

**UPDATE ON NATIONAL BOARD CERTIFICATION TEACHER MOBILITY
AND RETENTION RATES STUDY**

BACKGROUND

Through its accountability work, the Board is looking at ways to encourage high teaching quality in low performing schools. This directive aligns with the Board's goal to improve student achievement.

In national research and in Washington State, there are documented differences in the teacher mobility and retention rates, based on school characteristics and student performance. Washington State uses two policy levers to incentivize effective teaching. The first encourages eligible teachers to pursue National Board Certification. The second is to encourage concentrations of National Board Certificated teachers in challenging schools.

Washington has one of the highest numbers of National Board Certified Teachers (NBCT) in the nation. The 2009 Legislature appropriated \$64.8 million to support National Board Certification. A revolving fund supports conditional loans for eligible certification candidates. Teachers who hold a certificate from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards earn an annual salary enhancement of \$5,000. This stipend is included in a teacher's pension calculation and may be continued if an NBCT becomes a principal. NBCTs with fulltime teaching assignments earn up to an additional \$5,000 if they teach in "challenging" schools.¹

Due to the significant investment in these policies, the State Board of Education and the Professional Educator Standards Board want to know the effectiveness of these two incentives in the distribution and mobility patterns of teachers who earn National Board Certification as compared to those teachers who do not earn National Board Certification based upon school characteristics.

The State Board of Education awarded a contract to the Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession (CSTP), in September 2009 for a nine month period, to determine if the two incentives for attaining National Board Certification and serving challenging schools make a difference in the mobility, distribution, and retention patterns among the National Board Certified Teachers, compared to teachers that teach in schools with similar characteristics and do not obtain this certification. CSTP has prepared a preliminary report on its activities including a recent survey conducted and will give the Board an update. A final report is due in June 2010.

¹ Challenged schools are defined by students in poverty under Free and Reduced Lunch with 50 percent of student headcount in high school, 60 percent in middle school, and 70 percent in elementary school.

POLICY DISCUSSION

The Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession will provide an update on the progress of its study. Board members may want to give some feedback on findings for the next phase of their study. One potential issue that has surfaced is that the definition of challenging schools for the NBCT incentive, as defined by the legislature based on free and reduced lunch, may not coincide with schools that are lowest achieving. A PowerPoint will be provided at the meeting.

EXPECTED ACTION

None

CONTRACT FOR PERSONAL SERVICES
Contract No.

between

**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION,
STATE OF WASHINGTON**
(hereinafter referred to as the Board)
Old Capitol Building, P.O. Box 47200
Olympia, WA 98504-7200

and

THE CENTER FOR STRENGTHENING THE TEACHING PROFESSION
(hereinafter referred to as Contractor)
P.O. Box 1246
Silverdale, WA 98383-1246
Federal Identification #04-3769448
Unified Business Identifier #602 316 410

In consideration of the promises and conditions contained herein, Board and Contractor do mutually agree as follows:

I. DUTIES OF THE CONTRACTOR

A. The general objective(s) of this contract are as follows:

The Contractor shall determine if the two incentives for attaining National Board certification and serving challenging schools make a difference in the mobility, distribution, and retention patterns among the National Board Certified Teachers (NBCTs) compared to teachers with similar characteristics that teach in schools with similar characteristics and do not obtain this certification.

B. In order to accomplish the general objective(s) of this contract, Contractor shall perform the following specific duties to the satisfaction of the Board's designee, Edie Harding, Executive Director as follows:

1. What are the characteristics of teaching workforce in challenging schools, both prior to, and after the incentive began, and how the characteristics changed over time?
2. In what ways are the characteristics of NBCTs different from other teachers statewide, in terms of the: a) level of education and experience; b) types of schools (elementary, middle, or high) and districts in which they teach; c) overall retention/mobility rates; d) gender, age, and race/ethnicity; and 3) certification and endorsements held?
3. What are the mobility/retention patterns of NBCTs in different types of schools and districts (elementary/middle/high/alternative, socioeconomic status) and teacher endorsement areas (e.g., math, language arts, science, etc.) and how do these patterns

compare with teachers with similar characteristics who do not obtain this certification, both before and after the incentive program began?

4. What are the characteristics of the schools and districts in which NBCTs are located statewide (e.g., by region, SES level, percent students of color, student performance), and in what ways are they similar and different from state averages?
5. What proportion of NBCTs is working as classroom teachers either full or part-time? Who and how many have moved from teaching to principal, assistant principal, or some duty root other than that of a classroom teacher (e.g., instructional support specialist, librarian, etc.)?
6. In what ways do NBCTs affect the culture of the school/department where they work, and does it depend on other factors as well, such as the proportion or number of other NBCTs that are present?
7. What do educators believe are the strengths and weaknesses of the current incentive program, and how could the weaknesses be addressed?
8. What are the policy implications of these findings?
9. Other duties as mutually agreed upon by the Contractor and Board.

Estimated Project Milestones

	Deliverable #1	Deliverable #2
September 15, 2009 to June 30, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An interim report with an overview of program and descriptive statistics about NBCTs, and a two-page summary, is due December 1, 2009. • Possible presentations at SBE and PESB meetings and other briefings upon request. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A final report that includes results of quantitative and qualitative analyses, and an Executive Summary, is due June 1. • Possible presentations at SBE and PESB meetings and other briefings upon request.

**II. CONDITIONS OF COMMENCEMENT OF PERFORMANCE
AND
SCHEDULE OF PERFORMANCE**

Contractor shall not commence performance, or be entitled to compensation or reimbursement for any services rendered, prior to the occurrence of each of the following conditions: (1) This contract must be executed by a representative of the Contractor and the Board; (2) This contract must be filed with, and approved by, the Office of Financial Management, if and to the extent required by state personal service contract laws; and, (3) The Board's designee must confirm the occurrence of conditions number one and two and notify the contractor to commence performance.

The schedule of performance of contractor's duties is as follows subject; however, to the three prior conditions to commencement of performance set forth immediately above:

September 15, 2009 to June 30, 2010

III. DUTIES OF THE BOARD

- A. In consideration of Contractor's satisfactory performance of the duties set forth herein, Board shall compensate Contractor at a fixed rate of eighty thousand dollars (\$80,000).
- B. Payment shall be made to the Contractor as follows:

Product	Date Due	Amount Paid
Detailed proposal on Methodology for Study	September 30, 2009	\$2,000
Progress Report	October 30, 2009	\$2000
Interim Report	December 1, 2009	\$25,000
Preparation and Presentation for January SBE Board meeting	January 14, 2010	\$2,000
Progress Report	March 30, 2010	\$2,000
Draft Final Report	June 1, 2010	\$10,000
Final Report	June 30, 2010	\$34,400
Preparation and Presentation for July SBE Board meeting	Mid July, 2010	\$2,000
Total		\$79,400

Travel and per diem expenses in accordance with Attachment C in the amounts and for the purposes otherwise established for state employees at the time of incurrence by the rules and regulatory policies of the Office of Financial Management (OFM) not to exceed Two Hundred Dollars (\$200).

Expenses incurred in accordance with Attachment C for miscellaneous office expenses, not to exceed a total of Four Hundred Dollars (\$400). Contractor must submit receipts or other documentation. Payment shall be contingent on receipt of Contractor invoice and the Board's approval of the final written report.

IV. INCORPORATION OF GENERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS

This contract includes and incorporates as if fully set forth herein the GENERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS, which are attached hereto and marked "Attachment A".

We the undersigned agree to the terms of the foregoing contract.

CONTRACTOR

The State Board of Education
State of Washington

By: _____

By: _____

Jeanne Harmon, Executive Director

Edie Harding, Executive Director

Who certifies that he/she is the Contractor identified herein, OR a person duly qualified and authorized to bind the Contractor so identified to the foregoing Agreement.

Signed this ____ day of _____ 2009

Non-profit organization? yes* no
If yes, under what IRS section?

Signed this ____ day of _____ 2009

By: _____

Melanie Buechel, Contracts Administrator

Signed this ____ day of _____ 2009

Approved as to FORM ONLY
Assistant Attorney General