



May 2008

Teachers on the Move: A Look at Teacher Interstate Mobility Policy and Practice

Funded through a grant from the United States Department of Education.

Partner Organizations



Teachers on the Move: A Look at Teacher Interstate Mobility Policy and Practice

May 2008

**Jane G. Coggshall, Ph.D.
Susan K. Sexton
*Learning Point Associates***

Acknowledgments

Teachers on the Move was inspired by the collective thoughts of a group that comprises the membership and leadership ranks of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC), including Peter Donovan, Roy Einreinhofer, Rick Eiserman, and Martha Gage. A large and special thank you to Virginia Pilato for her ongoing leadership and endless brilliance—this project sprouted from her commitment to learning more about the facilitators and barriers associated with teacher interstate mobility and her desire to develop policy-level strategies and solutions to ensure each and every student is taught by a high-quality teacher.

The Learning Point Associates research team is indebted to Michelle Dunkle, Michael Long, Edith Stevens, and the rest of the management team for their unwavering advice, support, and guidance.

The research team also would like to thank the many individuals and teams from the state departments of education who assisted us with policy verification and data-collection efforts. Kudos to the education data teams in the District of Columbia, Georgia, Florida, New Hampshire, Kansas, Maryland, Missouri, Montana, South Carolina, and South Dakota for their perseverance and dedication—we could not have done this without them.

We greatly appreciate the gracious assistance of the dedicated individuals of the Troops-to-Teachers program, in particular, John Gantz, Stacy Ross, Kathy Shumack, Peter Peters, Melissa Vivar, and the state directors who enthusiastically participated in the focus group. We also thank the members of the American Association for Employment in Education who lent their time and expertise.

In addition, we would like to acknowledge and thank each and every teacher who invested time in completing our online surveys and shared with us their experiences with the interstate mobility process. Your candor will be rewarded as states reevaluate teacher interstate mobility policies and, it is hoped, smooth the transition for those attempting to transfer their credentials in the future.

Throughout this project, a group of smart, dedicated, and practical professionals from states and school districts across the country have provided ongoing support and guidance as members of the National Advisory Council. Their individual and collective good thinking never ceases to amaze us.

The research team is indebted to Michael Allen, Ph.D.; Dan Bucko; Larry Friedman, Ph.D.; Chris Funkhouser; Amy Potemski; Trisha Hinojosa, Ph.D.; Sabrina Laine, Ph.D.; Kenneth Smith; Andrew Swanlund; and Michelle Thruman, Ph.D., for their invaluable input and assistance on this project.

Finally, Learning Point Associates, in partnership with NASDTEC, acknowledges the generous support for this project from a U.S. Department of Education Troops-to-Teachers grant awarded to the Maryland Department of Education.

Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	1
Realities and Roadblocks to Teacher Interstate Mobility	5
Teacher Interstate Mobility Yesterday and Today.....	7
Teacher Distribution	8
Licensure Reciprocity	9
Employment Issues Affecting Interstate Mobility	10
Highly Qualified Teacher Requirements	11
Summing Up the Research.....	12
Findings.....	14
How many and what kinds of teachers are on the move?.....	14
What do teachers on the move say about their mobility experiences?	17
How do certification policies vary from state to state?.....	24
Which policies have the potential to support interstate mobility?	26
Discussion	31
Next Steps for Understanding the Issues	34
Issues for Further Study	34
Promoting Future Dialogue.....	36
References.....	37
Appendixes	
Appendix A. Project Design	41
Appendix B. State Extant Teacher Data Tables.....	43

Executive Summary

State certification and licensure policies ensure that teachers meet the state's standards of quality, having shown that teachers are of good character and have received recent and relevant training. The requirements for certification vary across states, as each state has different standards, governance structures, certification histories, and labor market dynamics. Sometimes the differences between state requirements are subtle, but oftentimes they are not (in the case of special education, early childhood, and middle school teachers, for example). If a teacher wishes to move to another state, or if a state wishes to recruit a teacher from another state, these teachers on the move must navigate a welter of state policies and practices, often having to take new certification exams and complete additional coursework at their own expense. In addition to navigating certification requirements, teachers moving across state lines sometimes lose pension and retirement benefits, or they may have to accept pay on a lower step of the salary scale.

As the dew dries on the dawn of the 21st century, this mosaic has become increasingly troublesome—for both teachers and the states that need them—for two primary reasons: (1) the federal government has raised the stakes for states to ensure that *all* of their teachers—even those coming from out of state—hold full in-state certification rather than resort to emergency certification, and (2) the rise of alternative routes to certification and other nontraditional preparation configurations has led to the development of yet more regulations concerning teacher certification—regulations that often differ from state to state and cause even greater ambiguity. The increasing use of the Internet to search for both jobs and candidates has further made supporting interstate mobility a necessity, especially for school leaders who want to cast as wide a net as possible for the best candidates, and for teachers who need or want to move for any number of personal and economic reasons.

Ten percent of all teachers and 12 percent of alternate-route teachers report “employment mobility” among their top three reasons for becoming a teacher (Feistritzer, 2005), but the public perception regarding the reciprocity of teacher licensure across state lines is often misguided. The common definition of the word *reciprocity* is the mutual exchange of privileges. However, in the context of teacher licensure, true reciprocity rarely exists. Although most states have articulated policies related to reviewing the credentials of teachers prepared out of state through the NASDTEC Interstate Agreement, it is unusual for one state to accept unconditionally a teacher with a license from another. Moreover, although State A may accept State B's certificate, State B might not accept a teacher certified in State A. With very few exceptions, each state has additional requirements that teachers must fulfill either at the time of licensure or within the license renewal cycle when moving to a new state.

Inefficiencies in teacher interstate mobility are detrimental for a number of reasons. The first is that while some states produce more teachers than they can employ, administrators in other states must routinely look across state lines for qualified teachers. The data provide a strong indication that teacher labor markets vary state to state, with some states importing more than 40 percent of the teachers to whom they grant initial licenses, so

states with shortages of teachers prepared in-state are likely to be more motivated to support teacher interstate mobility by lowering barriers to in-migration. Easing interstate mobility, particularly in these states, would theoretically redress some of the imbalances among states.

Second, although many teachers end up teaching near their hometown, in this increasingly mobile society, many tens of thousands move with their families across state lines and seek teaching positions. Barriers to interstate mobility engender a great deal of frustration among teachers who need or want to move, particularly when the new state does not seem to recognize their hard-earned knowledge, skills, and experience. As a result of this frustration, untold numbers of teachers opt to leave the profession when they leave their home state.

In examining the barriers to interstate teacher mobility, it has become evident that there are both purposeful and artificial barriers to teacher migration. Purposeful barriers are those that states erect to ensure the quality of incoming teachers prepared and certified in other states. These are necessary for quality control of the state's teaching workforce. Artificial barriers are those that may be unintended artifacts of the purposeful barriers.

Concerned about the artificial barriers to interstate mobility and the potential for unneeded attrition from the teaching profession due to the various state teacher certification and licensure laws, the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) with support from the Maryland State Department of Education through a grant from the U.S. Department of Education and the Troops-to-Teachers program hired an independent education research and consulting firm, Learning Point Associates, to investigate further. This report—based on an exploratory empirical study of state certification and licensure policies, 10 states' employment databases, a survey of teachers with interstate mobility experience, and focus groups of American Association for Employment in Education members and Troops-to-Teachers state directors—focuses on the certification and licensure aspect of the facilitators and barriers to teacher interstate mobility. It also includes an exploration of the unique mobility experiences of participants in the Troops-to-Teachers program.

With this report, NASDTEC takes the pulse on this important issue and points the way toward better understanding of the impact of policies and practices that allow teachers as professionals to choose where they want to live and work, and for states to fill all their classrooms with highly skilled, qualified, knowledgeable teachers.

Without debate, each state is committed to certifying high-quality teachers so that all students are taught by the best teachers available. State sovereignty laws permit individual states to develop and administer teacher licensure policies that fit the unique needs of the state. Yet, states are increasingly aware of the need to develop licensure policies that complement those of other states to ensure teachers are able to practice their profession in their chosen locale, no matter where they were trained or in which state(s) they previously taught. To that end, data collected for this study provide evidence that

suggests certain state licensure policies might ameliorate artificial barriers and promote fluid teacher interstate mobility. Such policies may include the following:

- ▶ Growth of temporary certification programs for out-of-state teachers.
- ▶ Test and coursework exemptions.
- ▶ Increased use of communication vehicles such as websites to make requirements for out-of-state teachers clear and explicit.
- ▶ Regionally recognized credentials such as the Meritorious New Teacher Candidate designation.
- ▶ Recognition of accomplished teaching such as National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification.
- ▶ Expanded teacher reciprocity agreements.

Unfortunately, at this time, states do not have the necessary data systems to determine which certification practices are indeed most effective. Nevertheless, the above-listed practices show promise for easing mobility, and upon thoughtful implementation, should continue to support each state's focus on a high-quality teacher corps.

In order to engage in meaningful workforce planning and to balance the imbalances of highly qualified teachers among states, those who govern licensure policy need to better understand the interstate mobility of their teacher corps. Thus, states must consider investing significantly in their state teacher data system and be sure to include data elements that would allow them to track the interstate movement of their most valuable asset: classroom teachers.

The analysis described in this report indicates that states have much common ground in their policies toward teacher licensure and reciprocity, yet differences remain. Motivated state directors of teacher education and certification must address these obstacles while maintaining high levels of quality. Continuing widespread teacher shortages in certain fields and the dim prospects that these shortages will disappear anytime soon provide a clear impetus for change. Based on the findings of this study, the need to build better infrastructure—including better data systems and communication channels—is clear. The challenges of the 21st century demand that the problems of interstate teacher mobility be addressed.

Realities and Roadblocks to Teacher Interstate Mobility

Throughout the better part of the 20th century, each state worked to establish a comprehensive teacher certification and licensure system. These systems were designed to ensure that America's public schools are staffed with qualified individuals according to each state's own standards and needs. State governing officials have written reams of legislation outlining what courses teachers must take, tests they must pass, and background checks they must clear in order to be eligible for employment in the state. Moreover, most states have instituted more than two dozen types of certificates, each with different levels, each with different requirements.

Although there have been efforts through the years to align these systems to one another, from a national perspective, they have generally resulted in a multicolored mosaic of state-specific certification policies and practices. This mosaic has often served to impede the movement of teachers across state lines—in many cases unnecessarily and unfortunately driving teachers to distraction, or worse, to other professions. States whose own programs of teacher preparation do not produce enough teachers to staff all of their classrooms are particularly concerned with such impediments to mobility.

As the dew dries on the dawn of the 21st century, this mosaic has become increasingly troublesome—for both teachers and the states that need them—for two primary reasons: (1) the federal government has raised the stakes for states to ensure that *all* of their teachers—even those coming from out of state—hold full in-state certification rather than resort to emergency certification, and (2) the rise of alternative routes to certification and other nontraditional preparation configurations has led to the development of yet more regulations concerning teacher certification—regulations that often differ from state to state and cause even greater ambiguity. The increasing use of the Internet to search for both jobs and candidates has further made supporting interstate mobility a necessity, especially for school leaders who want to cast as wide a net as possible for the best candidates, and for teachers who need or want to move for any number of personal and economic reasons.

The resulting jumble of policies and practices has led to the frustration of certification specialists, the schools that need teachers, and teachers themselves.¹ Reciprocity agreements attempt to support interstate mobility by ensuring that teachers certified in one state are eligible for certification in another, yet anecdotal stories among teachers about bureaucratic hurdles abound, and there is some evidence that many teachers choose to drop out of the profession altogether in the face of such hurdles. For example, *Teacher Attrition and Mobility: Results from the 2004–05 Teacher Follow-up Survey*, a National

¹ Teacher licensure policies and practices, of course, are not the only factors influencing the ease of teacher interstate mobility. Pension portability, salary, and working conditions also have a large influence. These are not specifically interrogated in this report. Where they arose in the data collection, we did mention them.

Center for Education Statistics (NCES) publication, indicated that of the 8 percent of all public school teachers who left teaching the year before, more than one in ten reported they left because they “changed residence” (Marvel, Lyter, Peltola, Strizek, Morton, & Rowland, 2007). Although it is uncertain whether this new residence was in another state, it still raises the question, why would a mere change in residence cause more than 30,000 teachers to stop being teachers? In just one year? Were there insurmountable barriers to teacher mobility, or did those teachers simply not meet their new state’s requirements? These questions are especially pertinent because, as another survey indicated, 10 percent of all teachers (and 12 percent of alternate-route teachers) said that “employment mobility” was among the top three reasons they became teachers in the first place (Feistritz, 2005).

Unfortunately, the empirical research needed to answer these questions is scant. This report, based on an exploratory study of state certification policies and extant state teacher data as well as a survey of teachers’ perceptions of their experiences of mobility and a case study of participants in the Troops-to-Teachers program (see Appendix A for a brief description of the full methods), aims not only to fill in some of the gaps in knowledge about this topic but also to “add meat to the bones” of a conversation that has been occurring in state departments of education and professional standards boards for decades and has yet to rise to the level of intensity that would begin to redress the problems of interstate teacher mobility. The purpose of this report is not to prove that certain policies and practices work better than others, or to show that certain barriers that states have erected (inadvertently or otherwise) are causing teachers to change professions or move to different states. Nor is the purpose to “rank-order” states in terms of the ease with which teachers may be recruited from other states and become certified in their new states. Indeed, the data available on the issue of teacher interstate mobility are simply not adequate to make such determinations.

Information on the mobility of Troops-to-Teachers participants is presented throughout this report. This population of teachers has particular concerns about interstate mobility as they are very often prepared in a state or even country different from where they wish to be certified and teach. Thousands of vacancies in high-needs schools across the country have been filled by Troops-to-Teachers participants. Thus, their interstate mobility concerns are highlighted in this report.

With this report, the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) takes the pulse on this important issue and points the way toward better understanding the impact of policies and practices that allow teachers as professionals to choose where they want to live and work, and for states to fill all their classrooms with highly skilled, qualified, knowledgeable teachers. Based on the findings of this study, the need to build better infrastructure—including better data systems and communication channels—is clear. The challenges of the 21st century demand that the problems of interstate teacher mobility be addressed.

Teacher Interstate Mobility Yesterday and Today

In 1942, a doctoral student at Columbia Teachers College named William Stratford conducted a study similar to the policy analysis conducted for this study. Of teacher interstate mobility, he wrote:

Specifically, a legally certificated teacher in one state is often unable to meet the corresponding requirements of another, either technically or actually. The result is a welter of restrictions and interference with the free interstate movement of teachers. Of the magnitude, quality, incidence or effects of such restrictions, no one can claim to have even approximate knowledge. Still less is known with respect to the significance for public welfare or the teaching profession. (Stratford, 1942, p. 1)

Alas, this state of affairs and knowledge has not changed much in the intervening decades. An extensive search of more recent literature on teacher mobility specifically, and the teaching profession broadly, uncovered *no* empirical research conducted within the last half century that directly investigated the movement of teachers between states. Most studies of teacher mobility investigate intrastate mobility, that is, teacher movement between schools within districts, as well as between districts within states (Ingersoll, 1997; Ingersoll, 2001; Ingersoll, 2004; Marvel et al., 2007; Murnane, 1981; Plecki & Elfers, 2007).

Holen (1965) defines *interstate mobility* as “the ability of a person duly trained and qualified in his profession to become licensed and to practice in a state of his choice” (p. 492). Anecdotal stories of the difficulties teachers face as they attempt to become licensed and therefore eligible for employment in another state abound—even in places where vacancies go unfilled with otherwise well-qualified teachers (Koepke, 1990; Mihalik, 1990; Sindelar, Bishop, Gill, Connelly, & Rosenberg, 2003). The literature that examines the problems of interstate mobility and licensure reciprocity is composed primarily of analyses of policy (e.g., Curran, Abrahams, & Clarke, 2001; Islas, 2001; Sindelar et al., 2003). Because much of these analyses is not based on empirical evidence of the actual movement of teachers across state lines, the solutions offered based on these analyses are limited.

Stratford’s (1942) study provides some historical context, which helps put into perspective the barriers to teacher interstate mobility today. For example, he noted that in 1898, only three states issued teacher certificates. In the other states, the certification of teachers was controlled by a county board of examiners, a superintendent, or a local board of education. In some, the local municipality controlled both the certification and employment of teachers. And in others, teacher certification was handled by some combination of state and locality. For example, in 1906, Illinois, Maryland, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Wisconsin had county-based certification systems in which either the superintendent or county examining board created, administered, and scored their own incomparable certification exams. And, when granted, their certificates were not valid outside the county where issued, so teachers would have to take still more

exams if they were to move to another county. Criticism of this nonsystem and the quality of the local teacher examinations mounted, so between 1900 and 1938, some 41 states obtained centralized control over teacher certification. This centralization tended to reduce restrictions on the intrastate mobility of teachers but left teachers moving between states needing to fulfill different requirements (Stratford, 1942).

Today, all 50 states and the District of Columbia certify their teachers, and there are many similarities and differences in requirements for licensure among them. The differences in licensure requirements and the lack of licensure reciprocity among states are commonly cited as barriers to the free movement of teachers across state lines (Curran, Abrahams, & Clarke, 2001; Islas, 2001; Sindelar et al., 2003; Stinnet, 1967). These barriers to interstate mobility may exacerbate imbalances in the supply of qualified teachers from one state to the next as some states experience critical shortages of teachers while others prepare more teachers than they can employ.

Teacher Distribution

Unfortunately, these imbalances in the supply of teachers among states are neither well understood nor adequately studied. They are tangentially described in the U.S. Secretary of Education's annual reports to Congress on the implementation of Title II. Since 2002, these reports have presented data that indicates that some states "import" more than 40 percent of the teachers to whom they grant initial licenses. That is, of the total number of teachers to whom those states granted initial certification, more than 40 percent had received their preparation in another state, as reported by each state. For example, in the 2004–05 school year, 12 states fell into this category—Alaska, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Maryland, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, South Carolina, and Wyoming—while 17 states imported fewer than 20 percent of their new teachers, and four states fewer than 10 percent (U.S. Department of Education, 2005b).

These data suggest, but fall short of demonstrating clearly, that the state-approved teacher-preparation institutions in some states do not produce enough teachers to meet the in-state demand for teachers. The full nature and magnitude of these imbalances in state teacher supply remains unclear, however, because these percentages do not include experienced teachers who are granted second-tier certification or teachers who were prepared in state but moved to another state to work for a few years, only to return again to their home state. Moreover, these data do not show what types of teachers are coming from out of state as opposed to being produced in state (e.g., are they secondary science teachers, elementary teachers, reading specialists, or English as a second language teachers?); nor do they show how many teachers wanted to move across state lines but were unable to become certified in a new state. They also do not show the kinds of schools in which out-of-state teachers are more likely to be employed. Finally, these data are state reported and have not been independently verified.

Nevertheless, these data do provide a strong indication that teacher labor markets vary from state to state, and so states with shortages of teachers prepared in-state are likely to be more motivated to support teacher interstate mobility by lowering barriers to in-

migration. Easing interstate mobility would theoretically redress some of the imbalances among states. However, as Sindelar et al. (2003) argue, because some types of shortages, particularly of special education teachers, are national in scope, improving mobility would not have a dramatic impact on solving such geographic shortages—it would simply spread those shortages around. The authors do suggest that states with low barriers to entry have an advantage in filling teacher vacancies (quality notwithstanding) over others. However, that advantage would be diluted if other states followed suit.

A related and important problem is the lack of equitable distribution of highly qualified teachers within states. Schools with student bodies that are primarily minority or live in poverty are more likely to have teachers who are inexperienced, teaching out of field, or either uncertified or teaching with emergency certifications (Clotfelter, Ladd, Vigdor, & Wheeler, 2007; Haycock, 2004; Ingersoll, 2003). Although a few states educate more than enough teachers to fill their aggregate need, most states have to rely on teachers recruited from other states (or even foreign countries) to meet their demand, and districts in almost every state encounter difficulties hiring enough teachers for bilingual and special education, mathematics, the physical sciences, computer science, English as a second language, and foreign languages (American Association for Employment in Education, 2004).

Some argue that these within-state teacher distribution problems may be ameliorated if interstate mobility is better supported. Curran et al. (2001), for example, contend that increased licensure reciprocity would more efficiently allocate teachers to at-risk or hard-to-staff schools by helping “teachers move across states and allow them to direct their skills and expertise to communities where they are in greatest demand” (p. 15). Sindelar et al (2003) raise the important and as yet unresolved question of whether teachers currently in the “reserve pool” (i.e., those who have temporarily left the profession to perhaps raise a family or pursue another career, intending to teach again) would be encouraged by eased interstate mobility to return to work in an area of shortage. Unfortunately, as the authors say, the research reveals “little about the extent to which reserve pool returnees relocate to find work or the extent to which relocation involves moving from state to state” (p.17).

Despite the lingering questions that remain about the imbalances in the supply of teachers both between and within states, and the policies that will likely ease shortages where they exist, many states are interested in supporting interstate mobility through increased licensure reciprocity. The following section briefly examines some licensure reciprocity agreements.

Licensure Reciprocity

The common definition of the word *reciprocity* is the mutual exchange of privileges. However, in the context of teacher licensure, true reciprocity does not exist. Although most states have articulated policies related to reviewing the credentials of teachers prepared out of state through the NASDTEC Interstate Agreement, it is unusual for one state to accept unconditionally a teacher with a license from another. Moreover, although

State A may accept State B's certificate, State B might not accept a teacher certified in State A. With very few exceptions, each state has additional requirements that teachers must fulfill either at the time of licensure or within the license renewal cycle when moving to a new state.

License reciprocity agreements are a moving target. Teacher licensure reciprocity was first tried in the early 1890s with an "exchange-of-certificate" plan developed by the New York State Education Department. By 1921, a total of 38 states had embraced the plan (Stratford, 1942). However, by the 1940s, it had fallen out of favor. Other regional agreements were struck, but few remain. Taking a relatively contemporary example, the Northeast Common Market, composed of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont, was established in 1988, creating a regional credential called the Northeast Regional Credential (NRC), which allowed teachers who gained a credential in any of the participating states to teach in any of the other states for two years before meeting the new state's requirements (Sommerfield, 1992). It was ended in June 2006 after more than 4,000 teachers took advantage of the program. According to the website of the program facilitators, "With changes and refinements in state standards and the specific requirements of NCLB for Highly Qualified Teachers, the participating states agreed to sunset the NRC program as of June 30, 2006. Current holders of valid NRCs may still use them until expiration" (WestEd, 2006).

The largest and longest lived interstate mobility agreement is the NASDTEC Interstate Agreement. It articulates states' policies related to review of out-of-state credentials of candidates applying for in-state certification, and it is renewed every five years (Mackey, McHenry, & Einreinhofer, 2003). Currently, 47 states and the District of Columbia each agree to some but not all tenets of the agreement.

Despite these efforts at licensure reciprocity, a mosaic of certification policies and practices across the states remains. Teachers duly certified in one state still need to be issued an in-state certification in their new (or receiving) state in order to be eligible for employment. Even if teachers from out of state are eligible in their new state, there are employment-related barriers to interstate mobility as well. This review of the research revealed that these employment-related barriers may present significant roadblocks to the free movement of teachers across state lines and thus may too exacerbate between-state inequities in teacher supply.

Employment Issues Affecting Interstate Mobility

In addition to the barriers posed by diverse certification and licensure systems, teachers on the move face any number of employment barriers to finding a desirable position. These include salary and cost-of-living differentials between states and rigid salary scales that do not recognize out-of-state teaching experience (Sindelar et al., 2003). Institutional arrangements that inhibit the hiring of teachers from other districts (much less states) such as post-and-fill seniority-based hiring (see Levin & Quinn, 2004) are another potentially powerful barrier to interstate mobility. The portability of pensions and other

retirement benefits also can restrict the ability of teachers to cross state lines (Sindelar et al., 2003).

Pension portability refers to whether a teacher can take retirement assets from one employer to another. In most defined-benefits plans (unlike defined-contribution plans), portability is restricted (Kimball, Heneman, & Kellor, 2003). Forty-seven states allow teachers to purchase credit for out-of-state teaching for years of nonvested service, although this is often prohibitively expensive and the types of assets that are affected are variable. Some federal tax changes have been made recently to ease pension portability through the rollover of certain types of annuities into individual retirement accounts, but it is usually the case that the decision to leave one employer, especially if vested, to go to an employer in another state may cost a teacher a significant amount of money. Veteran teachers who are often vested in retirement programs and have accrued high salary steps will be reluctant to switch districts, much less states, if they will lose their pensions or have to start lower on the salary scale. Retirement and pension plans are not uniform; states have distinctive systems in place that make transferring benefits difficult. The inability of teachers to maintain a certain level of earned benefits may keep them from moving to another state; thus, pension portability is a key consideration in easing teacher mobility. From another perspective, however, nonportable pensions may be in a state's best interest as it attempts to retain experienced teachers (Dorsey, 1995).

Highly Qualified Teacher Requirements

The highly qualified teacher provision of Title I of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act may also influence teacher interstate mobility because of how it affects employability across state lines. NCLB imposes the demand that teachers in all states be "highly qualified," meaning they must be fully licensed (as opposed to emergency credentialed) and they must adequately demonstrate knowledge of their teaching subject(s) (NCLB, 2002). States have responded to the law by ensuring that all teachers meet the criteria they set for adequate demonstration of content knowledge and that new teachers demonstrate this knowledge as a prerequisite for licensure. It would seem reasonable to assume that widespread compliance with the law would provide assurance to states that any teacher coming in from any other state has solid content knowledge. Unfortunately, for the ease of mobility, the reality is not so simple. In response to the law, states have developed a multiplicity of ways that teachers can demonstrate their content knowledge, and so the resulting *mélange* of requirements seems generally to have hindered interstate teacher mobility rather than promoted it. For example, the end of the Northeast Regional Credential program has been specifically attributed to the participating states' differing responses to the NCLB requirements (WestEd, 2006).

The fact that states are now accountable under NCLB for the adequate yearly progress of their schools means they may be more reluctant to take a chance on granting licensure to a teacher from a state with standards they perceive as lower than their own. Moreover, on the employment side, local school leaders and district human resources personnel tend to be reluctant to hire teachers who are not already highly qualified (Coggshall, 2006), further distorting the efficient allocation of teachers among and within states.

Summing Up the Research

Stratford (1942) reported that many of his contemporaries wished for the easing of restrictions on teacher interstate mobility. They thought that it would “avoid provincialism and inbreeding of ideas in local school systems” (p. 11), promote the raising of standards in the selection of teachers, and assist in the national dissemination of new educational ideas. Today, some argue for greater mobility in order to more efficiently allocate teachers to where they are needed; to give teachers, as professionals, the option of teaching and living where they like and where they may best apply their skills; and to improve the attractiveness of teaching as a lifelong career pursuit that may be practiced regardless of where a teacher’s spouse or family may need to be. Others might suggest that greater ease of interstate mobility will encourage a revolving door and simply spread teacher shortages around. With so little data existing in the current research base on teacher interstate mobility, the findings from the exploratory study described in this report will make a significant contribution to understanding teacher interstate mobility.

The Interstate Mobility of Troops-to-Teachers Program Participants

The Troops-to-Teachers program is a federal recruitment and incentive program created to help retired military personnel become teachers. Designed to ease teacher shortages in high-poverty schools, the program has been successful in recruiting thousands of teachers to high-needs schools. Troops-to-Teachers participants are spread throughout all 50 states and the District of Columbia. Most Troops-to-Teachers participants have interstate mobility concerns because they often received their training, and may be initially certified, in a state (or overseas post) other than the one in which they plan to teach. Therefore, they need to ensure ahead of time that their preparation and certification will be accepted by their destination state. Also, throughout the program's 14-year history, about 5 percent of Troops-to-Teachers participants have taught in a state different from the one in which they were initially hired (Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support [DANTES], 2006). Therefore, the barriers and facilitators that Troops-to-Teachers participants face as they attempt to cross state lines are of critical importance to both the participants and the continued viability of the program.

Unfortunately, the extant research provides little insight into the mobility of Troops-to-Teachers participants. While in the service, military personnel move frequently. They transfer from base to base, taking posts around the world. After they leave the service, however, less is known about their mobility. According to the U.S. Government Accountability Office's (GAO, 2006) analysis of DANTES (2006) data, the majority of Troops-to-Teachers participants were hired in one of seven states—Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Texas, and Virginia. The GAO study goes on to speculate that the presence and number of military bases in these locations affect the numbers of Troops-to-Teachers participants who move there. Analysis conducted for *Teachers on the Move* indicates that this is indeed the case. The average number of military personnel based in each state from 2003 to 2005—taken from the *Base Structure Report* published by the Department of Defense (Office of the Deputy Undersecretary of Defense, 2005)—is significantly related to the total number of Troops-to-Teachers participants employed in each state in the last five years ($R^2 = .42$, $p < .001$). Our focus group interview of state Troops-to-Teachers directors confirmed this finding as well—several participants indicated that the additional services these states offer veterans (such as military hospitals and commissaries) draw Troops-to-Teachers participants to particular states.

Findings

How many and what kinds of teachers are on the move?

As discussed earlier in this report, there has been no published research that specifically examines the movement of teachers across state lines, although an understanding of the magnitude of the number of teachers on the move can be pieced together from various places. For example, findings from the National Schools and Staffing Survey (NCES, 2006) showed that in the 2003–04 school year, 0.7 percent of U.S. teachers, or roughly 22,400 teachers, reported that they had worked in a public school in another state the previous year. And figures compiled from the 2007 Title II State Reports (available at <https://title2.ed.gov/default.asp>) show that in 30 states, more than one in five of the teachers to whom they granted initial certification in the 2005–06 school year had been prepared in another state. That figure rises to more than half in five states—South Carolina, North Carolina, Nevada, Maryland, and Alaska. States that produce the most teachers import far fewer teachers as a percentage of their initial certification grantees. Of those states that produced more than 10,000 new teachers in the 2005–06 school year, California imported the most out-of-state new teachers (13.5 percent) and Ohio the fewest (5.5 percent). The other large producer states include Florida (8.7 percent), Michigan (7.8 percent), New Jersey (12.8 percent), Pennsylvania (9.7 percent), Texas (12.1 percent), Georgia (9 percent), and New York (n/a).

Taken together, new teachers prepared in other states, in addition to those with experience teaching in other states, the number of teachers on the move is not insubstantial. Unfortunately, these statistics tell us nothing about who these teachers are, what they are certified to teach, what kinds of schools they move to, why they move, or how difficult they find the relocation.

The study described in this report was designed to independently analyze the extant teacher licensure and certification data from states across the United States to gain a more comprehensive picture of teachers on the move in the last five years (from the 2002–03 school year to the 2006–07 school year).

Researchers were able to gather extant teacher certification and employment data from 10 states in the four NASDTEC regions. Despite Herculean attempts by state agency personnel participating in the study to provide the researchers with access to useful data points, much of what was received was inconsistent among states and incomplete within states, making analysis difficult and any conclusions across states unreliable. Further, much of the data from these states was inconsistent and incomplete, so the picture of teachers on the move remains sketchy. Despite these limitations, certain data elements were available (see Table 1) and contributed to the review of teachers' movements across state lines. These data elements were not uniform across all 10 states; thus, few comparisons could be drawn.

Table 1. State Certification/Employment Data Elements to Determine Teacher Mobility

State	Unique Teacher ID	Data Elements Available to Define Teachers on the Move
District of Columbia	Legacy UID	Out-of-state license
Florida	SSN	Experience type: <i>N</i> for experience teaching in a nonpublic, out-of-state school or <i>P</i> for teachers with out-of-state public school experience
Georgia	SSN	State in which certification exam was taken
Kansas	SSN	Out-of-state recommending preparation program
Maryland	SSN	Preparation program state and previous experience state
Missouri	SSN	Years experience in a public school minus years experience in Missouri
Montana	UniqueID	College attended state (Montana has abbreviations for in-state colleges and FIPSE codes for out-of-state colleges.)
New Hampshire	UniqueID	In-state versus out-of-state
South Carolina	UniqueID	Out-of-state district codes within teacher experience table
South Dakota	SSN	Highest degree earned from an out-of-state institution of higher education (IHE)

Appendix B contains the findings from the analyses of the extant data from each of the 10 states using the variables listed in Table 1. These findings were verified by state-level personnel when possible. Because a fair amount of data was missing, incomplete, or unverifiable, few conclusions can confidently be drawn. However, in conjunction with the information gleaned from the Title II State Reports on initial certification, researchers were able to find answers to the questions that follow.

How many teachers newly employed in the state had come from out of state, and where are they from?

Over the last five years in Kansas, roughly 27 percent of all new hires were prepared in an out-of-state institution, *mainly* from nearby states (Missouri, Oklahoma, and Nevada). In Maryland, upwards of two thirds of new teachers were either trained or taught in another state, most of whom moved from Pennsylvania, New York, and Virginia. Montana has received teachers from nearby states such as North Dakota and Washington, but about one in ten of their movers (i.e., teachers who received their college degree in an out-of-state institution) came from Massachusetts. Roughly 10 percent of new Georgia teachers were from out of state, both from neighboring states such as Tennessee and Florida and from northern states that produce a lot of teachers such as Michigan, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. South Dakota has teachers who have experienced higher education in all 50 states and the District of Columbia.

In fact, in all 10 states whose certification and employment data were examined for this study, there was a fair amount of movement that varied from year to year. Florida, for example, saw a rise in the percentage of teachers with experience teaching in an out-of-state school—from 6 percent in 2001–02 to 16 percent in 2004–05. Kansas saw a jump of about 10 percent in the number of teachers prepared in another state between 2005–06 and 2006–07. Over the last five years, New Hampshire has seen a steady decline in the numbers of teachers prepared out of state.

What are the demographics of these teachers on the move?

Generally, and not surprisingly, teachers who were able to move had higher levels of education, were somewhat older, and had higher levels of certification, in comparison with new hires who had not moved.

Movers also tend to reflect the racial and gender makeup of the larger population of teachers in each of the 10 states, except in South Carolina (and possibly the District of Columbia whose data was not adequate to determine the demographics of movers versus nonmovers). In South Carolina, movers tended to be less diverse than the general population of teachers (that is, 93 percent of teachers moving to South Carolina were white versus 85 percent white among nonmovers). In terms of gender, teachers with interstate mobility experience were slightly (but not significantly) more often male than nonmovers.

What do teachers on the move teach?

Most movers were certified elementary education teachers, but subject areas of shortage were also well represented. For example, in New Hampshire and Montana, the second largest category of new out-of-state teachers was special education; in Florida, special education was the third highest ranked category. In South Carolina, mathematics and science teacher movers ranked high. Unfortunately, researchers were not able to determine from these data whether teachers on the move tend to relocate to high-needs schools or more well-resourced ones.

The Interstate Mobility of Troops-to-Teachers Program Participants

What kinds and how many Troops-to-Teachers participants are on the move?

An analysis of a subset of the national data that DANTES collects from Troops-to-Teachers participants revealed that slightly more than half (56 percent) of those hired in the last five years are white and almost 3 in 10 are African American. Eight percent are Hispanic, and the rest were classified as Asian/Pacific Islander (1.2 percent), Native American (1.1 percent), other (4.1 percent), or unknown (1.2 percent). Almost one third of Troops-to-Teachers participants come from the U.S. Army (32 percent) while one fourth come from the Air Force (25 percent) and 15 percent from the Navy. The rest are retired from the U.S. Coast Guard or Marines. Our analysis confirms the GAO findings that in the last five years, the majority of Troops-to-Teachers participants have been teaching in Texas, Florida, Georgia, Virginia, Colorado, California, and Arizona.

Of these Troops-to-Teachers participants, 98 percent have worked in only one state, and 2 percent (113) worked in at least two states. When they signed up for the program, all participants indicated in which states they preferred to teach. Nearly 92 percent of Troops-to-Teachers participants were teaching in the state that matched their teaching preference. An additional 3 percent were teaching in their second preference state. Of the 113 movers, 24 percent of them were certified in a state other than where they got their first teaching job. The majority (66 percent) of these movers moved between their first and second year in the classroom, while just over one fourth of movers moved after their second year on the job.

What do teachers on the move say about their mobility experiences?

“I could never understand how I could be fully certified, even tenured, in one state and have to jump through so many hoops to become certified in another. I have five separate state certifications, and it has been a challenge every time.”


—A teacher now teaching in Florida

To learn more about the experiences of teachers as they move across state lines, researchers fielded an online survey to teachers in 5 of the 10 focus states: Florida, Missouri, South Carolina, Montana, and Kansas. The link to the Web-based survey was posted on state education agency websites, posted on teachers union websites, and sent to teachers via e-newsletters. Thus, the nonrandom sample cannot be generalized to the wider population of teachers on the move; nevertheless, insight into the experiences of those who responded to the survey was gained. More than 1,000 teachers responded to the survey (965 of whom reported that they had some form of interstate mobility experience). This large response suggests that many teachers have a story of interstate mobility to tell and want it heard.

Of those teachers who responded to the survey, 94 percent who answered a question concerning their preparation indicated that they were certified via a “traditional college or university-based program”; the rest had completed some sort of alternate-route training. There were no statistically significant differences between these two groups in how they


experienced mobility; however, those who were certified using an alternate route were slightly more likely to find obtaining a certification in another state “much more difficult” than they expected, as Figure 1 indicates.

Figure 1. Responses to Survey Question: Was it more or less difficult than you expected to obtain certification across state lines?



The survey asked teachers to list their top three reasons for wanting to move to another state. The most frequently cited reason was that they followed a partner or spouse to another state (50 percent), followed by moving closer to family (21 percent). Better quality of life and greater teaching opportunities came next on the list. A number of teachers wrote in that the climate drew them to another state, and a large number of respondents indicated that they merely wanted a change (several because they had been recently widowed or divorced). When teachers decide to move to another state for whatever reason, the factors they weigh most heavily are the working conditions of the new school and the lifestyle that the new area affords (see Figure 2). Retirement and health benefits and salary were next. Pension portability and financial incentives were considered least important, perhaps because they were not available.

Figure 2. Responses to Survey Question: What factors did you weigh when making the decision to move from one state to another?



0 = not at all important; 1 = somewhat unimportant; 2 = somewhat important; 3 = very important.


In comparing the demographics of the schools (in terms of the percentage of students who were white, percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch, and the urbanicity of the school's location) in which teachers had been working in their previous state to the school in which they were working now, it seems as if there is quite a bit of mobility. While roughly half of all teachers found a job in a similar type of school in their new state, the other half moved to a school with either a lower or higher poverty rate, or from a rural to an urban school or vice versa.

For example, of the 207 teachers who had previously been working in urban schools, almost 40 percent had moved to a suburban school in their new state. Similarly, of the 228 teachers working in a rural school, 44 percent had moved to a suburban school. There was less, though not insignificant, movement out of suburban schools: 32 percent of teachers working in suburban schools moved to either a rural or urban school. Three percent of respondents (26 teachers) moved from a very wealthy school (with fewer than 20 percent of students qualifying for free or reduced-price lunch) to a very poor school; the same number did the reverse. In terms of minority percentages, 52 percent of teachers stayed in a school with similar percentages of white students; the largest movement was of teachers going from a high-minority school to one that was more diverse (14 percent of respondents).

Teachers with mobility experience gained information about obtaining a certification in another state from a variety of individuals—not just state-level certification officers (in

fact, one third of those respondents with mobility experience did not consult with anyone at the state level). Figure 3 shows how many teachers with mobility experience spoke with state certification officials, district-level administrators (including human resource representatives), principals, and preparation program officers about transferring their licenses. For example, of the 405 teachers who spoke to state-level officials, 156 spoke to district-level officials also. However, 12 of the respondents talked *only* to a principal, and 58 teachers talked to no one about how to become certified in their new state.

Figure 3. Responses to Survey Question: To whom did you speak in your new state as you were working through the application and transfer process? (Select all that apply.)



(N = 610)

Most survey respondents (62 percent) said they did not have to take any new courses in their new state to become certified; however, 19 percent said that they had to take between two and five new courses. Roughly one in ten respondents had to pay between \$100 and \$300 to take these courses, and about the same number of respondents had to pay between \$300 and \$500.

Additional testing also hit teachers' wallets. Although 42 percent of respondents reported they paid less than \$100 for extra testing (most of those said they had to take no new tests, so those costs would be zero), 53 percent of respondents said they paid between \$100 and \$500, and four individuals said they paid more than \$1,000 to take additional tests.

Finally, there was space on the survey for teachers to write in anything else they wanted the researchers to know about their mobility experiences. A surprising number of survey participants had quite passionate responses. Most of the personal stories about moving from one state to another were negative in tone, sometimes quite vehemently so. This was

perhaps due in part to the nature of the survey in that those who had negative experiences were most likely to want to vent about them, and this survey gave them the opportunity. Nevertheless, researchers counted 176 negative quotes and only 26 that were generally positive, 42 that were neither positive nor negative, and 26 that were mixed as describing both good and bad aspects of the experience. Among the 176 teachers reporting negative experiences, many had relocated years ago, so some of the problems might by now have been fixed. Still, this should give policymakers who want to roll back reciprocity policies pause.

Teachers with mobility experience who were negative about the process described it as “frustrating,” “annoying,” “insulting,” “disappointing” “difficult,” “expensive,” “time consuming” and “a pain in the butt.” Their complaints fell into two broad categories: issues of (1) recertification—particularly testing and coursetaking requirements, as well as problems of communication with certification officials at the state or district level—and (2) employment issues—particularly the transfer of credit for work experience in terms of salary and retirement benefits. The latter issues seemed to cause the most frustration for respondents, but these are issues of employment over which NASDTEC and its members have no authority so they necessarily fall outside the scope of this study.

Perhaps the biggest source of frustration for teachers moving to a new state in terms of certification is that they perceive they are being treated by their new state as if they had no experience or hard-earned skills and knowledge when they are required to take additional classes or basic skills tests. As one teacher currently teaching in a Midwestern state stated:

I think it is very discouraging for an experienced teacher who has a master’s degree in education to be told they’re not qualified to teach in this state without taking MORE [credit] hours at their own expense. It is just the state gouging us for more money.

Another teacher in a southern state wrote, “It should have been easier to transfer exams, etc. to [State X] since the state needed good teachers. Many experienced teachers were treated as if there had been no certificate at all, and no job history.” Similarly, a teacher in another Midwestern state said:

The extra courses that were required definitely did not make an impact on my teaching. It was just having to jump through the hoops in order to teach in [State X]. I think better arrangements can be made for those teachers like myself that are qualified in one state but not another. It is a real turn-off the way it stands.

Another teacher reported that she had to retake her student teaching even though she had been teaching on a temporary certificate in another state for three years. She said, “I thought this was ridiculous, so I left the state.” Another said that even though she had a minor in math and had been teaching it for eight years in her previous state, she had to produce her high school transcript for officials in her new state.

This sense of being disrespected was heightened in many cases by certification agency personnel who some teachers said were “unhelpful” even “rude,” although these comments could stem from teachers’ unwillingness to read policies carefully. As one teacher in a southern state wrote:

The right hand does not know what the left hand is doing. There are people in state certification offices in charge of one piece of paper and if that one piece of paper is not perfect, the entire process stops and, in many cases, has to start back at the beginning.

The delay in getting a clear sense of one’s certification status has implications for employment. As one teacher in another southern state noted, “It takes much too long to transfer records and license information. Oftentimes employers don’t want to hire you until all information has gone through, so it becomes a big issue.”

Another teacher in that state wrote of this disconnect in communication: “It was the most frustrating experience of my life. State and local agencies did not work together. It was like applying at two different locations.” A teacher in a central state said, “The rules kept changing as I tried to get my certificate. I had to take all these classes and then they decided I had to take the tests. It was a mess.” Another teacher put it more positively, “Respectful, helpful response of the state education staff, when it occurred, did make a huge difference.”

Having to wait long periods for fingerprinting and getting fingerprinted by both their new state and their new district led to disgruntlement as well.

A communication problem also existed for preparation programs and state agencies. Some teachers stated that their teacher preparation program promised that their certification was reciprocal with other states, but the program did not prepare teachers to understand that reciprocity often means that while your certification is recognized, you still may have to fulfill some state-specific requirements. This came as a surprise to many teachers, which made the process of obtaining a license in a new state all the more frustrating. As another teacher said, “There is no such thing as reciprocity between states. I had to apply for teaching certification in the two states I have taught in since receiving my initial certification as if I had never been a teacher! I think the only thing the out-of-state license got me was an interview.” Some teachers, however, are aware of the obstacles, and one said she even “ruled out” states that require more Praxis exams, classes, or portfolio assessments.

Having been alternatively certified presented unique problems for one teacher in a central state who wrote:

Having completed an alternative certification program in [State A], it was an absolute nightmare to get certification in [State B]. After gathering all the required paperwork and taking additional Praxis tests, I had to wait more than two months for a review committee to decide on my status. Then the Dept of Ed would not give me the results over the phone, I had to wait for the results in the

mail. This lengthy process made it almost impossible for me to secure a teaching position, and I missed out on several good opportunities.

Although difficulty in transferring certifications from state to state caused a lot of ire among teachers with mobility experience, the most bitterness emanated from the fact that teachers do not get “credit” for years of work experience in either their new state’s or district’s salary schedule, or in terms of the pension plans. Dozens of teachers reported taking steep cuts in pay when they moved to new states (although a few reported moving because salaries were higher). Again, these issues are not under the purview of NASDTEC or its members.

Some teachers, on the other hand, reported no difficulty becoming certified in their new state. One teacher now teaching in Missouri stated:

I completed a distance ed program through the state of Utah, completed my student teaching in Missouri where I live, received certification through Utah, then applied through the state of Missouri for my transfer of certification. The whole process of reciprocity was completely painless.

Another teacher who moved from Florida to Missouri called it “relatively simple” and still another said she was “impressed” with how easy it was to transfer her license. Thus, there was a diversity of experiences of interstate mobility among teachers on the move. The next section examines the potential reasons for these stories of frustration and ease.

The Interstate Mobility of Troops-to-Teachers Program Participants

What do Troops-to-Teachers participants have to say about their mobility experiences?

Learning Point Associates administered a survey to all Troops-to-Teachers participants in the 12 states that receive the most Troops-to-Teachers movers: Florida, Georgia, Texas, North Carolina, Virginia, California, Colorado, Nevada, Arizona, Missouri, Mississippi, and Kentucky. Thirty-three percent of survey responders had some sort of mobility experience. This meant that they (1) were trained in a state other than their current teaching state, (2) were initially certified in another state, or (3) actually taught in a state other than their current state. Of the participants with mobility experience, 80 percent were male, 20 percent female. And most (87 percent) were married. Sixty-six percent were white; 20 percent were black; 6 percent were Hispanic; the rest were American Indian, Hawaiian, or of another ethnicity. These participants reported that among the factors they considered when moving to a new state, lifestyle and working conditions were weighed most heavily. Next were career aspirations and salary. Fifty-six percent of the Troops-to-Teachers responders who were trained in another state said that becoming certified in their new state was either much more difficult (18 percent) or somewhat more difficult (38 percent) than they had expected.

How do certification policies vary from state to state?

As discussed earlier, although states' credentialing systems follow a similar logic, teacher certification requirements vary widely among states. For initial licensure, nearly every state requires a bachelor's degree and some form of state-approved preparatory experience as well as a passing score on one or more licensure exams, but there is a wide range of diversity in the specifics of these requirements. It is these specifics that can create barriers to interstate mobility, as the "rules of the road" change depending on the state in which a teacher is teaching.

Variations in Testing Requirements

During the 2003–04 school year, 44 states required passing scores on written assessments in order to grant a teaching license; the rest were in the process of implementing one or more licensure assessments (U.S. Department of Education, 2006). Overall, there are roughly 1,100 different certification exams nationwide. According to Baber (2008), basic skills exams (such as the Praxis I or the NES Basic Skills Assessment) are currently required in 42 states (either for entry into a preparation program or for initial licensure), content exams such as the Praxis II Content Tests are required in 44 states, and pedagogical skills assessments (such as the Praxis II Principles of Teaching and Learning exams) are required in 29 states. Even with two testing companies supplying the bulk of teacher licensure exams (Educational Testing Services [ETS] Praxis and Evaluation Systems Group of Pearson [formerly NES] together are required in 40 states), each state sets its own cut score to determine which teachers are granted a license and which are not. Cut scores are usually determined through a process that involves panels of teachers and other educators recommending a score to a governing body that makes the final decision based on state labor needs and other factors.

Variations in Licensure Tiers and Types

Significant variations exist among states in the spectrum of grades and subjects included in the different specific licenses states issue. These differences are most notable for special education teachers, early childhood teachers, and middle school teachers. For example, in special education, in many states, teachers are licensed to teach all children with a specific disability regardless of age. In other states, teachers are licensed to teach children within a specified age range with any type of disability. In yet other states, teachers are licensed to teach a specified age range of students who have a particular spectrum of disabilities. Moreover, the differences in state-defined licensure categories for special education teachers mean that the preparation required of special education teachers also differs widely from state to state. The Education Commission of the States (2008) notes specifically that these differing licensure policies impede the interstate transfer of teaching credentials in special education.

As for the criteria for middle school licensure, some states have dedicated middle school licenses for teachers in Grades 5–9 (or some narrower range within Grades 5–9) on the assumption there are special skills and knowledge that good middle school teachers ought

to have. Other states have a blanket secondary school license for teachers in Grades 6–12. These differences in grade spans may cause one state to hesitate granting reciprocity to a teacher from another state. For example, authorities in a state that grants a license that covers Grades 6–12 may fear that the content preparation of teachers with dedicated middle school licenses will not be sufficiently strong and that the teachers will have difficulty being effective in college preparatory classes such as algebra or geometry or the specific sciences that are sometimes offered in middle school.

In addition to the different grade levels that licenses cover, states have a diversity of approaches to the requirements for additional tiers of licensure. For example, to move from a Level I (initial) license to a Level II license (often called a professional license), some states require additional coursework or professional development and three years of successful teaching experience while others may require a performance-based assessment such as the Praxis III to move from a Level I to Level II. Twelve states rely on one tier of licensure (defined in this study as levels of standard certification), 20 states use two tiers, and 19 states use three tiers when granting teaching licenses. They are as follows:

One Tier of Licensure	Two Tiers of Licensure	Three Tiers of Licensure
Alabama	Arizona	Alaska
Arkansas	California	Colorado
Florida	District of Columbia	Connecticut
Georgia	Maryland	Delaware
Hawaii	Massachusetts	Illinois
Idaho	Michigan	Indiana
Minnesota	Missouri	Iowa
Mississippi	Montana	Kansas
Nevada	New York	Kentucky
New Jersey	North Carolina	Louisiana
Texas	Ohio	Maine
Wyoming	Oklahoma	Nebraska
	Pennsylvania	New Hampshire
	Rhode Island	New Mexico
	South Carolina	North Dakota
	South Dakota	Oregon
	Tennessee	Utah
	Vermont	West Virginia
	Virginia	Wisconsin
	Washington	

The names of these different tiers in different states cause additional confusion. For example, one participant from the American Association of Employment in Education focus group noted:

What we're finding is that certification terminology from various states is beginning to cause difficulty because many states are establishing one-year "temporary" certification after student teaching in which the candidate has to teach before they get their full state licensure. And that's causing difficulty in our states [because it is not seen as] as real licensure for reciprocity reasons.

Therefore, one state's temporary certification may be another state's conditional certificate. The names of second-tier certificates are also confusing. For example, a Level II certificate in Connecticut is a provisional license, and in Louisiana it is called a Level II Professional Certificate. The lack of uniformity may present additional challenges to mobility.

The variations in teacher certification requirements and the policies designed to support interstate mobility (discussed next) present a complex picture. Focus groups of individuals responsible for interpreting this picture and communicating it to teachers on the move—members of the American Association for Employment in Education and state directors of the Troops-to-Teachers program—emphasized that these requirements seemed to change often, especially while states were developing their responses to the highly qualified teacher provisions of NCLB. For example, one focus group participant suggested that these requirements change in response to teacher shortages:

I have seen a lot of states start compromising. Okay, you've had classes in special ed. If you have an interest in special ed, we'll work with you—we'll pay for your master's degree in special ed. We're seeing states kind of just say, "If a student has an interest in special ed, we'll take you and we'll train you," because they're in such demand.

In response to the various and dynamic certification requirements, states have established policies designed to ameliorate some of the barriers that these variations cause. These are discussed in the next section.

Which policies have the potential to support interstate mobility?

NASDTEC Interstate Agreement

Nearly all 50 states and the District of Columbia have signed the NASDTEC Interstate Agreement giving teachers who are certified in other member states eligibility for certification in their state; however, not all states have signed all tenets of the agreement.

Transitional Certificates

State policy data collected and analyzed for this study indicate that 39 states (76.5 percent) use a transitional certificate to help facilitate the licensure process for teachers

who hold a license in another state. Transitional certificates are valid for one, two, three, or five years, depending upon the state. In limited cases, the certificate is renewable should the teacher not meet the requirements in the respective state's specified amount of time.

For further illustration of this idea, consider Nebraska's approach. The state offers a transitional, provisional, or temporary certificate to teachers applying from out of state, and, depending on the candidate's deficiencies, the certificate can be valid for one or two years and may be renewed with evidence of specified progress. Certificates are issued on a case-by-case basis when all the initial requirements cannot be met and if a candidate has been offered employment in a Nebraska school. Because Nebraska, like other states, desires the best teachers for its students, the Teacher Certification Office has asked to eliminate the need for employment for the issuance of a provisional certificate.

Test Exemptions

Thirty-four states offer an exemption to testing requirements for teachers who hold a full standard Level I certificate. Most frequently, states offer testing exemptions if a teacher demonstrates at least three years of classroom experience or is National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS, 2007) certified. Arkansas and Colorado are two examples of states that aim to facilitate teacher interstate mobility by waiving testing requirements for teachers with at least three years of experience.

Coursework Exemptions

Nine states require some classroom experience prior to issuing a teaching license to an out-of-state teacher, with experience requirements ranging from 10 weeks to three years. Of the 41 states that indicated no classroom experience requirements for out-of-state teachers, most do require student teaching but consider that to be part of the preparation program. Some allow exemptions to additional coursework requirements for experienced teachers who have taken additional postbaccalaureate courses—these include Montana and Oregon.

Nine states require uniform additional coursework for all early-career, out-of-state teachers. This coursework might include a state-specific history class, a computer skills test, reading methods, a first aid course, a cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) class, a human relations course, and others. According to the policy data analyzed for this study, all but one of these nine states impose greater than average barriers to teacher interstate mobility.

Moreover, while a limited number of states mandate additional coursework, many out-of-state teachers do not possess the appropriate content requirements to meet the importing state's highly qualified teacher requirements. In turn, this seemingly causes out-of-state teachers to enroll in additional courses prior to receiving a teaching license equivalent to the license held in their previous state. And that, according to teachers surveyed for this study, can be aggravating.

Free and Clear Reciprocity

Free and clear reciprocity is the rare case, with only Delaware and Florida currently employing this tool to teachers who are fully certified in another state. Essentially, fully certified teachers who are interested in teaching in one of these two states must complete all application requirements, as follows: submit a complete application; pay the application fee; provide official transcripts from all colleges and universities attended, including proof that the bachelor's degree was awarded from an approved/accredited program; and provide photocopies of all valid teaching licenses.

Licensure Reciprocity for National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Certification

If a teacher possesses NBPTS certification, he or she may have an easier time transferring credentials to another state, and, in many cases, the teacher may do nothing more than provide proof of certification and teaching experience in order to receive a comparable teaching license in another state. Testing for NBPTS-certified teachers coming from out of state is often waived, and, in some cases, NBPTS-certified teachers are the only teachers eligible for the state's highest licensure level. The following 20 states accept NBPTS certification as an exemption for one or more requirements for out-of-state teachers seeking a Level II license:

Arizona	New Hampshire
California	New Jersey
Connecticut	Oklahoma
Delaware	Pennsylvania
Kansas	South Carolina
Louisiana	South Dakota
Maryland	Utah
Massachusetts	Vermont
Michigan	Virginia
Missouri	Washington

Shared Recognition of Regional Credentials

The Mid-Atlantic Regional Teachers Project is attempting to establish a regionally recognized teaching credential that would ease mobility for particularly outstanding teachers within the Mid-Atlantic Region. The project involves the cooperation of Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia in establishing the Meritorious New Teacher Candidate (MNTC) designation (U.S. Department of Education, 2005a). Although MNTC is not a teaching license, it is a special designation on the licenses of outstanding new teachers in the four jurisdictions. It guarantees that a designated licensee can move to any of the four jurisdictions and automatically obtain an initial license without the need to satisfy any additional requirements.

Passport to Teaching

One effort to create a nationally recognized teaching credential is the Passport to Teaching of the American Board for Certification of Teacher Excellence (2007). After several years of effort and millions of dollars, it is now accepted in eight states as an alternate route to an initial-stage license. This is another option for states to consider in response to the teacher shortage.

Summary

A policy rubric created for this study revealed a wide spectrum in terms of the activities that states undertook to support interstate mobility. Overall, the state policy analysis conducted for this study reveals two findings: (1) states that rely on tiered licensure more easily accept out-of-state teachers into their teaching ranks; (2) states that offer exemptions to testing requirements, acknowledge years of relevant work experience, and impose no additional coursework requirements more easily facilitate teacher interstate mobility than states that do not rely on any one or a combination of these licensure policies. Further, NBPTS certification is increasingly being used as a signal of teacher quality, and many states are relying on its merits when issuing a license to an out-of-state teacher.

The Interstate Mobility of Troops-to-Teachers Program Participants: Facilitators and Barriers

The moderator of the focus group asked the Troops-to-Teachers state directors, “What are some of the greatest facilitators that encourage teacher placement across state lines, from your experience?” For one member of the group, the first thing that came to mind was “state-approved [alternative teacher] education programs.” Several others nodded. This is especially salient for Troops-to-Teachers candidates for two reasons: (1) they are career changers and so are unable or unwilling to complete a full two- or four-year college- or university-based program, and (2) they often intend to teach in a state in which they do not currently live. Having access to teacher preparation programs that are approved by multiple states would facilitate both the recruitment and the mobility of Troops-to-Teachers participants.

Troops-to-Teachers state directors also act as facilitators for mobility themselves. They work with state departments of education to get candidates’ questions answered and help candidates navigate the process. For example, as one state director stated, “If a T3 calls his office and says, ‘Hey, I’m stationed in San Diego, but I really want to work in Kentucky,’ then we’ll get in touch with Kentucky and register and work through them to get them prepped and provide one-on-one counseling there.” State directors also manage the teaching, schools, and education policy expectations held by the candidates based on their experiences in the military. For instance, Troops-to-Teachers candidates often ask their state directors, “Where will you assign me?” Of course, in the education sector, the “assignment” process is much more complicated, especially when it comes to interstate mobility.

Not all Troops-to-Teachers participants surveyed, however, spoke with their state director when they sought to obtain their certification in a new state. Roughly 20 percent of participants with mobility experience said they spoke with their Troops-to-Teachers state placement assistance officer, the rest spoke to some combination of state and district officials, 9 percent spoke to someone at the teacher preparation program, and 17 percent spoke to a school principal. More than three fourths of participants with mobility experience reported that they took at least one new test to teach in their current state while almost one fourth took four or more new tests. Almost one third of Troops-to-Teachers participants with mobility experience took two courses to become certified in their new state. In sum, although the interstate mobility experiences of Troops-to-Teachers participants are somewhat different from the larger population of teachers, the barriers they face in terms of communication and additional requirements are similarly felt.

Discussion

“I graduated summa [cum laude], have three master’s [degrees], and have scored perfect scores on four different Praxis tests. Shouldn’t I be able to teach in any state?”
—A teacher now teaching in Kansas

The answer to the teacher’s question above is, in most cases, yes. Any state, especially a state with a critical shortage of teachers in her subject area and that had signed the NASDTEC interstate agreement, would be glad to certify that teacher, especially if she held full standard certification in the state in which she has been working. Officials in many states, however, wish to be sure as well that she has knowledge of reading pedagogy, for example, and can pass their own state’s rigorous licensing exam.

These are reasonable state standards for quality, and this teacher would likely be able to pass those quality controls with little trouble. From the survey data, however, we learned that problems arise when it is unclear which tests the teacher needs to take, when the tests are administered at awkward times in awkward places, when the fees for the exams or extra courses are high, and when the state review of the teacher’s credentials and criminal history is slow. Additional problems arise when such teachers are given false information about the steps in the process—either because they did not read or have access to state certification policies in their new state, or because they spoke with someone who was not well informed. Finally, frustration can occur for teachers because they hold unwarranted expectations about what their experience, knowledge, and skills should gain them—that is, easy entry into the classroom no matter where it is located—and instead encounter seemingly rigid bureaucratic structures that they perceive to be demeaning of their professional status.

Taken together, there are both purposeful and artificial barriers to interstate teacher mobility. Purposeful barriers are those that states erect to ensure the quality of incoming teachers prepared and certified in others states. Artificial barriers are those that may be unintended artifacts of the purposeful barriers. Both must be considered in understanding the barriers and creating the supports for interstate teacher mobility. Building capacity of state education agencies to address the artificial barriers to interstate mobility would appear to be crucial. Based on the review of state policy and the focus group interview and survey findings, the researchers identified different types of barriers. Table 2 lists them by category.

Table 2. Barriers to Interstate Teacher Mobility: Quality Controls and Obstacles

Purposeful Barriers to Teacher Interstate Mobility	Artificial Barriers to Teacher Interstate Mobility
Tests of teacher knowledge (including basic skills tests, content knowledge tests, and pedagogical knowledge tests)	• High fees • Lag time between test administrations • Duplicative testing (When tests are comparable, is there a need for retake?) • Irrelevant testing (tests that have no validity for particular content or grade level) • Slow processing of scores • Poor data infrastructure • Poor communication of licensure testing requirements to schools, districts, teacher prep programs, teachers, and teacher candidates
Teacher preparation/coursework requirements	• High fees • Duplicative coursework • Low-quality or irrelevant coursework • Poor or inequitable access to coursework from state-approved institutions • Slow processing of academic transcripts • Unclear coursework requirements • Poor data infrastructure
Differential requirements for teachers not attending a nationally accredited IHE (e.g., alternative-route certifications)	• Unclear requirements • Inflexible policies
Finger printing and background checks	• High fees • Slow processing • Lack of articulation between state processes
Demonstration of content knowledge requirements (for highly qualified teacher [HQT] status)	• Lack of articulation or alignment between certification requirements and HQT requirements between states

Clearly, significant numbers of teachers are prepared in states different from the ones in which they teach, and many with classroom experience in one state have relocated to teach in another. The states profiled in this study import many of their teachers from nearby states, and these teachers fill vacancies in many different subject areas. Unfortunately, because of significant limitations in the extant state teacher licensure and certification data, there remain many unanswered questions—specifically about just what types of teachers move, what kinds of schools they move to, and what policy changes would likely support teacher mobility.

Nevertheless, the study provides important insight into the practices and policies that influence teachers’ experiences of interstate mobility. For example, teachers on the move consult with a wide range of individuals for information on gaining certification in new states, from principals to preparation providers to state certification specialists. The

complexity of the differences in requirements among states may make acquiring accurate information more difficult, especially if teachers on the move rely on such varied sources.

Troops-to-Teachers participants seem to be less likely to relocate after they are employed as teachers, but they are more likely to live and be prepared in a state different from the one in which they will teach. Navigating the different requirements for state certification is especially difficult when a Troops-to-Teachers participant (or a Spouses-to-Teachers participant) is not certain in which state he or she will end up teaching—in fact, 56 percent said that becoming certified in another state from which they were prepared was more difficult than they had expected.

States have adopted a number of strategies to support interstate mobility. Although the effectiveness of such strategies has yet to be fully determined, states that suffer shortages of teachers and employ school leaders who wish to recruit the best candidates from across the country should consider exploring such strategies, including offering temporary credentials (or even a Level I credential) for out-of-state teachers who were prepared in other states or who have only very limited experience in others states. Policies that also seem to support mobility include recognizing the NBPTS certification, providing testing or coursework exemptions for out-of-state teachers with Level II or Level III certificates, and joining with other states in the region to standardize licensure requirements or to create a regional credential freely accepted in any of the member states. Whether these mobility supports would also unacceptably compromise the quality of a state's teacher corps would have to be assessed based on each state's individual needs and standards.

Next Steps for Understanding the Issues

Without debate, each state is committed to certifying high-quality teachers so that all students are taught by the best teachers available. State sovereignty laws permit individual states to develop and administer teacher licensure policies that fit the unique needs of the state. Yet, states are increasingly aware of the need to develop licensure policies that complement those of other states to ensure teachers are able to practice their profession in their chosen locale, no matter where they were trained or in which state(s) they previously taught. To that end, data collected for this study provide evidence that suggests certain state licensure policies might ameliorate artificial barriers and provide fluid teacher interstate mobility. Such policies might include transitional or tiered licensure, test exemptions, negotiable experience requirements, no additional coursework requirements, and the use of NBPTS certification as a proxy for testing requirements.

Nevertheless, the need for better data to fully assess the impact of these policies on the quality and quantity of the teacher supply among states is clear. Tracking the movement of teachers across state lines is not easily accomplished given the current state of national, regional, and state certification and employment data systems. Many states are working to be able to track teachers back to their preparation programs in order to better understand the teacher pipeline and the effectiveness of various routes to licensure. Our understanding of the movement of teachers across state lines would be greatly improved if states at least collected the name of the state in which the teacher preparation program was located—only two of the focus states for this study were able to share this information at the time the data were requested.

In addition to this gap in many state teacher data systems, the fact that many states house certification information separate from employment information meant that these data in some cases were not able to “talk” to one another, and separate queries needed to be conducted, which can be very time and labor intensive. Finally, and perhaps most crucially, there was no way to tell from state data systems how many qualified teachers attempted to move to one state, only to be too discouraged by the requirements for gaining certification in the new state. Teacher attrition is a major challenge for the profession, and certification barriers may contribute to this loss of human capital.

Improvements in state data systems are an important, even critical, next step in understanding the barriers and supports to teacher interstate mobility as well as addressing the imbalances in the supply of teachers among states. Thus, federal funding to support state data infrastructure improvements is both warranted and very much needed.

Issues for Further Study

How teacher licensure systems interact with teacher labor markets bears further scrutiny. In theory, if a particular state required teachers to take additional exams and a course on state history, that state would be in a sense imposing a tariff on imported teachers. These additional requirements then make them slightly more expensive. Would-be interstate

movers would calculate their decision to take a new job based on whether it was worth the effort of overcoming these higher barriers to entry. The net effect therefore is to protect the jobs of in-state teachers (Holen, 1965). It is unclear whether the market is as sensitive to such policies—which are enacted to protect the quality of a state’s labor force—as some might attest (Mason, 2004–2005), but a better understanding of these interactions would be important for policymakers to understand as they develop reciprocity processes and policies.

This study confirms the need for states to review their respective teacher licensure policies if they wish to ease the process by which high-quality teachers transfer their teaching licenses across state lines. To determine if their state does indeed facilitate the inflow of teachers from other states, states might consider investigating the following:

Do state licensure policies and practices facilitate teacher mobility without compromising teacher quality?

- ▶ Has the state adopted a tiered licensure system that includes a special temporary license for out-of-state teacher applicants?
- ▶ Has the state adopted exemptions to testing and/or coursework requirements for out-of-state teacher applicants based upon meeting specific demonstrable criteria?
- ▶ Has the state adopted exemptions to teaching and coursework requirements for NBPTS–certified, out-of-state teacher applicants based upon meeting specific demonstrable criteria?
- ▶ Do state department of education staff, state professional standards board staff, and district human resources personnel all understand and speak clearly and effectively to the intricacies of transferring a teaching license to the state?
- ▶ Are out-of-state teachers provided consistent, accurate, up-to-date information through websites, a call center, and other means to help them navigate the transfer of their teaching license to a new state?
- ▶ Are state certification offices fully staffed and funded so licensure professionals can adequately and efficiently review transcripts and provide guidance to incoming teachers efficiently and effectively?
- ▶ Are state certification offices engaged in discovering and remedying artificial barriers?

Are principals and district human resources staff trained on how to support out-of-state teachers in their attempts to obtain in-state licensure?

- ▶ Are changes in rules and regulations surrounding state certification communicated directly and effectively to school leaders at the local, district, and state levels so that teachers seeking licensure receive consistent and correct information?
- ▶ Does the state sponsor regional meetings that include state certification officials, preparation program officers, and state Troops-to-Teachers program placement

assistance officers so that they understand neighboring states' policies to again ensure that migrating teachers receive consistent information?

- ▶ Are staff members familiar with the NASDTEC KnowledgeBase and the information about state certification requirements contained in it?

Has the state invested significantly in data systems for the benefit of improving teacher quality and teacher interstate mobility?

- ▶ Does the state collect and track information on teachers specifically as it relates to where out-of-state teacher candidates are coming from, where they were prepared, and any other relevant background and demographic data?

Ongoing and rigorous study of this issue is clearly necessary. Finding the best policies to balance state licensure policies with lower barriers and higher standards that would both ease mobility and ensure teacher quality will take further experimentation; committed data collection and analysis; and productive, evidence-based conversation.

Promoting Future Dialogue

This report provides some grist for the ongoing discussion but will not end the debate. Its recommendations for further research need to be explored and tested if states are to collectively ease mobility without sacrificing teacher quality. What is important now is that state legislators who govern licensure policy understand the issues of teacher interstate mobility and recognize that their policies are interpreted and enacted by state agency officials who require time and resources to do their jobs well. Ensuring that states get great teachers and share best practices will take a coordinated and sustained effort, including a shared terminology on licensure policies. This is an area in which NASDTEC is looking forward to taking the lead.

References

- American Association for Employment in Education. (2004). *Educator supply and demand in the United States*. Retrieved May 19, 2008, from <http://www.aaee.org/pdf/2004fullreportforwebsite.pdf>
- American Board for Certification of Teacher Excellence. (2007). *Become a teacher*. Retrieved May 19, 2008, from <http://www.abcte.org>
- Baber, A. (2008). *Teacher certification and licensure/testing requirements*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. Retrieved May 20, 2008, from <http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/77/13/7713.pdf>
- Clotfelter, C., Ladd, H. F., Vigdor, J., & Wheeler, J. (2007). *High-poverty schools and the distribution of teachers and principals* (Working Paper No. 1). Durham, NC: CALDER Center.
- Cogshall, J. G. (2006). *High school teacher assignment and the new governance of teacher quality*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan.
- Curran, B., Abrahams, C., & Clarke, T. (2001). *Solving teacher shortages through license reciprocity*. Denver, CO: State Higher Education Executive Officers. Retrieved May 19, 2008 from <http://www.sheeo.org/quality/mobility/reciprocity.PDF>
- Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support. (2006). [Subset of DANTE extant national data on Troops-to-Teachers participants from 2002 to 2006]. Unpublished data.
- Dorsey, S. (1995). Pension portability and labor market efficiency: A survey of the literature. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 48(2), 276–292.
- Education Commission of the States. (2008). *Special education: Teacher issues*. Retrieved May 19, 2008, from <http://www.ecs.org/html/issue.asp?issueid=112&subissueid=120>
- Feistritzer, C. E. (2005). *Profile of troops to teachers*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Information. Retrieved May 19, 2008, from http://www.ncei.com/NCEI_TT_v3.pdf
- Haycock, K. (2004). The elephant in the living room. In D. Ravitch (Ed.), *Brookings papers on education policy: 2004* (pp. 229–247). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Holen, A. S. (1965). Effects of professional licensing arrangements on interstate labor mobility and resource allocation. *Journal of Political Economy*, 73(5), 492–498.

- Ingersoll, R. M. (1997). Teacher turnover and teacher quality: The recurring myth of teacher shortages. *Teachers College Record*, 99(1), 41–44.
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). *Teacher turnover, teacher shortages, and the organization of schools* (Document R-01-1). Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy. Retrieved May 19, 2008, from <http://depts.washington.edu/ctpmail/PDFs/Turnover-Ing-01-2001.pdf>
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2003). *Out-of-field teaching and the limits of teacher policy* (Document R-03-1). Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, & Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Retrieved May 19, 2008, from <http://depts.washington.edu/ctpmail/PDFs/LimitsPolicy-RI-09-2003.pdf>
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2004). *Why do high-poverty schools have difficulty staffing their classrooms with highly qualified teachers?* Washington, DC: Center for American Progress and Institute for America's Future. Retrieved May 19, 2008, from <http://www.americanprogress.org/kf/ingersoll-final.pdf>
- Isas, M. R. (2001). *License reciprocity: Eliminating the barriers to teaching in the Mid-Atlantic Region*. Washington, DC: Council for Basic Education. Retrieved May 19, 2008, from <http://www.aacte.org/programs/martp/licenserecipr.pdf>
- Kimball, S. M., Heneman, H. G., III, & Kellor, E. M. (2003). *Pensions for teachers: Possible changes and implications* (WPRE-UW Working Paper Series TC-03-09). Madison, WI: Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Retrieved May 19, 2008, from <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/papers/Pensions%20Draft.pdf>
- Koepke, M. (1990, April). How to avoid getting trapped in license hell. *Teacher Magazine*, 1(7), 51–56. Retrieved May 19, 2008, from <http://www.teachermagazine.org/tm/articles/1990/04/01/7certint.h01.html?qs=how+to+avoid+getting+trapped+in+license+hell>
- Levin, J., & Quinn, M. (2004). *Missed opportunities: How we keep high-quality teachers out of urban classrooms*. New York: The New Teacher Project. Retrieved May 20, 2008, from <http://www.tntp.org/docs/reportfinal9-12.pdf>
- Mackey, C. C., McHenry, V. A., & Einreinhofer, R. J. (2003). *The history of NASDTEC*. Whitinsville, MA: National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification.
- Marvel, J., Lyter, D. M., Peltola, P., Strizek, G. A., Morton, B., & Rowland, R. (2007). *Teacher attrition and mobility: Results from the 2004–05 Teacher Follow-up Survey* (NCES 2007-307). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved May 19, 2008, from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2007/2007307.pdf>

- Mason, E. (2004–2005). Uniform national standards: No teacher left behind. *National Forum of Teacher Education Journal*, 17(3), 1–10. Retrieved May 19, 2008, from <http://www.nationalforum.com/Electronic%20Journal%20Volumes/Mason,%20Edward%20Uniform%20National%20Standards-No%20Teacher%20Left%20Behind.pdf>
- Mihalik, M. (1990, May). The long and costly road. *Teacher Magazine*. Retrieved May 19, 2008, from <http://www.teachermagazine.org/tm/articles/1990/05/01/8move.h01.html?qs=the+long+and+costly+road>
- Murnane, R. J. (1981). Teacher mobility revisited. *Journal of Human Resources*, 16(1), 3–19.
- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2007). *Better teaching, better learning, better schools*. Retrieved May 19, 2008, from <http://www.nbpts.org>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2006). *Schools and staffing survey 2003–04* (Public school teacher file, general question Q05). Retrieved June 4, 2007, from <http://nces.ed.gov/dasolv2/tables/mainpage.asp?mode=NEW&filenumber=46>
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425 (2002). Retrieved May 19, 2008, from <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html>
- Office of the Deputy Undersecretary of Defense. (2005). *Department of Defense base structure report (A summary of DoD's real property inventory)*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense.
- Plecki, M. L., & Elfers, A. M. (2007, April). *Retention, mobility, and career pathways of beginning teachers: A longitudinal and comparative analysis*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, Chicago.
- Sindelar, P. T., Bishop, A. G., Gill, M. G., Connelly, V., & Rosenberg, M. S. (2003). *Getting teachers where they're needed most: The case for licensure reciprocity* (COPSSE Document No. RS-8E). Gainesville, FL: Center on Personnel Studies in Special Education. Executive Summary retrieved May 19, 2008, from <http://www.coe.ufl.edu/copsse/docs/RS-8E/1/RS-8E.pdf>
- Sommerfield, M. (1992, August 5). Regional credential found to remove job barriers for relocating teachers. *Education Week*. Retrieved May 22, 2008, from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/1992/08/05/40cred.h11.html>
- Stinnett, T. M. (1967). Teacher certification. *Review of Educational Research*, 37(3), 248–259.

- Stratford, W. (1942). *Some restrictions and limitations to the free interstate movement of teachers*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2005a, August 2). Mid-Atlantic Regional Teachers Project. *The Education Innovator*, 3(28). Retrieved May 19, 2008, from <http://www.ed.gov/news/newsletters/innovator/2005/0802.html>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2005b). *Title II state report 2005*. Retrieved May 19, 2008, from <https://title2.ed.gov/Title2DR/ChooseState.asp?Type=Map&Year=2005>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2006). *The secretary's fifth annual report on teacher quality: A highly qualified teacher in every classroom*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved May 19, 2008, from <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/teachprep/2006-title2report.pdf>
- U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2006). *Troops-to-Teachers: Program brings more men and minorities to the teaching workforce, but Education could improve management to enhance results* (Report No. GAO-06-265). Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved May 19, 2008, from <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d06265.pdf>
- WestEd. (2006). *Northeast Regional Credential Program (NRC)*. Retrieved June 4, 2007, from <http://www.wested.org/cs/li/view/pj/185>

Appendix A. Project Design

To begin to answer the question of whether contemporary developments in state licensure policies promote or restrict teacher interstate mobility, the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) partnered with Learning Point Associates to conduct a study on the issue. The study was designed to identify promising policies and practices that facilitate teacher mobility across state lines as well as the barriers that prevent teachers from easily transferring their teaching licenses from one state to another. The study is supported by a U.S. Department of Education grant awarded to the Maryland Department of Education that includes a broader focus on the preparation and interstate mobility experiences of participants in the Troops-to-Teachers program and other career changers.

Methodology

Methods for the study are as follows:

- ▶ The research team gathered current state-level teacher licensure information for all 50 states and the District of Columbia from various resources including state Web pages, the NASDTEC Interstate Agreement, the NASDTEC KnowledgeBase, and the Higher Education Act Title II teacher quality data in the fall of 2006. These policies were then totaled for Phase I, which provided a preliminary mobility score for each state. In spring of 2007, also known as Phase II, each state was asked to verify its respective current state policies. After policies were verified, they were entered into a policy rubric and select policies were assigned a value that signifies the extent to which they promote teacher interstate mobility. The values were then aggregated to develop a mobility measure for each state and the District of Columbia.
- ▶ Using the totals from Phase I of the policy analysis and rubric, the research team in collaboration with NASDTEC officials chose 10 states (to represent different points on the mobility spectrum). The states were District of Columbia, Georgia, Florida, New Hampshire, Kansas, Maryland, Missouri, Montana, South Carolina, and South Dakota. Each state's certification and employment data (covering roughly the last five years, depending upon the state) were collected and analyzed to understand patterns of mobility within each state.
- ▶ To learn more about the experiences of teachers as they move across state lines, researchers fielded an online survey to teachers in the focus states. The survey contained 35 questions designed to elicit the attitudes toward and experiences of interstate mobility. Because of limitations in access, the survey was not administered to teachers in all of the 10 focus states. In addition, researchers were not able to take a random sampling of teachers in each of these states because of insufficient data-collection systems. Instead, the link to the survey was posted on state department of education and teacher association websites as well as included in education newsletters. Therefore, although the results of the survey of teachers with mobility experiences yield important insight, the results cannot be generalized to the experiences of teachers across the country or even in one state. Nevertheless, despite these limitations, more than 1,000 teachers responded to the survey, which suggests that many teachers had a story of mobility to tell and wanted it heard.

- ▶ A convenience sample of 13 members of the American Association for Employment in Education (AAEE) was taken for two open-ended focus group interviews at the AAEE annual meeting in October 2006. In the first focus group, the following states were represented: Alaska, Idaho, Massachusetts, Michigan, North Carolina, and Utah; in the second focus group, the following states were represented: Colorado, Iowa, Illinois, Maryland, Missouri, and Texas (two members were from Texas). Responses were coded using a mix of anticipated and open codes, and qualitative content analysis was conducted.
- ▶ Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support (DANTES) supplied the researchers with a subset of their extant national data on Troops-to-Teachers participants from 2002 to 2006. Descriptive statistics on the Troops-to-Teachers program were calculated from this information. Twelve states were chosen for further study because they imported the most teachers from the Troops-to-Teachers program (Arizona, Florida, California, Georgia, Kentucky, Missouri, Mississippi, North Carolina, Nevada, Colorado, Texas, and Virginia). The directors of Troops-to-Teachers state placement assistance offices from these 12 states were invited to participate in a focus group interview. Of those sampled, 100 percent responded. An interview protocol similar to that used for the AAEE focus groups was used, and similar analyses were conducted. Finally, an online survey link was e-mailed to all Troops-to-Teachers participants whose hire date was within the last five years in the 12 states.

Appendix B. State Extant Teacher Data Tables

The State Extant Teacher Data Tables in Appendix B contain the findings from the analysis of existing state teacher certification and employment data. The data from each state were supplied to Learning Point Associates between late 2006 and late 2007. The method for determining which teachers were “movers” versus “nonmovers” was different in each state, and may be different from the way that the state itself would define a teacher mover.

Many of the cells in these tables contain the symbol *n/a*. This means that information was either not available or not analyzable. In the latter case, that usually meant that there was too much missing data to provide an accurate analysis.

The findings were verified as seeming to be accurate by state personnel in five states (each is denoted by an asterisk). These states are Florida, Kansas, Maryland, Missouri, and New Hampshire (although in New Hampshire, no independent analysis of the data was conducted—state officials provided the findings). The format of the data provided by the District of Columbia was insufficient for confident analysis.

Supplemental information was drawn from Title II State Reports (which are posted at <http://title2.ed.gov>). These data points are reported by each state to the U.S. Department of Education to comply with Sections 207 and 208 of Title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended.

Florida*

Independent Analysis of State-Supplied Raw Data					
Method used for identifying imported teacher movers in this data set: Teachers with teaching experience in an out-of-state public or nonpublic school. There was no way from the data provided to determine which teachers were prepared in another state.					
Total movers new to state in last 5 years		Demographics of all movers			
	Total % of all new FL teachers		% of movers % of non-movers		
2001–02	252	5.9%	White	81%	60%
2002–03	214	10.8%	African-American	9%	16%
2003–04	386	13.4%	Hispanic	9%	23%
2004–05	529	16.0%	Asian	1%	1%
2005–06	356	12.6%	Native American	<1%	<1%
Total	1,737	11.4%	Other/Not Reported	<1%	<1%
Average age of all “movers”: 42 Average age of all “non-movers”: 35		Males		10%	9%
		Females		90%	91%
Five states from which most movers come to Florida: n/a					
Education levels of movers versus nonmovers: n/a		Certification levels of movers versus nonmovers			
			Certification Level	% of movers	% of non-movers
		Professional	90.9%	88.6%	
		Nonrenewable			
		Temporary	3.0%	9.5%	
		Nonrenewable			
		Professional	0.0%	0.0%	
		Part time	0.0%	0.0%	
		Unknown	6.1%	1.9%	
NBPTS-certified movers: n/a					
Top five areas of certification for movers: Elementary Education, Prekindergarten/Primary Education, Exceptional Student Education, Reading, English to Speakers of Other Languages					
Supplemental Mobility Information					
From Florida Title II State Reports (https://title2.ed.gov/default.asp)					
School Year	Total no. of persons receiving initial certification or licensure in the state during this academic school year		Total no. of persons receiving initial certification or licensure in the state who completed their teacher preparation program in another state		% of total
2002–03	21,257		2,002		9%
2003–04	20,521		2,918		14%
2004–05	23,366		2,300		10%
2005–06	25,485		2,218		9%

Georgia

Georgia

Independent Analysis of State-Supplied Raw Data																																										
Method used for identifying imported teacher movers in this data set: The only way to determine mobility in this data set was to look at the state in which the certification exam was taken. Teachers tested in a state other than Georgia are considered movers. Researchers received data for the 2005–06 and 2006–07 school years.																																										
Total movers new to state in last 5 years		Demographics of all movers																																								
	<table><tr><td></td><td>Total</td><td>% of all new GA teachers</td></tr><tr><td>2005–06</td><td>714</td><td>10%</td></tr><tr><td>2006–07</td><td>741</td><td>10%</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>1,455</td><td>10%</td></tr></table>		Total	% of all new GA teachers	2005–06	714	10%	2006–07	741	10%	Total	1,455	10%	<table><tr><td></td><td>% of movers</td><td>% of non- movers</td></tr><tr><td>White</td><td>n/a</td><td>n/a</td></tr><tr><td>African-American</td><td>n/a</td><td>n/a</td></tr><tr><td>Hispanic</td><td>n/a</td><td>n/a</td></tr><tr><td>Asian</td><td>n/a</td><td>n/a</td></tr><tr><td>Native American</td><td>n/a</td><td>n/a</td></tr><tr><td>Males</td><td>16%</td><td>16%</td></tr><tr><td>Females</td><td>65%</td><td>49%</td></tr><tr><td>Unknown</td><td>19%</td><td>35%</td></tr></table>			% of movers	% of non- movers	White	n/a	n/a	African-American	n/a	n/a	Hispanic	n/a	n/a	Asian	n/a	n/a	Native American	n/a	n/a	Males	16%	16%	Females	65%	49%	Unknown	19%	35%
	Total	% of all new GA teachers																																								
2005–06	714	10%																																								
2006–07	741	10%																																								
Total	1,455	10%																																								
	% of movers	% of non- movers																																								
White	n/a	n/a																																								
African-American	n/a	n/a																																								
Hispanic	n/a	n/a																																								
Asian	n/a	n/a																																								
Native American	n/a	n/a																																								
Males	16%	16%																																								
Females	65%	49%																																								
Unknown	19%	35%																																								
Average age of all movers: 27 Average age of all nonmovers: 33																																										
Five states from which most movers come to Georgia: Tennessee, Florida, Michigan, Ohio, and Pennsylvania																																										
Education levels of movers versus nonmovers: n/a		Valid certification types of movers versus nonmovers																																								
		<table><tr><td>Certification Category</td><td>% of movers</td><td>% of non- movers</td></tr><tr><td>Leadership</td><td>1%</td><td>0%</td></tr><tr><td>N/A</td><td>0%</td><td>0%</td></tr><tr><td>Paraprofessional</td><td>2%</td><td>9%</td></tr><tr><td>Permit</td><td>0%</td><td>1%</td></tr><tr><td>Supervision</td><td>1%</td><td>1%</td></tr><tr><td>Teaching</td><td>99%</td><td>97%</td></tr><tr><td>Technical Specialist</td><td>0%</td><td>1%</td></tr></table>		Certification Category	% of movers	% of non- movers	Leadership	1%	0%	N/A	0%	0%	Paraprofessional	2%	9%	Permit	0%	1%	Supervision	1%	1%	Teaching	99%	97%	Technical Specialist	0%	1%															
Certification Category	% of movers	% of non- movers																																								
Leadership	1%	0%																																								
N/A	0%	0%																																								
Paraprofessional	2%	9%																																								
Permit	0%	1%																																								
Supervision	1%	1%																																								
Teaching	99%	97%																																								
Technical Specialist	0%	1%																																								
NBPTS-certified movers: n/a																																										
Top five areas of certification for all movers teaching in the last two years: Elementary Instruction (23%), English Language Arts (6%), Mathematics (5%), Social Studies (4%), Music (2%)																																										
Supplemental Mobility Data																																										
From Georgia Title II State Reports (https://title2.ed.gov/default.asp)																																										
School Year	Total no. of persons receiving initial certification or licensure in the state during this academic school year	Total no. of persons receiving initial certification or licensure in the state who completed their teacher preparation program in another state	% of total																																							
2002–03	9,759	1,513	16%																																							
2003–04	10,217	1,481	15%																																							
2004–05	10,619	1,048	10%																																							
2005–06	11,287	1,020	9%																																							

Kansas*

Independent Analysis of State-Supplied Raw Data			
Method used for identifying imported teacher movers in this data set: Teachers whose recommending preparation program is located in another state.			
Total movers new to state in last 5 years		Demographics of all movers	
	Total	% of all new KS teachers	
2002–03	270	25%	
2003–04	336	28%	
2004–05	386	23%	
2005–06	714	24%	
2006–07	841	34%	
Total	2,547	27%	
Average age of all movers: 38 Average age of all nonmovers: 36			
Five states from which most movers come to Kansas: Missouri (24%), Oklahoma (14%), Nevada (10%), Iowa (5%), and Texas (5%)			
Education levels of movers versus nonmovers		Certification levels of movers versus nonmovers	
	Highest Degree Earned	% of movers	% of nonmovers
	Bachelor’s	52%	63%
	Master’s	21%	13%
	Doctorate	0%	0%
	Specialist	1%	1%
	Other	27%	23%
NBPTS-certified movers: Five NBPTS-certified teachers moved into the state in the last five years, as indicated in the state data.			
Top five areas of certification areas for all movers: Single Grade Self-Contained Classroom, Interrelated, English Language Arts, Math, Music			
Supplemental Mobility Data			
From Kansas Title II State Reports (https://title2.ed.gov/default.asp)			
School Year	Total no. of persons receiving initial certification or licensure in the state during this academic school year	Total no. of persons receiving initial certification or licensure in the state who completed their teacher preparation program in another state	% of total
2002–03	1,867	657	35%
2003–04	2,406	657	27%
2004–05	2,723	716	26%
2005–06	2,387	767	32%

Maryland*

Independent Analysis of State Mobility Data					
Method used for identifying imported teacher movers in this data set: Teachers new to Maryland classrooms who were previously employed in another state <i>and</i> whose teacher preparation program was located out of state.					
Total movers new to state in last 5 years		Demographics of all movers			
	Total	% of all new MD teachers	% of movers	% of non-movers	
2002–03	1,845	42.5%	White	79%	75%
2003–04	1,302	43.0%	African-American	18%	20%
2004–05	1,041	33.5%	Hispanic	1%	2%
2005–06	111 ²	2.6%	Asian	2%	3%
2006–07	n/a	n/a	Native American	0%	0%
Total	4,299	23%	Males	27%	24%
			Females	73%	76%
Average age of all movers: 31 Average age of all nonmovers: 30					
Five states from which most movers come to Maryland: Pennsylvania, New York, Virginia, West Virginia, and North Carolina					
Education levels of movers versus nonmovers			Certification levels of movers versus nonmovers: n/a		
Highest Degree Earned	% of movers	% of non-movers			
Bachelor’s degree	77%	77%			
Bachelor’s with Master’s equivalent	4%	3%			
Doctoral degree	1%	0%			
Fewer than 2 years of college	0%	1%			
Master’s degree	17%	17%			
Master’s degree plus 30 semester hours	2%	2%			
			NBPTS-certified movers: n/a		
Top five areas of certification for all movers: Movers were certified in the following subjects most often: Elementary (47%), English Language Arts Grades 7–12 (13%), Mathematics Grades 7–12 (11%), Social Studies Grades 7–12 (8%), and Early Childhood (7%).					
Supplemental Mobility Data					
School Year	Total no. of persons receiving initial certification or licensure in the state during this academic school year		Total no. of persons receiving initial certification or licensure in the state who completed their teacher preparation program in another state		% of total
2002–03	4,377		2,832		65%
2003–04	3,084		1,344		44%
2004–05	4,380		2,007		46%
2005–06	4,350		2,911		67%

From Maryland Title II State Reports (<https://title2.ed.gov/default.asp>)

From Maryland Title II State Reports (<https://title2.ed.gov/default.asp>)

² Partial data was supplied for this year, which accounts for the drop.

Missouri*

Independent Analysis of State-Supplied Raw Data																																																
Method used for identifying imported teacher “movers” in this data set: Any teacher with more public school experience than Missouri experience																																																
Total movers new to state in last 5 years		Demographics of all movers																																														
	<table><tr><th></th><th>Total</th><th>% of all new MO teachers</th></tr><tr><td>2002–03</td><td>752</td><td>14%</td></tr><tr><td>2003–04</td><td>397</td><td>10%</td></tr><tr><td>2004–05</td><td>460</td><td>10%</td></tr><tr><td>2005–06</td><td>727</td><td>14%</td></tr><tr><td>2006–07</td><td>511</td><td>10%</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>2,847</td><td>12%</td></tr></table>		Total	% of all new MO teachers	2002–03	752	14%	2003–04	397	10%	2004–05	460	10%	2005–06	727	14%	2006–07	511	10%	Total	2,847	12%		<table><tr><th></th><th>% of movers</th><th>% of non-movers</th></tr><tr><td>White</td><td>91%</td><td>91%</td></tr><tr><td>African-American</td><td>6%</td><td>7%</td></tr><tr><td>Hispanic</td><td>1%</td><td>1%</td></tr><tr><td>Asian</td><td>1%</td><td>1%</td></tr><tr><td>Native American</td><td><1%</td><td><1%</td></tr><tr><td>Males</td><td>22%</td><td>23%</td></tr><tr><td>Females</td><td>78%</td><td>77%</td></tr></table>		% of movers	% of non-movers	White	91%	91%	African-American	6%	7%	Hispanic	1%	1%	Asian	1%	1%	Native American	<1%	<1%	Males	22%	23%	Females	78%	77%
	Total	% of all new MO teachers																																														
2002–03	752	14%																																														
2003–04	397	10%																																														
2004–05	460	10%																																														
2005–06	727	14%																																														
2006–07	511	10%																																														
Total	2,847	12%																																														
	% of movers	% of non-movers																																														
White	91%	91%																																														
African-American	6%	7%																																														
Hispanic	1%	1%																																														
Asian	1%	1%																																														
Native American	<1%	<1%																																														
Males	22%	23%																																														
Females	78%	77%																																														
Average age of all movers: n/a Average age of all nonmovers: n/a																																																
Five states from which most movers come to Missouri: n/a																																																
Education levels of movers versus nonmovers		Certification levels of movers versus nonmovers: n/a																																														
	<table><tr><th>Highest Degree Earned</th><th>% of movers</th><th>% of non-movers</th></tr><tr><td>Bachelor’s</td><td>59%</td><td>87%</td></tr><tr><td>Master’s</td><td>39%</td><td>13%</td></tr><tr><td>Doctorate</td><td><1%</td><td><1%</td></tr><tr><td>Specialist</td><td><1%</td><td><1%</td></tr></table>	Highest Degree Earned	% of movers	% of non-movers	Bachelor’s	59%	87%	Master’s	39%	13%	Doctorate	<1%	<1%	Specialist	<1%	<1%																																
Highest Degree Earned	% of movers	% of non-movers																																														
Bachelor’s	59%	87%																																														
Master’s	39%	13%																																														
Doctorate	<1%	<1%																																														
Specialist	<1%	<1%																																														
NBPTS-certified movers: n/a																																																
Available information on where and what movers teach once in state: n/a																																																
Supplemental Mobility Data																																																
School Year	Total no. of persons receiving initial certification or licensure in the state during this academic school year	Total no. of persons receiving initial certification or licensure in the state who completed their teacher preparation program in another state	% of total																																													
2002–03	5,326	1,233	23%																																													
2003–04	5,059	1,378	27%																																													
2004–05	5,958	1,601	27%																																													
2005–06	5,113	1,637	32%																																													

From Missouri Title II State Reports (<https://title2.ed.gov/default.asp>)

From Missouri Title II State Reports (<https://title2.ed.gov/default.asp>)

Montana

Independent Analysis of State-Supplied Raw Data				
Method used for identifying imported teacher movers in this data set: State in which most recent degree was earned.				
Total movers new to state in last 5 years		Demographics of all movers		
	Total	% of all new MT teachers	% of movers	% of non-movers
2002–03	n/a	n/a	White	n/a
2003–04	n/a	n/a	African-American	n/a
2004–05	n/a	n/a	Hispanic	n/a
2005–06	n/a	n/a	Asian	n/a
2006–07	n/a	n/a	Native American	n/a
Total	4,785	28%	Males	70%
			Females	30%
Average age of all movers: 49 Average age of all nonmovers: 46				
Five states from which most movers come to Montana: North Dakota (11.9%), Massachusetts (9.1%), Minnesota (8.0%), Washington (7.3%), California (5.9%)				
Education levels of movers versus nonmovers: n/a		Certification levels of movers versus nonmovers: n/a		
NBPTS-certified movers: n/a				
Top five subjects taught by all movers: Prep, Elementary Self-Contained (only), Other (Instructional), Special Education Teacher, English/Language Arts				
Supplemental Mobility Information				
From Montana Title II State Reports (https://title2.ed.gov/default.asp)				
School Year	Total no. of persons receiving initial certification or licensure in the state during this academic school year	Total no. of persons receiving initial certification or licensure in the state who completed their teacher preparation program in another state	% of total	
2002–03	1,381	n/a	n/a	
2003–04	1,376	n/a	n/a	
2004–05	1,473	n/a	n/a	
2005–06	1,130	379	34%	

New Hampshire*

Data Prepared for this Study by New Hampshire			
Method used for identifying imported teacher movers in this data set: This data was prepared by New Hampshire (could not conduct independent analysis). Not all totals add up across data sets.			
Total movers new to state in last 5 years			Demographics of all movers
	Total	% of all new NH teachers	
2002–03	152	38%	
2003–04	338	35%	
2004–05	223	32%	
2005–06	197	27%	
2006–07	200	26%	
Total	1,110	30%	
Average age of all movers: 39 Average age of all nonmovers: 37			
Five states from which most movers come to New Hampshire: Massachusetts (30%), New York (11%), Maine (8%), Vermont (6%), Pennsylvania (5%)			
Education levels of movers versus nonmovers			Certification levels of movers versus nonmovers
Highest Degree Earned	% of movers	% of non-movers	
Bachelor’s	48%	n/a	
Master’s	42%	n/a	
Doctorate	2%	n/a	
Unknown	n/a	n/a	
NBPTS-certified movers: n/a			
Top five certification subject areas of all movers: Elementary Education (K–8), General Special Education, English Education (5–12), Social Studies (5–12), Music Education			
Supplemental Mobility Information			
School Year	Total no. of persons receiving initial certification or licensure in the state during this academic school year	Total no. of persons receiving initial certification or licensure in the state who completed their teacher preparation program in another state	% of total
2002–03	1,873	883	47%
2003–04	1,928	869	45%
2004–05	1,816	741	41%
2005–06	1,722	682	40%
From New Hampshire Title II State Reports (https://title2.ed.gov/default.asp)			

South Carolina

Independent Analysis of State-Supplied Raw Data																																															
Method used for identifying imported teacher movers in this data set: Using out-of-state district codes within the teacher experience table																																															
Total movers new to state in last 5 years		Demographics of all movers																																													
	<table><tr><th>Total</th><th>% of all new SC teachers</th></tr><tr><td>2002–03</td><td>n/a</td></tr><tr><td>2003–04</td><td>n/a</td></tr><tr><td>2004–05</td><td>n/a</td></tr><tr><td>2005–06</td><td>n/a</td></tr><tr><td>2006–07</td><td>n/a</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>n/a</td></tr></table>	Total	% of all new SC teachers	2002–03	n/a	2003–04	n/a	2004–05	n/a	2005–06	n/a	2006–07	n/a	Total	n/a		<table><tr><th></th><th>% of movers</th><th>% of non-movers</th></tr><tr><td>White - not Hispanic</td><td>93%</td><td>85%</td></tr><tr><td>Black - not Hispanic</td><td>4%</td><td>13%</td></tr><tr><td>Hispanic</td><td>1%</td><td>0%</td></tr><tr><td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td><td>0%</td><td>0%</td></tr><tr><td>American Indian</td><td>0%</td><td>0%</td></tr><tr><td>Unknown</td><td>1%</td><td>1%</td></tr><tr><td>Males</td><td>20%</td><td>15%</td></tr><tr><td>Females</td><td>79%</td><td>84%</td></tr><tr><td>N/A</td><td>1%</td><td>1%</td></tr></table>		% of movers	% of non-movers	White - not Hispanic	93%	85%	Black - not Hispanic	4%	13%	Hispanic	1%	0%	Asian or Pacific Islander	0%	0%	American Indian	0%	0%	Unknown	1%	1%	Males	20%	15%	Females	79%	84%	N/A	1%	1%
Total	% of all new SC teachers																																														
2002–03	n/a																																														
2003–04	n/a																																														
2004–05	n/a																																														
2005–06	n/a																																														
2006–07	n/a																																														
Total	n/a																																														
	% of movers	% of non-movers																																													
White - not Hispanic	93%	85%																																													
Black - not Hispanic	4%	13%																																													
Hispanic	1%	0%																																													
Asian or Pacific Islander	0%	0%																																													
American Indian	0%	0%																																													
Unknown	1%	1%																																													
Males	20%	15%																																													
Females	79%	84%																																													
N/A	1%	1%																																													
Average age of movers: 28 Average age of nonmovers: 28																																															
Five states from which most movers come to South Carolina: Ohio (15%), North Carolina (11%), New York (9%), Pennsylvania (9%), Michigan (8%)																																															
Education levels of movers versus nonmovers		Certification levels of movers versus nonmovers: n/a																																													
	<table><tr><th>Highest Degree Earned</th><th>% of movers</th><th>% of non-movers</th></tr><tr><td>Bachelor’s</td><td>79%</td><td>78%</td></tr><tr><td>Master’s</td><td>21%</td><td>22%</td></tr><tr><td>Doctorate</td><td>0%</td><td>0%</td></tr><tr><td>Specialist</td><td>0%</td><td>0%</td></tr><tr><td>Unknown</td><td>0%</td><td>0%</td></tr></table>	Highest Degree Earned	% of movers	% of non-movers	Bachelor’s	79%	78%	Master’s	21%	22%	Doctorate	0%	0%	Specialist	0%	0%	Unknown	0%	0%																												
Highest Degree Earned	% of movers	% of non-movers																																													
Bachelor’s	79%	78%																																													
Master’s	21%	22%																																													
Doctorate	0%	0%																																													
Specialist	0%	0%																																													
Unknown	0%	0%																																													
NBPTS-certified movers: n/a																																															
Available information on where and what movers teach once in state: English/Language Arts, Math, Science																																															
Supplemental Mobility Information																																															
From South Carolina Title II State Reports (https://title2.ed.gov/default.asp)																																															
School Year	Total no. of persons receiving initial certification or licensure in the state during this academic school year	Total no. of persons receiving initial certification or licensure in the state who completed their teacher preparation program in another state	% of total																																												
2002–03	2,049	1,514	74%																																												
2003–04	2,159	752	35%																																												
2004–05	2,063	5,78	28%																																												
2005–06	1,881	1,060	56%																																												

South Dakota

South Dakota

Independent Analysis of State-Supplied Raw Data							
Method used for identifying imported teacher movers in this data set: New teachers whose highest degree earned was from an out-of-state institution of higher education							
Total movers new to state in last 5 years		Demographics of all movers					
	Total	% of all SD Teachers			% of movers	% of non-movers	
2002–03	n/a	n/a	White	97%	n/a		
2003–04	n/a	n/a	African-American	<1%	n/a		
2004–05	n/a	n/a	Hispanic	<1%	n/a		
2005–06	n/a	n/a	Asian	<1%	n/a		
2006–07	n/a	n/a	Native American	3%	n/a		
Total	888	30%	Males	28%	n/a		
			Females	72%	n/a		
Average age of movers: South Dakota does not collect/did not collect this data.							
Average age of nonmovers: South Dakota does not collect/did not collect this data.							
Five states from which most movers come to South Dakota: Minnesota (20%), Nebraska (17%), Iowa (11%), North Dakota (11%), and Colorado (4%). South Dakota has imported teachers from all 50 states and DC in the last five years.							
Education levels of movers versus nonmovers			Certification levels of movers versus nonmovers				
	Highest Degree Earned	% of movers	% of non-movers		Certification Level	% of movers	% of non-movers
Bachelor’s	81%	82%	1- or 2-yr Cert.	22%	n/a		
Master’s	18%	6%	1-yr Extension for lapsed Cert.	2%	n/a		
Doctorate	<1%	<1%	5-yr Cert.	62%	n/a		
Specialist	<1%	<1%	Alternative Cert. (1-yr, 2-yr, or limited)	3%	n/a		
Unknown	<1%	12%	Teach for America	4%	n/a		
			Other/unknown	7%	n/a		
NBPTS-certified movers: South Dakota does not collect/did not collect this data.							
Available information on where and what movers teach once in state: South Dakota provided information on the schools in which teachers taught, but researchers were unable to determine what types of schools those were. The subjects that movers most often are certified in (and most likely teach) are Preparation/Study Hall/Travel/High School Teacher, Special Education/Special Education Teacher, K–12, Preparation/Study Hall/Travel/Middle School Teacher, First-Grade/Elementary School Teacher, Kindergarten/Kindergarten Teacher, Second-Grade/Elementary School Teacher							
Supplemental Mobility Data							
School Year	Total no. of persons receiving initial certification or licensure in the state during this academic school year	Total no. of persons receiving initial certification or licensure in the state who completed their teacher preparation program in another state	% of total				
2002–03	943	233	35%				
2003–04	957	277	29%				
2004–05	1,057	304	29%				
2005–06	1,165	351	30%				

From South Dakota Title II State Reports (<https://title2.ed.gov/default.asp>)

From South Dakota Title II State Reports (<https://title2.ed.gov/default.asp>)

District of Columbia

The data tables supplied were not formatted to allow researchers to analyze the data with a high degree of confidence for the accuracy of the results. The following supplemental information is from the District of Columbia Title II State Reports:

School Year	Total no. of persons receiving initial certification or licensure in the state during this academic school year	Total no. of persons receiving initial certification or licensure in the state who completed their teacher preparation program in another state	% of total
2002–03	1,200	n/a	n/a
2003–04	1,070	104	10%
2004–05	1,380	953	69%
2005–06	859	421	49%