

Minnesota Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Kathleen Foord, President
kathleen.foord@mnsu.edu 507-389-1607

Bob Utke, Executive Assistant
bobjutke@gmail.com 612-759-7878

MACTE Minute April 10, 2015

Last month's MACTE Minute focused on the accountability processes for teacher licensure programs and the rigorous assessments that identify Minnesota's graduating teachers' ability to teach. This month's message will elaborate on the important role of the Board of Teaching in working with teacher preparation programs to ensure that high standards are met. To that end, we present several suggestions:

1. The 1992 InTASC Standards were revised and released in 2013. The revised standards describe the increasing complexity and sophistication of teaching practice for each Model Core Teaching Standard across three developmental levels. These learning progressions serve as a continuum for higher levels of specific teacher performance. At this time, the revised InTASC standards are not aligned with Minnesota's Standards of Effective Practice. Teacher preparation programs need a bridge between InTASC and the Standards of Effective Practice in order to build robust accountability systems. It also puts Minnesota at a disadvantage for out-of-state reciprocity. Rather than each program developing its own bridge, it makes sense for the Board of Teaching to build this bridge. We ask that the BOT align the InTASC and Standards of Effective Practice so that all programs have the same clear expectations.
2. Accountability is possible only with clear, transparent, and stable targets (Stiggins, 2006). We ask that the Board of Teaching develop rubrics to assist teacher preparation programs with PERCA submission via EPPAS. Clear and consistent written guidelines are needed so that each program receives the same message. We understand that rubrics are being developed to address program improvement, but data entry guidelines would also be helpful in alleviating confusion for licensure programs.
3. Rubrics would also address the confusion regarding EPPAS thresholds. It is often unclear how programs are to meet course credit thresholds across Standards of Effective Practice, Content, and Core (in the case of special education). In recent years in Minnesota, most of us have adopted the mantra that *standards matter—not credits*. However, the current credit requirements seem to contradict this belief. We ask that rubrics and/or a guidance manual be developed to clarify expectations.
4. The Board of Teaching is required to perform many arduous and multifaceted licensure and program approval tasks. In order to accomplish these tasks, increased funding is required. The MACTE Executive Committee advocates increased funding for the Board of Teaching, and it is our hope that the legislature authorizes such funding for the important work you do.
5. Finally, MACTE looks forward to your feedback regarding requests we have made in our MACTE Minutes. We invite BOT members to join us at our June retreat so that we can understand your thoughts and perspectives, which will enhance future collaboration on these issues. Unfortunately, we have not yet determined a date for the June retreat, but we will notify as soon as it is scheduled.

Thank you for considering these requests. Please let us know how we can be of assistance.

Stiggins, R. (2006). Assessment for learning: A key to motivation and achievement. *EDge*, 2(2), 1-20.