



HB 2274

Sponsor: Ed Lewis

PART 1 — QUICK SNAPSHOT

1.1 One-Paragraph Overview (plain language)

HB 2274 would enroll Missouri in the **Interstate Teacher Mobility Compact** and create a **multi-state governing commission** that can set **binding rules with the force of law** across all member states. In practice, it creates a new “fast lane” for out-of-state teachers (especially military spouses) to obtain Missouri licensure through an “equivalency” decision, while also requiring Missouri to share investigative/disciplinary information with other states. The bill also commits Missouri to the compact’s enforcement machinery—default penalties, litigation, and multi-state rulemaking—until Missouri repeals the law and waits out the withdrawal period. **Bottom line:** it’s not just “*license mobility*”; it’s **joining an interstate regulatory government** that can issue rules Missouri must live under.

Sources:

HB 2274

Fiscal Note for HB2274

1.2 Triage Table (Fast Flags)

Check	Quick Finding
Single-Subject / Clear Title	Likely <i>technically</i> single-subject (teacher licensure compact), but the title does not signal the scale of binding interstate rulemaking + assessments + litigation venue embedded in the compact.
Title Specificity (0–3)	3 — “Interstate teacher mobility compact” is specific, even if it understates downstream effects.

Check	Quick Finding
Department Scope	Single (DESE/teacher licensing authority), but it also effectively binds Missouri to an interstate commission that functions as an additional regulator.
Does it grow government?	Yes. Creates/joins an interstate commission with rulemaking, budgeting, staffing, fees/assessments, and enforcement powers.
Impact on MO families (overall)	Mixed , with real risks: standards/oversight drift, governance moved out of state, and new costs.
Alignment with AFMO core beliefs	Violates — the strongest conflict is state sovereignty + delegation to unelected bodies.
Initial stance	Oppose

PART 2 — PURPOSE & PROVISION MAP

2.1 Stated Purpose & Title

Title: “*relating to the interstate teacher mobility compact.*”

Stated purpose: streamline teacher license mobility across member states and support military spouse relocation.

What it *really* accomplishes: Missouri joins a **standing interstate regulatory structure** that can issue **binding rules** and impose **multi-state compliance and enforcement** mechanisms.

2.2 Provision-by-Provision Map (major clusters)

- §168.046.1–2 — **Creates the compact; broad objectives**
 - Plain language:** Establishes the compact and lists goals (streamlined pathway, military spouses, info sharing, removing barriers).
 - Tag:** [Bad]
 - Why:** The goals sound good, but they’re used to justify a governance structure that goes far beyond simple reciprocity.
- §168.046.3–5 — **“Equivalency” licensure pathway + background checks**
 - Plain language:** Missouri must decide which Missouri licenses an out-of-state teacher qualifies for and grant them (especially if they hold an unencumbered, eligible license). Military spouses can qualify even with an encumbered license in certain cases. Requires a receiving-state background check and allows extra info requests for compensation.
 - Tag:** [Concern]

- **Why:** This pressures Missouri toward **lowest-common-denominator portability** over Missouri-specific vetting—especially because state-specific requirements are largely pushed to renewal/advancement (see §168.046.4(2)).
3. **§168.046.6 & §168.046.9 — Mandatory cross-state investigative/disciplinary data exchange**
- **Plain language:** Requires member states to share investigative/disciplinary files upon request and sets up an information-exchange framework.
 - **Tag: [Concern]**
 - **Why:** Expands interstate data flow and creates a durable pipeline for sharing sensitive licensure/discipline information.
4. **§168.046.7–8 — The “Commission”: binding rules, fees/assessments, closed meetings, immunity, emergency rules**
- **Plain language:** Creates the Interstate Teacher Mobility Compact Commission; empowers it to adopt bylaws and **uniform rules with the force of law**; hire staff; accept donations; borrow money; set budgets; levy assessments/fees; and run committees. Allows closed meetings for broad categories (including “anticipated litigation”). Grants qualified immunity/defense/indemnification protections. Allows **emergency rules** with short notice.
 - **Tag: [Bad]**
 - **Why:** This is the core sovereignty problem: **unelected interstate rulemaking** that binds Missouri, paired with funding mechanisms and legal shields.
5. **§168.046.10–13 — Enforcement, default penalties, litigation venue, supremacy over conflicting state law**
- **Plain language:** Sets enforcement/oversight; allows the commission to take member states to court; includes default/termination procedures; keeps the compact alive even if membership drops below 10 after activation; delays withdrawal effectiveness; and states that conflicting member-state laws are superseded to the extent of conflict.
 - **Tag: [Bad]**
 - **Why:** The enforcement structure is designed to **hold states in line** and treat commission rules as superior to conflicting state law—exactly the kind of “government above Missouri” compact advocates always downplay.

2.3 Changes to Existing Law (High-Level)

- Creates a new §168.046 adopting the **Interstate Teacher Mobility Compact**.
- Commits Missouri to **interstate rulemaking** that carries the **force of law** in Missouri.

- Requires Missouri to participate in **interstate data sharing** for licensure/investigation/discipline.
- Opens Missouri to **assessments/fees** and administrative compliance burdens.
- Exposes Missouri to **compact enforcement and litigation** mechanisms until withdrawal is completed.

PART 3 — CONSTITUTIONAL & PROCESS CHECKS

3.1 Single-Subject & Original-Purpose (Art. III §23)

- **Main subject:** Joining and implementing an interstate compact for teacher licensure mobility.
- **Additional subjects:** Not truly separate subjects, but major embedded “barnacles” include: interstate rulemaking, assessments/fees, immunity/indemnification, and enforcement/litigation structure.
- **Title clarity vs real effects:** Title is specific, but it **fails the citizen fair-notice test** because ordinary voters won’t infer “binding interstate rules + assessments + enforcement” from a compact-mobility label.
- **Conclusion:** **Likely upheld legally**, but **violates the spirit of fair notice** because the most consequential impacts are governance and sovereignty, not just licensure convenience.

3.2 U.S. & Missouri Constitutional Rights

No direct 2A/free speech/religious liberty language here. The biggest constitutional tension is structural: **separation of powers and accountability**, because binding rules are made by an interstate commission rather than Missouri’s elected lawmakers.

3.3 Delegation to Unelected Bodies & Separation of Powers

This bill is **delegation-heavy**:

- Commission rules have the **force of law** in Missouri.
- Missouri’s normal in-state rulemaking safeguards are functionally bypassed (compact rules bind by membership).
- The commission can levy **assessments/fees**, operate with broad discretion, and adopt emergency rules.

That is the opposite of accountable, Missouri-controlled governance.

PART 4 — IMPACT ON MISSOURI FAMILIES

4.1 Economic / Tax Impacts

- The fiscal note projects **General Revenue costs of (\$292,572) in FY2027**, then **(\$59,978) in FY2028**, and **(\$61,978) in FY2029**, mainly for DESE/OA-ITSD changes to educator certification systems. It also flags the impact that exceeds \$250,000 in one of the first three fiscal years.
- The compact structure also allows ongoing operational costs through assessments/fees set by the commission.

4.2 Family, Parental Rights, and Education

- Supporters will sell this as “helping fill classrooms,” but it also risks **standards drift** by prioritizing portability over Missouri-specific expectations—especially since state-specific requirements can be pushed to renewal/advancement rather than the initial grant.
- Missouri already has an out-of-state certification pathway, so the “necessity” case for creating an interstate regulator needs to be proven, not assumed.

4.3 Moral & Cultural Climate

Not directly a life/family-policy bill, but it does affect who gets credentialed into Missouri’s schools under a multi-state framework—meaning **Missouri voters and parents have less practical leverage** than they do under purely Missouri-controlled licensing rules.

PART 5 — CORE PRINCIPLES CHECK (AFMO)

- **Sanctity of life:** Not directly implicated.
- **Limited government: Violates** — creates/joins a new interstate bureaucracy with rulemaking and enforcement.
- **Property rights & economic liberty: Concern** — assessments/fees + GR costs without strong caps.
- **Constitutionalism & rule of law: Concern/Violates** — binding rules made outside Missouri’s legislative process.
- **State sovereignty & Tenth Amendment: Violates** — interstate commission rules and enforcement mechanisms constrain Missouri’s independent control.
- **Surveillance/data control: Concern** — formalizes interstate data exchange for teacher investigation/discipline files.

PART 6 — SPECIAL TOPIC TEST

Compact / Globalism-adjacent governance pattern)

This compact is part of the broader **CSG interstate compact** ecosystem, designed to standardize licensure portability across states and is promoted as a multi-state solution to workforce mobility. Even when intentions are good, the structure predictably shifts policymaking from Missouri voters to an interstate body.

PART 7 — RED FLAGS, AMENDMENT IDEAS, FINAL RECOMMENDATION

7.1 Red-Flag List (Prioritized)

1. **Binding interstate rulemaking (“force of law”)**
 - **Location:** §168.046.7(3)(f); §168.046.8
 - **Why it matters:** Missouri laws should be made by Missouri’s elected legislature, not an interstate commission.
 - **Severity: Critical**
2. **Commission can levy assessments/fees + accept donations; budget grows outside MO control**
 - **Location:** §168.046.7(3)(m) & §168.046.7(2)(g) financing provisions
 - **Why it matters:** Creates a standing mechanism for ongoing costs and influence pathways.
 - **Severity: Serious**
3. **Enforcement/litigation machinery aimed at member states**
 - **Location:** §168.046.10
 - **Why it matters:** Builds a legal structure to pressure Missouri into compliance, including court actions and fee shifting.
 - **Severity: Serious**
4. **Emergency rules with short notice**
 - **Location:** §168.046.8(5)
 - **Why it matters:** Accelerates mission creep and reduces transparency.
 - **Severity: Serious**
5. **Guaranteed GR cost + ongoing IT/administrative burden**
 - **Location:** Fiscal Note (DESE/OA-ITSD)
 - **Why it matters:** Real taxpayer cost for a program that may duplicate existing pathways.
 - **Severity: Moderate**

7.2 Possible Fixes / Amendments

This is **structural**, not a “small tweak” bill. If lawmakers want a clean solution, it is to **improve Missouri’s own reciprocity/processing timelines** without joining an interstate regulator.

7.3 Final Recommendation

Act for Missouri OPPOSES HB 2274. While “teacher mobility” sounds harmless, the bill’s real effect is to bind Missouri to a **multi-state commission** with **rulemaking power that carries the force of law**, plus assessments, enforcement, and mission-creep risk—alongside guaranteed General Revenue costs. This is an unnecessary surrender of governance when Missouri can address licensing efficiency under Missouri law.