



February 27, 2019

Representative Cheryl Youakim, Chair, House Education Policy Committee
Members of the House Education Policy Committee
Senator Carla Nelson, Chair, Senate E-12 Finance and Policy Committee
Members of the Senate E-12 Finance and Policy Committee

RE: HF1329 / SF1557

Chairs & Members,

Career & Technical Education (CTE) and Career Pathways programs in Minnesota include students engaged in agriculture, health sciences, business & marketing, family & consumer sciences, construction, manufacturing, transportation, work-based learning/youth apprenticeship, communication technology, law enforcement, cosmetology, and a variety of other careers.

On behalf of the boards of the Minnesota Association of Career & Technical Administrators (MACTA); a statewide association of professional educators that administer CTE programs across Minnesota, and the Minnesota Association of Career and Technical Education (MnACTE); a statewide organization of CTE teachers and other CTE professional, we write to you in opposition to several of the provisions included in HF1329/HF1557. For the first time in our career, there has been a clear and discernable pathway to recruit, hire, and retain high quality CTE and Career Pathways teachers in Minnesota, and unfortunately, if this bill becomes law, it completely strips those pathways away and may ultimately force the closure of many of our vital CTE/CP programs across the state due to the inability to hire or retain teachers. Specific provisions of this bill that are problematic include:

Line Number(s) 2.6-2.10	MACTA Position: Strongly Oppose
CTE Impact: The limitation of renewals for Tier 1 teachers will close CTE programs across the state. Not only are there limited options (or none in some instances) for CTE teacher preparation programs, there are actually not licenses for some areas (Career Pathways). In addition, many small districts have only a small fraction of FTEs in these positions, and they require a high level of content expertise. Ultimately, if this language was adopted, anyone under Tier 1 would be able to teach there for two years and either have to leave teaching or move to Tier 2 under significantly more restrictive pathways in this current language proposal, unless a district can prove "good cause" per the discretion of PELSB. Teachers that previously worked under non-licensed community experts would also be included in this change.	
Line Number(s) 2.26 & repeal of 122A.182, Subd 2 (10.26)	MACTA Position: Strongly Oppose
By removing the "coursework" options to obtain a Tier 2 license, the only pathway for Tier 1 CTE/CP teachers to move from Tier 1 to Tier 2 is to complete or be enrolled in a Minnesota teacher preparation, which are limited or not in existence for many areas. This would ultimately close every program operating under Career Pathways as there are no licensure standards/programs and therefore no pathway to a Tier 2, 3, or 4 license.	



Line Number(s) 2.29-2.31	MACTA Position: Strongly Oppose
This language would remove the option of a CTE/CP teacher with a master's degree to obtain Tier 2 and replace it with the completion of teacher preparation (which, again, is very limited or does not exist for CTE/CP).	
Line Number(s) 3.14 & 3.17	MACTA Position: Strongly Oppose
Limits the possible length of teaching tenure of a Tier 2 teacher from 8 years to 6 years, again with the addition of restricted pathways to Tier 3 proposed, would be incredibly detrimental to CTE/CP programs for the aforementioned reasons.	
Line Number(s) 4.1-4.4	MACTA Position: Strongly Oppose
This provision would remove the option of a CTE/CP teacher to move to Tier 3 after three years of successful teaching experience under Tier 2. If removed, essentially, the only pathway for a CTE/CP teacher to obtain a Tier 3 is to complete a portfolio or complete a teacher preparation, both of which are not viable options for all CTE areas and not an option at all for CP teachers.	
Line Number(s) 5.11-5.15	MACTA Position: Strongly Oppose
Due to the nature of CTE/CP, districts are oftentimes forced to hire Tier 1 and Tier 2 teachers at a higher rate. This requirement to report and publish this data would likely paint CTE/CP as "lesser than" when there is no actual correlation in CTE/CP that indicates that a Tier 1 or Tier 2 teacher is less effective than a Tier 3 or Tier 4 teacher.	
Line Number(s) 37.32 & 8.1, 10.19 & 10.22	MACTA Position: Strongly Oppose
Effectively equates a Tier 1 and Tier 2 license as ineffective teachers and limits the students that can be in their classrooms. Again, it implies that Tier 1 and Tier 2 CTE/CP teachers are ineffective regardless of their performance in the classroom.	


For the reasons outlined above, MACTA cannot support HF1329/SF1557 and strongly encourages the respective committees from considering it for inclusion in the education omnibus bill. Moving this legislation forward and making it law would be devastating to Career & Technical Education and Career Pathways programs across the state, which are ultimately the lifeblood of Minnesota's economic stability and prosperity.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact us at thaugen@lcsc.org or jean.rakun@wayzataschools.org.

Sincerely,



Troy M. Haugen
President
Minnesota Association of Career & Technical Administrators



Jean Rakun
President
Minnesota Association for Career & Technical Education

