



Outreach

Supporters of Career and Technical Education (CTE) need to be aware of changes that are occurring or have been proposed that may erode the CTE delivery system in Missouri. Interested groups and individuals would include business and industry along with their trade associations, community leaders, legislators, teachers, administrators, staff, parents and STUDENTS, both current and former. Think about whom in your community should be alerted and asked to take action.

Overview

The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) has proposed MSIP 5 – Resource and Process Standards and Indicators which has been filed with the Secretary of State’s office and has been published in the November 1, 2012 Missouri Register for public comment, as required under statute for an agency promulgating a new administrative rule. This will replace MSIP 4, which has effectively been suspended by the DESE. The MSIP 5 proposal appears to erode the weight given to CTE programs in a school evaluation process and no longer specifically requires 4 program areas to be available with a minimum of 12 credit hours and 20 credit hours as the desirable standard for CTE.

MSIP 5 Resource and Process Standards and Indicators – Issues and Concerns

There are a number of questions and concerns surrounding this proposal by DESE. If CTE supporters can demonstrate strong and effective communication for changes, it is possible to persuade DESE to make language adjustments to this proposed rule when they issue the final order of rulemaking. There is also an opportunity for the legislative Joint Committee on Administrative Rules (JCAR) to intervene or advocate on behalf of the changes we need.

MSIP 4 clearly states what is expected of schools. The proposed MSIP 5 rule does not make this clear, especially with respect to career education. “R-3” in the proposed rule says high schools must offer content areas to meet minimum graduation requirements. Career education is included in this section. However, the current graduation requirement rule does not include career education specifically. What career education are we talking about in the proposed rule? This should be clarified by adding a reference to DESE approved career education. Section “i-9” of the proposed rule talks specifically about career education. The section purports to require high quality career education, although again, there is no reference to DESE or Department approved career education programs. This language should be added in this section. This addition would insure that we are aligning to the Federal Perkins Act as well. There is concern that the APR scoring guidelines are not going to give enough weight to the availability of high quality career education programs. The proposed rule refers to career education programs offered, but does not specify they must be offered and how many programs. Does this mean one program area will satisfy the minimum? If career education is not “offered” is there any consequence in



the scoring? Measures should be clear and not written in the vague manner that can result in arbitrary application. The rule should clearly require a minimum of 4 Department approved career education programs with a minimum of 12 credit hours as the standard and 20 being the desirable number of credit hours available to students. The rule states Career and Technical Student organizations as state and nationally recognized and as an intra-curricular part of the CTE program. On face value we are very supportive of this requirement, but the scoring guideline should reflect this importance and carry weight in the APR. Without these changes Career and Technical Education will not carry the priority treatment that is so important to student success.

CTE brings value to our educational system because students gain skills and experiences that build confidence in their ability to learn. It is through CTE that many students are able to envision themselves in succeeding in college or other postsecondary pursuits. It is through CTE that many at risk students gain an interest in learning and have a sense of relevance of an education to their adult life. Through the CTSOs students learn how to apply their skills, work as a team and develop leadership and work ethic many young adults lack when they enter the workforce.

If we are serious about achieving the “top ten by 20” and in having more of our adult population with a postsecondary education, then we must not move forward on the path to diminish or erode career and technical education . Students must be motivated to learn. More testing doesn’t accomplish motivation. Saying we want more students going on to college doesn’t accomplish the goal. Students must be able to envision themselves on the college path and see themselves in a career. Businesses and industry want employees who are work ready. CTSOs produce a well-rounded individual who possesses the skills needed to meet the needs of the workforce. The proposed MSIP 5 rule doesn’t foster any of that potential in its current form.

Action

We need to generate as many letters as possible objecting to the proposed rule in its current form and ask for changes mentioned above. Send your letters to the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Attention: Margie Vandeven, Assistant Commissioner, Office of Quality Schools, P.O. Box480, Jefferson City, MO 65102-0480**. Be sure to reference the appropriate code of state regulation citation of **5 CSR 20-100.255**. Send a copy of your letter to your legislator and follow up with a conversation regarding what is at stake. Forward your letter on to the MoACTE office so that we can keep track of letters submitted. Comments must be received within 30 days of publication of the proposed rule, which is November 1, 2012.