development of a plan to facilitate the building of a web-based exhibit room. Electronic exhibit rooms allow team members to review documents and other exhibits before arriving on-site. This gives team members more time to learn about an institution and increases the team's familiarity with the unit's organization.

Units often name a committee or subcommittee to develop the web-based exhibit room plan. They then develop a map of the site, outlining the design and creating a master document list. The plan also specifies a system for collecting and indexing the documents, including who is responsible for collection and due dates.

The plan should identify a "labeling strategy" which includes categories and names of button labels and links. Units find it best to use the terminology of the standards by which they will be evaluated as much as possible. The unit's plan should also identify the format for documents. Most units find HTML useful for the following reasons:

- it can be viewed across computing platforms,
- it requires only browser software to view the pages, and
- it supports additional file types and formats.

It is important to have a web page designated for the program review team's visit. This page should orient the team members to the exhibits that are on-line. It is important that team members have a central location where they can learn which exhibits are available on-line and how the exhibits have been organized. It is completely acceptable to include active links on this page to all on-line exhibits, regardless of where they are housed. Some units prefer an outline

¹¹ Adapted the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)

with text-based hyperlinks; others choose to use icons. Clarity is much more important than form.

It is essential that exhibits be organized around the program review standards. The conceptual framework is often presented as a separate document. The self-study is often presented as an HTML document with a table of contents and links to relevant documents and other evidence. All exhibits should be organized and clearly connected to a standard. This is important because it will help team members to understand which exhibits are presented to address which standards and elements. It is the unit's responsibility to make the connections between evidence and standards. The review team judges the quality of the evidence presented. In some instances, one exhibit may address or be related to more than one standard.

Review team members must be able to navigate between exhibits. Therefore, it is important that all exhibits have links back to the team homepage. In addition, team members should be provided with a site map (in hard copy or readily visible on the web page) to provide direction as they move between exhibits. An index of the site in hard copy is also helpful; it can serve to orient team members to the site and help them keep track of which exhibits they have reviewed.

21. A. Electronic Exhibit Room

Web-based exhibits can prove beneficial for internal communication and organization. Web-based exhibit rooms also serve as a common and accessible repository for all information. Faculty members or designated staff can collect and report candidate assessment data, update resumes and course syllabi, and review and examine program offerings via the web. Because of the shared and public nature of the website, some units find that it increases accountability and allows faculty to see the results of their work.

21. B. Availability of Web-Based Exhibits

The web-based exhibit room should be up and running at least 60 days before the visit. This gives the program review team adequate time to review the web site and supporting online materials before arriving on campus. Some units will likely continue building the website until the week before the visit. If this is the case, then inform the team of major changes and recent additions during their orientation to your institution once they arrive.

21. C. Need for a Webmaster

The Department encourages institutions to use the resources that they have available to prepare for a visit. At the same time, it is necessary to have content knowledge and a certain degree of technical expertise to design and maintain an electronic exhibit room. Designate a person with technical expertise to be available to help the team should difficulties arise both before and during the on-site visit and while the team is in the hotel. The unit coordinator should provide the name and contact information for this person to the team during initial contact and once the site visit starts.

21. D. Informing the Team about the Web Address

The review team chair and members should receive the web address with the self-study report. The self-study report needs to be submitted electronically and sent to the team members information regarding where the report and exhibits can be accessed. Most units create a link to

the report in an e-mail to the team members. Send this information to team members approximately 60 days before the site visit. If the site requires the use of a password or user ID, the unit coordinator will need to inform the team in communications with them; once again, specify if the password or user ID is case sensitive.

22. Legal Issues – be sure to work with legal advisors when personal information is being disclosed on the web.

23. The Exit Conference

On Wednesday morning, the review team chair meets with the unit head, unit coordinator, and other key institutional administrators to summarize the review team's findings. The president, provost, and/or the vice president for academic affairs may also participate in the exit conference. The review team chair will articulate the process and timeline for State Board of Education to make a decision.

The summary of the review team's findings at the exit conference should be consistent with the written report that the institution will receive later. The written report must not hold any surprises for the institution and that they would have an opportunity to review the final draft of the report for factual errors. The applicant program may file with the review team chair and the Commissioner additional information or a clarifying statement with reference to the review team report and its recommendations at least fifteen (15) days prior to the action of the State Board of Education. The review team report and any institutional submissions will be forwarded to the State Board of Education.

24. The Review Team Report

Following visit, the review team chair (within 60 days) compiles the written report of the review team's findings. The following information is also provided:

- Recommendation Rationale for the Decision describes why the review team decision was made. This section should include examples of evidence that helped determine the review team's decision.
- Recommendations cite specific areas of concern to be addressed by the unit.
- Commendations sites practices or programs that substantially exceed the expectations of the standards in implementation and/or in outcomes. Exemplary practices include activities that are progressive, innovative, and implemented in an exceptional fashion that produce outcomes that are exceptional, and/or represent practices other institutions may wish to emulate.
- Review team findings indicate whether the standard was declared MET or NOT MET.
- Lists individuals interviewed and sources of evidence includes all individuals interviewed and documentation reviewed by the review team in making its decision.
- Recommendation to the State Board of Education: includes the level of state program approval as well as the approval cycle.

24. A. Timetable for Final Report

Prior to the end of the 60-day period following the visit, the review team chair submits the final draft of the report to the Department of Education and the unit head. Corrections will be

incorporated into the final version of the report. One copy of the final review team report is due at the Maine Department of Education within 60 days after the on-site visit.

24. B. Review Team Actions within 60 Days of an On-site Visit

The review team report shall be finalized by the team chair within 60 days of the conclusion of the visitation. The final review team report will be furnished to the unit head of the applicant program, to the Commissioner and to the members of the review team.

- A. After the visit is completed, the review team chair edits the report, and sends copies of the draft to each review team member and to the Department of Education for review. Recommendations from review team members are incorporated into the final draft report.
- B. The Higher Education Specialist sends one copy of the final draft to the unit head, who is asked to review it for clarity and for factual errors only and to communicate any recommended changes.
- C. At the chair's discretion, corrections thus identified will be incorporated into the final report.
- D. One copy of the final report is submitted to the Department of Education by the review team chair. The Department will duplicate the report and send a copy to the unit head and copies to the State Board of Education, as appropriate.

25. Appeals

The applicant unit shall have available three appeal routes as cited in Chapter 114: Purpose, Standards and Procedures for the Review and Approval of Educational Personnel Preparation Programs.

25. A. Administrative Procedural Appeal

At any point through the completion of the final review team report, the applicant unit may file an appeal of any procedural matter governed by sections 3.4, 3.5, 3.6 and 3.7 of this rule in writing directly to the Commissioner of Education. Such appeal must be made within five (5) days of the time of the action in question.

At the discretion of the Commissioner, the request for approval process may be put on hold pending resolution of the issue in question or, where immediate resolution of the question is possible, such resolution shall be made and the process not be interrupted. In such cases when a hold is necessary, every effort shall be made to resolve the question within ten (10) days. In all cases, requests and decisions must be made in writing but in no case shall any procedural appeal be made a part of the presentation for action by the State Board of Education except at the request of the applicant unit.

25. B. Substantive Review

In cases when the applicant unit wishes to question formally the recommendation(s) of the review team prior to action of the State Board of Education, it may do so by filing a description of its concern. The applicant unit must indicate its intent to take this action within ten (10) days of the receipt of the final review team report and have its description of concern on file with the Department within fifteen (15) days of the statement of intent. All such information then becomes a part of the record for review by the State Board of Education.

25. C. Appeal of State Board of Education Action

The applicant unit may, in all cases when it does not accept the action of the State Board of Education, request a hearing before the State Board of Education at which time any new or additional information and evidence may be presented for the consideration of the Board. The State Board of Education shall then take action again on the request in one of the three approval categories as described in Chapter Section 4.1 (d) and be deemed as final agency action.

26. Program Approval Decisions

The State Board of Education will consider the report and recommendations contained therein at the next scheduled meeting of the Board following the report's submission. The unit head and any other institutional representatives deemed to be appropriate should plan to attend the meeting during which the Board will take action.

27. Action by the State Board of Education¹²

- A. The Commissioner, in conjunction with the Higher Education Specialist, shall direct the preparation of the State Board of Education presentation on the unit's request. The presentation shall include the self-assessment document for initial approval or the Status Report for renewal, the final review team report and any supplemental information and evidence relevant to the applicant program. The review team shall be represented by the chair and the unit liaison at the State Board of Education meetings and hearings.
- B. The applicant program may file with the review team chair and the Commissioner additional information or a clarifying statement with reference to the review team report and its recommendations at least fifteen (15) days prior to the action of the State Board of Education on the request.
- C. Final action of the State Board of Education shall be based on the review of the program approval request, the self-assessment document and the final review team report.
- D. Approval status by the State Board of Education in one of the following categories:
 - a. Seven (7) year approval. To be approved in this category the unit must be nationally accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation.
 - b. Five (5) year approval. If approved in this category, the unit must submit an annual program update, not to exceed five (5) pages, summarizing yearly data, changes, additions and deletions using a template provided by the Department. This update must be submitted by April 7th of each calendar year.
 - c. Two (2) year approval. If approved in this category, the unit must submit a report that addresses the standard(s) found to be in need of improvement in the review team report. The date for submission of the report will be determined by the Board. The interim report will serve as the basis for either: full program approval or a re-visit by a review team to determine eligibility for full program approval status. Depending upon the severity and/or the continuation of the weaknesses identified within the interim report, a conditionally approved unit may be required to develop and submit a full self-assessment before a re-visit by a review team is conducted. The unit report will serve as the basis for the Board's decision to extend the current approval period to five (5) years or to determine whether a re-visit to the unit needs to be conducted by a Board approved review team.

¹² Section 3.11 of Chapter 114

- d. Approval denied for cause. Units denied approval may not reapply for one (1) year following such action by the State Board of Education.

28. Requests for Extension of Existing Approval

A request for extension of existing approval, due to extraordinary circumstances, may be granted by the state Board of Education. The circumstances must be of an emergency in nature. If request is granted it will be for up to one year and will result in the reduction, by one year, in the period of subsequent state program approval.

29. National Accreditation

Educator preparation units seeking national accreditation for the programs they offer should contact the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) at:

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)
2010 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20036-1023
Phone: (202) – 223 – 007
Website: <http://www.caepsite.org>
General Inquiries: caep@caepnet.org

30. Affirmative Action

The Maine Department of Education, in accordance with State and Federal law, ensures equal employment, educational opportunities and affirmative action, and does not discriminate in its educational programs, services, activities, or employment policies on the basis of race, gender, religion or creed, sexual orientation, national or ethnic origin, age, economic status, or disability.

Affirmative Action Officer Maine	207-624-6600 Voice
Department of Education	207-624-6700 FAX
23 State House Station	
Augusta, Maine 04333-0023	