



Economic Impact Analysis Virginia Department of Planning and Budget

8 VAC 20-21– Licensure Regulations for School Personnel Department of Education April 11, 2000

The Department of Planning and Budget (DPB) has analyzed the economic impact of this proposed regulation in accordance with Section 9-6.14:7.1.G of the Administrative Process Act and Executive Order Number 25 (98). Section 9-6.14:7.1.G requires that such economic impact analyses include, but need not be limited to, the projected number of businesses or other entities to whom the regulation would apply, the identity of any localities and types of businesses or other entities particularly affected, the projected number of persons and employment positions to be affected, the projected costs to affected businesses or entities to implement or comply with the regulation, and the impact on the use and value of private property. The analysis presented below represents DPB's best estimate of these economic impacts.

Summary of the Proposed Regulation

The current Licensure Regulations for School Personnel include a provisional license that provide potential teachers an alternative route (versus the traditional route) to licensure. The Board of Education (board) proposes to add an additional route for teacher licensure. Through this proposed route, qualified military personnel would be able to obtain an eligibility license as an entry into the teaching profession.

Estimated Economic Impact

Differences between Routes to Teacher Licensure

In the traditional route to teacher certification in Virginia, the candidate completes a state-approved teacher preparation program, which includes professional studies and student teaching. The candidate also takes courses necessary for endorsement in specific content areas (for example, math courses for an endorsement to teach mathematics). Additionally, the

candidate is required to pass¹ the PRAXIS I (basic skills: reading, writing, and mathematics) and PRAXIS II (subject area) exams, the national standardized qualifying exams for teachers. The Department of Education (department) will grant a collegiate professional license to candidates that meet these requirements and earn a bachelor's degree.

Table 1: Differences between Routes to Teacher Licensure

	Standard Route	Current Alternative	Career Change
First License	Collegiate Professional	Provisional	Eligibility
When Obtained	Before employment	After employment	Before employment
Duration	5 years	3 years	1 year
Student Teaching	Required	One year of successful, full-time experience in lieu of student teaching	Summer field experience and one year of successful, full-time experience in lieu of student teaching
Professional Studies	Completion of a state-approved teacher preparation program	15 credits (for secondary) or 18 (for elementary) during 3 year license period	Intensive 9 credit-equivalent before employment
PRAXIS I and II	Pass before employment	Pass after employment	Pass before employment
Requirements for Endorsement in a Content Area	Course work	Course work	Course work, but can use work experience to meet elements of the course content requirements

Currently, individuals may enter the teaching profession via an alternative route (see Table 1 for a summary of the differences between routes to licensure). A person can obtain a provisional license to teach if she possesses a bachelor's degree, has completed the subject-specific coursework necessary for endorsement in a content area, and gains employment with a Virginia school division. The provisional license lasts for three years and is not renewable. In order to be granted a collegiate professional license, the individual must accomplish the following by the end of the three-year period: pass PRAXIS I and II; complete 15 credits of professional studies if teaching at the secondary level, or 18 credits if teaching at the elementary

¹ The board specifies which scores must be met or exceeded in order to qualify for a state teaching license.

level; and be judged to have demonstrated at least one year of successful, full-time teaching experience by the school division. The school division is required to provide a fully licensed experienced teacher in the school building to assist the provisionally licensed teacher.

The board proposes, as a pilot program, to permit military personnel leaving their employment in the military to enter the teaching profession through an alternative, somewhat accelerated licensing process. Retiring military personnel can obtain an eligibility license to teach if the following requirements are satisfied: a bachelor's degree, completion of teaching area requirements in an endorsement area, passing scores on PRAXIS I and II, and completion of an intensive professional studies program which includes field experience with summer school students. Unlike the provisional license, individuals can earn the eligibility license prior to employment with a school division. The eligibility license lasts one year. In order to be granted a collegiate professional license, the individual must be judged by a school division to have demonstrated at least one year of successful, full-time teaching. School divisions are required to provide a trained mentor for each teacher with an eligibility license.

Teacher's Perspective

From the prospective teacher's perspective, the proposed new licensing process has several advantages. First, the professional studies requirement appears to be considerably less burdensome than under either the current alternative route or the traditional route. The candidate would complete a three-week intensive course on professional studies, as compared to coursework usually lasting significantly longer under the traditional route, or 15 to 18 credits (about 5 or 6 classes) under the current alternative. Second, candidates can use work experience to meet elements of the course content requirements for endorsement in a content area. Third, the prospective teacher can obtain a license without first obtaining a position with a school division. According to the department, school divisions often do not consider job candidates who are not already licensed. This can create a barrier for individuals seeking to enter the profession via the current alternative route. Thus, the new process may make it easier for non-traditional teaching candidates to obtain teaching positions. Fourth, the student teaching requirement for individuals following the new route is limited to some summer field experience, considerably less time than in the traditional route. Instead, the licensee is assigned a mentor to confer with during her time teaching under the eligibility license. This will allow the candidate

to become employed as a teacher significantly sooner than she would be able to under the traditional route.

Finally, the monetary cost to the candidate may be less under the new process than under either the traditional route or the current alternative. This is clearly the case for the proposed pilot program which will be conducted by the department during the summers of 2000 and 2001. Under the pilot program, military personnel will receive three intensive weeks of professional studies education at no cost (to the candidate). Additionally, the department will reimburse PRAXIS I and II test fees. Individuals using the traditional and current alternative routes must pay for their professional studies education and PRAXIS I and II test fees. The department will also give school divisions \$2,000 for mentoring per eligibility-licensed teacher employed. This may make candidates going through the proposed route more attractive to school divisions, holding other attributes constant, than candidates following the current alternative route, since under the current alternative school divisions receive no funding for mentoring or assistance from a fully-licensed experienced teacher.

The department's payment for the professional studies education, PRAXIS I and II test fees, and \$2,000 contribution toward mentoring costs are proposed for the pilot program. The board is not specifying the funding source for the new process beyond the pilot. But even if the candidate is required to contribute to the funding of her training, the cost will still likely be somewhat less than under the current alternative route since the intensive professional studies program lasts only three weeks and is equivalent to only 9 credits,² versus 15 to 18 credits for the current alternative route.

From the prospective teacher's perspective, the new licensing process also has some disadvantages. Unlike the current alternative route, candidates must pass PRAXIS I and II and complete professional studies requirements prior to licensure and employment. Also, the eligibility license lasts only one year, versus three years for the provisional license. If the school division believes the individual has the potential to be a good teacher, but has yet to demonstrate the necessary skills to advance on to the collegiate professional license, then the eligibility license may be renewed for one year. Thus, the candidate has only one or two years in which to

² Source: Department of Education

demonstrate one year of successful, full-time teaching versus three years under the current alternative.

Overall, the proposed addition of the eligibility license and the accelerated route to licensure is a positive development for military personnel considering entry into teaching. The advantages of the new route will likely outweigh the disadvantages for at least some military personnel; and the current alternative route remains open for those individuals that find that route preferable.

Commonwealth's Perspective

For the citizens of Virginia, the proposed new route to licensure has several advantages. If the proposed route encourages individuals who would not have otherwise to enter the teaching profession, then it increases the pool of prospective teachers from which local school districts may hire. The department has indicated that there are widespread and persistent teacher shortages in Virginia, and that the shortages are projected to increase over the next decade. An increased pool of qualified teachers would help reduce the current and projected shortage. Also, the candidate needs to show sufficient teaching competence within one (or possibly two) years, rather than the three in the current alternative. If the candidate lacks the ability to be a successful teacher, then she may stop teaching sooner under the new route versus the current alternative route. Additionally, the candidate demonstrates knowledge in relevant subject areas prior to teaching via passing PRAXIS I and II prior to teaching. Teachers with provisional licenses can teach up to three years without passing these exams. If some individuals who would have otherwise followed the current alternative route choose the proposed new route, then these individuals will need to acquire sufficient knowledge to pass the PRAXIS exams prior to teaching. Therefore, students with teachers entering by the new route may be more likely to have a new teacher with greater knowledge in the subject than they would otherwise.

For the citizens of Virginia, the proposed new licensing process to licensure also has some disadvantages. This route does involve the highest cost to taxpayers among the alternative licensing routes. The department estimates that the cost of the pilot program will be \$5,000 to \$6,500 per candidate. With 100 participants in the program this year and another 100 next year, that is \$500,000 to \$650,000 for each year. It has not been determined who will pay the costs

once the pilot program is over and the department begins to approve professional studies training programs for eligibility licenses run by colleges, training schools, etc. The costs could be borne by the Commonwealth, localities, teaching candidates themselves, or some combination of those entities.

Also, individuals following the new licensing process will have fewer hours of professional studies education and will not be required to have student teaching experience. The 1996 National Commission on Teaching and America's Future report, "What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future," emphasizes the importance of pedagogy training and that all teachers should graduate from an accredited school of education. However, research exists that indicates that students with teachers who have not had the additional hours of professional studies and student teaching experience perform no worse than students who have traditionally certified teachers. Barnes, Salmon, and Wale (1989), Goebel, Romacher, and Sanchez (1989), and Miller, McKenna, and McKenna (1996) all find that students of alternative route teachers do at least well as pupils of traditionally licensed teachers. In a careful study that uses the *National Educational Longitudinal Study of 1988* (NELS) data set, Goldhaber and Brewer (2000) find that math and science students who have teachers with emergency credentials do no worse than students whose teachers have standard teaching credentials. Goldhaber and Brewer also find that science students who have a teacher with a BA in education perform no better than students whose teacher does not have an education degree; and having a teacher with a BA in education actually has a statistically significant negative impact on students' math scores.

Conclusion

Increasing the pool of qualified teachers from which school divisions may hire is beneficial in that it will help fill vacancies and may allow school divisions to be more selective in their hiring. Although there is not a complete consensus concerning the quality of teaching by alternatively certified teachers versus traditionally certified teachers, existing research implies that students with alternatively certified teachers perform at least as well as students with traditionally certified teachers, particularly in subjects with the most severe teaching shortages (math and science). It is unclear, though, how much the addition of the new process will add to the pool of qualified teachers. Some individuals who will choose the new process would likely

have followed the current alternative route if the former route were not available, and thus will not be truly adding to the pool of qualified teachers. Also, the proposed regulation amendment restricts participation to military personnel. This restriction will likely keep addition to the pool of qualified teachers modest in number.³ According to the department, in 2001 the board will propose expanding eligibility for the career switcher route to individuals outside of the military. Deleting the military requirement has the potential to significantly add to the pool of qualified teachers. Since there is no compelling reason to limit participation to military personnel, the elimination of this restriction is advisable.

As stated earlier, the department estimates that the cost of running the pilot program will be \$5,000 to \$6,500 per candidate. The department believes that the cost of the new licensing process per candidate will decrease as the program is more established and economies of scale are utilized. The board has not determined who will pay the costs once the pilot program is over and the department begins to approve professional studies training programs for eligibility licenses run by colleges, training schools, etc. If all the costs are borne by the candidate, then the proposed career switcher route would appear to produce a net economic benefit. By choosing to follow the career switcher route, the candidate demonstrates that she believes the benefits outweigh the costs for her, and thus the benefits outweigh the costs in aggregate (she bears all the costs). The participation of individuals in the new program will likely be less without any public subsidy, than with some public subsidy. Thus, the total benefit is limited when the candidate bears all the cost.

Subsidizing some or all of the costs will likely increase the participation rate in the new licensing process. Determining whether increasing the subsidy adds to net economic benefit depends on how much the subsidy improves student performance. Increasing the subsidy could potentially improve student performance by adding to participation in the new program (more qualified candidates to hire could fill more positions and reduce class size), and improving the quality of teachers that are hired (larger pool for school divisions to choose from, and higher subsidy may entice better potential teachers to enter the profession). Even if an accurate estimate of how much student performance would improve given a specific subsidy increase existed,

³ “Military personnel” is not defined in the proposed regulation. Thus, the degree of restrictiveness of this restriction is not clear.

determining whether that level of improved student performance was worth the given subsidy cost to the public would depend upon how much the public valued improved student performance. An accurate estimate of how much a subsidy would increase the pool of qualified teaching candidates and by how much that would improve student performance does not exist. Thus, it cannot be determined what the ideal subsidy, if any, would be for participants in the new program.

According to the results of a department survey of Virginia school divisions, shortages of science and mathematics teachers are much more severe than in other non-special education areas. The proposed regulation does not allow for focusing subsidization funds on specific teaching areas. If public funds are to be used to subsidize the participation in the new program, perhaps state funds would be most effectively used to alleviate teacher shortages by focusing proportionally more of the subsidies into the specific teaching fields where the shortages are greatest. The potential effectiveness of these subsidies on recruiting new teachers across different fields should also be taken into consideration. Since potential participants qualified to teach science or math may on average earn more in their current career than potential participants qualified to teach in other areas, the same dollar amount of subsidy may be less effective in inducing these individuals into the teaching profession than those individuals with less lucrative careers.

Businesses and Entities Affected

The proposed changes to the regulation will affect the 132 school divisions, as well as potential teachers and potential providers of the proposed intensive professional studies programs.

Localities Particularly Affected

The proposed changes to the regulation affect localities throughout the Commonwealth.

Projected Impact on Employment

The proposed changes to this regulation may increase the number of teacher positions that are filled in the Commonwealth. The proposed alternative may also increase employment with potential providers of the proposed intensive professional studies programs.

Effects on the Use and Value of Private Property

The proposed program may produce additional demand for professional studies training from private colleges and contractors. The potential additional demand could increase the value of these private entities.

References:

Barnes, Susan, James Salmon, and William Wale (1989), "Alternative Teacher Certification in Texas," Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, March. ERIC Document No. 307316.

Goebel, Stephen D., Karl Romacher, and Kathryn S. Sanchez (1989), *An Evaluation of HISD's Alternative Certification Program of the Academic Year: 1988-1989*. Houston: Houston Independent School District Department of Research and Evaluation. ERIC Document No. 322103.

Goldhaber, Dan D. and Dominic J. Brewer (2000), "Does Teacher Certification Matter? High School Teacher Certification Status and Student Achievement," forthcoming in *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*.

Miller, John W., Michael C. McKenna, and Beverly A. McKenna (1996), "A Comparison of Alternatively and Traditionally Prepared Teachers," *Journal of Teacher Education*, 49(3): 165-176.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996), *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future*. New York: Author.