

LFC Requester:	Connor Jorgensen
-----------------------	-------------------------

**AGENCY BILL ANALYSIS
2024 REGULAR SESSION**

WITHIN 24 HOURS OF BILL POSTING, UPLOAD ANALYSIS TO:

AgencyAnalysis.nmlegis.gov

{Analysis must be uploaded as a PDF}

SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION

{Indicate if analysis is on an original bill, amendment, substitute or a correction of a previous bill}

Check all that apply:
Original **Amendment** _____
Correction _____ **Substitute** _____

Date 1/28/2024
Bill No: HB 256

Sponsor: Reps. Jaramillo and Madrid
Short Title: Higher Ed Teacher Preparation

Agency Name and Code University of New Mexico-952
Number: _____
Person Writing Lenaya Montoya
Phone: 5052771670 **Email** lenayamontoya@unm.edu

SECTION II: FISCAL IMPACT

APPROPRIATION (dollars in thousands)

Appropriation		Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
FY24	FY25		
	N/A	N/A	N/A

(Parenthesis () Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

SECTION III: NARRATIVE

BILL SUMMARY

Synopsis: HB 256 re-envisioning teacher preparation programs at higher education institutions, as well as directs the Public Education Department (PED) surrounding their work in public schools. HB 256 provides new requirements for colleges of education at public four-year higher education institutions and requires that teacher preparation programs include teacher residencies. HB 256 further requires that teacher preparation programs provide culturally and linguistically responsive curricula, which shall include research- and evidence-based best practices for structured literacy reading intervention, mathematics and science instruction and intervention, instruction on the Indian Education Act, Hispanic Education Act, and the Black Education Act, along with any laws governing the education of Asian American students, and additional educational topics. HB 256 additionally directs the PED to align state accreditation of colleges of education with national accreditation.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

This bill does not address the increased costs to the state related to residencies and the yearlong clinical experience, which is currently paid through one-time funds. In addition, this bill does not address the additional pay to cooperating teachers, as well as paying for their training and involvement as part of this work. The bill does not contain an appropriation to address these issues.

Additionally, there are costs to colleges in relation to accreditation. The state should consider providing fiscal support to institutions in seeking accreditation, as these are expensive requirements for institutions to take on (accreditation fees, increased need for accreditation staff to track documents and lead efforts, etc.).

SIGNIFICANT ISSUES

There are a number of significant issues with this bill. To begin, the bill title doesn't fully encompass the various issues and changes present in the bill and the bill's scope. This should potentially be revised to better reflect the different issues presented in the bill.

The teacher preparation requirements in the bill would impact existing coursework, with the potential to require students to take more than 120 hours or remain in colleges for a longer period of time (in relation to the year long clinical experience requirement). Many students take their methods courses earlier than their clinical experiences, so they can be best prepared to enter the classroom. If a student has a full-year clinical experience, this would either require students to take courses for a longer period of time, or force students to take extra coursework during their clinical experiences (in the evenings) which could be quite cumbersome and onerous an experience. This might dis-incentivize some students from seeking a teaching degree, or a delayed graduation could create a new workforce issue.

Currently, teacher residencies require a 3-year work commitment to the school district, not currently addressed by this bill. Would this also follow for the year long clinical experience (and would there be pay differences between the two types of students)? For 3-year commitments, this can be challenging for some students, such as military families that are often required by the federal government to move with little notice.

The additional requirements set forth in this bill may increase the burden on traditional teacher training programs and may increase the flow of students into alternative training programs. It may be helpful to have information on whether there have been any differences in outcomes between teachers trained in traditional programs versus alternative programs, along with student outcomes, including student retention. We should review this information first and consider the quality of alternative training programs before increasing the burden on traditional teacher training programs.

The timelines set in Sections 1 and 2 of the bill, should both be for the 2028-2029 academic year. Common course numbering is quite onerous and would require changes through university curricular systems, that can take upwards of a year or two. At the University of New Mexico (UNM), it took about two years to resolve a previous common course numbering issue.

For the research and evidence-based practices required as part of this bill (culturally and

linguistically relevant practice, science, and math, etc.) it is unclear who decides what is research and evidenced-based. If this is set by rule by PED, the UNM College of Education and Human Services requests that the rules not be based on a single article or book but based on a body of knowledge found within the field, and in consultation with university faculty statewide.

In relation to the required training for faculty members at higher education institutions, it is unclear who is responsible for organizing, training, and paying for this training (both the facilitators, as well as the faculty members required to participate in this programming).

The UNM College of Education and Human Services does agree with Subsection R of Section 2, that any review of educator preparation programs by a national accreditor should be reviewed by the state at the same time to cut down duplication of efforts to support review processes by universities.

PERFORMANCE IMPLICATIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS

CONFLICT, DUPLICATION, COMPANIONSHIP, RELATIONSHIP

TECHNICAL ISSUES

The reference to national accreditation mis-identifies the name of the accrediting agency cited. The bill incorrectly states, "Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Preparation", this should be revised to the Council for the Accreditation for Educator Preparation (CAEP). The other nationally recognized accreditor for educator preparation, Association for Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation (AAQEP) should also be recognized and considered in this bill.

OTHER SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

ALTERNATIVES

WHAT WILL BE THE CONSEQUENCES OF NOT ENACTING THIS BILL

AMENDMENTS