

*Commission on Local Government*

**Estimate of Local Fiscal Impact**  
2012 General Assembly Session

**Bill:** HB 325      **Patron:** Massie      **Date:** January 23, 2012

In accordance with the provisions of §30-19.03 of the Code of Virginia, the staff of the Commission on Local Government offers the following analysis of the above-referenced legislation:

**I. Bill Summary**

HB 325 requires the Board of Education to include in its regulations governing licensure a requirement that by September 1, 2014, every person seeking initial licensure or renewal of a license with an endorsement in special education and working with students with autism spectrum disorders must demonstrate proficiency in student behavior management. The bill also requires that by September 1, 2014, each local school division must provide, prior to such person's taking such responsibility, 40 hours of training in student behavior management to any aide assigned to work with a teacher with primary responsibility for students with autism spectrum disorders and 12 hours of training for other personnel with other oversight responsibility for students with autism spectrum disorders.

**II. Fiscal Impact Analysis**

The Commission on Local Government (CLG) received fiscal impact statements from 12 localities - the Counties of Campbell, Carroll, Rappahannock, and Spotsylvania; the Cities of Danville, Lynchburg, Radford, Richmond, and Winchester; and the Towns of Blacksburg, Christiansburg, and Hillsville. In addition, the Virginia Association of School Superintendents assisted the Commission in obtaining information from local school divisions, including Orange County Public Schools and Chesapeake Public Schools.

Three of the respondents – the Towns of Blacksburg, Christiansburg, and Hillsville – indicated that they would not experience an increase in costs as a result of HB 325. All three towns stated that the provisions of the bill do not apply to them because they do not operate public school systems.

Two of the respondents – the County of Rappahannock and the City of Radford – reported that they will experience an increase in costs of under \$5,000. In their estimate, Rappahannock County assumed a minimal rate of turnover for teachers and aides whose training is mandated by the bill.

The remaining seven localities – the Counties of Campbell, Carroll, and Spotsylvania and the Cities of Danville, Lynchburg, Richmond, and Winchester – expect

an increase in costs of over \$5,000 as a result of the provisions of HB 325. Estimates ranged from a low of \$8,100 in Spotsylvania County to a high of \$85,000 in Campbell County. Listed below are the cost estimates:

Campbell County:	\$85,000
Carroll County:	75,000
Spotsylvania County:	8,100 (minimum)
Danville City:	38,984
Lynchburg City:	54,000
Richmond City:	unknown
Winchester City:	18,000

Campbell County's estimate is based upon training costs and the cost for substitute teachers while full-time teachers attend training. They also indicate an opportunity cost as school divisions are forced to comply with the provisions of the bill instead of expending resources to train in math, reading, and instruction. They also note that 75% of their bus drivers would be subject to the training requirement.

The City of Danville estimated that 41 aide positions would require training at a cost of \$764.40 per trainee. They also estimate that 10 employees per year would require training due to attrition.

The City of Lynchburg estimates that they will be required to train 45 teachers and 25 aides as well as 70 members of other staff per year. They also include trainers' fees and materials costs in their estimate.

Orange County Public Schools stated that the cost for the first year of training will be approximately \$12,000. It is difficult for them to provide future impact because turnover is unknown. They also note that they may have to train individuals who do not work with autistic children in case there is turnover during the school year.

Chesapeake Public Schools estimated a cost of \$500,000 to implement the provisions of HB 325. Their estimate includes the training of staff to comply with the mandate along with the costs for substitute teachers.

### **III. Conclusion**

In response to HB 325, jurisdictions and school divisions have indicated a number of different costs associated with its compliance. These expenditures include the costs for training and materials as well as substitute teachers. The costs will vary by school division based upon how many teachers, aides, and staff members will be required to take training.