

**4.27.17 MACTE Legislative Update**  
**Prepared by Cyndy Crist, MACTE Legislative and Policy Liaison**

I've been waiting to write an update until there was something of substance to report, and although the news at this point is largely procedural, it seemed worth sharing.

As has been previously reported, there was some confusion until very recently about how teacher preparation and licensure matters were going to be handled during the conference committee phase of legislative activity. The original plan seemed to be to move these issues forward separately from the omnibus bills, but mid-process the two were combined in the Senate. Disagreement about this approach clearly persisted behind the scenes, but ultimately the Senate decided to pull out the provisions from the previous SF 4 to be handled separately.

Per my most recent contact with you, the bill was taken up on the floor of the Senate last week and, unfortunately, passed without the amendments that we had hoped might be taken up. Thanks to those of you who contacted your senators about our concerns; even though they didn't have immediate impact, I believe there is always value in making sure our elected officials know what we believe is important and why.

The second point of confusion was whether both sets of bills were going to be taken up by a single conference committee or if a second group would be appointed to address the licensure issues. That was resolved earlier this week with the appointment of a small conference committee to take up the licensure provisions of HF 140/SF 4. Its House members are Sondra Erickson, Peggy Bennett, and Carlos Mariani; Senate members are Eric Pratt, Karin Housley, and Susan Kent. Four of these six members served on the Legislative Study Group, so they will approach the task with much more knowledge of the issues than would many other legislators. Their first meeting is scheduled for Monday, 5.01 at 8:30.

We have sent a letter to all of the members of both conference committees outlining MACTE's top priorities, along with some follow-up language at Senator Pratt's request. Bob has posted the letter on our MACTE website and I am copying below the more specific follow-up language. This same information has also been shared with key staff at the BOT, Education Minnesota, MDE, and the Governor's Office in the hopes that it may help shape the final outcome of deliberations during the remaining three and a half weeks of the 2017 session.

Please stay vigilant for any calls to action that MEC may decide to send in these waning weeks of the session. And thanks again for everything you have done to share our interests, concerns, and priorities with your legislators.

## **MACTE Recommendations, Teacher Licensure Legislative Language**

*Recently, MACTE was asked by Senator Eric Pratt to offer specific language changes it would propose relative to the issues and items raised in our letter of April 21, 2017 to members of the E-12 Education Conference Committee. The following is what was sent.*

As requested, I can offer the following about several of our comments. Since the request came from you, Senator Pratt, I'll use your bill language for making the suggestions:

(1) Tier 1 License — We would like to see this language fully reflect the difference between a CTE license and any other license. One way to do this may have already been suggested to you by Education Minnesota and/or the Board of Teaching. There would be a Tier 1 CTE license, using the language currently in your bill and making renewals unlimited for CTE fields for which no license exists. A second Tier 1 credential might be called an emergency credential with up to three renewals (MACTE would frankly prefer fewer, but we offer this in the spirit of compromise and in recognition of the hiring challenges facing school districts). I reiterate our support for the Senate language requiring school boards to confirm to the Board that it was unable to hire a Tier 2,3, or 4 licensed teacher for these positions.

(2) Tier 2 License — We would like to see this level require enrollment in an approved teacher preparation program, at least for any renewals. This would ensure that all candidates have preparation in pedagogy, not just the appropriate content area. We would recommend removal of passing scores on licensure tests as a sufficient qualification for a Tier 2 license.

(3) Tier 3 License — We would remove passing scores of licensure tests from the initial list of qualifications and add it instead to the “and meets at least one of the following criteria” list instead. This would ensure that all Tier 3 teachers have had student teaching or comparable field experience and presumably some preparation in pedagogy as well.

(4) Tier 4 License — We have nothing new to propose here with the notation that we support the Senate language requiring at least three years teaching experience in any state for the reasons outlined in our letter.

I believe our other comments either supported retaining language in one or the other bill or offered brief suggestions for changes with the exception of setting a different deadline for completion of the changes outlined in the bill. We would assume that the Board of Teaching may have offered a recommendation and believe they are in the best position to know how long it would reasonably take to make the needed changes effectively.

Thank you for this opportunity to offer further comments.