As reported in the February MACTE Minute, members of the Minnesota Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (MACTE) have engaged in thoughtful deliberation in order to respond to the Board of Teaching’s request for a recommendation in how best to fulfill the reporting requirements found in MN Statute 122A.09 Subd.4a. We appreciate the opportunity to provide information and feedback and value the Board’s desire that the tool/s be useful for institutions to use as part of their own continuous improvement.

Understanding MACTE
MACTE, founded in 1973, is a voluntary organization comprised of 31 educational institutions and a small number of affiliate members. We are dedicated to providing standards and leadership in the preparation and development of highly qualified professional educators. MACTE represents all three Minnesota education systems including seven Minnesota State Colleges and Universities, three University of Minnesota campuses, and 21 independent colleges. Our teacher preparation programs are all designed to prepare quality teachers for Minnesota’s schools, and they do so while embracing their diversity in size, focus, and delivery. The MACTE mission is three-fold: 1) to clarify and address issues in teaching and learning; 2) to promote quality teacher preparation and development; and 3) to share the collective knowledge and data of all state-approved teacher education programs.

MACTE is strong in its shared commitment to teacher preparation—and in its respect for differences in context and institutional mission. The voices of our 31 member institutions needed to be heard and represented in this feedback.

Deliberation and Information-Gathering Activities
The following activities were conducted to gather MACTE input:

- Members of the MACTE Executive Committee (MEC) met with BOT staff members and representatives of the Common Metrics group to discuss survey options and possible timelines
- At the November 2016 Fall MACTE Business Meeting, the full MACTE membership was presented with the BOT request and began discussion.
- On Monday, December 19th, representatives from teacher preparation institutions attended a meeting at MDE that was designed to allow the BOT to engage all providers in understanding and discussing the statute and rule requirements, the Common Metrics instruments, other options, and impact. Attendees were encouraged to bring their institution's survey instrument/s to
inform the conversation. The discussions and questions at this meeting helped
guide the preparation for a questionnaire that was sent to all institutions.

- A questionnaire developed by MEC was sent to all institutions asking them to
  respond to a set of questions that would show their preference for the type of
  survey they would like to use and their opinion of the factors that were important
  when choosing a survey.

- At the February MACTE Business Meeting, MACTE members viewed the results
  of the questionnaire and participated in an in-depth, respectful discussion to
  increase understanding of the impact and continuous opportunities associated with
  survey options.

- As follow-up to the discussion and questions raised by MACTE members, MEC
  collected further information in phone and Email communication with staff
  members from the BOT, members of the Common Metrics committee, and
  colleagues from institutions that use their own validated surveys.

- Also contacted was representative (Mark Lacelle-Peterson) from our parent
  organization the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
  (AACTE) to discover what guidance, recommendations, or procedures might be
  available from our parent organization.

- Additional information was distributed to MACTE deans and institutional
  representatives, and additional comments invited.

Essential MACTE Concerns and Commitments
Based on questionnaire responses, MACTE and MEC discussions, and follow-up
comments, the following principles are supported by MACTE and should guide BOT
decision making:

- MACTE institutions are committed to assessment for continuous improvement.
- MACTE remains committed to a survey that is valid and meets both the needs of
  the state and of the IHEs.
- Costs (time, personnel, and budget) should be low, and ease of administration
  should be great. There is a differential impact on institutions depending on their
  size, location, and existing resources. This is a serious concern.
- Data should be protected.
- Comparisons among institutions should be minimized, and a focus on continuous
  improvement maximized.
- MACTE is mindful that most institutions preferred and valued their own current
  surveys.
- Any agreement should be detailed and clearly explained in writing.
- A time limit and clear review process should be in place for any option chosen.
Feedback on Survey Options
At the time of the questionnaire, MEC was aware of three options for a standard measure: the Common Metrics battery of tests, a MACTE-developed survey, or a BOT-developed survey. Subsequent information from AACTE presented a fourth option. Each option is presented below with a characterization of the support from MACTE institutions.

Note: 27 institutions responded to the questionnaire. In the few cases with more than one representative from a single institution responding with different answers, responses were averaged and rounded.

1. Common Metrics
In the MACTE questionnaire, 11 institutions rated Common Metrics as a great option, and seven rated it as acceptable. Nine institutions had serious concerns. Fifteen institutions named it as their preferred option of the options provided. Reasons for their preference as well as the concerns of those who did not select it are provided in Table One.

After the February MACTE discussion, the NExT Common Metrics Group (CM) met to address concerns raised and then shared updated information. The information demonstrates a responsiveness to MACTE concerns:

- Stacy Duffield from NDSU is the contact for communication with CM. MACTE had explained that lack of systematic communication and channels of authority had been an obstacle to clear communication. This is a helpful clarification.
- CM has decided to allow IHEs to use the surveys without having to join the aggregate. This is a restatement of the original message heard at the 12/19 meeting. CM does indeed encourage all to participate but will not require it.
- Though the CM message does not state specifically that there will be no cost to IHEs if not joining the aggregate, it is implied. This should be confirmed.
- Certain rules and agreements would accompany the use of CM. Many of these conditions are explained, but a clear and detailed memorandum of understanding would be necessary and expected.

2. MACTE Developed
In the MACTE questionnaire, five institutions considered a MACTE-developed survey as a great option, and 11 rated it as acceptable. Eleven institutions had serious concerns. Five institutions named it as their preferred option of the options provided (See Table One.)

There are MACTE members who would be willing to participate in the development of a survey, but the time frame remains an issue. One suggestion given was that the BOT allow/require institutions to administer their own surveys (aligned not only to the SEPs
but also to the institutional mission) and require the addition to that survey of one or two shared items asking about satisfaction with the preparation program. This suggestion reflects the strong preference of many institutions to continue to use their own surveys. Though a small number of member institutions continue to support this option, MACTE has a general concern that this minimal action is not a strong enough response to the legislative mandate.

3. **BOT Developed**

MACTE members did not support this item in the January survey or at the February meeting. No new information was provided.

4. **AACTE Survey**

This is new information and was unavailable to MEC at the time of our meeting in February. AACTE, our parent organization, has developed and is piloting an employer and graduate survey. AACTE had been in communication with the Common Metrics group about the CM instruments, but reported that they had decided to work with Westat to develop surveys with questions aligned to the INTASC standards. These surveys would allow for benchmarking at the national level. Samples of the surveys are shared with the BOT with AACTE permission. They can be ready for piloting by April. The cost and logistics of this option are in development, but the plan is for the state to provide the names and locations of graduates with Westat administering the survey. MACTE institutions who selected a MACTE-developed option as their preference would be very interested in the Board’s consideration and further investigation of this option.

**Final Remarks**

By describing the opinions of our MACTE membership, we have provided the Board with information that allows them to see the impact of the decision and where support for our members will be needed and expected.

We again would like to thank the Board for giving MACTE institutions an opportunity to share their voices in this process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reasons for Preference</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
<th>Reasons for Preference</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Prevalent Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prevalent Responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Well designed and tested</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Established reliability and validity</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Survey Length</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ready to go and in use</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Who owns the data? How will it be reported? How will it be used?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Also Mentioned</td>
<td></td>
<td>Also Mentioned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Value of aggregated data and comparison to others</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Wording and content concerns for certain items</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Developed with grass roots collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ability to add institution-specific questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACTE-Developed</td>
<td>• More inclusive with stakeholder input from all types of institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Not enough time to do well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Focus on program quality and goals</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Developed by practitioners</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Too much work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can be kept simple and institution-specific items can be added easily</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Redundant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOT-Developed</td>
<td>• It’s their job to do</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Too much would be up to their discretion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Survey</td>
<td>• Already in use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Responsive to unique settings and goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>