

Minnesota Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Rhonda Bonnstetter, President
Rhonda.Bonnstetter@smsu.edu 507-537-6100

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

MACTE Minute May 8, 2020

MACTE would like to sincerely thank PELSB members and staff for their dedication and efforts to advancing education in Minnesota especially during this unprecedented time. We recognize how time intensive this spring has been, especially for members of the new Teacher Preparation Subcommittee, as each member navigated this work along with your full-time positions and personal lives. Thank you!

The focus of this MACTE Minute is on the new Teacher Preparation subcommittee (TPC).

According to PELSB bylaws approved in early 2020, we understand the duties of the new “TPC,” to include reviewing and making recommendations to the full board about the following:

- unit review team recommendations after site visits,
- interim reports submitted as part of unit approval processes,
- discretionary variances regarding unit standards and approval,
- Program Review Panel (PRP) recommendations for program approval (whether to adopt or take a different action than what PRP recommended), and
- discretionary variances submitted regarding program standards and approval.

In each duty noted above, the 3-member TPC makes recommendations to the full board about approval or denial and, when applicable, what conditions should be established.

Another important group for PELSB is the 10-member Program Review Panel (PRP). These stakeholder representatives review teacher provider program proposals, bringing multiple perspectives and peer-review to the process. The PRP has been critical to ensuring recommendations moving forward to the board are thoroughly vetted by stakeholders and innovations in teacher preparation are supported. In the proposed new Rule the PRP’s role has been reduced due to changes in the PERCA process. Also, according to the board’s bylaws, the TPC can 1) overrule the recommendation of the PRP without having benefited from participating in the PRP’s review process and 2) make determinations about discretionary variances without the benefit of the PRP representatives’ input and expertise.

With only one teacher preparation representative, the TPC as a subcommittee has limited background and context with specific experiences in teacher preparation. We are concerned with how this lack of background knowledge specific to teacher preparation influences their decisions when reviewing proposals and discussing variances. Though we understand the endeavor to reduce the amount of review the full board takes up as part of its role to oversee teacher preparation in Minnesota, we believe the TPC would function better with a mechanism for more input from people with direct connection to teacher preparation contexts.

Therefore, we ask that PELSB consider ensuring representation from different systems/stakeholders as non-voting advisory members to participate in the TPC meetings. This would help provide additional perspectives, knowledge of higher education and alternative prep systems. Perhaps PRP could take this

Minnesota Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Rhonda Bonnstetter, President
Rhonda.Bonnstetter@smsu.edu 507-537-6100

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

up as part of its future defined role in R4576 with more clarity to ensure a stronger relationship between the two groups with PELSB staff support in both.

In closing, MACTE remains available to share information with board members at any time in regards to provider policies for hiring faculty, teacher preparation “unit” governance, the impact of increased accountability expectations, and R4576. Thank you for your time and attention.