AN HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL BOARD CERTIFICATION STIPENDS IN VIRGINIA

Kerry N. Alday

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

in

Educational Leadership and Policy Studies

Theodore B. Creighton, Chair
Carol S. Cash
N. Wayne Tripp
Travis W. Twiford

March 21, 2011
Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, Effective Teachers, Improving Low-Performing Schools, Teacher Leadership, National Board Certification
This study examines the historical evolution and legislative valuation of the National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund in the Commonwealth of Virginia. This fund offers stipends to teachers who earn National Board Certification from the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards. This research project included three steps of data collection. First, the legislative history of Virginia’s National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund, which covered the General Assembly Session in 1999, was reviewed. The second step was open-ended interviews with legislators and a representative from the Virginia Education Association who participated in the creation of the “Fund.” The third step was to collect and report the incentives that are offered by the local education agencies for teachers who earn National Board Certification. The study reported that the initial plan devised by the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy in the report, A Nation Prepared (1986) that National Board Certification was not implemented with fidelity in the Commonwealth of Virginia, according to the intended design when it pertained to both how to strategically use the skills of NBCTs and how to ensure NBCTs are working with the students most in need of help. As supported by the interview data, the study shows those interviewed value great teachers and are willing to support them with financial incentives.
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CHAPTER ONE

Background of the Study

National Board of Professional Teaching Standards

The Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession wrote a response to *A Nation at Risk*, entitled *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* in 1986. This report led to the creation of the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 2002). Its mission was:

To improve the quality of teaching and learning by: maintaining high and rigorous standards for what accomplished teachers should know and be able to do; providing a national voluntary system certifying teachers who meet these standards, and advocating related education reforms to integrate National Board Certification in American education and to capitalize on the expertise of National Board Certified Teachers (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 2002, p. 1).

National Board of Professional Teaching Standard’s Goals

In 1989, a document was written by NBPTS, entitled, *What Teachers Should Know and Be Able to Do*. This policy set both the standards for the organization and for five core propositions for teachers. The goal of these standards and propositions was to help identify teachers “who effectively enhance student learning and demonstrate the high level of knowledge, skills, abilities and commitments reflected in the following five core propositions” (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 2002, p. 3).

1. Teachers are committed to students and their learning (NBPTS, 2002, p. 3).
   Through observation and gleaning their students’ backgrounds, academic abilities, peer friendships, and skills, teachers should be able to gear their lessons toward better educating their students (National Board of Professional Teaching Standards, 2002).

2. Teachers should be knowledgeable in the subjects they teach and in the methodology best used to teach those subjects to students (National Board of Professional Teaching Standards, 2002).
Educators should have an abundance of knowledge in the subject area they teach, and should be able to apply it to the real world. They should also be able to convey this knowledge to their students in an engaging manner (National Board of Professional Teaching Standards, 2002).

3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning (National Board of Professional Teaching Standards, 2002, p. 3).

Teachers should be able to engage students in their own learning by using a variety of techniques. Teachers should be able to alter techniques as needed in order to ensure student learning (National Board of Professional Teaching Standards, 2002).


Teachers should inspire students to reach for higher goals and perspectives. They should draw on students’ prior knowledge and encourage their higher aspirations. Teachers should strengthen their teaching by daily examination and reflection. (National Board of Professional Teaching Standards, 2002).

5. Teachers are members of learning communities (National Board of Professional Teaching Standards, 2002, p. 4).

Teachers should work collaboratively with their colleagues on curriculum development, policy, and staff development. They should strategize with parents. (National Board of Professional Teaching Standards, 2002, p. 4)

In order to attain National Board Certification (NBC), one must validate that one is an accomplished teacher. Requirements for validation consist of the completion of a portfolio and an assessment center evaluation. The portfolio consists of three classroom-teaching experiences documented by video recordings, as well as a student work product in order to further authenticate the quality of the experiences. A fourth portfolio entry affirms evidence that the teacher reaches out beyond his classroom to the parents, community, and/or colleagues to collectively advance student learning. The assessment center consists of six exercises that establish and evince content knowledge in the certificate area in which the teacher is working. These exercises are situational, and each requires teacher completion within a 30-minute time frame (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 2008b).
National Board Certification Monetary Awards

In 2001, 16,040 teachers in the United States held National Board Certification. This number tripled to 55,300 in 2006. Forty-nine states and 530 localities offer incentives for those who earn certification as local, state, and federal governments have allocated substantial monetary compensation to the National Board Certification process (Rotherham, 2004). The Commonwealth of Virginia budgets $75,000 annually to reimburse individual teachers $1000 to assist in the cost of seeking National Board Certification, and a $5000 one time stipend upon attainment of certification. Thereafter, a $2500 stipend is awarded annually for the life of the certification for every teacher who has earned National Board Certification (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Advocacy Link, 2008). The Progressive Policy Institute has concluded that states spend approximately $100 million dollars annually on NBC incentives. This number does not include local school district contributions toward incentive bonuses and salary adjustments (Rotherham, 2004).

National Board Certification in Virginia

In 2008, NBPTS reported that there were 1,765 NBCTs in the Commonwealth of Virginia, which was less than two percent of the total number of teachers. Three hundred twenty-six of these teachers earned their certification in 2008; this was a 14% increase from the previous year. In addition, 25.3% of the 1,765 NBCTs in Virginia are employed in Title I schools (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 2008c).

Statement of the Problem

The Commonwealth of Virginia and the division school boards within the Commonwealth are investing substantial sums of money in the acquisition and establishment of National Board Certified teachers. Analysis of the funds allocated to National Board Certification in the Commonwealth of Virginia requires scrutiny of cost justification as related to NBPTS goal attainment. Furthermore, disparities among the localities in NBC compensation necessitate exploration.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the reasons why Virginia’s General Assembly has chosen to budget for the National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund by examining the historical evolution of the Fund. The researcher also determined the incentives that are offered by division school boards in the Commonwealth of Virginia to National Board Certified Teachers. This study systematically reviewed the monetary awards that are expended to National Board Certified Teachers by the General Assembly and the Virginia Board of Education. The continuation of The National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund was also addressed.

Significance of the Study

The number of Nationally Board Certified Teachers in the Commonwealth of Virginia has increased in great measure. Since 2006, the percentage of teachers who are NBC in Virginia has increase at a rate by 90.6%, compared to a national NBC increase of 54.7%. The continued escalation Nationally Board Certified Teachers requires an examination of currently offered incentives. In addition, a review of financial incentives allocated for National Board Certified Teachers necessitates research, exploration, and documentation. Equally as important is determining the perceived value of National Board Certification, envisioned by division school boards and the General Assembly.

The significance of this study is to apprise division school boards and legislators in the Commonwealth of Virginia of the historical background of the National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund. Concurrently, the literature review looks at other studies that describe the effectiveness of NBCTs in the classroom as compared with non-NBCTs. Additional reviewed studies consider leadership roles NBCTs obtain upon earning the certification, the documented reasons why NBCTs initially decided to try and achieve the certification, and NBCTs’ impact on a school and student learning.

Definition of Terms

- Assessment Center Exercises – A candidate must demonstrate content knowledge by responding to six computer-based exercises that are specific to each certificate area.
Completion time is limited to 30 minutes per exercise (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Advocacy Link, 2008).

- Virginia General Assembly – A legislative body whose responsibilities include the representation of Virginia’s citizens in determining and enacting laws and policies. The General Assembly consists of the House of Delegates and the Senate of Virginia.
- National Board Certified Teacher (NBCT) – A teacher who has attained National Board Certification from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Advocacy Link, 2008).
- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) – an independent, nonprofit organization that was founded to advance the quality of teaching and learning (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Advocacy Link, 2008).
- Portfolio Assessment – A collection of classroom practice chronicled by four entries:
  - A classroom entry accompanied by student work,
  - Two entries that involve videos of interactions between students and the NBC candidate
  - Documented accomplishments that detail exactly how the candidate impacts student learning outside of his own classroom. (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Advocacy Link, 2008)

**Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical framework of this study was developed from research and analysis of both literature examining National Board Certification and the monetary fund established by Virginia’s General Assembly, in determination of the value of National Board Certification. The researcher explored the development and passage of Virginia Statute 22.1-299.2, which established the monetary fund for NBC teachers. In addition, financing that is allocated for NBCTs by division school boards was also examined. Finally, representatives from the Virginia General Assembly were interviewed to ascertain factors leading to the organization, enacting, and perpetuation of the Virginia Statute 22.1-299.2. An evaluation and reflection of these topics will facilitate insight into the General Assembly’s valuation of Nationally Board Certified Teachers.
Research Questions

The intention of this study was to complete an analysis of the historical development of the National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund in the Commonwealth of Virginia by addressing the following questions regarding the General Assembly’s resolution to prioritize funding for National Board Certified Teachers.

1. The Commonwealth of Virginia pays stipends to National Board Certified Teachers because of this legislation. Are the identified objectives and perceptions of the Commonwealth of Virginia's General Assembly aligned with the projected outcomes?
   a. What were the objectives of the legislators for introducing and passing the law to provide stipends to National Board Certified Teachers?
   b. What are the legislators’ perceptions on the impact of National Board Certified Teachers?

2. How much money, since 1999, has the Commonwealth of Virginia paid to National Board Certified Teachers as a result of this legislature?
   a. How much has been expended by the Virginia Board of Education though the General Assembly’s budget?

Figure 1. General assembly’s valuation of NBCTs in Virginia.
b. What do divisions in Virginia offer teachers who are in the process or have earned National Board Certification?

3. What are selected legislatures perceptions of the future of continued support of the National Board Certification?
   a. Do the legislators perceive they will continue to provide stipends for the current certifications offered by NBPTS?
   b. Do the legislators perceive they will include the projected certifications in Administrations and Teacher Leadership?

**Limitations**

There were conditions over which the researcher did not have control. These limitations included:

1. A select number of Virginia’s General Assembly legislators were commissioned for an interview concerning the National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund due to their direct interaction with the statute.
2. The lapse of time between the original statute (1999) and current time spans 12 years. As such, some legislators may have difficulty recalling key points in relation to the statute.
3. The subjects interviewed are retired from their positions in the General Assembly and the Virginia Education Association, so knowledge gained from the interviews cannot determine how the General Assembly may vote on this statute in the future.
4. The researcher audio-taped each interview, an action that could affect how the questions were answered, as some people are uncomfortable with being audio-taped.
5. Data taken during the interviews was entirely dependent on the participants’ honesty.

**Delimitations**

The study consisted of some conditions over which the researcher did have control. This delimitation includes:

1. Interview participants were chosen directly due to their perceived knowledge of the National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund.
Organization of the Study

The study is organized into five chapters. Chapter One is comprised of an introduction to the research, the statement of the problem, the purpose and significance of the study, the definitions of terms, the theoretical framework, the research questions, the limitations, and the delimitations. Chapter Two includes the review of literature on National Board Certification, specifically, an analysis of the history of the creation of the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards and the development of the Commonwealth of Virginia’s National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund. The review of literature also encompasses NBCT’s impact on student learning, why teachers chose to pursue NBC, the certifications’ influence on teacher leadership, and the effect of NBCTs on low performing schools. The methodology of the study is located in Chapter Three. Chapter Four details the data retrieved from the actual research. The findings, implications, and recommendations are stated in Chapter Five.
CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

Historical Development of the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards

In 1983, A Nation at Risk was introduced to the American public. The nation was alarmed to learn that student knowledge was declining.

Each generation of Americans has outstripped its parents in education, in literacy, and in economic attainment. For the first time in the history of our country, the educational skill of one generation will not surpass, will not equal, will not even approach, those of their parents (Gardner & Larsen, 1983, p. 11).

A Nation at Risk affected the nation, and in response, the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, wrote “A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century,” in 1986. The focus of this report was to stress the idea that educators needed not just to teach, but to focus on how students learn. The Task Force opined that the nation needed to determine “what a teacher needs to know and be able to do at a truly professional level of performance” (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, 1986, p. 35) The Task Force asserted that there would be dramatic improvements in education if teachers were required to meet higher standards of preparation and skill.

A plan was devised by the Task Force to focus on and address the issues they had with the present educational system. They were convinced that teachers should work collectively to strive to improve their performance. There were eight major elements to their plan for educational improvement. One of the most important elements called for the creation of a National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), which would have regional and state membership structures. Another major element was to create Lead Teachers who would be Nationally Board Certified Teachers and who would help colleagues uphold the high standards of learning set by NBPTS. These Lead Teachers “must create communities, work together with colleagues, take responsibility to help colleagues who are not performing where they should be and arrange for coaching, technical assistance, or other remediation” (Carnegie Forum on Teaching as a Profession, 1986, p. 58). The task force further suggested that Lead Teachers take
overall responsibility for groups as well as serve as consultants/experts in their particular fields. The Task Force deemed it critical that if teachers were able to reach the high standards set by NBPTS, there needed to be financial compensation. Overall, the Task Force determined that, “Schools will capitalize on the knowledge and skills of its most capable staff and create a career path worth pursuing” (Carnegie Forum on Teaching as a Profession, 1986, p. 60).

The Task Force advised that:

A National Board for Professional Teaching Standards should be created to establish standards for high levels of competence in the teaching profession, to assess the qualification of those seeking board certification, and to grant certificates to those who meet the standards.

1. The Board would grant Teacher’s Certificates that attest to a high level of competence. It would also grant Advanced Teacher’s Certificates that indicate outstanding teaching competence and demonstrated ability for school leadership.

2. In developing its standards, the Board should determine what teachers need to know and what they should be able to do.

3. The Board should work with institutions engaged in preparing prospective teachers to assist them in preparing candidates for certification.

4. A majority of the members of the National Board should be elected by Board-certified teachers.

5. Candidates for Board certification should be able to choose the means of preparation that best suits their needs.

6. The assessment of candidates for Board certification will require geographically decentralized administration. State or regional organizations of certified teachers should be created by the National Board to oversee Board functions at the regional and state level. (Carnegie Forum on Teaching as a Profession, 1986, p. 62)

The Task Force’s plan made several recommendations to ensure that Nationally Board Certified Teachers were being utilized effectively. The Task Force noted that states needed to take precautions to provide for an equitable distribution of NBCTs throughout the state’s localities. In their plan they stated,
Within districts, the most experienced teachers are often assigned to the most promising students. Incentives at every level should be designed to ensure that the students most in need of help are taught by many of the best and most experienced teachers (Carnegie Forum on Teaching as a Profession, 1986, p. 103).

They also asserted that states should either offer salary supplements to teachers who are in high-need districts, or design other policies to establish a fair distribution of their most capable teachers. Lastly, they pronounced that experienced teachers should be offered incentives to teach in high priority schools (Carnegie Forum on Teaching as a Profession, 1986).

In 2006, Koppich, Humphrey, and Hough completed a research study on National Board Certification. Part of the study included interviews with the founders and key executives of NBPTS. They learned that the founders and key executives held different views on the purpose of NBPTS, as well as its goals. Lee Shulman, one of the original founders of NBPTS, stated during his interview that the purpose of the standards was “making excellent teaching more salient and visible as a way of identifying real excellence in teaching” (Koppich, Humphrey, & Hough, 2006). Originally, he did not intend for NBPTS to be part of school reform; rather, his visions focused on individualistic reform. Shulman’s co-researcher, Gary Sykes, who eventually helped create NBPTS standards, was also interviewed. Sykes’ vision was to make staff development for educators more thorough and to possibly set a status differentiation among teachers (Koppich, et al., 2006). The founding president of the board, James Kelly, was also interviewed. Kelly, like Sykes, saw the potential of building a learning community, but his ideal went further. He proposed the potential of NBCTs being offered professional roles above and beyond teaching (Koppich, et al., 2006). Finally, David Mandel, the associate director of the Carnegie Task Force on Education and the Economy and an early vice-president of NBPTS, was interviewed. Mandel believed that, “Teachers would no longer practice as individual entrepreneurs” (Koppich, et al., 2006, p. 9). Overall, the founders and executives of NBPTS envisioned the role of NBPTS as an effort to make teaching more of a profession, to provide a learning community, and to have teachers offered educational roles outside of the classroom.
NBCT’s Effect on Student Learning

There has yet to be a consensus on whether or not Nationally Board Certified Teachers have an effect on student learning. Many professionals in the field of education, all of whom debate the outcome and reason for the certification, have studied National Board Certification.

A study was conducted by Stone (Stone, 2002) that explored teachers’ test scores over a period of three years to determine whether Nationally Board Certified teachers effectively influenced student achievement more than teachers not Nationally Board Certified. This study is often not considered valid due to the small population of sixteen participants in the study, disallowing definitive conclusions. At the time of this study, there were not many NBCTs in the state of Tennessee, so this Stone believes this is a representation of the state.

Stone’s goal was to explore the relationships, if any, between NBC compensation and the test scores of the students taught by NBCTs. The underlying goal of this study was to explore whether NBPTS-certified teachers were effective in increasing student achievement as evidenced by standardized test scores. Sixteen NBCTs’ students’ test scores in the subjects of math, reading language; social studies and science were used for the study. The percentage of annual growth was the indicator for teacher effectiveness. In Chattanooga, Tennessee they use the 115% standard to define a high performing teacher. (115% of the national norm gain is considered exemplary, a gain less the 85% is considered deficient) (Stone, 2002).

The outcome of the three-year study showed that the test scores of NBCTs were average compared to the other non-NBC teachers in the state. Only 15% of the test scores reached what Tennessee would consider “exemplary” and 13% of the students with NBCTs received state test scores that would be considered “deficient” (Stone, 2002).

In 2004, the Teachers College Record contained an article on the subject that received a lot of attention. The article was entitled, National Board Certification for Teachers: A Billion-Dollar Hoax. It presented the idea that the standards that NBPTS has set are mediocre and do not deserve the prestige that has been bestowed upon them (Thirunarayanan, 2004).

In 2004, Cavalluzzo conducted a study to determine if there was a correlation between student achievement in ninth and tenth grades and NBCTs in those grades. Standardized tests were implemented over a two-year period to determine these students’ academic achievements. The researcher found that students who had NBC teachers in their classrooms attained
statistically higher test scores than those who had teachers who had never applied for NBC. In addition, Cavalluzzo found that teachers who were currently applicants for NBPTS certification had students who scored higher than those students whose teachers who had no affiliation with NBPTS. Interestingly, teachers who had tried to achieve NBC, but failed, produced students who scored significantly lower than those whose teachers had never applied (Cavalluzzo, 2004).

Cantrell, Fullerton, Kane, and Staiger (2007), examined the relationship between NBCTs and student achievement in grades 3-5. Three groups of teachers were studied: NBCTs, unsuccessful NBCTs, and those teachers who never tried to achieve NBC. The researchers found that the teachers who tried but were unsuccessful at earning NBC were less effective in the classroom than teachers who had never tried to achieve NBC. The researchers also noted a significant difference between NBCTs and those who had been unsuccessful at earning NBC. Teachers with NBC elicited a higher level of achievement from their students than those who were unsuccessful in achieving NBC. Finally, the study reported no difference in student achievement between NBCTs and teachers who had never applied for NBC (Cantrell, Fullerton, Kane, & Staiger, 2007).

Goldhaber and Anthony (Goldhaber & Anthony, 2007), also examined the relationship between board certification and student achievement. The participants were students and teachers in grades 3 to 5 in the state of North Carolina. The study encompassed the 1996-97 and 1998-99 school years. The research revealed that, compared with students of teachers who had never applied or applied and did not earn NBC, students of NBCTs made significantly higher gains in reading (p<.05), but not in mathematics. The researchers also noted that students of teachers who later earned NBC had made consistently higher gains than students in classes taught by non-NBC teachers. In addition, first year NBCTs attained higher student test scores than teachers who were not NBC. NBCTs who had been certified for two or more years revealed inconsistent gains of their students’ test scores. The gains were positive in reading, but not significant, whereas the results of math testing were significantly negative (Goldhaber & Anthony, 2007).

**Why Teachers Pursue National Board Certification**

In 2002, a study was conducted with teachers in California to determine the reasons why teachers chose to pursue NBC (Belden, 2002). A survey was completed by 519 NBCT (68
percent response rate), followed by a focus group discussion. The survey questioned why the
teachers tried to achieve the certification, how the process affected their teaching, and the
demographics of their schools (Belden, 2002).

The survey concluded that there were five major reasons why these California teachers
chose to pursue NBC. A summary of teacher responses is as follows:

1. Personal challenge 84%
2. Opportunity to strengthen their teaching 79%
3. Monetary stipends 54% - 59%
4. Career advancement 53%
5. Professional recognition 50% (Belden, 2002)

**Impact of NBCTs on Schools**

Koppich, Humphrey, and Hough (Koppich, et al., 2006) researched the way school
systems use accomplished teachers to enhance the education of low-performing schools. They
specifically analyzed the effectiveness of National Board Certified Teachers. The researchers
used a multi-method approach, including interviews, NBPTS database, surveys, case studies, and
focus groups.

The first method implemented in the study was interviews conducted with the founders
and key executives of the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards both in person and
via telephone, with a duration average of an hour. Second, the NBPTS database was used in
order to determine the NBCTs’ teaching assignments, as well as their school’ demographics.
Third, a survey was conducted on a sample of NBCTs from six states to explore whether the
board certified teachers served as teachers assisting low-performing schools. Fourth, case studies
were conducted in the three states that had the largest number of NBCTs: California, North
Carolina, and Ohio. The case studies analyzed what circumstances and situations improved or
impeded the ability of NBCTs to facilitate quality education and school reform in low-
performing schools. Finally, focus groups were formed from each of the case studies’ groups,
specifically from NBCTs who worked in either low-performing or high-performing schools. The
purpose of the focus groups was to provide forums for the research team to pose questions
relevant to their findings (Koppich, et al., 2006).
Upon analyzing the situational demographics of 18,806 NBCTs from the NBPTS database, the research team found that the majority of the NBCTs did not teach in low performing schools. The database revealed that only twelve percent of NBCTs taught in high poverty schools, sixteen percent in high-minority schools, and nineteen percent in low-performing schools. The exception was California, where the distribution of NBCTs was more equitable. The research team concluded that this was directly related to the financial incentives NBCTs amass for teaching in low-performing schools in California (Koppich, et al., 2006).

The survey and focus groups provided information to the research team that enlightened their understanding of why teachers endeavored to earn National Board Certification, as well as what incentives could convince them to transfer to low-performing schools. “NBCT survey respondents give improving student learning (95%), potential for increased financial compensation (90%) and ‘increased credibility of my teaching’ (88%) as the top reasons for pursuing board certification” (Koppich, et al., 2006, p. 15). Teachers also noted that motivation for earning the advanced certification was personal and individual achievement. In the focus groups, many principals noted that the NBCTs were leaders in their schools, and had, in fact, undertaken leadership roles prior to the onset of the certification process. The NBCTs reported, via survey and/or focus group, that several factors affected their consideration of a transfer to low-performing schools. Though financial incentives played a role in such decisions, the NBCTs also stated that, “the school must have an excellent principal, collaborative colleagues, and the availability of adequate instruction resources” (Koppich et al., 2006, p. 18).

In reviewing the case studies, the research team found that one low-performing school in rural North Carolina, Adams Elementary School, was able to use National Board Certification to benefit their schools’ performance. Positive growth in the school began with an administration (Principal and Assistant Principal) that were both Nationally Board Certified Teachers. This administration was able to build a learning community that encouraged teachers to improve their teaching by using the standards and processes for staff development. The administrative team was also well supported by the district and its policies. The administration and NBCTs in the school were able to reform the school by supporting teacher improvement through observation, open dialogue, peer observation, and building a trusting learning community (Koppich et al., 2006).
NBPTS Impact on Teacher Leadership

Sato, Hyler, and Monte-Sano (Sato, Hyler, & Monte-Sano, 2002), researched the impact of the National Board Certification process on teacher leadership. They investigated NBCTs’ leadership positions and responsibilities both before and after they achieved National Board Certification via interview. Their definition of leadership was given to each of the informants during the interviews:

Leadership can encompass a broad range of responsibilities and actions. For example, you can hold particular positions of leadership (e.g. Committee membership, mentor teacher, department chair) or you might participate in activities that you consider to be leadership (e.g. Developing new curriculum, develop initiatives or programs on your own, or volunteer for extra projects at the school) or you might engage in behaviors that influence others or set an example (plan with a teacher partner, take risks in your own classroom, or openly share ideas about instruction). I want you to think broadly about your leadership while talking about your leadership responsibilities today. (Sato, et al., 2002, p. 6)

Interviews were completed by telephone with fifteen teachers who had completed National Board Certification. The informants were primarily recruited from The National Board Resource Center at Stanford University’s Candidate Support Program. Each interview lasted between 30 and 45 minutes. The participants were selected based certain criteria. The first criterion for participation was that different schools should employ the participants, resulting in varied leadership opportunities. Another criterion was the teaching status of the NBCTs; they were required to be employed by a public school system at the time of the interview. The informants also had to be Nationally Board Certified at the time of the interview, with no consequence give to length of time taken for completion of NBC. The informants were also required to be current teachers in grades seven through twelve, with certification in early adolescent or adolescent through young adulthood education. (Subject area was not a selection factor for the interviews). The last criterion for interview selection was a required mix of gender and ethnicity to provide well-rounded perspectives of leadership (Sato, et al., 2002).

The interviews’ objectives were as follows: to analyze leadership responsibilities prior to National Board Certification; leadership responsibilities following NBC; leadership opportunities that arose due to the attainment of National Board Certification; whether the certification process
impacted the leadership opportunities both available to NBCTs as well as accepted by NBCTs; and the influence of the certification process on the NBCTs’ leadership style. The research team studied five randomly chosen interviews in order to attempt to determine commonalities, and once determined studied the remaining ten interviews. Sato, Hyler, and Monte-Sano concurred on the commonalities of the initial five interviews, and from there determined their focus of study: change in leadership opportunities before and after National Board Certification, leadership opportunities chosen by NBCTs, and the impact of the certification process on the NBCTs’ leadership styles. (Sato, et al., 2002)

Each of the teachers interviewed had experienced leadership roles prior to earning National Board Certification. These roles included: mentor teacher, department chair, curriculum developer, fundraiser, and grant writer. Upon obtaining NBC, all fifteen teachers stated that they took on new leadership roles, though some discontinued previous leadership roles. Seventy-three percent of the informants believed the increase of leadership roles were due to their earning the advanced certification. Ninety percent of them believed that the certification gave them more credibility in the educational field. Some of the leadership roles that the NBCTs opted for included university-based research projects, state and national committee positions, and school reform participation (Sato, et al., 2002).

The analysis of the NBCTs choices of leadership roles reflected the impact of the process of National Board Certification on NBCTs. The leadership roles they chose focused on improving teacher effectiveness and student learning at both the local and national levels. NBCTs seemed more concerned with the processes of teaching and learning, rather than bureaucratic policies and politics.

Eleven of the fifteen teachers avowed that the National Board Certification process strongly impacted their leadership styles. The other four believed that the experience had not made a significance difference on their leadership styles and approaches. These four teachers stated that their current leadership styles had remained constant in their professional lives (Sato, et al., 2002).

Sato, Hyler, and Monte-Sano’s study demonstrated that many NBC teachers took on new educational leadership roles within their schools or divisions. Some of the teachers felt the opportunities were provided because they were identified as NBCTs. In addition, earning NBC made the teachers think differently about the leadership roles they wished to obtain. They began
looking at the long-term impact of these roles and how they would ultimately benefit learning. Conversely, some teachers felt obligated to take on leadership roles because of the new certification. However, all of the teachers changed as leaders because of what they learned from the National Board process. As a whole, they became more reflective, understood the benefits of analyzing student work, and used NBPTS standards to direct themselves. (Sato, et al., 2002).

In 2001, a study was conducted by Yankelovich Partners of about 2,200 NBCTs and the leadership roles they engaged in upon attainment of NBC. Ninety percent of the teachers stated they mentored other teachers pursuing NBC, while eighty three percent stated they mentored struggling teachers. Other leadership roles they undertook included creating or finding material to support student learning (80%) and involvement in school and/or district leadership roles (68%). When asked if they held any of these roles prior to obtaining NBC, more than half of the respondents certified that they had. Respondents also stated that most of the leadership roles they took on after earning NBC dealt directly with NBPTS in some form, (for example, mentoring teachers trying to achieve NBC). Only a few of the respondents stated that earning NBC had any impact on their gaining any new leadership roles (Yankelovich Partners, 2001).

**NBPTS in Low Performing Schools**

Linquanti and Peterson (Linquanti & Peterson, 2001) performed a study about the untapped potential of implementing National Board’s teaching standards to improve low-performing schools. They developed a brief questionnaire to be completed by 25 NBCTs in a California Support Network. The questionnaire was then used to construct interview questions. Six different groups were interviewed as part of the study: NBCTs, National Board Candidates, School administrators at low-performing schools that employed NBCTs or NBCs, District Administrators, Teacher Union Representatives, and NBPTS support providers. The NBPTS support providers were interviewed first, and were asked to identify the NBCTs and NBCs who would become the study informants. The final study interviews were sixty minutes in duration, and were performed with twenty-seven NBCT informants.

The research team analyzed several aspects related to the pursuit of National Boards at low-performing schools, as well as implementing the standards of National Boards to effect school improvement. In the interviews, the informants identified a number of issues affecting the pursuit of certification in low-performing schools. The consensus was that “instability and
unpredictability are more prevalent in low-performing schools” (Linquanti, et al. 2001, p. 5). The informants also lamented the high turnover rate of staff, students and administrators at these schools. Such turnover often represses support and growth in the staff and students. In addition, the National Board candidates stated that they were asked to take on many roles at their schools. They were often seen as leaders in their buildings, and as such, were requested to take on mentoring and lead teacher roles. Another concern of the informants was that National Board candidates found working in a high-needs school difficult to demonstrate excellence because of their students’ low performance. However several informants did state that the process spurred them to better involve parents and the community in the school (Linquanti, et al. 2001).

Linquanti’s study also determined that federally mandated programs tend to contradict or conflict with the National Board Standards. Programs and curriculum that are scripted (i.e.: federal programs) are typically not aligned with the NB standards. Consequently, candidates trying to achieve certification would be unable to follow the mandated programs. Similarly, on the state level, achievement tests do not align with the holistic approach of the NB standards (Linquanti, et al. 2001).

Finally, Linquanti’s study reflected the informants’ belief in the importance of administrator’s ability to understand and support candidates in the NB process. One interviewed administrator admitted staff development was needed in order for administrators to have them better understand how they can support candidates. In sum, the study stated that district leaders needed to ensure that the district’s priorities matched the standards, and that they were providing needed support to the candidate (Linquanti, et al. 2001).
Table 1

Summary of Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Research Design</th>
<th>Population/Sample</th>
<th>Analysis/Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belden (2002) California Teachers Perceptions of NBC</td>
<td>Why do teachers seek NBC? What motivates them to undertake this process?</td>
<td>Quantitative Survey</td>
<td>NBCTs in California Received 519 responses (68% response rate)</td>
<td>84% believed they pursued certification as a personal challenge 79% said they pursued it to strengthen their teaching 54%-59% pursued it for the state’s monetary compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantrell, Fullerton, Kane, &amp; Staiger (2007) National Board Certification and Teacher Effectiveness</td>
<td>Is there a relationship between board certification and student achievement?</td>
<td>Experimental Sample – Covariate model Random assignment of classrooms to the teachers</td>
<td>NBPTS applicants, non-NBPTS applicants teaching grades 3-5 in the Los Angeles Unified School District during 2003-2005</td>
<td>Teachers who applied for NBC, but were unsuccessful, were less effective than non-applicants on standardized testing. Differences between NBCTs and those who were unsuccessful were statistically significant by .2 standard deviations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavalluzzo (2004) Is National Board Certification an Effective Signal of Teacher Quality?</td>
<td>Is there a relationship between board certification and student achievement?</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Students of NBCTs and non-NBCTs teaching ninth and tenth grade math in a county in Florida 107,997 students</td>
<td>Students who had NBCTs achieved test scores that were significantly higher than those of students with non-NBCTs. by .07 standard deviations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank, Sykes, Anagnostopoulos, Cannata, Chard, Krause, &amp; McCrory (2008) Does NBPTS Certification Affect the Number of Colleagues a Teacher Helps With Instructional Matters?</td>
<td>Does NBPTS certification affect the number of co-workers an NBCT helps?</td>
<td>Quantitative – Survey Qualitative – Case Studies Propensity scoring</td>
<td>Entire faculty in 47 elementary schools in two states.</td>
<td>Those who believed that leadership could assist their teaching were statistically more likely to become a NBCT. The chance that a NBCT would help versus a non-NBCT was modest .57.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Research Design</th>
<th>Population/Sample</th>
<th>Analysis/Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goldhaber and Anthony (2007) Can Teacher Quality be Effectively Assessed? National Board Certification as a Signal of Effective Teaching.</td>
<td>Examine the relationship between student achievement and National Board Certification</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Students in North Carolina in grades 3 to 5 and their teachers for the 1996-97 and 1998-99 school years.</td>
<td>NBCTs had significantly higher gains in reading than non-NBCTs, but not in math. Teachers who earn certification later had consistently higher scores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koppich, Humphrey, &amp; Hough (2006) Making Use of What Teachers Know and Can Do: Policy, Practice, and NBC</td>
<td>What kind of impact are NBCTs having on their schools?</td>
<td>Quantitative – Survey, Stratified random sampling, Qualitative – Case Studies</td>
<td>1,136 NBCTs Samples of NBCTs in California, Florida, Mississippi, North Carolina, Ohio, and South Carolina Colleagues of NBCTs</td>
<td>75% response rate Researchers found little evidence that NBCTs were being used for their expertise in the school building as mentors or in leadership positions. There were not many NBCTs who were doing any more than their teaching duties. Principals were not knowledgeable of NBC or did not want to show favoritism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linquanti &amp; Peterson (2001) An Enormous Untapped Potential: A Study of the Feasibility of Using NBPTS Certification to Improve Low-Performing Schools</td>
<td>Can NBPTS standards/certification be used to improve the professional culture and instruction in low-performing schools?</td>
<td>Quantitative – Questionnaire, Likert-scale and open response items, Qualitative - Interviews</td>
<td>Questionnaire - 25 NBPTS in California in low-performing schools Interviews – 27 NBCTs</td>
<td>Earning NBC in low- performing schools can be difficult because of the instability and unpredictability in low-performing schools. The high turnover rate does not allow for staff growth and development. NBCTs felt they could not demonstrate excellence because their students perform lower than students in high performing schools. Informants stated that administrators needed to support candidates through the process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Research Design</th>
<th>Population/Sample</th>
<th>Analysis/Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sato, Hyler, &amp; Monet-Sano (2002)</td>
<td>The National Board Certification Process and its Impact on Teacher Leadership</td>
<td>Qualitative – Interviews</td>
<td>15 NBCTs teaching grades 7-12</td>
<td>All fifteen teachers took on new leadership roles after earning NBC. 90% of the 15 NBCTs said that the status of being an NBCT gave them more credibility in the profession. 81% said NBC opened more opportunities for leadership roles. While most of the NBCTs interviewed stated that NBC had changed their leadership style, four of them stated that it had not significantly impacted their style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone (2002) The Value-Added Achievement Gains of NBPTS-Certified Teachers in Tennessee: A Brief Report</td>
<td>Are NBCTs exceptionally effective in raising objectively measured student achievement scores?</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>16 NBCTs that teach in grades three through eight</td>
<td>Out of the 16 teachers studied, none of them would have been considered exceptionally effective in their ability to raise their student’s test scores. No difference was shown in the students in NBCTs’ classrooms and those student in non-NBCTs’ classrooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yankelovich Partners (2001) Accomplished Teachers Taking on New Leadership Roles in Schools</td>
<td>Do NBCTs take on new leadership roles after earning certification?</td>
<td>Quantitative-Survey</td>
<td>2,186 (46% response rate) NBCTs</td>
<td>More than half of the respondents said they were involved in leadership activities before earning the certification. The leadership roles they gained after obtaining NBC were all related to NBPTS: mentoring candidates for NBC, advocating for NBPTS, or participating in the NBPTS network.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

Introduction

The methodology utilized to answer the specific research questions includes the population and the sample chosen, instrumentation used, interview protocol, data collection and data analysis. This study used mixed methodology and included a research design involving two steps: document analysis and open-ended interview questions. The researcher collected data on the evolution and continuing implementation of National Board Certification monetary awards by Virginia’s General Assembly. Open-ended interview questions were conducted with members of the General Assembly and a representative from the Virginia Education Association all of whom were deemed to have participated in the passing of legislature to provide stipends to NBC teachers.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the reasons why Virginia’s General Assembly has chosen to budget for the National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund by examining the historical evolution of the Fund. The researcher also determined the incentives that are offered by division school boards in the Commonwealth of Virginia to National Board Certified Teachers. This study systematically reviewed the monetary awards that are expended to National Board Certified Teachers by the General Assembly and the Virginia Board of Education. The continuation of The National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund was also addressed.

Research Questions

The intention of this study was to complete an analysis of the historical development of the National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund in the Commonwealth of Virginia by addressing the following questions regarding the General Assembly’s resolution to prioritize funding for National Board Certified Teachers.
1. The Commonwealth of Virginia pays stipends to National Board Certified Teachers, because of this legislation. Are the identified objectives and perceptions of the Commonwealth of Virginia's General Assembly aligned with the projected outcomes?
   a. What were the objectives of the legislators for introducing and passing the law to provide stipends to National Board Certified Teachers?
   b. What are the legislators’ perceptions of the impact of National Board Certified Teachers?

2. How much money, since 1999, has the Commonwealth of Virginia paid to National Board Certified Teachers as a result of this legislature?
   a. How much has been expended by the Virginia Board of Education though the General Assembly’s budget?
   b. What do divisions in Virginia offer teachers who are in the process or have earned National Board Certification?

3. What are selected legislators’ perceptions of the future continued support of the National Board Certification?
   a. Do the legislators perceive they will continue to provide stipends for the current certifications offered by NBPTS?
   b. Do the legislators perceive they will include the projected certifications in Administrations and Teacher Leadership?

Research Design

The study used a mixed method research design. Mixed method design incorporates both qualitative and quantitative data (Creswell & Clark, 2007). This study included documented analysis of §22.1-299.2, open-ended interviews to explore the evolution of legislative funding for NBCTs, and a scrutiny of financial compensation from the division school boards in the Commonwealth to NBCTs on an annual basis. The document analysis researched the National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund from 1999 through 2010. The open-ended interviews were used to gather first-hand knowledge of the development of the bill that funded the National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund from legislators in the General Assembly. The researcher also examined the funding from the division school boards in the Commonwealth of Virginia that has been appropriated for National Board Certified
Teachers. This information was amassed in order to discern what was allocated in the Commonwealth of Virginia to National Board Certified Teachers.

**Selection of Participants**

Purposeful sampling of an elite group of legislators was adopted due to their involvement in the passing of the statute guaranteeing NBC stipends. This type of sampling strategy was preferred because these legislators can reveal enlightening information relevant to the research problem (Creswell & Clark, 2007). This small group of legislators, who participated in the passing of the bill, will allow the researcher to acquire “inside” information. The restriction of interviewees will enable a focus on coherent themes and issues relating to the research questions. A group of four interviewees was selected based upon them being Patrons on an education subcommittee in the House or Senate.

When analyzing the amount of money that was allocated yearly for NBCTs, the researcher gathered, reviewed, and documented expenditures by school divisions in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Local school board budgets are public documents and may be examined without consent.

**Instrumentation**

In order to retrieve information about the legislators’ experiences with the passing of the National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund, interview questions were derived and validated. A set of open-ended interview questions was extrapolated from the review of literature as well as past and current legislation (see Appendix A).

**Data Collection Procedures**

In order for the researcher to adhere to all ethical considerations and guidelines to do research with human subjects, an application and documentation was submitted to the Internal Review Board (IRB) at Virginia Tech to obtain approval to begin research (see Appendix B). After obtaining IRB approval, the researcher contacted legislators to arrange interviews. Copies of the informed consent and confidentiality letters were signed by the interviewed participants, prior to the conduction of the interviews.
The data collection consisted of three-step process: analysis of the National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund’s evolution, determination of the funding from Virginia Board of Education and each division school board has allocated annually to National Board Certification, and exploration of the legislators’ knowledge of the law. The mixed method research included the gathering of and reporting on Virginia budgets and Virginia law, as well as conducting interviews with legislators.

Quantitative Procedures. The archival data for the Commonwealth of Virginia’s National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund were collected, reviewed, and analyzed to examine how the Virginia legislators created, voted, and either supported or did not support the law. In order to collect information about the compensation given by division school boards, human resources were contacted at each division. Two phone call attempts were made to each division human resource departments. If a connection was made then the researcher asked each division what incentives they offered to candidates working towards National Board Certification and then what incentives were offered after they earned the certification. If a connection was not made from the two phone calls, an email went out to those divisions asking them the same questions.

Qualitative Procedures. Face-to-face interviews were conducted with three legislators and a Virginia Education Association who either sat on the committee that enacted the bill in 1999 or worked on the writing of the idea of the bill prior to it being introduced to the General Assembly. Seidman states, “At the root of in-depth interviewing is an interest in understanding the lived experiences of other people and the meaning they make of that experience” (2006, p. 9). Each interview was audio-taped, and the researcher documented observations through field notes. Following completion of the interviews, the researcher transcribed them.

Validity

The interview questions were culled from a compilation of available literature and government documents. The researcher’s committee assisted in designing the interview questions. The research questions were given to current Delegates of the General Assembly to review and comment on the structure and content. Questions were validated by ensuring that:

1. The questions would be understood consistently among the participants
2. The questions are well-phrased in order to stimulate participants’ ease of response
3. The questions encourage the participants to speak freely and openly. Responses from the Delegates were received and the questions were edited and validated again by the Delegates.

**Data Analysis Procedures**

Upon the completion of the interviews, the researcher transcribed the sessions. The researcher analyzed the interview data, marked individual passages, grouped the passages into separate categories, and then them sorted by themes, key words, and phrases. The information given from the interviews was placed in a chart to see commonalities and differences between each of the interviewees’ answers to each interview question. Following the data sorting process, the researcher looked for commonalities and themes among the participants interviewed. The analysis of these data is discussed in Chapter Four.
CHAPTER FOUR

The purpose of this study was an analysis of the historical development of the National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund in the Commonwealth of Virginia. The findings of the study are presented in four sections: (a) Analysis of Legislative Documents, (b) Analysis of Interviews, (c) Analysis of the Impact on the Budget to Support National Board Certification, and (d) Summary of Findings. The first section, the Analysis of Legislative Documents, consists of an examination of the relative legislative documents from January 21, 1999 to May 10, 1999. Presented in the second section, Analysis of Interviews, are the identified themes of the study, derived from interviews with various members of the General Assembly and a representative from the Virginia Education Association. The impact on the Commonwealth’s budget regarding the financial support of National Board Certification is evaluated in the chapter’s third section, Analysis of the Impact on the Budget to Support National Board Certification. The fourth section, Summary of Findings, summarizes the legislative documents, the themes identified from the interview data, and the budgetary findings.

Analysis of Legislative Documents

Legislative documents on record for the General Assembly, specifically HB 2710 and its companion SB 1145, (January 1999 through May 1999), were reviewed. HB 2710 and SB 1145 were introduced to the Virginia House and Senate in January 1999, as the Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program (National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund, 1999). The proposed legislation’s intent was to monetarily compensate teachers for both achieving and maintaining national certification (National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund, 1999). Every action taken by the respective legislative bodies regarding the program was reviewed, from its introduction in January of 1999 to its adoption in May of 1999. The legislative documents are referenced chronologically, as they relate to their corresponding legislative sessions.

Introduction of HB 2710

On January 21, 1999, the Education Accountability Act of 1999 was introduced to Virginia House of Delegates. This proposed legislation amended and reenacted several state
statutes as well as added sections that would amend the Code of Virginia. Delegate Alan A.
Diamonstein was the patron for House Bill 2710 (HB 2710), the Teacher Certification Incentive
Reward Program. Senator R. Edward Houck was the patron for the identical bill in the Senate
(SB 1145). In January of 1999, Delegate Alan Diamonstein of the House of Delegates in the
Commonwealth of Virginia introduced a bill that would reward teachers a monetary stipend if
they obtained a national certification from the National Board of Professional Teaching
Standards. The original bill, House Bill No. 2710, Education Accountability and Quality
Enhancement Act of 1999, was part of a larger bill that was introduced to improve teacher
preparation, evaluation, and teacher performance. It also stated the Commonwealth of Virginia
would compensate every teacher with National Board Certification $5,000 per year for the life of
the ten year certificate. This proposed statute, §22.1-199.3, also stated that these teachers would
have to

…agree to assist the relevant employing division school boards with certain instructional
services, which may include, but shall not be limited to, serving instructional personnel
professional development committees, providing workshops on instructional
methodologies, or assisting other candidates in seeking national certification.

The purpose of this statement was to establish criteria for monetary awards for teachers and
nonmonetary awards for exemplary performance by teachers, administrators and students. This
bill also included incentive grants for public schools that attained specific established criteria
(National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund, 1999).

The bill was then referred to the House of Delegate’s Committee on Education. The
Committee proceeded to write a House Substitute to the bill. The original section under §22.1-
199.3 that included awards for National Board Certification was removed and became its own
statute (§22.1-299.2). The monetary award was maintained at the original $5,000 per year for the
life of the certificate. On February 8, 1999, the House voted on the House Bill No. 2710, and it
was passed with 99 Delegates voting for the bill’s passage and none dissenting.

The Senate then received the bill, where it was subsequently referred to the Senate
Committee on Education and Health. The committee submitted a substitute document to the
Finance committee on February 19, 1999, but none of the changes affected the National Teacher
Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund. The Senate voted on the substitute bill, and it
passed unanimously. (Commonwealth of Virginia, 1999)
The House overwhelmingly rejected the Senate’s Substitute Bill with five delegates voting for passage and 94 dissenting. The House wanted to strike out lines 24-28, which awarded $5,000 each year for the ten year certificate, and insert the following statement in its place:

To the extent funds are available in the Fund, teachers who obtain national certification shall receive an initial state-funded award of $5,000 and a subsequent award of $2,500 each year for the life of the certificate. Such awards will continue to be paid upon renewal of the certificate. The Board [of Education] shall establish procedures for determining amounts of awards if the moneys in the Fund are not sufficient to award each eligible teacher the appropriate award amount.

The bill was then sent to Governor Jim Gilmore for approval. The Governor approved the bill on May 7, 1999 and labeled it Chapter 1037. Table 3 illustrates the progression of the Teacher Certification Incentive Reward program as it evolved through both the House and Senate in 1999.
### Table 2

**Historical Summary of the Progression of the Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House (HB 2710) Alan A. Diamonstein</th>
<th>Senate (SB 1145) R. Edward Houck</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 21, 1999</td>
<td>January 21, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent to introduce</td>
<td>Consent to introduce (37-Y 0-N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presented and ordered printed</td>
<td>Yeas: Barry, Bolling Chichester, Couric,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(see Appendix C)</td>
<td>Edwards, Forbes, Hanger, Hawkins, Holland,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Committee on Education</td>
<td>Houck, Howell, Lambert, Lucas, Marsh,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martin, Maxwell, Miller, K.G., Miller, Y.B.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mimms, Newman, Norment, Potts, Puckett,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quayle, Reynolds, Saslaw, Schrock, Stolle,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stosch Ticer, Trumbo, Walker, Wampler,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watkins, Whipple, Williams, Woods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Voting: Colgan, Gartlan, Marye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presented and ordered printed (see Appendix C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referred to Committee on Education and Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>January 22, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assigned to Education and Health sub-committee: Public Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Membership: Woods (Chairman), Walker,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chichester, Saslaw, Lambert, Houch, Barry,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lucas, Potts, Howell, Quayle, Martin,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newman, Edwards, Couric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>January 28, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned to Education sub-committee</td>
<td>Assigned to Education sub-committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continued)*
### Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House (HB 2710) Alan A. Diamonstein</th>
<th>Senate (SB 1145) R. Edward Houck</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>February 1, 1999</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education sub-committee 1 reported a substitute (23-Y 1-N)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nays: O’Brien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Committee on Appropriations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership: Callahan (Co-Chair), Dickinson (Co-Chair), Diamonstein, Hall, Thomas, Councill, Van Landingham, Clement, Plum, Croshaw, Robinson, Christian, Jackson, Phillips, Woodrum, Murphy, Putney, Bloxom, Guest, Dillard, Morgan, Tata, Rollison, Hamilton, Ingram, Rhodes, May, Ruff, Sherwood, Bryant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February 4, 1999</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee substitute printed (see Appendix D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported from Education and Health with substitute (15-Y 0-N)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Finance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership: Walker (Co-Chair), Chichester (Co-Chair), Colgan, Gartlan, Holland, Lambert Marye, Wampler, Stosch, Miller, K.G., Houck, Barry, Hawkins, Howell, Saslaw, Trumbo, Stolle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February 5, 1999</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported to Appropriations with substitute (30-Y 0-N)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee substitute printed (see Appendix E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February 6, 1999</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The House Substitute was read</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February 7, 1999</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The House Substitute was read a second time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engrossed by House- committee substitute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February 7, 1999</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported from Finance (17-Y 0-N)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continued)
Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House (HB 2710) Alan A. Diamonstein</th>
<th>Senate (SB 1145) R. Edward Houck</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 8, 1999</td>
<td>February 8, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The House Substitute was read a third time and passed House (Block Vote) (99-Y 0-N)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Constitutional reading dispensed (40-Y 0-N)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Voting- Behm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicated to Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 9, 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senate Read a second time</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading of substitute was waived</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee substitute agreed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engrossed by Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution reading dispensed (40-Y 0-N)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passed Senate (40-Y 0-N)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicated to the House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 10, 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constitutional Reading in the Senate</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Referred to the Committee on Education and Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership: Woods (Chairman), Walker, Chichester, Saslaw, Lambert, Houch, Barry, Lucas, Potts, Howell, Quayle, Martin, Newman, Edwards, Couric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 12, 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>House places SB 1145 on the Calendar</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 15, 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>House reads SB 1145 for the first time</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Referred to the Committee on Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 16, 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>House assigned it to the Education sub-committee: 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$table continued$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House (HB 2710) Alan A. Diamonstein</th>
<th>Senate (SB 1145) R. Edward Houck</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 18, 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Committee on Education and Health reported with a substitute (13-Y 2-N) Nays- Martin, Newman Referred to Finance Membership: Walker (Co-Chair), Chichester (Co-Chair), Colgan, Gartlan, Holland, Lambert Marye, Wampler, Stosch, Miller, K.G., Houck, Barry, Hawkins, Howell, Saslaw, Trumbo, Stolle Committee substitute printed 999149204-S1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 19, 1999</td>
<td>February 19, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported from Finance (14-Y 0-N)</td>
<td>Reported from the House Committee on Education with amendments (22-Y 0-N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 22, 1999</td>
<td>February 22, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional Reading Dispensed, passed by for the day (40-Y 0-N)</td>
<td>House read for a second time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 23, 1999</td>
<td>February 23, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Read for a third time Senate waived reading of the substitute Committee substitute agreed to 999149204-S1 Committee substitute reconsidered (39Y 0-N) Senate Passed by for the day</td>
<td>House read for a third time Committee amendments agreed to Pending question ordered Amendment by Mr. Cox rejected Engrossed by the House as amended Passed House with amendments (87-Y 9-N) Nays-Black, Cox, Davis, Guest, Harris, Howell, Katzen, Nixon, Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 24, 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate read for a third time Reading of substitute waived Committee substitute rejected 999149204-S1 Reading of substitute waived Substitute by Senator Woods agreed to 999156760-S2 (Woods) Passed Senate with substitute (40-Y 0-N)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House (HB 2710) Alan A. Diamonstein</th>
<th>Senate (SB 1145) R. Edward Houck</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 25, 1999</td>
<td>February 25, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placed on Calendar in the House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate substitute rejected by the</td>
<td>Reading of the amendments waived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House (5-Y 94-N)</td>
<td>in Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeas: Bryant, Cox, Hull, Reid,</td>
<td>House amendments agreed to by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Senate (40-Y 0-N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Voting-Ware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconsideration of Senate substitute agreed to by the House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate substitute agreed to by the House (93-Y 5-N)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nays: Cantor, Cox, Katzen, Nixon,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Voting: Guest, Murphy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March 4, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill text as passed Senate and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House (SB1145ER)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March 8, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled by Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signed by the Speaker of the House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9, 1999</td>
<td>March 9, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill text as passed House and</td>
<td>In Senate, signed by President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate (HB2710ER)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 12, 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled by House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signed by the Speaker of the House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15, 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Senate, signed by President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 29, 1999</td>
<td>March 29, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor’s recommendation received by the House</td>
<td>Governor’s recommendation received by the Senate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continued)
Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House (HB 2710) Alan A. Diamonstein</th>
<th>Senate (SB 1145) R. Edward Houck</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 7, 1999</td>
<td>April 7, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placed on House’s Calendar</td>
<td>Placed on Senate’s Calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending question ordered</td>
<td>Senate concurred with Governor’s recommendation #1 and #2 (20-Y 20-N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House rejected Governor’s recommendation (41-Y 55-N)</td>
<td>Nays: Colgan, Edwards, Gartlan, Holland, Houck, Howell, Lambert, Lucas, Marsh, Marye, Maxwell, Miller, Y.B., Potts, Puckett, Quayle, Reynolds, Saslaw, Ticer, Walker, Whipple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nays: Alamand, Armstrong, Baker, Barlow, Baskerville, Bennett, Blevins, Bloxom, Brink, Bryant, Callahan, Christian, Clement, Cranwell, Crittenden, Croshaw, Darner, Davies, Davis, Day, DeBoer, Deeds, Diamonstein, Dillard, Griffith, Hall, Hamilton, Hull, Jackson, Johnson, Jones, D.C., Jones, J.C., Keating, McEachin, Melvin, Moran, Murphy, Orrock, Phillips, Plum, Puller, Rhodes, Robinson, Scott, Shuler, Spruill, Stump, Tate, Thomas, Van Landingham, Van Yahres, Watts, Williams, Woodrum, Mr. Speaker</td>
<td>Tie vote, chair votes yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Voting: Councilill, Marshall, Parrish, Weatherholtz</td>
<td>Senate concurred with Governors recommendation #3 (40-Y 0-Y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Communicated Rejection to the Governor</td>
<td>Senate rejected Governor’s recommendations #4 thru #8 (17-Y 23-N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House rejected Governor’s recommendation #1 and #2 (35-Y 60-N)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nays: Abbitt, Almand, Armstrong, Baker, Barlow, Baskerville, Behm, Blevins, Bloxom, Brink, Bryant, Christian, Clement, Cranwell, Crittenden, Croshaw, Darner, Davies, Davis, Day, DeBoer, Deeds, Diamonstein, Dickinson, Grayson, Griffith, Guest, Hall, Hamilton, Hull, Jackson, Joannou, Johnson, Jones, D.C., Jones, J.C., Keating, Kilgore, McEachin, Moran, Morgan, Murphy, Orrock, Phillips, Plum, Puller, Putney, Rhodes, Robinson, Scott, Shuler, Spruill, Stump, Tate, Thomas, Van Landingham, Van Yahres, Watts, Williams, Woodrum, Mr. Speaker</td>
<td>Not Voting: Bennett, Callahan, Councilill, Melvin, Parrish, Weatherholtz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Voting: Bennett, Callahan, Councilill, Melvin, Parrish, Weatherholtz</td>
<td>House rejected the Governor’s recommendation #3 (43-Y 49-N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House rejected the Governor’s recommendation #3 (43-Y 49-N)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nays: Almand, Armstrong, Baker, Barlow, Baskerville, Bennett, Bloxom Brink, Bryant, Christian, Cranwell, Crittenden, Croshaw, Darner, Davies, Davis, Day, DeBoer, Deeds, Diamonstein, Dillard, Hall, Hamilton, Hull, Johnson, Jones, D.C., Keating, McEachin, Moran, Murphy, Orrock, Phillips, Plum, Puller, Putney, Rhodes, Robinson, Scott, Shuler, Spruill, Stump, Tate, Thomas, Van Landingham, Van Yahres, Watts, Williams, Woodrum, Mr. Speaker</td>
<td>Not Voting: Callahan, Clement, Councilill, Jackson, Melvin, Parrish, Rust, Weatherholtz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continued)
Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House (HB 2710) Alan A. Diamonstein</th>
<th>Senate (SB 1145) R. Edward Houck</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 7, 1999</td>
<td>April 7, 1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House Communicated to the Governor</th>
<th>Senate Communicated to the Governor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 7, 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governor Approves Chapter 1030 (effective July 1, 1999)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 10, 1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governor: Acts of Assembly Chapter text (CHAP1030)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(see Appendix F)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2. Historical view of the money allocated to NBCTs by Virginia’s general assembly.
Code of Virginia. The Virginian Acts of Assembly (1999 Session) approved Chapter 1037. Within Chapter 1037 was §22.1-199.2. The National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund. The state statute reads:

A. From such funds as may be appropriated for such purpose and from such gifts, donations, grants, bequests, and other funds as may be received on its behalf, there is hereby established the National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program (the Program), to be administered by the Board of Education, and a special nonreverting fund within the state treasury known as the National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program Fund (the Fund). The Fund shall be established on the books of the Comptroller, and any moneys remaining in the Fund at the end of the biennium shall not revert to the general fund but shall remain in the Fund. Interest earned on such funds shall remain in the Fund and be credited to it.

The State Treasurer shall manage the Fund, subject to the authority of the Board of Education to provide for its disbursement. The Fund shall be disbursed to award incentive grants to public school teachers obtaining national certification from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

To the extent funds are available in the Fund, teachers who obtain national certification shall receive an initial state-funded award of $5,000 and a subsequent award of $2,500 each year for the life of the certificate. Such awards shall continue to be paid upon renewal of the certificate. The Board shall establish procedures for determining amounts of awards if the moneys in the Fund are not sufficient to award each eligible teacher $5,000.

B. The Board may issue guidelines governing the Program as it deems necessary and appropriate.

Analysis of Interviews

Following an intensive examination of the legislative documents regarding the National Board Certification Reward Program and Fund from 1999 through 2010, purposeful interviews were conducted. Four interviews were conducted with legislators and representatives of educational organizations who had direct involvement with of the National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund as it progressed through both the House and the Senate. The interviewees either collaborated with the bill’s inception in the Senate and the House or participated in the drafting of the bill prior to its being introduced to legislation. Interviews will be noted as Interviews A, B, C, and D. All interviews were audio-taped and transcribed for the purpose of data analysis. The researcher scrutinized the data and identified four recurring themes: objectives, impact, budget, and continuation. The subsequent sections review these themes, as well as their associated sub-themes. The following table delineates each theme, its
definition, corresponding identified sub-themes, and the interview questions that elicited each theme.

Table 3.

The Themes Identified During the Interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Sub-Themes</th>
<th>Interview Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Objectives of the Bill</td>
<td>The purpose of introducing the bill and succession of events as it worked its way through the House and Senate</td>
<td>Origination, Financial Incentives, Recognition, Removal of Stipulations</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Impact of the “Fund”</td>
<td>The effect of the “Fund’s” influence on the teaching profession, the evaluation process, and the number of NBCTs in the Commonwealth</td>
<td>Main Influences, Evaluation Process, Goal of the Number of NBCTs</td>
<td>5, 6, 7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>The budget’s effect on the bill as it was being interpreted in the House and Senate, including the changes in the bill.</td>
<td>Decrease in Stipend Amount</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuation</td>
<td>The longevity of the “Fund” and whether the Commonwealth will recognize the new Certifications for Teacher Leaders and Principals</td>
<td>Review of the “Fund”, Potential Stipends for New Certifications</td>
<td>10, 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Perceived Objectives of the Bill**

Objectives of the bill were identified by legislators and a representative from the Virginia Education Association interviewed regarding the National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund. The critique of this theme revealed four emergent sub-themes gleaned from the responses to the interview questions: (a) origination, (b) financial incentives, (c) recognition, and (d) removal of stipulations.

**Origination.** During the interviews, interviewees were questioned about the roots of the bill’s origination. Interviews A, B, and C revealed the belief that the VEA was the reason that the bill came to the General Assembly. In addition, the subject of Interview A surmised that the bill was derived from teacher discussions regarding National Board Certification. Overall, there was
a consensus from the legislators’ interviews that they were personally introduced to the bills concept through the VEA. In fact, the subject of Interview D stated,

VEA brought it to the General Assembly and it was folded into The Education Accountability Enhancement Act.

**Financial Incentive.** The financial incentive of earning National Board Certification was revealed as a serious consideration among the interviewees during this inquiry. Several of the interviewees voiced concerns regarding teacher compensation. Most pointedly, the participant in Interview C avowed,

I think it is amazing that teachers make less than a cocktail waitress. I would vote for any bill that gave teachers more money.

Furthermore two additional interviewees determined that National Board Certification would enhance teacher goal-setting, and that they supported a financial benefit to such an endeavor. Specifically, the subject of Interview B stated,

You have to encourage people with financial incentives to make them want to excel.

There has to be a reward to get people to go and improve their skills.

The interviews resoundingly extolled a need to financially support, and subsequently reward, teachers who strive to better their teaching.

**Recognition.** The interviewees were queried in relation to recognition of teachers who earned National Board Certification. All of the interviewees concurred that recognition was, at the least, obligatory, given the rigors associated with such an accomplishment. However, none of the subjects interviewed found recognition alone to be a sufficient recompense for the attainment of National Board Certification. Instead, all interviewees asserted the need for financial award to be a correlated with any National Board Certification recognition. The subject of Interview A attested that,

We depend a great deal on our teachers to take care of our children, to educate our children. Take care is the wrong word, but that is what they end up doing. The parents don’t shoulder their responsibility, and so, I thought we could get them some sort of national level, some sort of award for excellence.

Furthermore, Interviewee B, stated that,

It [National Board Certification] set a bar, that if people achieve National Certification then they ought to benefit from it financially and then the more Nationally Certified
teachers we have the better our school system ultimately would be and then there was a real push by some of the urban localities to get it [the Fund] thru.

The interviews did not disclose support solely for recognition of National Board Certification; rather the participants overwhelmingly championed the idea of both recognition and an increase in teacher income via a monetary award for their achievement.

**Removal of Stipulations.** When the bill HB 2710 was first drafted, it included stipulations that required the newly NBCTs to further serve their schools in order to receive the promised stipend. The original proposed statute, §22.1-199.3, stated that these teachers would have to “…agree to assist the relevant employing local school board with certain instructional services, which may include, but shall not be limited to, serving instructional personnel professional development committees, providing workshops on instructional methodologies, or assisting other candidates in seeking national certification.” However the bill that was ultimately approved by the General Assembly and the Governor omitted the aforementioned statement. Interestingly, some of the interview data differed. For example, the subject of Interview B was in favor of including the stipulation in the bill, as he believed that,

…it [assistance in training others] strengthens your workforce and education system.

Conversely, the subject of Interview D did not approve of aligning the stipend to a set of determining factors (the stipulations originally added to §22.1-199.3), as he stated,

…it sometimes there are opportunities for people and sometimes there are not. You know those kinds of things could set up problems, in terms of equity.

The subject of Interview A clarified the differing opinions regarding the original bill’s stipulations. He said that in order to obtain the votes for this bill they had to remove the stipulations. The legislators believed it was more important to obtain a sufficient number of votes for the bill’s passage, and the disharmony resultant from the inclusion of the stipulation may have prevented its approval.

**Impact**

An analysis of the intended impact of the National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund on the Commonwealth’s educational system is important in order to determine whether the intended outcomes have been met. Three sub-themes regarding said
impact were produced by the survey questions: (a) Main influences, (b) Evaluation process, (c) Goal of the number of NBCTs.

**Main Influences.** The interview questions revealed the intentions and motivations of three of the interview subjects regarding the implementation of the National Teacher Certification and Incentive Reward Program and Fund. The subject of Interview A stated that it would provide a goal for teachers, as well as influence them to increase their professional knowledge. Similarly, the participant in Interview B believed that the program demonstrated the Commonwealth’s recognition of its need for stronger teachers and that in turn, the Fund would provide an infrastructure to strengthen its system.

The subject of Interview D expounded on these revelations by stating,

> The incentive says we value that. It is the same kind of thing I think about how woefully underpaid educators are in Virginia compared to other occupations with the same education and what kind of statement is that and how can we expect to not just attract, but keep. If we focused on that kind of quality professional development, quality induction and mentoring and that kind of professional development that teaches, that teaches already wonderful teachers to be reflective about their practice. And all of these other chasing of standardized test scores and all of that isn’t necessary. It would never be necessary. It has the potential to really do it. (Interview C)

**Evaluation Process.** Each school district in the Commonwealth employs its own independent evaluation process of teacher competency. The interview subjects were questioned regarding the use of the National Board Process as an evaluative process, as opposed to standard evaluative measures as many of the school divisions allow teachers to use the earned certificate as their 180 points they need to acquire for license renewal and other divisions exempt teacher who earn National Board Certification from formal observations.

In response, the subject of Interview B stated,

> I think it leads to more self-evaluation.

The subject of Interview D opined,

> …as teachers go through it [National Board Certification Process], you know it is a growth model for evaluation and measured by standards that have been developed by practitioners, by the best minds in the field, and continue to be.
None of the interview participants proposed that the National Board Certification process should replace current evaluative practices utilized in schools; rather, they espoused the view that the National Board Certification process would enhance schools’ assessment practices.

**Goal for the Number of NBCTs.** Interview participants were questioned regarding what the goal for the number of NBCTs should be in the Commonwealth. Their viewpoints were markedly disparate.

The subject of Interview A avowed,

I don’t think there should be a numerical goal.

The subject of Interview B responded,

Well, I think it ought to be a minimum of 10-15% of the teaching base, simply because I think you have to get to that level to make a significant difference. Until you get to that level you won’t have very many in the rural areas.

The subject of Interview D surmised,

It would be wonderful if we had a majority of NBCTs and administrators in our schools. Critical mass, because it does change the culture.

Though the interview participants varied in their conceptualizations of the ideal number of NBCTs in the Commonwealth, it is important to note that they all asserted the need for Virginia to increase the number of NBCTs annually, in order to better serve its schools and students.

**Budget**

The process of the “Fund’s” passage through the General Assembly resulted in a dramatic decrease in the annual stipend for NBCTs, from $5000 to $2500. The original bill, House Bill No. 2710, Education Accountability and Quality Enhancement Act of 1999, was part of a larger bill that was introduced to improve teacher preparation, evaluation, and teacher performance. It also specified that the Commonwealth of Virginia would compensate every teacher with National Board Certification $5,000 annually, for the life of the ten year certificate.

However, the bill as it was passed stated, *To the extent funds are available in the Fund, teachers who obtain national certification shall receive an initial state-funded award of $5,000 and a subsequent award of $2,500 each year for the life of the certificate.* The interview participants were questioned regarding the reasons for the marked decrease in the stipend.

The subject of Interview A responded,
It was for budgetary negotiations, no other reason. He further explained that, sometimes, in order to secure a bill’s passage, sacrifices to the original tenets of that bill must be made. Similarly, the subject of Interview B reflected upon the reduced stipend by revealing,

The real risk is the elimination of the program.

Thus, the participants interviewed, passage of the National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund was predicated on budgetary issues, and a compromise was reached in order to ensure passage of the bill.

Continuation

The budgetary future of National Board Certification was a further element of the interview process. Interview participants were questioned regarding their knowledge of stipend review dates, as well as their stances regarding potential stipends for the new Principal and Teacher Leadership Certificates.

Frequency of Stipend Review. In response to the survey questions regarding the frequency of stipend review, the subjects of Interviews B and C concurred that the stipends should be reviewed on an annual basis.

Meanwhile, the subject of Interview D stated,

Every year VEA lobbies for it. VEA is the only voice. When it [the stipend] is lost, you have to work doubly as hard to get it back.

Principal and Teacher Leader Potential Stipends. In 2011, the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards will be awarding two new certificates: Principal and Teacher Leader. The participants were questioned whether they believed that holders of these certificates should be awarded the stipends offered by the Commonwealth for NBCTs.

The subject of Interview B responded,

Absolutely, I mean if there is an area that needs reinforcement and support it is the leadership of the people who are having to implement the policies and the programs.
Analysis of the Impact on the Budget to Support National Board Certification

The Commonwealth of Virginia

The researcher analyzed the Commonwealth’s budgets from 1999 to 2010, to determine annual fiscal allocations for the National Board Certification Fund. Included in the allocated budget were incentive awards for individuals who opted to seek National Board Certification. The General Assembly appropriated funds from the general fund each year to assist individuals in financing the $2,500 National Board Certification assessment fee. The Commonwealth funded a predetermined number of candidates, selected by a lottery system and provided a $1,000 contribution toward the assessment fee. The National Board of Professional Teaching Standards has also awarded grants to the Commonwealth of Virginia to assist in the provision of incentives for additional teachers to seek National Board Certification (Wright, 2008).

In 2010, there were 2,177 Nationally Board Certified Teachers in the Commonwealth of Virginia. The National Board of Professional Teaching Standards reports that 234 were newly awarded the certification in 2009. This number represents a 13% increase from the number of teachers certified in 2008 (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 2010). The table below reflects the annual increase of new NBCTs in the Commonwealth of Virginia from 1994 to 2010.
Figure 3. The number of new teachers who have earned national board certification each year from 1994 to 2010.

The Virginia Board of Education has established guidelines for the distribution of NBCT incentive awards of $5,000 and $2,500. There are three criteria that must be met for eligibility:

1. The individual must be employed as a teacher in the Commonwealth of Virginia.
   a. The definition of a teacher is a person who is teaching in a Virginia public school (verified on September 30 of the current school year) and is in direct teaching contact with students at least 50% of the scheduled school day.
   b. Administrators, supervisors in Central Office, or a person teaching less than 50% of the scheduled school day are excluded from the incentive awards.

2. The NBCT must be fully licensed in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

3. The superintendent must verify the NBCT’s employment annually (Virginia Department of Education, 2010).
Once a teacher is found eligible for the incentive award, the Virginia Department of Education employs procedures for distributing the incentive awards. These procedures provide a checks and balance system, and prevents an underfunding of monies allocated for the number of eligible NBCTs. The procedures for distributing incentive awards are as follows:

1. If a teacher is eligible by the definition, an initial award is not to exceed $5,000.
2. A teacher who continues to be eligible by the definition will receive a continued award not to exceed $2,500 annually for the life of the certificate (10 years). A teacher cannot receive an initial and a continuing award in the same year.
3. The Virginia Department of Education shall disburse the awards to those teachers who meet the definition by September 30 of the current school year. If a teacher earns NBC in another state, and is now eligible by the definition set by the Virginia Department of Education, he is eligible for the continuing award, but not for the initial award.
4. Available funds will be released by November 30 of the current school year.
5. If full funding is not available for the awards, then a 2:1 ratio will be established, whereas the initial award will be twice that of the continuing award.
6. If no funding is available that year, disbursement for the following year are as follows:
   a. Once funds are available, a teacher meeting the definition for an initial award will be granted that award.
   b. Once funds are available, a teacher meeting the definition for a continuing award would be granted that award.
   c. Awards from previous years when funding is not available will not be granted in subsequent years (Virginia Department of Education, 2010).

The graph below reflects the expenditures each year in the Commonwealth of Virginia since the inception of National Board Certification Awards. The funding for the stipends had steadily increased each year. The stipends are only awarded to teachers who are in the classroom for at least 50% of the school day. If a Virginia NBCT leaves the Commonwealth, takes a non-classroom position, or leaves the field, the teacher may not receive a stipend. The budget also has to account for any NBCTs from other states that move to Virginia and accept a classroom
position. The 2009-2010 school year has demonstrated, a decrease in the number of new NBCTs in the Commonwealth of Virginia. However, the funding has continued to increase, due primarily to the total number of NBCTs in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

![Funding for Bonuses 1999-2012](image)

**Figure 4.** The amount of money that was expended each year to pay the stipends to teachers who have earned national board certification.

**Local Education Agencies**

Most individual divisions in the Commonwealth offer additional incentives for their teachers who have earned National Board Certification. The researcher contacted the Human Resources Directors from each school division in the Commonwealth of Virginia and compiled the following data regarding the incentives each school division gives to NBCTs in their division. When contacting the Human Resource Department at all of the divisions, some of the divisions did not respond. In the above table those divisions that did not respond are blank. Those who did not offer incentives are labeled “None.”
Table 4.

Incentives Offered From Divisions to Candidates and Teachers Who Have Earned National Board Certification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Candidate Support</th>
<th>Support with the $2,500 NBPTS fee</th>
<th>NBCT Incentives</th>
<th>Other Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accomack</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albemarle</td>
<td>Two professional leave days Candidacy Workshop</td>
<td>$1,000 upon completion of the certificate</td>
<td>Videos, workbooks, and technology support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Two professional leave days Graduate level course</td>
<td>Pays candidate’s fee</td>
<td>$2,200 annually for the life of the certificate</td>
<td>Technical support and tuition and books for college level course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleghany</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$1,756 yearly for the life of the certificate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia</td>
<td>Two professional leave days</td>
<td>$300 towards registration fee and use of tuition reimbursement</td>
<td>$2,000 annually for the life of the certificate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appomattox</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>Two professional leave days Graduate level course Pre-candidacy workshop and 18 hour seminar</td>
<td>Pays the full fee for 30 candidates</td>
<td>Skip step increase 5% increase for individual on longevity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$1,500 upon completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>Professional leave for testing</td>
<td>$1,000 towards candidate’s fee</td>
<td>$750 annually</td>
<td>$500 stipend for NBCTs who mentor candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bland</td>
<td>Professional leave for testing</td>
<td>$1,000 annual stipend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botetourt</td>
<td>$1,000 annually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>$1500 annual stipend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunswick</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td>Two professional leave days</td>
<td>$300 towards the candidate’s fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Candidate Support</th>
<th>Support with the $2,500 NBPTS fee</th>
<th>NBCT Incentives</th>
<th>Other Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buena Vista</td>
<td>$2,000 towards the candidate’s fee</td>
<td>$4,000 base salary increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles City</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Professional leave is given on a case by case basis</td>
<td>$2,500 annually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlottesville</td>
<td>$1,000 annually</td>
<td>$1,000 supplement for the life of the certificate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesapeake</td>
<td>$2,000 of the fee for 11 candidates</td>
<td>$5,000 the first year of certification and up to $2,500 thereafter if state funds are not appropriated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>Two professional leave days Candidate Support through VCU and pays tuition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Heights</td>
<td>Professional leave and reimbursement of the cost of prep classes up to $800 per semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Depends on funding</td>
<td>$2,000 annually (dependent upon the budget)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culpeper</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danville</td>
<td>Maximum of 3 professional leave days</td>
<td>Reimbursement of the application fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickenson</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinwiddie</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continued)
Table 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Candidate Support</th>
<th>Support with the $2,500 NBPTS fee</th>
<th>NBCT Incentives</th>
<th>Other Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Fairfax County    | Pre-Candidate and Candidate Course | Pays $2,500 if the candidate takes the Pre-Candidate Course | $1,750 if the candidate works with students 50% of the school day  
Additional $1,750 for a NBCT who works in a high-risk school |               |
| Falls Church      | 3 professional leave days | Pays all fees for first attempt, pays $250 for second attempt, $0 for all other attempts | $2000 annual stipend for life of certificate |               |
| Fauquier          |                   | $2,000 annually                   |                                                                                   |               |
| Floyd             |                   | $2,000 stipend added to their annual base salary |                                                                                   |               |
| Fluvanna          | Case by case basis | Leftover funds are divided equally among candidates at year’s end to assist in the cost of the fee |                                                                                   |               |
| Franklin City     |                   | $2,500 annually for the life of the certificate |                                                                                   |               |
| Franklin County   |                   | $2,500 annually for the life of the certificate |                                                                                   |               |
| Frederick County  | $150 towards a candidate support class at Mary Washington College | $6,000 a year is divided equally among candidates to assist in the cost of the fee | $2,000 each year for the life of the certificate |               |
| Fredericksburg    |                   | $3,000 annual stipend             |                                                                                   |               |
| Galax             | None              | None                              | None                                                                               |               |
| Giles             | None              | None                              | None                                                                               |               |
| Gloucester        | Professional leave days given on case by case basis | Up to $2,300 (less grants received) reimbursed | $2,400 supplement for the first year they are certified  
Guarantee that if state support falls below $2,500  
level, they will make up any difference, up to and including the entire $2,500 |               |
| Goochland         | None              | None                              | None                                                                               |               |
| Grayson           | None              | None                              | None                                                                               |               |
| Greene            |                   | $1,000 annually                   |                                                                                   |               |
| Greensville       |                   |                                   |                                                                                   |               |

(table continued)
Table 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Candidate Support</th>
<th>Support with the $2,500 NBPTS fee</th>
<th>NBCT Incentives</th>
<th>Other Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>Two professional leave days</td>
<td>$2,500 of the candidate’s fee</td>
<td>$2,000 annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,300 of the candidate’s fee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mentoring support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Videotaping support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Postage fee paid for portfolio submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>At least one professional leave day Pre-candidate and candidate support program through VCU</td>
<td>$2,000 toward the applicant’s fee for 10 candidates</td>
<td>$5,000 the first year of certification and up to $2,500 thereafter if state funds are not appropriated Recertification points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrico</td>
<td>Two to three professional leave days Pre-candidate and candidate support program through VCU</td>
<td>$2,000 toward applicant’s fee for 18 candidates</td>
<td>Two step increase on the salary schedule $5,000 the first year of certification and up to $2,500 thereafter if state funds are not appropriated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopewell</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Wight</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide a $1,500 annual supplement to those certified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James City (Williamsburg)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King and Queen</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King George</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000 annual stipend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King William</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reimburses up to 70% for cost of coursework, up to 3 courses per year (if funding is available)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,300 candidate fee upon completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loudoun</td>
<td></td>
<td>$300 toward candidate’s fee Reimbursement the remainder of the fee upon completion</td>
<td>$1,000 one time bonus</td>
<td>Exemption from formal evaluation for three years if certificate is earned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continued)
Table 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Candidate Support</th>
<th>Support with the $2,500 NBPTS fee</th>
<th>NBCT Incentives</th>
<th>Other Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louisa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two step increase on the salary schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunenburg</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynchburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual stipend of $1,000 to teachers holding National Board Certification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Provide professional in-house development days</td>
<td>Full fee reimbursement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manassas City</td>
<td>Two professional leave days</td>
<td>Full fee reimbursement</td>
<td>One step increase on the salary schedule</td>
<td>180 license renewal points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manassas Park</td>
<td>Two professional leave days</td>
<td>$2,500 towards the candidacy fee $1,065 for re-take fees</td>
<td>$3,000 stipend the first year $5,000 continuing incentive (depending on state allocation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinsville</td>
<td></td>
<td>Payment for the candidate's fees</td>
<td>$1,500 annually if the NBCT is teaching in the classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathews</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecklenburg</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>Professional leave days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>Three paid days</td>
<td></td>
<td>One step increase on salary schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Kent</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport News</td>
<td>Two professional leave days Writing workshops Monthly meetings</td>
<td>$1,000-$2,000 grants to offset the applicant’s fee</td>
<td>$2,500 annually for the life of the certification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>Two professional leave days</td>
<td>Reimbursement of the equivalent of two college courses toward the applicant’s fee</td>
<td>$525 stipend annually for the life of the certificate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>Reimbursement in full for any 3 courses taken, during 3-year period.</td>
<td>Payment of the initial registration fee</td>
<td>$1,000 added to salary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Support Provided</th>
<th>Fee Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottoway</td>
<td>$2,500 annually</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>$300 per year until certification is achieved</td>
<td>$2,150 annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petersburg</td>
<td>VSU support program-12 sessions for candidates</td>
<td>$2,000 upon completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private companies and other grants help with funding</td>
<td>Instructional content, test prep, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsylvania</td>
<td>$2,000 annually</td>
<td>$2,000 annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poquoson</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>$2,500 annually</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powhatan</td>
<td>Payment of the candidate’s fee</td>
<td>$1,000 added to the NBCT’s teaching contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward</td>
<td>Seminar program through VSU</td>
<td>$750 towards the applicant’s fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000 annually</td>
<td>$2,000 annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George</td>
<td>Two professional leave days</td>
<td>$1,000 of the applicant’s fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000 salary increase for life of the certificate</td>
<td>Technical support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince William</td>
<td>Two professional leave days</td>
<td>$300 reimbursement upon completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulaski</td>
<td>Two professional leave days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radford</td>
<td>$1,068 supplement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rappahannock</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond City</td>
<td>One professional leave day Pre-candidate and candidate support programs with VCU</td>
<td>Payment of the fee for up to 10 candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5% salary increase</td>
<td>Offers all needed recertification points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond County</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roanoke City</td>
<td>Two professional leave days</td>
<td>$500 annually for the life of the certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roanoke County</td>
<td>$300 towards the candidate’s fee</td>
<td>$1,000 annually for the life of the certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offers 180 recertification points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockbridge</td>
<td>$1,500 annual stipend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>$1,000 of the candidate’s fee</td>
<td>$1,000 annually for the life of the certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>Professional leave days</td>
<td>$3,000 stipend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Candidate Support</th>
<th>Support with the $2,500 NBPTS fee</th>
<th>NBCT Incentives</th>
<th>Other Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>Two professional leave days</td>
<td>Partial fee payment</td>
<td>$2,500 annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyth</td>
<td>Two professional leave days</td>
<td>$300 of the candidate’s fee</td>
<td>$1,200 annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000 supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spotsylvania</td>
<td>One day professional leave</td>
<td>Cover all fees not paid for by grants</td>
<td>$2,500 annual stipend</td>
<td>Recertification points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stafford</td>
<td>Paid tuition of a graduate program through GWU designed to support candidates</td>
<td>$2,500 annually for the life of the certificate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staunton</td>
<td>Professional Development days if approved</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000 the first year and $2,000 each year of the certificate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>Assistance with candidate’s fee for teachers who work in “hard to staff” schools</td>
<td>$610 annually for the life of the certificate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surry</td>
<td>Tuition reimbursement can be used to pay for candidate fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tazewell</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Beach City</td>
<td>Two professional leave days Pre-candidate seminars Candidate academy</td>
<td>$2,500 reimbursement of candidate’s fees</td>
<td>$2,000 annually for the life of the certificate $1,000 annual Career Teacher Allowance eligibility</td>
<td>Access to a Professional Development Library Videotaping supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual stipend of $2,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,970 annual supplement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waynesboro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Point</td>
<td>Professional days are given on a case-by-case basis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Candidate Support</th>
<th>Support with the $2,500 NBPTS fee</th>
<th>NBCT Incentives</th>
<th>Other Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000 added to the NBCT’s teaching contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,700 annually for the life of the certificate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wise</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wythe</td>
<td></td>
<td>$750 annually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>2 days professional leave</td>
<td>$3,000 annual stipend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The counties in the Commonwealth vary greatly in their allotment of incentives. Table Four shows the different financial support that is offered by the divisions in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Some of the divisions offer candidate support through workshops, graduate level courses, professional leave, or they offer support by paying for the some or the entire $2,500 NBPTS fee. After achieving the certification some divisions award step increases or stipends (yearly or for the life of the certificate).

There were fourteen school divisions that did not respond. The other 118 school division’s incentives were compiled and gave the following information. Twenty-six percent of the divisions did not offer incentives during the process or after achieving National Board Certification. Thirty-five school divisions (27%) offer one to three days of professional leave to teachers who are in the process of achieving NBC. Fourteen percent offer some type of workshop, seminar, graduate level course, or financial support towards a course. Twenty-seven percent pay for all or part of the $2,500 NBPTS fee. Fifty-two percent of the divisions have an additional incentive they pay to NBCT after they achieve the certification. Some of these yearly incentives are for the life of the ten-year certificate and others are for the time they are employed by the school district.

Not every school division in the Commonwealth of Virginia employs National Board Certified Teachers. The table below shows the number of Nationally Board Certified Teachers there are in each of the school divisions in Virginia. This information was collected from The National Board of Professional Teaching Standard’s website.
Table 5.
The number of Nationally Board Certified Teacher employed by division in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Number of NBCTs</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Number of NBCTs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accomack</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albemarle</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria City</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleghany</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Loudoun</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Louisa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amherst</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lunenburg</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appomattox</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lynchburg</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Manassas City</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Manassas Park</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Martinsville</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mathews</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botetourt</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mecklenburg</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunswick</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckingham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>New Kent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buena Vista</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Newport News</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles City</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Norton</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nottoway</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlottesville</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesapeake</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Petersburg</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Beach</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pittsylvania</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Heights</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poquoson</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Powhatan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culpeper</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Prince Edward</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Prince George</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danville</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prince William</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickenson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pulaski</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinwiddie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Radford</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rappahannock</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continued)
Table 5 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Number of NBCTs</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Number of NBCTs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax County</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>Richmond City</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Church</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Richmond County</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fauquier</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Roanoke City</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Roanoke County</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvanna</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rockbridge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin City</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin County</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick County</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredericksburg</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galax</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shenandoah</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Smyth</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goochland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Spotsylvania</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Stafford</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Staunton</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensville</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Surry</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Tazewell</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Virginia Beach City</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrico</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Waynesboro</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopewell</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>West Point</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Wight</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James City (Williamsburg)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King and Queen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Wise</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King George</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wythe</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King William</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows that the number of National Board Certified teachers in each division ranges from 0-386 teachers. Larger divisions like Arlington, Chesterfield, Hampton, and Prince William each have over one-hundred NBCTs. Fairfax County has by far the largest number of NBCTs in the Commonwealth at 386 NBCTs. Alexandria City, Hanover, Henrico, James City/Williamsburg, Loudoun, Newport News, Spotsylvania, and Stafford range from 40-91 NBCTs in their division.
Figure 5. Virginia school divisions that employ one to five national board certified teachers.

Figure 6. Virginia school divisions that employ over five national board certified teachers.
Summary of Findings

The first section, the Analysis of Legislative Documents, provided an examination of the legislative documents associated with National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund from January 21, 1999 to May 10, 1999. When the Fund’s bill was originally introduced in the legislature, it proceeded through both the Virginia House and Senate simultaneously. The decision to enact the bill proved bi-partisan, as both Democrat and Republican legislators were in favor of its passage.

An Analysis of Interviews was presented in the second section, whereby, the identified themes of the study were documented, based upon interviews with various members of the General Assembly and a representative from the Virginia Education Association. The four themes that were identified were: objectives, impact, budget, and continuation.

The objectives surrounding the introduction of and the passing of the bill was reflected during the interviews. The VEA was the educational organization that originally introduced the bill to the Virginia Delegates. The VEA encouraged teachers who had earned NBC to educate their House or Senate Representatives on the NBC process. The idea of the “Fund” was subsequently included in The Education Accountability Enhancement Act. The interview participants strongly believed that passage of NBC would allow teachers to enhance their skills while being provided a financial incentive. Each interview subject was in favor of the monetary incentives as they expressed deep concern over the current teacher salaries. The removal of the original stipulations was an additional interview topic. The subjects’ responses clearly demonstrated that they were removed to promote equity and to prevent National Board Certification from being tied to determining factors.

The intended impact of National Board Certification also emerged during the interviews. The participants noted that the Commonwealth recognized the need for stronger teachers, and the stipend reflected the value that legislators placed upon National Board Certification. In addition, National Board Certification would positively impact professional development, because teachers would strive to become the best in their field. Finally, the interview participants were confident that teachers would aspire to earn National Board Certification, but differed in their views regarding a financially acceptable number NBCTs in the Commonwealth.

Continuation of National Board Certification fiscal support appears to be a priority for the Virginia legislature as noted during the interviews. In addition to the budgeting of funds, two
new certifications will become available for attainment in 2011: Principal Certification and Teacher Leadership Certification. The interview subjects all expressed support for stipends being offered for achievement of these certifications. However, because the stipends are reviewed annually due to budget constraints, the VEA lobbies annually for the continuation of said stipends.

The impact on the Commonwealth’s budgets to fiscally subsidize National Board Certification was evaluated in the chapter’s third section, Analysis of the Impact on the Budget to Support National Board Certification. The original proposal provided for an annual stipend of $5,000 per year for the ten-year life of the certificate. As the bill progressed through the House and the Senate the financial incentive was reduced for budgetary reasons as well as to ensure the bill’s passage. The Commonwealth of Virginia currently provides stipends of $5,000 following achievement of National Board Certification and $2,500 annually for the life of the certificate. There are presently 2,177 National Board Certified teachers in Virginia, not all of whom are receiving stipends, as they do not qualify under the criteria that were erected by the Virginia Board of Education, for example, the NBCT may not be teaching at least 50% of the day, may have left the profession, or have become an administrator. However, the Commonwealth of Virginia has budgeted $5,000,000 for NBC for both the 2011 and the projected 2012 budgets. Planned fiscal disbursement continues to increase annually in the Commonwealth, as more and more teachers strive to attain NBC.

In addition to the Commonwealth’s budget the local education agencies provide support to National Board Candidates both during the process of certification and following achievement of the certification. Some supports offered during the process are professional leave days, workshops, graduate level courses, technology support, mentoring, and payment for part of or all of the $2,500 NBPTS candidate’s fee. Many school divisions also offer a financial incentive to candidates upon attainment of National Board Certification.
CHAPTER FIVE

Summary and Discussion

Chapter five shall provide both a critique and an examination of the study’s findings, in four delineated sections. The first section, Analysis of Legal Documents, will scrutinize the legislative progression of National Board Certification, as well as implications regarding the content of the final bill. The second section, Analysis of Interviews, will review and assess the content of the dialogues with the interview participants. The third section, Analysis of the Impact on the Budget to Support National Board Certification, shall provide a synopsis of the funds currently appropriated in the Commonwealth to subsidize National Board Certification. Conclusions, Recommendations, and Implications for Education Leadership will comprise the chapter’s fourth section.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the reasons why Virginia’s General Assembly has chosen to budget for the National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund by examining the historical evolution of the Fund. The researcher also determined the incentives that are offered by division school boards in the Commonwealth of Virginia to National Board Certified Teachers. This study systematically reviewed the monetary awards that are expended to National Board Certified Teachers by the General Assembly and the Virginia Board of Education. The continuation of The National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund was also addressed.

Research Questions

The intention of this study was to complete an analysis of the historical development of the National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund in the Commonwealth of Virginia by addressing the following questions regarding the General Assembly’s resolution to prioritize funding for National Board Certified Teachers.

1. The Commonwealth of Virginia pays stipends to National Board Certified Teachers, because of this legislation. Are the identified objectives and perceptions of the Commonwealth of Virginia's General Assembly aligned with the projected outcomes?
a. What were the objectives of the legislators for introducing and passing the law to provide stipends to National Board Certified Teachers?

b. What are the legislators’ perceptions on the impact of National Board Certified Teachers?

2. How much money, since 1999, has the Commonwealth of Virginia paid to National Board Certified Teachers as a result of this legislature?
   a. How much has been expended by the Virginia Board of Education though the General Assembly’s budget?
   b. What do divisions in Virginia offer teachers who are in the process or have earned National Board Certification?

3. What are selected legislators perceptions of the future continued support of the National Board Certification?
   a. Do the legislators perceive they will continue to provide stipends for the current certifications offered by NBPTS?
   b. Do the legislators perceive they will include the projected certifications in Administrations and Teacher Leadership?

Analysis of Legal Documents

Summary of Finding One

The original tenets of National Board Certification were not implemented with fidelity in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Discussion

National Board Certification was initially proposed in the publication, “A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century,” in 1986 (Carnegie Forum on Teaching as a Profession, 1986). The authors were convinced that teachers should work collectively in order to improve their performance. There were eight major elements to the authors’ plan for educational improvement. One of the most important features of this plan called for the creation of a National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), which would have regional and state membership structures. Another major component of the proposal was the creation of Lead
Teachers, who would be Nationally Board Certified Teachers, and who would assist colleagues in upholding the high standards of learning set by NBPTS (Carnegie Forum on Teaching as a Profession, 1986). These Lead Teachers “must create communities, work together with colleagues, take responsibility to help colleagues who are not performing where they should be and arrange for coaching, technical assistance, or other remediation” (Carnegie Forum on Teaching as a Profession, 1986, p. 58). The Carnegie Task Force further suggested that Lead Teachers take responsibility for specific teacher groups, as well as serve as consultants/experts in their particular fields in their respective schools and school systems. The Carnegie Task Force deemed it critical that should teachers attain the high standards set by NBPTS, they must be financially compensated. The Carnegie Task Force projected that, “Schools will capitalize on the knowledge and skills of its most capable staff and create a career path worth pursuing” (Carnegie Forum on Teaching as a Profession, 1986, p. 60).

Chapters Two and Four of this study analyzed the evolutions of HB 2710 and SB 1145 in the Commonwealth’s legislature. It was noted that the original drafts of the bills included stipulations for stipend disbursement. The proposed statute, §22.1-199.3, stated that National Board Certified teachers would have to “…agree to assist the relevant employing school board with certain instructional services, which may include, but shall not be limited to, serving instructional personnel professional development committees, providing workshops on instructional methodologies, or assisting other candidates in seeking national certification.” The purpose of this statement was to establish criteria for monetary awards for teachers, and for auxiliary awards for exemplary performance by teachers, administrators and students. In addition, the bill included incentive grants for public schools that attained specified established criteria (“National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund,” 1999).

Implications

The authors of “A Nation Prepared” (1986) proposed that NBCTs become integral participants in the reform of public education. The intent was for NBCTs to become Lead Teachers, who could assist struggling schools and teachers. It is unfortunate that the section of §22.1-199.3 requiring NBCTs to assist in reforming education at their schools and school districts was ultimately removed from the bill. The National Board of Professional Teaching Standards requires proof in its NBC portfolio section that teachers step outside of their
classrooms and provide services to other teachers, their schools, and their communities. However, the Commonwealth of Virginia has neglected to include this stipulation in The National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund. In fact, the sole prerequisite for NBCTs to receive an annual stipend in the Commonwealth is that they teach in a classroom for a minimum of fifty percent of the school day. To reiterate, the Commonwealth of Virginia willingly expends $27,500.00 in individual compensation per teacher during the ten-year period for NBCTs, yet has chosen not to uphold one of the basic tenets of NBPTS: that NBCTs impart their knowledge to their schools and school systems through individual service. Although those interviewed admitted during the study’s interviews that they did not want to tie the stipend to a set of determining factors, they, in fact, could have had a greater impact on education reform if they had left in the stipulations.

The purpose of NBPTS was to reform education, and in turn, to provide a higher quality education to this country’s children; an education that would prepare them for the 21st century. In order to receive an annual stipend, NBCTs should be required to assist struggling teachers, schools and districts, as this was the intended design of A Nation Prepared.

Analysis of Interviews

Summary of Finding Two

The General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia values public education and exceptional teachers, but cannot always pass legislation that reflects this viewpoint. The study has revealed that legislators value great teachers and are willing to support them with financial incentives.

Discussion

As stated by Interviewee A, legislator’s job in the Commonwealth of Virginia is considered part-time, and, as such, legislators rely upon the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) and Virginia Education Association (VEA) to apprise them of and educate them on educationally relevant bills progressing through the House and Senate. The VDOE distributes briefings to the legislators regarding issues surrounding education in Virginia. In addition, an annual briefing pertaining to National Board Certification is dispensed to the General Assembly,
in order for its relevance to the Commonwealth’s educational system to remain in the forefront of the legislators’ consciousness and attention (Commonwealth of Virginia, 1999).

The interviews revealed a recurring concern among all interviewees: teachers do not earn adequate salaries. Furthermore, during the interviews it was stated by two interviewees that they would vote for any measure that would increase teacher compensation. The consensus among the interview subjects was that they valued strong public education, and valued great teachers immeasurably. Contrary to these views were the legislators’ actions: Interviewee A readily admitted that in order to obtain a bill’s passage, legislators often have to compromise and give up a part of the bill. Discordant to their assertions that they lament teacher salaries, these legislators have determined that this bill’s sure passage was more important than defending their views regarding teacher salaries; specifically, NBC stipend reduction. It seems that the risk of inadequate support of the bill has outweighed the legislators’ principled statements and avowals regarding teacher compensation. However, the fact remains that the NBC bill continues to remain in effect during tough economic times, affirming that the General Assembly continues to value excellent educators. The research question, “What were the objectives of legislators for introducing and passing the law to provide stipends to National Board Certified Teachers?” was answered during the interviews. As stated in the finding, legislators value great teachers and wants to reward them with monetary stipends. Their identified objectives were to reward NBCTs and passing The National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund allowed for them to reach their intended outcome. The VEA’s representative also valued great teachers and believed that National Board Certification would assist in reforming education. As stated in the interview, this was the reason the VEA introduced the idea to the General Assembly.

Implications

The General Assembly is convincing as it attests to value excellent teachers. It continues to find National Board Certification meritorious, as reflected by its fiscal support of the NBC Reward and Fund. The finding from this study lead on to consider the implication that legislators value National Board Certification and even during difficult economic times they continue to support the National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund. However, reducing the original stipend amount reflects a political move to ensure the bill’s passage, which, for the educational field, is disappointing. Support of NBCTs requires legislators’ full patronage,
not their compromising for a bill’s passage. It seems the General Assembly votes for political reasons over value and intent. How at the policy level can someone assist them in understanding the importance of Carnegie’s Task Force’s recommendations? The opinions of those interviewed about the Principal Certification and Teacher Leader Certification are not transferrable because they are retired from the General Assembly.

**Analysis of the Impact on the Budget to Support National Board Certification**

**Summary of Finding Three**

National Board Certification has had a significant financial impact upon local education agencies, primarily due to the incentives that are offered both during the NBC process and upon completion of the certification. Unfortunately, only one division, Fairfax County is implementing their incentives with fidelity, according to the intended protocol revealed in *A Nation Prepared* (1986).

**Discussion**

The impact on Commonwealth’s budgets regarding fiscal support of National Board Certification was reported in Chapter 4. The Commonwealth of Virginia provides stipends of $5,000 for the first year following a teacher’s obtaining NBC, and $2,500 per year for the life of the ten-year certificate, totaling a potential stipend earning of $27,500. There are currently 2,177 National Board Certified teachers in Virginia, some of whom are not receiving stipends as they do not meet qualifications outlined by the Virginia Board of Education. The Commonwealth of Virginia has budgeted $5,000,000 for the 2011 budget and another $5,000,000 for the projected 2012 budget. Virginia’s fiscal support for NBCTs increases annually, as more and more teachers are earning NBC.

Local education agencies also provide various supports to National Board Candidates as they work toward NBC attainment, including professional leave days, workshops, graduate level courses, technology support, and mentoring. In addition, school divisions also provide financial support to potential NBCTs through payment of some or the entire $2,500 NBPTS fee, and some school divisions offer an additional financial incentive upon completion of certification.

- 26% of Virginia school divisions do not offer any incentives to NBCTs
- 27% of Virginia school divisions offer professional leave days NBC candidates
- 11% of Virginia school divisions offer a workshop, seminar, graduate level course or funds to pay for a course to assist the candidate in the NBC process.
- 27% of Virginia school divisions offer to pay for the entire or part of the participation fee of $2,500.
- 52% of Virginia school divisions offer an additional incentive after the candidate achieves National Board Certification.

The Carnegie Task Force that authored “A Nation Prepared” in 1986 made specific recommendations to ensure that Nationally Board Certified Teachers were being utilized effectively. The Carnegie Task Force stressed that states needed to provide for equitable distribution of NBCTs throughout the its localities. They stated, “Within districts, the most experienced teachers are often assigned to the most promising students. Incentives at every level should be designed to ensure that the students most in need of help are taught by many of the best and most experienced teachers” (Carnegie Forum on Teaching as a Profession, 1986, p. 103). Specifically, the Carnegie Task Force recommended that states offer salary supplements to teachers working in high need districts, offer incentives to experienced teachers to work in high priority schools, and/or design other policies to establish a fair distribution of their most capable teachers (Carnegie Forum on Teaching as a Profession, 1986).

National Board Candidates can potentially have a significant impact upon school divisions. Table 6 demonstrates the implied costs to various divisions in the Commonwealth, given a hypothetical fifth year teacher holding a Bachelor’s degree, who has recently attained NBC, and who continues to be a classroom teacher for the life of the certification.

For the purpose of this study, school districts that employed the largest number of NBCTs were selected, save King George, which was included to portray an example of a smaller school district’s incentive program for NBCTs. In addition, Arlington’s 5% salary increase was calculated using the 2010-2011 salary schedule and compounding it to approximate an NBCT’s salary for the given year. As the table portrays, divisions value National Board Certification as they offer a NBCT monetary awards. Looking at the table above a National Board Certification is worth $29,000 to $66,000.

This finding answers the research question, “What do divisions in Virginia offer teachers who are in the process or have earned National Board Certification?” As shown in Table Four
and Table Six there are many incentives offered to teachers who are in the process or have earned NBC. The research question, “How much has been expended by the Virginia Board of Education through the General Assembly’s budget?” was answered in Chapter Four. The General Assembly’s expenditures for National Board Certification, since its inception in 1999, equates to $32,724,996.

Implications

The authors of “A Nation Prepared” (1986) wanted to ensure that NBCTs were educating students who were in the most need of assistance. The Carnegie Task Force recommended that states offer financial incentives to teachers who worked in high-risk schools. Unfortunately, most divisions have ignored the Carnegie Task Force’s sound advice. Scrutiny of Table 5 reveals that only Fairfax County pays an extra stipend to teachers who work in high-risk schools. None of the divisions require teachers to work with students at-risk. School divisions have a prime opportunity to increase student achievement in high-risk schools and initiate reform: by utilizing their NBCTs as the Carnegie Task Force recommended.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local School Division</th>
<th>Candidate Support</th>
<th>NBPTS Fee</th>
<th>NBCT Incentives</th>
<th>Other Support</th>
<th>Total for the school division</th>
<th>Total School Division + Commonwealth’s Incentive ($27,500)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>2 days of substitute pay - $102.83 each day = $205.66</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>5% salary increase (1 step increase) = $16,963</td>
<td>$19,668</td>
<td>$19,668</td>
<td>+$27,500 = $47,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>2 days of substitute pay: $78.40 each day = $156.80 Graduate Level Course (two semesters) = $2,874</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$5,030</td>
<td>$5,030</td>
<td>+$27,500 = $32,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax</td>
<td>Graduate Level Course $1,400</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$1,750 x 10 years $1,750 x 10 if working in a high risk school</td>
<td>$21,400 or $38,900 if working in a high risk school</td>
<td>$21,400 or $48,900</td>
<td>+$27,500 = $66,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,300</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,300</td>
<td>$2,300</td>
<td>+$27,500 = $29,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King George</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000 x 10 = $30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>+$27,500 = $57,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince William</td>
<td>2 days of substitute pay: $90 each day = $180</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$2,000 x 10 Technical Support = $100</td>
<td>$21,280</td>
<td>$21,280</td>
<td>+$27,500 = $48,780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions, Recommendations, and Implications for Educational Leadership

This study produced three findings that were supported by the research and data collected. First, the Commonwealth of Virginia has not implemented the original components of National Board Certification with fidelity, regarding the recommended roles National Board Certified Teachers should embrace in schools and school divisions. Second, legislators consistently attest that exceptional teachers merit increased pay, as a strong educational system only serves to enhance the Commonwealth. Third, the incentives offered during the NBC process and upon certification produce a financial impact on school divisions that requires closer scrutiny.

This study’s findings indicate that the Commonwealth of Virginia did not implement the plan that was advocated by the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession as defined in “A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century,” in 1986. The Commonwealth chose to ignore the exhortation to strategically utilize the skills of NBCTs in their schools and districts. In addition, the Commonwealth has done nothing to ensure that NBCTs are actively teaching the neediest student populations, as advised by the Carnegie Task Force. My recommendations regarding these findings are that §22.1-199.3 requires serious review, with an addition of stipulations of assisting employing school boards with staff development and assisting struggling colleagues. Only when the Carnegie Task Force’s recommendations are held accountable can NBCTs assist in educational reform on a larger scale. In addition, school divisions need to ensure that NBCTs in their districts are working with students who exhibit the greatest need. The most effective manner to elicit support for such an endeavor is financial incentive.

Recommendations

This study has revealed that legislators value great teachers and are willing to support them with financial incentives. My recommendation is that when educational organizations lobby for an education bill’s passage, said bill should be correlated to the improvement of teacher skill levels. The fact that legislators in the Commonwealth value excellent teachers and opt to reward them is all well and good; however, checks and balances should be enacted regarding NBC stipends. Receipt of a certification in no way ensures good teaching; rather, evaluative measures need to be established to ensure consistent excellence in the classroom.
Furthermore, the legislature’s continued support of ongoing professional development for teachers is a necessity. In addition, school divisions need to encourage teachers to grow professionally through NBC, as well as to utilize the NBCTs in their districts to mentor their colleagues, perform staff development roles, and assist struggling teachers. Educational reform, as referred to in “A Nation Prepared” (1986), requires a true collaboration among the legislature, educational organizations, school administrators, and teachers. National Board Certified Teachers could greatly enhance student achievement in schools and school districts, if the stipend disbursement were directly related to service. Educational reform in the Commonwealth will not occur in any great measure if the skills of the best and most talented National Board Certified Teachers are not adequately utilized.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

There are many facets of National Board Certification that require further study and inquiry. One such study might address the differing viewpoints regarding the effectiveness of Nationally Board Certified Teachers versus their non-certified colleagues. However, teacher effectiveness is currently evaluated via students’ standardized test scores, which is ironic, as NBPTS does not want NBC candidates to refer to or address test scores in their portfolio entries. In order to explore such a study, alternative measures of teaching quality and effectiveness would need to be devised.

A study reflecting the distribution of NBCTs in the school divisions of the Commonwealth of Virginia would prove quite beneficial, especially the determination of the positions held by NBCTs (i.e.: classroom v. leadership roles). An associated case study could be initiated in Fairfax County, to ascertain whether the additional stipend offering has encouraged NBCTs to work in high need schools.

A study addressing the correlation between school divisions, their NBC incentives, and teacher motivation could also greatly benefit the Commonwealth. Superintendents could be interviewed to establish their impetus for offering incentives to NBCTs, while the NBCTs could be interviewed to determine whether the incentives offered impact their decisions regarding assignment locales. It may also benefit the Commonwealth of Virginia if a study was completed to review how other states and their respective school divisions offer stipends to NBCTs. The Commonwealth could use that information to reevaluate how they decide to give out stipends.
Another study might address the relationship between additional pay and cost of living concerns in the various school divisions within the Commonwealth. A researcher could determine whether there is a correlation between the needs of the district, the cost of living, and the additional payment incentives.

In summary, continued research is needed to examine the impact of Nationally Board Certified Teachers on education; specifically, assignment positions, additional service roles, effectiveness in the classroom, motivations, and the effect of incentives. This information shall better assist the General Assembly, school divisions, and Educational Leaders in utilizing their NBCTs to improve the state of education in the Commonwealth of Virginia.
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APPENDIX A
RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. How would you describe your involvement in the development of and/or contribution to the National Board Certification and the Education and Quality Enhancement Act? Specifically, were you a patron or co-patron of the bill creating the act? Did you vote for it in committee and/or the full house of Delegates?

2. Where do you think the idea of the Fund originated? Is it the Fund’s chief purpose to allocate money in the Commonwealth’s biennium budget?

3. At the beginning of the bill there were stipulations of requiring recipients to assist the relevant employing school board with instructional services like providing workshops and professional development in order for the NBCT to receive the stipend. Why do you think this was removed from the bill?

4. What is your perception of National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund?

5. What were the main influences and/or circumstances that prompted the National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund?

6. What impact do you think National Board Certification will have on public school education in Virginia?

7. In what ways do you see National Board Certification as an evaluation process for teachers?

8. Currently in Virginia there are 1,765 National Board Certified Teachers. What do you think the goal of the number of National Board Certified Teachers should be and why?

9. The original draft of the bill for the Fund stated a stipend of $5,000 every year for the length of the ten-year certification. What were the reasons it was reduced to $5,000 for the first year and $2,500 every year for the length of the certificate?

10. In the Commonwealth of Virginia, the number of National Board Certified Teachers has increased by 326 teachers (14%) in 2008. At what point do you review the monetary stipends awarded to National Board Certified Teachers?

11. In 2011, National Board of Professional Teaching Standards is offering an Advanced Certification in Education Leadership for Principals and Teacher Leaders. What are your thoughts on awarding a monetary stipend to those who earn this certification?
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IRB APPROVAL LETTER

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 28, 2010

TO: Theodore Creighton, Kerry Alday, Carol Cash, Travis W. Twiford, Wayne Tripp

FROM: Virginia Tech Institutional Review Board (FWA00000572, expires June 13, 2011)

PROTOCOL TITLE: An Historical Analysis of the Development of National Board Certification Stipends in Virginia

IRB NUMBER: 09-869

Effective October 27, 2010, the Virginia Tech IRB Chair, Dr. David M. Moore, approved the continuation request for the above-mentioned research protocol.

This approval provides permission to begin the human subject activities outlined in the IRB-approved protocol and supporting documents.

Plans to deviate from the approved protocol and/or supporting documents must be submitted to the IRB as an amendment request and approved by the IRB prior to the implementation of any changes, regardless of how minor, except where necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to the subjects. Report promptly to the IRB any injuries or other unanticipated or adverse events involving risks or harms to human research subjects or others.

All investigators (listed above) are required to comply with the researcher requirements outlined at http://www.irb.vt.edu/pages/responsibilities.htm (please review before the commencement of your research).
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Approved as: Expedited, under 45 CFR 46.110 category(ies) 6, 7
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HOUSE BILL NO. 2710
Offered January 21, 1999


Consent to introduce

Referred to Committee on Education

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia:


§ 22.1-60.1. Evaluation of superintendent.

The Board of Education shall prescribe by regulation uniform performance standards and criteria to be used by local school boards in evaluating superintendents. These standards and criteria shall include, but not be limited to, assessing teacher and administrator skills and knowledge, improving student achievement, providing for school safety and enforcing student discipline.


A. From such funds as may be appropriated for such purpose and from such gifts, donations, grants, bequests, and other funds as may be received on its behalf, there is hereby established the Virginia Educational Excellence Incentive Reward Program ("the Program"), to be administered by the Board of Education, and a special nonreverting fund within the Department of the Treasury known as the Virginia Educational Excellence Incentive Reward Fund, hereafter
referred to as the "Fund." The Fund shall be established on the books of the Comptroller, and any moneys remaining in such Fund at the end of the biennium shall not revert to the general fund but shall remain in the Fund. Interest earned on such funds shall remain in the Fund and be credited to it.

The Department of the Treasury shall administer and manage the Virginia Educational Excellence Incentive Reward Fund, subject to the authority of the Board of Education to provide for its disbursement. The Fund shall be disbursed to award incentive grants to public schools meeting certain performance criteria established by the Board, for monetary awards for teachers, and to support nonmonetary awards recognizing exemplary performance by teachers, administrators, and students across the Commonwealth.

B. The Board shall establish performance criteria for determining eligibility of public schools to receive incentive grants from the Fund. Such criteria shall include annual performance benchmarks for individual public schools developed with the assistance of the relevant division superintendents and shall recognize improved and exceptional educational performance in the Commonwealth's public schools. The criteria may be based upon, but shall not be limited to, various school and pupil performance indicators, such as:

1. Pupil academic performance;

2. Standards of Learning end-of-course assessment scores;

3. Student and teacher attendance rates;

4. Graduation rates, including minority graduation rates; and

5. Parental and community involvement.

In establishing such awards criteria, the Board may consider school population information, such as the percentage of students speaking English as a second language, the percentage of students enrolled in special education classes, community education and income levels, local ability-to-pay for public education, and schoolwide and divisionwide enrollments.

C. The Board shall establish procedures for determining amounts for incentive grants to public schools. The incentive grants shall be calculated on a per teacher-per-teacher basis and may be used for salary bonuses, professional development, school improvement funds, or other educational initiatives or expenses approved by the Board.

D. The Board shall also establish within the Program a system of nonmonetary awards to recognize exemplary performance by teachers, administrators, and students in the public schools. Teachers, administrators, and students meeting performance criteria established by the Board shall be recognized annually at the regional and state level. For the purposes of this section, "administrators" shall include principals, assistant principals, and supervisors.
E. The Board shall also establish within the Program a system of monetary awards for public school teachers obtaining national certification from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. To the extent funds are available in the Fund, teachers who obtain national certification shall receive a state-funded award of $5,000 each year for the life of the certificate. Such awards will continue to be paid upon renewal of the certificate. Board of Education guidelines shall require recipients of such awards to agree to assist the relevant employing school board with certain instructional services, which may include, but shall not be limited to, serving in instructional personnel professional development committees, providing workshops on instructional methodologies, or assisting other candidates in seeking national certification. The Board shall establish procedures for determining amounts of awards if the moneys in the Fund are not sufficient to award each eligible teacher $5,000.

F. The Board may issue guidelines governing the Program as it deems necessary and appropriate.


A. The General Assembly and the Board of Education find that effective educational leadership and personnel and appropriate programs of professional development and training are essential for the advancement of public education in the Commonwealth.

B. Each member of the Board of Education shall participate in in-service programs on personnel, curriculum and current issues in education as part of his service on the Board.

C. Consistent with the finding that leadership is essential for the advancement of public education in the Commonwealth, the Board of Education shall develop leadership standards for superintendents and principals, which standards shall include training in the implementation of the Standards of Learning and training in the evaluation and documentation of teacher and administrator performance based on student achievement and the skills and knowledge of instructional personnel.

D. The Board of Education shall sponsor, conduct or provide advice on (i) training and professional development of teachers, principals, supervisors, division superintendents and other school staff; (ii) training for all administrative and supervisory personnel in the evaluation and documentation of teacher and administrator performance based on student achievement and the skills and knowledge of such instructional or administrative personnel; (iii) in-service programs for school board members on personnel, curriculum and current issues in education; and (iv) in cooperation with the Virginia Department for the Visually Handicapped, in-service programs in Braille for teachers of the blind and visually impaired. The Board shall provide technical assistance on professional development to local school boards designed to seek to ensure that all instructional personnel are proficient in the use of educational technology consistent with its Six-Year Educational Technology Plan for Virginia.

E. Each local school board shall require (i) its members to participate annually in in-service programs on personnel, curriculum and current issues in education as part of their service on the local board and (ii) require the division superintendent to participate annually in professional
development activities at the local, state or national levels.

F. Each local school board shall provide (i) a program of professional development, as part of the license renewal process, to assist teachers and principals in acquiring the skills needed to work with gifted students and handicapped students and to increase student achievement, (ii) a program of professional development in educational technology for all instructional personnel, and (iii) a program of professional development for administrative personnel designed to increase proficiency in instructional leadership and management, including training in the evaluation and documentation of teacher and administrator performance based on student achievement and the skills and knowledge of such instructional or administrative personnel.

§ 22.1-293. School boards authorized to employ principals and assistant principals; license required; powers and duties.

A. A school board, upon recommendation of the division superintendent, may employ principals and assistant principals. Persons employed in these positions shall hold licenses as prescribed by the Board of Education.

B. A principal shall provide instructional leadership in, shall be responsible for the administration of and shall supervise the operation and management of the school or schools and property to which he has been assigned, in accordance with the rules and regulations of the school board and under the supervision of the division superintendent.

C. A principal may submit recommendations to the division superintendent for the appointment, assignment, promotion, transfer and dismissal of all personnel assigned to his supervision. Beginning July 1, 2000, principals must have received training in the evaluation and documentation of performance based on employee skills and knowledge and student achievement provided pursuant to § 22.1-253.13:5 prior to submitting such recommendations.

D. A principal shall perform such other duties as may be assigned by the division superintendent pursuant to the rules and regulations of the school board.

§ 22.1-294. Probationary terms of service for principals, assistant principals and supervisors; evaluation; reassigning principal, assistant principal or supervisor to teaching position.

A. A person employed as a principal, assistant principal or supervisor, including a person who has previously achieved continuing contract status as a teacher, shall serve three years in such position in the same school division before acquiring continuing contract status as principal, assistant principal or supervisor.

B. Each local school board shall develop for use by the division superintendent a performance evaluation process for principals, assistant principals, and supervisors that includes an assessment of such administrators’ skills and knowledge; student achievement and school gains in student learning; and effectiveness in addressing school safety and enforcing student discipline. The division superintendent shall implement such performance evaluation process in
making employment recommendations to the school board pursuant to § 22.1-293.

C. Continuing contract status acquired by a principal, assistant principal or supervisor shall not be construed (i) as prohibiting a school board from reassigning such principal, assistant principal or supervisor to a teaching position if notice of reassignment is given by the school board by April fifteenth, 15 of any year or (ii) as entitling any such principal, assistant principal or supervisor to the salary paid him as principal, assistant principal or supervisor in the case of any such reassignment to a teaching position.

D. No such salary reduction and reassignment, however, shall be made without first providing such principal, assistant principal or supervisor with written notice of the reason for such reduction and reassignment and an opportunity to present his or her position at an informal meeting with the division superintendent, the division superintendent's designee or the school board. The principal, assistant principal or supervisor shall elect whether such meeting shall be with the division superintendent, the division superintendent's designee or the school board. The school board, division superintendent or the division superintendent's designee shall determine what processes are to be followed at the meeting. The decision to reassign and reduce salary shall be at the sole discretion of the school board.

The intent of this section is to provide an opportunity for a principal, assistant principal or supervisor to discuss the reasons for such salary reduction and reassignment with the division superintendent, his designee or the school board, and the provisions of this section are meant to be procedural only. Nothing contained herein shall be taken to require cause, as defined in § 22.1-307, for the salary reduction and reassignment of a principal, assistant principal or supervisor.

E. As used in this section, "supervisor" means a person who holds a supervisory position as specified in the regulations of the Board of Education and who is required to hold a license as prescribed by the Board of Education.


A. The teachers in the public schools of a school division shall be employed and placed in appropriate schools by the school board upon recommendation of the division superintendent. In placing teachers, school boards shall fill positions with licensed instructional personnel with endorsements in the relevant subject areas.

B. School boards shall adopt employment policies and practices designed to promote the employment and retention of the highest quality instructional personnel and to effectively serve the educational needs of students. Such policies shall include, but shall not be limited to, incentives for excellence in teaching, including financial support for teachers attending professional development seminars or those seeking and obtaining national certification. School boards shall develop a procedure for use by the division superintendent and principals in evaluating instructional personnel that is appropriate to the tasks performed and addresses student achievement and the skills and knowledge of instructional personnel, including, among
other things, instructional methodology, classroom management, and subject matter knowledge.

§ 22.1-298. Regulations governing licensure.

A. The Board of Education shall, by regulation, prescribe the requirements for licensure of teachers. Regardless of the authority of any other agency of the Commonwealth to approve educational programs, only the Board of Education shall have the authority to license teachers to be regularly employed by school boards, including those teachers employed to provide nursing education.

B. Such regulations shall include:

1. A requirement that every teacher seeking initial licensure take a professional teacher's examination prescribed by the Board;

2. A requirement that persons seeking licensure on and after July 1, 2000, complete study in attention deficit disorder and gifted education, including the use of multiple criteria to identify gifted students;

3. A requirement that persons seeking initial licensure on and after July 1, 2002, complete study in, among other things, (i) methods of improving communication between schools and families; (ii) ways of increasing family involvement in student learning at home and in school; and (iii) the Standards of Learning.

4. A requirement that, on and after July 1, 2000, persons seeking licensure with endorsements as teachers of the blind and visually impaired demonstrate minimum proficiency in Braille; and

5. A requirement that persons seeking licensure renewal on and after July 1, 2004, and those persons seeking initial licensure on and after July 1, 2003, complete study in instructional methods tailored to promote student achievement and effective preparation for the Standards of Learning end-of-course and end-of-grade assessments and submit materials evidencing proficiency in classroom instruction.

C. Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, the Board may provide for the issuance of a provisional license, valid for a period not to exceed three years, to any person who does not meet the requirements of this section or any other requirement for licensure imposed by law.

D. The Board's licensure regulations shall also require that licensure for superintendents and principals, on and after July 1, 2000, be contingent upon acquiring the skills established in the Board's leadership standards.

E. Persons seeking initial licensure who graduate from Virginia institutions of higher education shall, on and after July 1, 2002, only be licensed as instructional personnel by the Board of Education if the endorsement areas offered at such institutions have been assessed by a national accrediting agency or by a state approval process, with final accreditation by the Board of
F. The Board shall prescribe a professional teacher’s examination for administration by Virginia public institutions of higher education as provided in § 23-9.2:3.1 to persons seeking entry into teacher education programs in such public institutions and shall establish a minimum passing score for such examination. The examination shall be sufficiently rigorous and the minimum score set as necessary to ensure that candidates have adequate academic and professional preparation to teach.

Candidates who fail to achieve the minimum score established by the Board shall not be denied entrance into the relevant teacher education programs solely on the basis of such failure and shall have the opportunity to address any deficiencies if enrolled in such program. Before completing any approved teacher education program, candidates must achieve the minimum score on the test prescribed by the Board.

The Board of Education, in consultation with the State Council on Higher Education, shall develop guidelines for performance reports to be submitted by the public institutions of higher education pursuant to § 23-23-9.2:3.1. Such reports shall include annual data on the pass rates, by institution, of graduates of Virginia institutions of higher education taking the state licensure examination and shall not include any information identifying individual graduates.


A. A probationary term of service for three years in the same school division shall be required before a teacher is issued a continuing contract. School boards shall provide each probationary teacher a mentor teacher, as described by Board guidelines developed pursuant to § 22.1-305.1, during the first year of the probationary period to assist such probationary teacher in achieving excellence in instruction. At the end of the first and third years of the probationary period, such probationary teacher shall be evaluated based upon the evaluation procedures developed by the employing school board for use by the division superintendent and principals in evaluating instructional personnel as required by § 22.1-295 B. The division superintendent shall consider such evaluations in making any recommendations to the school board regarding the nonrenewal of such probationary teacher’s contract as provided in § 22.1-305.

If the teacher’s performance evaluation during the probationary period is not satisfactory, the school board shall not reemploy the teacher; however, nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to require cause, as defined in § 22.1-307, for the nonrenewal of the contract of a teacher who has not achieved continuing contract status.

B. Once a continuing contract status has been attained in a school division in the Commonwealth, another probationary period need not be served in any other school division unless such probationary period, not to exceed one year, is made a part of the contract of employment. Further, when a teacher has attained continuing contract status in a school division in the Commonwealth, and separates from and returns to teaching service in a school division in Virginia by the beginning of the third year, such teacher shall be required to serve a probationary
period not to exceed one year, if made a part of the contract for employment.

C. For the purpose of calculating the three years of service required to attain continuing contract status, at least 160 contractual teaching days during the school year shall be deemed the equivalent of one year in the first year of service by a teacher.

§ 22.1-303.1. Immunity from civil liability for certain individuals.

Any teacher who, in good faith, participates in conducting a peer review of another teacher or a person who conducts a review of a teacher under the Beginning Teacher Assistance Program as a mentor teacher shall be immune from civil liability for any act, omission or statement made in the performance of these duties unless such act, omission or statement was made in bad faith or with malicious intent.


A. Before a division superintendent recommends to the school board nonrenewal of the contract of a teacher who has not achieved continuing contract status, the division superintendent shall consider the performance evaluations for such teacher required by § 22.1-303 and shall notify the teacher of the proposed recommendation. Upon written request of the teacher within five working days after receipt of such notice, the division superintendent or his designee shall orally provide the specific reasons, if any, for such recommendation, along with supporting documentation, including such performance evaluations, to the teacher and, if requested by the teacher, to his or her representative. Within ten days after receiving such reasons, the teacher may request, by notification in writing to the division superintendent, a conference before the division superintendent. Upon such request, the division superintendent shall set a date for the conference, which shall be within thirty days of the request, and shall give the teacher at least fifteen days' notice of the time and place of the conference.

B. The conference shall be before the division superintendent or his designee. No such designee shall have recommended to the division superintendent the nonrenewal of the teacher's contract. The teacher and the person or persons who recommended the nonrenewal of the teacher's contract to the division superintendent, or a representative of either or both, shall be allowed to participate in the conference, but no such representative shall be an attorney.

C. If the conference is before a designee of the division superintendent, the designee shall communicate his recommendations to the division superintendent and to the teacher.

D. The division superintendent shall notify the teacher, in writing, of his intention with respect to the recommendation within ten days after the conference.

E. In any case in which a teacher requests a conference as provided in this section, written notice of nonrenewal of the contract by the school board must be given within thirty days after the division superintendent notifies the teacher of his intention with respect to the recommendation and the provisions of § 22.1-304 requiring such notice on or before April fifteenth shall not be
applicable.

F. The conference shall be confidential and no written or oral communication of such conference shall be made to anyone other than the school board, in executive session, and employees of the school division having an interest therein; provided, however, that both the teacher and the division superintendent, upon request, may provide the reasons for the nonrenewal to a potential employer of the teacher.

G. The provisions of this section shall be inapplicable when a decrease in enrollment or the abolition of a particular subject or reduction in the number of classes offered in a particular subject causes a reduction in the number of teachers; provided, however, that a statement to that effect shall be placed in the personnel file of each teacher whose contract is nonrenewed for any such reason.

H. The intent of this section is to provide an opportunity for a probationary teacher to discuss the reasons for nonrenewal with the division superintendent or his designee, and the provisions of this section are meant to be procedural only. Nothing contained herein shall be taken to require cause, as defined in § 22.1-307, for the nonrenewal of the contract of a teacher who has not achieved continuing contract status nor shall the failure of the school board or the division superintendent to comply with any time requirement herein constitute a basis for continued employment of the teacher.

§ 22.1-305.1. Mentor teacher programs.

A. As part of the Beginning Teacher Assistance Program, the Board of Education may establish, from such funds as may be appropriated by the General Assembly, mentor teacher programs utilizing specially trained public school teachers as mentors to provide support, orientation and guidance for beginning teachers assistance and professional support to teachers entering the profession and to improve the performance of experienced teachers who are not performing at an acceptable level.

The Board shall issue guidelines for such mentor teacher programs and shall set criteria for beginning and experienced teacher participation, including self-referral, and the qualifications and training of mentor teachers. Such guidelines shall provide that the mentor programs be administered by local school boards with the assistance of an advisory committee made up of teachers and administrators and that mentors (i) be classroom teachers working in the same building as the teachers they are assisting; (ii) should not be assigned to more than four teachers at any time; (iii) assist teachers in the program by demonstrating, observing, referring, providing and assisting; (iv) evaluate the teachers in the program and make recommendations to the school principal and division superintendent regarding future employment; and (v) serve in such capacity for no more than three years; and (vi) receive adequate release time during the contract day.

Local school boards choosing to implement mentor teacher programs shall provide the Board with any information requested concerning such programs in a timely fashion.
B. The Board shall serve as fiscal agent for the participating school boards in matters concerning the mentor teacher programs. The Board shall allocate, from such funds as are appropriated, moneys to participating school divisions for the purpose of supporting such programs which shall include, but not be limited to, compensation for mentor teachers.

§ 23-9.2:3.1. Teacher education programs; reporting requirements.

A. The boards of visitors of those public institutions of higher education providing teacher education programs shall administer the entrance examination prescribed by the Board of Education pursuant to § 22.1-298 to all persons seeking entry into such teacher education programs.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this title to the contrary, such boards of visitors shall not deny candidates who fail to achieve the minimum score established by the Board entrance into the relevant teacher education programs solely on the basis of such failure, and shall require achievement of such minimum passing score as a condition of completing any approved teacher education program. Students failing to achieve the minimum passing score shall have the opportunity to address any deficiencies while enrolled in such teacher education program.

B. All Virginia public institutions of higher education that offer teacher education programs, master’s degree programs in education or master’s degree programs in administration shall submit annual performance reports, as set forth in Board of Education guidelines and as required by § 22.1-298 F. Such reports shall include annual data on the pass rates of graduates of such Virginia institutions of higher education taking the state licensure examination and shall not include any information identifying individual graduates.
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HOUSE BILL NO. 2710
AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE
(Proposed by the House Committee on Appropriations on February 4, 1999)
(Patron Prior to Substitute--Delegate Diamonstein)
Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia:
§ 22.1-60.1. Evaluation of superintendent.

Each local school board shall evaluate the division superintendent annually. The Board of Education shall develop guidelines for uniform performance standards and criteria to be used by local school boards in evaluating superintendents. These standards and criteria shall include, but not be limited to, assessing teacher and administrator skills and knowledge, improving student academic progress, providing for school safety and enforcing student discipline.


A. The General Assembly and the Board of Education find that effective educational leadership and personnel and appropriate programs of professional development and training are essential for the advancement of public education in the Commonwealth.

B. Each member of the Board of Education shall participate in in-service programs on personnel, curriculum and current issues in education as part of his service on the Board.

C. Consistent with the finding that leadership is essential for the advancement of public education in the Commonwealth, the Board of Education shall develop leadership standards for superintendents and principals, which standards shall include training in the implementation of the Standards of Learning and training in the evaluation and documentation of teacher and administrator performance based on student academic progress and the skills and knowledge of instructional personnel.

D. The Board of Education shall sponsor, conduct or provide advice on (i) training and professional development of teachers, principals, supervisors, division superintendents and other school staff; (ii) training for all administrative and supervisory personnel in the evaluation and
documentation of teacher and administrator performance based on student academic progress and the skills and knowledge of such instructional or administrative personnel; (iii) in-service programs for school board members on personnel, curriculum and current issues in education; and (iii) in cooperation with the Virginia Department for the Visually Handicapped, in-service programs in Braille for teachers of the blind and visually impaired. The Board shall provide technical assistance on professional development to local school boards designed to seek to ensure that all instructional personnel are proficient in the use of educational technology consistent with its Six-Year Educational Technology Plan for Virginia.

E. Each local school board shall require (i) its members to participate annually in in-service programs on personnel, curriculum and current issues in education as part of their service on the local board and (ii) require the division superintendent to participate annually in professional development activities at the local, state or national levels.

F. Each local school board shall provide (i) a program of professional development, as part of the license renewal process, to assist teachers and principals in acquiring the skills needed to work with gifted students and handicapped students and to increase student achievement, (ii) a program of professional development in educational technology for all instructional personnel, and (iii) a program of professional development for administrative personnel designed to increase proficiency in instructional leadership and management, including training in the evaluation and documentation of teacher and administrator performance based on student academic progress and the skills and knowledge of such instructional or administrative personnel.

§ 22.1-293. School boards authorized to employ principals and assistant principals; license required; powers and duties.

A. A school board, upon recommendation of the division superintendent, may employ principals and assistant principals. Persons employed in these positions shall hold licenses as prescribed by the Board of Education.

B. A principal shall provide instructional leadership in, shall be responsible for the administration of and shall supervise the operation and management of the school or schools and property to which he has been assigned, in accordance with the rules and regulations of the school board and under the supervision of the division superintendent.

C. A principal may submit recommendations to the division superintendent for the appointment, assignment, promotion, transfer and dismissal of all personnel assigned to his supervision. Beginning September 1, 2000, (i) principals must have received training, provided pursuant to § 22.1-253.13:5, in the evaluation and documentation of employee performance, which evaluation and documentation shall include, but shall not be limited to, employee skills and knowledge and student academic progress, prior to submitting such recommendations; and (ii) assistant principals and other administrative personnel participating in the evaluation and documentation of employee performance must also have received such training in the evaluation and documentation of employee performance.
D. A principal shall perform such other duties as may be assigned by the division superintendent pursuant to the rules and regulations of the school board.

§ 22.1-294. Probationary terms of service for principals, assistant principals and supervisors; evaluation; reassigning principal, assistant principal or supervisor to teaching position.

A. A person employed as a principal, assistant principal or supervisor, including a person who has previously achieved continuing contract status as a teacher, shall serve three years in such position in the same school division before acquiring continuing contract status as principal, assistant principal or supervisor.

B. Each local school board shall adopt for use by the division superintendent clearly defined criteria for a performance evaluation process for principals, assistant principals, and supervisors that includes, among other things, an assessment of such administrators’ skills and knowledge; student academic progress and school gains in student learning; and effectiveness in addressing school safety and enforcing student discipline. The division superintendent shall implement such performance evaluation process in making employment recommendations to the school board pursuant to § 22.1-293.

C. Continuing contract status acquired by a principal, assistant principal or supervisor shall not be construed (i) as prohibiting a school board from reassigning such principal, assistant principal or supervisor to a teaching position if notice of reassignment is given by the school board by April fifteenth (15) of any year or (ii) as entitling any such principal, assistant principal or supervisor to the salary paid him as principal, assistant principal or supervisor in the case of any such reassignment to a teaching position.

D. No such salary reduction and reassignment, however, shall be made without first providing such principal, assistant principal or supervisor with written notice of the reason for such reduction and reassignment and an opportunity to present his or her position at an informal meeting with the division superintendent, the division superintendent's designee or the school board. The principal, assistant principal or supervisor shall elect whether such meeting shall be with the division superintendent, the division superintendent's designee or the school board. The school board, division superintendent or the division superintendent's designee shall determine what processes are to be followed at the meeting. The decision to reassign and reduce salary shall be at the sole discretion of the school board.

The intent of this section is to provide an opportunity for a principal, assistant principal or supervisor to discuss the reasons for such salary reduction and reassignment with the division superintendent, his designee or the school board, and the provisions of this section are meant to be procedural only. Nothing contained herein shall be taken to require cause, as defined in § 22.1-307, for the salary reduction and reassignment of a principal, assistant principal or supervisor.

E. As used in this section, "supervisor" means a person who holds a supervisory position as specified in the regulations of the Board of Education and who is required to hold a license as
prescribed by the Board of Education.


A. The teachers in the public schools of a school division shall be employed and placed in appropriate schools by the school board upon recommendation of the division superintendent. In placing teachers, school boards shall fill positions with licensed instructional personnel qualified in the relevant subject areas.

B. School boards shall adopt employment policies and practices designed to promote the employment and retention of the highest quality instructional personnel and to effectively serve the educational needs of students. Such policies shall include, but need not be limited to, incentives for excellence in teaching, including financial support for teachers attending professional development seminars or those seeking and obtaining national certification. School boards shall develop a procedure for use by division superintendents and principals in evaluating instructional personnel that is appropriate to the tasks performed and addresses, among other things, student academic progress and the skills and knowledge of instructional personnel, including, but not limited to, instructional methodology, classroom management, and subject matter knowledge.

§ 22.1-298. Regulations governing licensure.

A. The Board of Education shall, by regulation, prescribe the requirements for licensure of teachers. Regardless of the authority of any other agency of the Commonwealth to approve educational programs, only the Board of Education shall have the authority to license teachers to be regularly employed by school boards, including those teachers employed to provide nursing education.

B. Such regulations shall include:

1. A requirement that every teacher seeking initial licensure take a professional teacher's examination prescribed by the Board;

2. A requirement that persons seeking licensure on and after July 1, 2000, complete study in attention deficit disorder and gifted education, including the use of multiple criteria to identify gifted students;

3. Persons seeking initial licensure on and after July 1, 2002, to have completed study in, among other things, (i) methods of improving communication between schools and families; (ii) ways of increasing family involvement in student learning at home and in school; and (iii) the Standards of Learning;

4. A requirement that, on and after July 1, 2000, persons seeking licensure with endorsements as teachers of the blind and visually impaired demonstrate minimum proficiency in Braille; and
5. A requirement that persons seeking initial licensure on and after July 1, 2003, complete study in instructional methods tailored to promote student academic progress and effective preparation for the Standards of Learning end-of-course and end-of-grade assessments; and

6. A requirement that persons seeking licensure renewal on and after July 1, 2004, receive training in instructional methods tailored to promote student academic progress and effective preparation for the Standards of Learning end-of-course and end-of-grade assessments.

C. Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, the Board may provide for the issuance of a provisional license, valid for a period not to exceed three years, to any person who does not meet the requirements of this section or any other requirement for licensure imposed by law.

D. The Board's licensure regulations shall also require that licensure for superintendents and principals, on and after July 1, 2000, be contingent upon acquiring the skills established in the Board's leadership standards.

E. Persons seeking initial licensure who graduate from Virginia institutions of higher education shall, on and after July 1, 2002, only be licensed as instructional personnel by the Board of Education if the endorsement areas offered at such institutions have been assessed by a national accrediting agency or by a state approval process, with final accreditation by the Board of Education.

F. The Board shall prescribe a professional teacher’s examination for administration by Virginia’s public institutions of higher education as provided in § 23-9.2:3.4 to persons seeking entry into teacher education programs in such public institutions and shall establish a minimum passing score for such examination. The examination shall be sufficiently rigorous and the minimum score set as necessary to ensure that candidates have adequate academic and professional preparation to teach.

Candidates who fail to achieve the minimum score established by the Board shall not be denied entrance into the relevant teacher education programs solely on the basis of such failure and shall have the opportunity to address any deficiencies if enrolled in such program. Before completing any approved teacher education program, candidates must achieve the minimum score on the test prescribed by the Board.

The Board of Education, in consultation with the State Council on Higher Education, shall develop guidelines for performance reports to be submitted by the public institutions of higher education pursuant to § 23-9.2:3.4. Such reports shall include annual data on the pass rates, by institution, of graduates of Virginia’s institutions of higher education taking the state licensure examination and shall not include any information identifying individual graduates.

§ 22.1-299.2. National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund.

A. From such funds as may be appropriated for such purpose and from such gifts, donations, grants, bequests, and other funds as may be received on its behalf, there is hereby established
the National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program (the “Program”), to be administered by the Board of Education, and a special nonreverting fund within the state treasury known as the National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program Fund (the “Fund”). The Fund shall be established on the books of the Comptroller, and any moneys remaining in the Fund at the end of the biennium shall not revert to the general fund but shall remain in the Fund. Interest earned on such funds shall remain in the Fund and be credited to it.

The State Treasurer shall manage the Fund, subject to the authority of the Board of Education to provide for its disbursement. The Fund shall be disbursed to award incentive grants to public school teachers obtaining national certification from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

To the extent funds are available in the Fund, teachers who obtain national certification shall receive a state-funded award of $5,000 each year for the life of the certificate. Such awards shall continue to be paid upon renewal of the certificate. The Board shall establish procedures for determining amounts of awards if the moneys in the Fund are not sufficient to award each eligible teacher $5,000.

B. The Board may issue guidelines governing the Program as it deems necessary and appropriate.


A. A probationary term of service for three years in the same school division shall be required before a teacher is issued a continuing contract. School boards shall provide each probationary teacher a mentor teacher, as described by Board guidelines developed pursuant to § 22.1-305.1, during the first year of the probationary period, to assist such probationary teacher in achieving excellence in instruction. During the probationary period, such probationary teacher shall be evaluated annually based upon the evaluation procedures developed by the employing school board for use by the division superintendent and principals in evaluating instructional personnel as required by § 22.1-295 B. The division superintendent shall consider such evaluations, among other things, in making any recommendations to the school board regarding the nonrenewal of such probationary teacher’s contract as provided in § 22.1-305.

If the teacher’s performance evaluation during the probationary period is not satisfactory, the school board shall not reemploy the teacher; however, nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to require cause, as defined in § 22.1-307, for the nonrenewal of the contract of a teacher who has not achieved continuing contract status.

B. Once a continuing contract status has been attained in a school division in the Commonwealth, another probationary period need not be served in any other school division unless such probationary period, not to exceed one year, is made a part of the contract of employment. Further, when a teacher has attained continuing contract status in a school division in the Commonwealth, and separates from and returns to teaching service in a school division in Virginia by the beginning of the third year, such teacher shall be required to serve a probationary
period not to exceed one year, if made a part of the contract for employment.  
C. For the purpose of calculating the three years of service required to attain continuing contract 
status, at least 160 contractual teaching days during the school year shall be deemed the 
equivalent of one year in the first year of service by a teacher.

§ 22.1-303.1. Immunity from civil liability for certain individuals.

Any teacher who, in good faith, participates in conducting a peer review of another teacher or a 
person who conducts a review of a teacher under the Beginning Teacher Assistance Program as 
a mentor teacher shall be immune from civil liability for any act, omission or statement made in 
the performance of these duties unless such act, omission or statement was made in bad faith or 
with malicious intent.


A. Before a division superintendent recommends to the school board nonrenewal of the contract 
of a teacher who has not achieved continuing contract status, the division superintendent shall 
consider, among other things, the performance evaluations for such teacher required by § 22.1- 
303 and shall notify the teacher of the proposed recommendation. Upon written request of the 
teacher within five working days after receipt of such notice, the division superintendent or his 
designee shall orally provide the specific reasons, if any, for such recommendation, along with 
supporting documentation, including such performance evaluations, to the teacher and, if 
requested by the teacher, to his or her representative. Within ten days after receiving such 
reasons, the teacher may request, by notification in writing to the division superintendent, a 
conference before the division superintendent. Upon such request, the division superintendent 
shall set a date for the conference, which shall be within thirty days of the request, and shall give 
the teacher at least fifteen days' notice of the time and place of the conference.

B. The conference shall be before the division superintendent or his designee. No such designee 
shall have recommended to the division superintendent the nonrenewal of the teacher's contract. 
The teacher and the person or persons who recommended the nonrenewal of the teacher's 
contract to the division superintendent, or a representative of either or both, shall be allowed to 
participate in the conference, but no such representative shall be an attorney.

C. If the conference is before a designee of the division superintendent, the designee shall 
communicate his recommendations to the division superintendent and to the teacher.

D. The division superintendent shall notify the teacher, in writing, of his intention with respect to 
the recommendation within ten days after the conference.

E. In any case in which a teacher requests a conference as provided in this section, written notice 
of nonrenewal of the contract by the school board must be given within thirty days after the 
division superintendent notifies the teacher of his intention with respect to the recommendation 
and the provisions of § 22.1-304 requiring such notice on or before April fifteenth shall not be applicable.
F. The conference shall be confidential and no written or oral communication of such conference shall be made to anyone other than the school board, in executive session, and employees of the school division having an interest therein; provided, however, that both the teacher and the division superintendent, upon request, may provide the reasons for the nonrenewal to a potential employer of the teacher.

G. The provisions of this section shall be inapplicable when a decrease in enrollment or the abolition of a particular subject or reduction in the number of classes offered in a particular subject causes a reduction in the number of teachers; provided, however, that a statement to that effect shall be placed in the personnel file of each teacher whose contract is nonrenewed for any such reason.

H. The intent of this section is to provide an opportunity for a probationary teacher to discuss the reasons for nonrenewal with the division superintendent or his designee, and the provisions of this section are meant to be procedural only. Nothing contained herein shall be taken to require cause, as defined in §22.1-307, for the nonrenewal of the contract of a teacher who has not achieved continuing contract status nor shall the failure of the school board or the division superintendent to comply with any time requirement herein constitute a basis for continued employment of the teacher.

§22.1-305.1. Mentor teacher programs.

A. As part of the Beginning Teacher Assistance Program, the Board of Education may establish, from such funds as may be appropriated by the General Assembly, mentor teacher programs utilizing specially trained public school teachers as mentors to provide support, orientation and guidance for beginning teachers and experienced teachers entering the profession and to improve the performance of experienced teachers who are not performing at an acceptable level.

The Board shall issue guidelines for such mentor teacher programs and shall set criteria for beginning and experienced teacher participation, including self-referral, and the qualifications and training of mentor teachers. Such guidelines shall provide that the mentor programs be administered by local school boards, with the assistance of an advisory committee made up of teachers and administrators, and that mentors (i) be classroom teachers who have achieved continuing contract status and who work in the same building as the teachers they are assisting; (ii) should not be assigned to more than four teachers at any time; (iii) assist teachers in the program by demonstrating, observing, referring, providing and assisting; and (iv) serve in such capacity for no more than three years.

Local school boards choosing to implement mentor teacher programs shall provide the Board with any information requested concerning such programs in a timely fashion.

B. The Board shall serve as fiscal agent for the participating school boards in matters concerning the mentor teacher programs. The Board shall allocate, from such funds as are appropriated, moneys to participating school divisions for the purpose of supporting such programs which shall include, but not be limited to, compensation for mentor teachers.
§ 23-9.2:3.4. Teacher education programs; reporting requirements.

A. The boards of visitors of those public institutions of higher education providing teacher education programs shall administer the entrance examination prescribed by the Board of Education pursuant to § 22.1-298 to all persons seeking entry into such teacher education programs.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this title to the contrary, such boards of visitors shall not deny candidates who fail to achieve the minimum score established by the Board entrance into the relevant teacher education programs solely on the basis of such failure, and shall require achievement of such minimum passing score as a condition of completing any approved teacher education program. Students failing to achieve the minimum passing score shall have the opportunity to address any deficiencies while enrolled in such teacher education program.

B. All Virginia public institutions of higher education that offer teacher education programs, master’s degree programs in education or master’s degree programs in administration shall submit annual performance reports as set forth in Board of Education guidelines and as required by § 22.1-298 F. Such reports shall include annual data on the pass rates of graduates of such Virginia institutions of higher education taking the state licensure examination and shall not include any information identifying individual graduates.
Each local school board shall evaluate the division superintendent annually. The Board of Education shall develop guidelines for uniform performance standards and criteria to be used by local school boards in evaluating superintendents. These standards and criteria shall include, but not be limited to, assessing teacher and administrator skills and knowledge, improving student academic progress, providing for school safety and enforcing student discipline.

§ 22.1-60.1. Evaluation of superintendent.

A. The General Assembly and the Board of Education find that effective educational leadership and personnel and appropriate programs of professional development and training are essential for the advancement of public education in the Commonwealth.

B. Each member of the Board of Education shall participate in in-service programs on personnel, curriculum and current issues in education as part of his service on the Board.

C. Consistent with the finding that leadership is essential for the advancement of public education in the Commonwealth, the Board of Education shall develop leadership standards for superintendents and principals, which standards shall include training in the implementation of the Standards of Learning and training in the evaluation and documentation of teacher and administrator performance based on student academic progress and the skills and knowledge of instructional personnel.

D. The Board of Education shall sponsor, conduct or provide advice on (i) training and professional development of teachers, principals, supervisors, division superintendents and other
school staff; (ii) training for all administrative and supervisory personnel in the evaluation and documentation of teacher and administrator performance based on student academic progress and the skills and knowledge of such instructional or administrative personnel; (iii) in-service programs for school board members on personnel, curriculum and current issues in education; and (iv) in cooperation with the Virginia Department for the Visually Handicapped, in-service programs in Braille for teachers of the blind and visually impaired. The Board shall provide technical assistance on professional development to local school boards designed to seek to ensure that all instructional personnel are proficient in the use of educational technology consistent with its Six-Year Educational Technology Plan for Virginia.

E. Each local school board shall require (i) its members to participate annually in in-service programs on personnel, curriculum and current issues in education as part of their service on the local board and (ii) require the division superintendent to participate annually in professional development activities at the local, state or national levels.

F. Each local school board shall provide (i) a program of professional development, as part of the license renewal process, to assist teachers and principals in acquiring the skills needed to work with gifted students and handicapped students and to increase student achievement, (ii) a program of professional development in educational technology for all instructional personnel, and (iii) a program of professional development for administrative personnel designed to increase proficiency in instructional leadership and management, including training in the evaluation and documentation of teacher and administrator performance based on student academic progress and the skills and knowledge of such instructional or administrative personnel.

§ 22.1-293. School boards authorized to employ principals and assistant principals; license required; powers and duties.

A. A school board, upon recommendation of the division superintendent, may employ principals and assistant principals. Persons employed in these positions shall hold licenses as prescribed by the Board of Education.

B. A principal shall provide instructional leadership in, shall be responsible for the administration of and shall supervise the operation and management of the school or schools and property to which he has been assigned, in accordance with the rules and regulations of the school board and under the supervision of the division superintendent.

C. A principal may submit recommendations to the division superintendent for the appointment, assignment, promotion, transfer and dismissal of all personnel assigned to his supervision. Beginning September 1, 2000, (i) principals must have received training, provided pursuant to § 22.1-253.13:5, in the evaluation and documentation of employee performance, which evaluation and documentation shall include, but shall not be limited to, employee skills and knowledge and student academic progress, prior to submitting such recommendations; and (ii) assistant principals and other administrative personnel participating in the evaluation and documentation of employee performance must also have received such training in the evaluation and documentation of employee performance.
D. A principal shall perform such other duties as may be assigned by the division superintendent pursuant to the rules and regulations of the school board.

§ 22.1-294. Probationary terms of service for principals, assistant principals and supervisors; evaluation; reassigning principal, assistant principal or supervisor to teaching position.

A. A person employed as a principal, assistant principal or supervisor, including a person who has previously achieved continuing contract status as a teacher, shall serve three years in such position in the same school division before acquiring continuing contract status as principal, assistant principal or supervisor.

B. Each local school board shall adopt for use by the division superintendent clearly defined criteria for a performance evaluation process for principals, assistant principals, and supervisors that includes, among other things, an assessment of such administrators' skills and knowledge; student academic progress and school gains in student learning; and effectiveness in addressing school safety and enforcing student discipline. The division superintendent shall implement such performance evaluation process in making employment recommendations to the school board pursuant to § 22.1-293.

C. Continuing contract status acquired by a principal, assistant principal or supervisor shall not be construed (i) as prohibiting a school board from reassigning such principal, assistant principal or supervisor to a teaching position if notice of reassignment is given by the school board by April fifteenth of any year or (ii) as entitling any such principal, assistant principal or supervisor to the salary paid him as principal, assistant principal or supervisor in the case of any such reassignment to a teaching position.

D. No such salary reduction and reassignment, however, shall be made without first providing such principal, assistant principal or supervisor with written notice of the reason for such reduction and reassignment and an opportunity to present his or her position at an informal meeting with the division superintendent, the division superintendent's designee or the school board. The principal, assistant principal or supervisor shall elect whether such meeting shall be with the division superintendent, the division superintendent's designee or the school board. The school board, division superintendent or the division superintendent's designee shall determine what processes are to be followed at the meeting. The decision to reassign and reduce salary shall be at the sole discretion of the school board.

The intent of this section is to provide an opportunity for a principal, assistant principal or supervisor to discuss the reasons for such salary reduction and reassignment with the division superintendent, his designee or the school board, and the provisions of this section are meant to be procedural only. Nothing contained herein shall be taken to require cause, as defined in § 22.1-307, for the salary reduction and reassignment of a principal, assistant principal or supervisor.

E. As used in this section, "supervisor" means a person who holds a supervisory position as specified in the regulations of the Board of Education and who is required to hold a license as
prescribed by the Board of Education.


A. The teachers in the public schools of a school division shall be employed and placed in appropriate schools by the school board upon recommendation of the division superintendent. *In placing teachers, school boards shall fill positions with licensed instructional personnel qualified in the relevant subject areas.*

B. School boards shall adopt employment policies and practices designed to promote the employment and retention of the highest quality instructional personnel and to effectively serve the educational needs of students. *Such policies shall include, but need not be limited to, incentives for excellence in teaching, including financial support for teachers attending professional development seminars or those seeking and obtaining national certification. School boards shall develop a procedure for use by division superintendents and principals in evaluating instructional personnel that is appropriate to the tasks performed and addresses, among other things, student academic progress and the skills and knowledge of instructional personnel, including, but not limited to, instructional methodology, classroom management, and subject matter knowledge.*

§ 22.1-298. Regulations governing licensure.

A. The Board of Education shall, by regulation, prescribe the requirements for licensure of teachers. Regardless of the authority of any other agency of the Commonwealth to approve educational programs, only the Board of Education shall have the authority to license teachers to be regularly employed by school boards, including those teachers employed to provide nursing education.

B. Such regulations shall include:

1. A requirement that every teacher seeking initial licensure take a professional teacher's examination prescribed by the Board;

2. A requirement that persons seeking licensure on and after July 1, 2000, complete study in attention deficit disorder and gifted education, including the use of multiple criteria to identify gifted students;

3. *Persons seeking initial licensure on and after July 1, 2002, to have completed study in, among other things, (i) methods of improving communication between schools and families; (ii) ways of increasing family involvement in student learning at home and in school; and (iii) the Standards of Learning;*;

4. A requirement that, on and after July 1, 2000, persons seeking licensure with endorsements as teachers of the blind and visually impaired demonstrate minimum proficiency in Braille; and
5. A requirement that persons seeking initial licensure on and after July 1, 2003, complete study in instructional methods tailored to promote student academic progress and effective preparation for the Standards of Learning end-of-course and end-of-grade assessments; and

6. A requirement that persons seeking licensure renewal on and after July 1, 2004, receive training in instructional methods tailored to promote student academic progress and effective preparation for the Standards of Learning end-of-course and end-of-grade assessments.

C. Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, the Board may provide for the issuance of a provisional license, valid for a period not to exceed three years, to any person who does not meet the requirements of this section or any other requirement for licensure imposed by law.

D. The Board's licensure regulations shall also require that licensure for superintendents and principals, on and after July 1, 2000, are contingent upon acquiring the skills established in the Board's leadership standards.

E. Persons seeking initial licensure who graduate from Virginia institutions of higher education shall, on and after July 1, 2002, only be licensed as instructional personnel by the Board of Education if the endorsement areas offered at such institutions have been assessed by a national accrediting agency or by a state approval process, with final accreditation by the Board of Education.

F. The Board shall prescribe a professional teacher’s examination for administration by Virginia’s public institutions of higher education as provided in § 23-9.2:3.4 to persons seeking entry into teacher education programs in such public institutions and shall establish a minimum passing score for such examination. The examination shall be sufficiently rigorous and the minimum score set as necessary to ensure that candidates have adequate academic and professional preparation to teach.

Candidates who fail to achieve the minimum score established by the Board shall not be denied entrance into the relevant teacher education programs solely on the basis of such failure and shall have the opportunity to address any deficiencies if enrolled in such program. Before completing any approved teacher education program, candidates must achieve the minimum score on the test prescribed by the Board.

The Board of Education, in consultation with the State Council on Higher Education, shall develop guidelines for performance reports to be submitted by the public institutions of higher education pursuant to § 23-9.2:3.4. Such reports shall include annual data on the pass rates, by institution, of graduates of Virginia’s institutions of higher education taking the state licensure examination and shall not include any information identifying individual graduates.

§ 22.1-299.2. National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund.

A. From such funds as may be appropriated for such purpose and from such gifts, donations, grants, bequests, and other funds as may be received on its behalf, there is hereby established
the National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program (the “Program”), to be administered by the Board of Education, and a special nonreverting fund within the state treasury known as the National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program Fund (the “Fund”). The Fund shall be established on the books of the Comptroller, and any moneys remaining in the Fund at the end of the biennium shall not revert to the general fund but shall remain in the Fund. Interest earned on such funds shall remain in the Fund and be credited to it.

The State Treasurer shall manage the Fund, subject to the authority of the Board of Education to provide for its disbursement. The Fund shall be disbursed to award incentive grants to public school teachers obtaining national certification from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

To the extent funds are available in the Fund, teachers who obtain national certification shall receive a state-funded award of $5,000 each year for the life of the certificate. Such awards shall continue to be paid upon renewal of the certificate. The Board shall establish procedures for determining amounts of awards if the moneys in the Fund are not sufficient to award each eligible teacher $5,000.

B. The Board may issue guidelines governing the Program as it deems necessary and appropriate.


A. A probationary term of service for three years in the same school division shall be required before a teacher is issued a continuing contract. School boards shall provide each probationary teacher, except probationary teachers who have obtained continuing contract status in a school division, a mentor teacher, as described by Board guidelines developed pursuant to § 22.1-305.1, during the first year of the probationary period, to assist such probationary teacher in achieving excellence in instruction. During the probationary period, such probationary teacher shall be evaluated annually based upon the evaluation procedures developed by the employing school board for use by the division superintendent and principals in evaluating instructional personnel as required by § 22.1-295. The division superintendent shall consider such evaluations, among other things, in making any recommendations to the school board regarding the nonrenewal of such probationary teacher’s contract as provided in § 22.1-305.

If the teacher’s performance evaluation during the probationary period is not satisfactory, the school board shall not reemploy the teacher; however, nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to require cause, as defined in § 22.1-307, for the nonrenewal of the contract of a teacher who has not achieved continuing contract status.

B. Once a continuing contract status has been attained in a school division in the Commonwealth, another probationary period need not be served in any other school division unless such probationary period, not to exceed one year, is made a part of the contract of employment. Further, when a teacher has attained continuing contract status in a school division in the Commonwealth, and separates from and returns to teaching service in a school division in
Virginia by the beginning of the third year, such teacher shall be required to serve a probationary period not to exceed one year, if made a part of the contract for employment.

C. For the purpose of calculating the three years of service required to attain continuing contract status, at least 160 contractual teaching days during the school year shall be deemed the equivalent of one year in the first year of service by a teacher.

§ 22.1-303.1. Immunity from civil liability for certain individuals.

Any teacher who, in good faith, participates in conducting a peer review of another teacher or a person who conducts a review of a teacher under the Beginning Teacher Assistance Program as a mentor teacher shall be immune from civil liability for any act, omission or statement made in the performance of these duties unless such act, omission or statement was made in bad faith or with malicious intent.


A. Before a division superintendent recommends to the school board nonrenewal of the contract of a teacher who has not achieved continuing contract status, the division superintendent shall consider, among other things, the performance evaluations for such teacher required by § 22.1-303 and shall notify the teacher of the proposed recommendation. Upon written request of the teacher within five working days after receipt of such notice, the division superintendent or his designee shall orally provide the specific reasons, if any, for such recommendation, along with supporting documentation, if any, including such performance evaluations, to the teacher and, if requested by the teacher, to his or her representative. Within ten days after receiving such reasons, the teacher may request, by notification in writing to the division superintendent, a conference before the division superintendent, a conference before the division superintendent. Upon such request, the division superintendent shall set a date for the conference, which shall be within thirty days of the request, and shall give the teacher at least fifteen days' notice of the time and place of the conference.

B. The conference shall be before the division superintendent or his designee. No such designee shall have recommended to the division superintendent the nonrenewal of the teacher's contract. The teacher and the person or persons who recommended the nonrenewal of the teacher's contract to the division superintendent, or a representative of either or both, shall be allowed to participate in the conference, but no such representative shall be an attorney.

C. If the conference is before a designee of the division superintendent, the designee shall communicate his recommendations to the division superintendent and to the teacher.

D. The division superintendent shall notify the teacher, in writing, of his intention with respect to the recommendation within ten days after the conference.

E. In any case in which a teacher requests a conference as provided in this section, written notice of nonrenewal of the contract by the school board must be given within thirty days after the division superintendent notifies the teacher of his intention with respect to the recommendation.
and the provisions of § 22.1-304 requiring such notice on or before April fifteenth 15 shall not be applicable.

F. The conference shall be confidential and no written or oral communication of such conference shall be made to anyone other than the school board, in executive session, and employees of the school division having an interest therein; provided, however, that both the teacher and the division superintendent, upon request, may provide the reasons for the nonrenewal to a potential employer of the teacher.

G. The provisions of this section shall be inapplicable when a decrease in enrollment or the abolition of a particular subject or reduction in the number of classes offered in a particular subject causes a reduction in the number of teachers; provided, however, that a statement to that effect shall be placed in the personnel file of each teacher whose contract is nonrenewed for any such reason.

H. The intent of this section is to provide an opportunity for a probationary teacher to discuss the reasons for nonrenewal with the division superintendent or his designee, and the provisions of this section are meant to be procedural only. Nothing contained herein shall be taken to require cause, as defined in § 22.1-307, for the nonrenewal of the contract of a teacher who has not achieved continuing contract status nor shall the failure of the school board or the division superintendent to comply with any time requirement herein constitute a basis for continued employment of the teacher.

§ 22.1-305.1. Mentor teacher programs.

A. As part of the Beginning Teacher Assistance Program, the Board of Education may establish, from such funds as may be appropriated by the General Assembly, mentor teacher programs utilizing specially trained public school teachers as mentors to provide assistance and professional support to teachers entering the profession and to improve the performance of experienced teachers who are not performing at an acceptable level.

The Board shall issue guidelines for such mentor teacher programs and shall set criteria for beginning and experienced teacher participation, including self-referral, and the qualifications and training of mentor teachers. Such guidelines shall provide that the mentor programs be administered by local school boards, with the assistance of an advisory committee made up of teachers and administrators, and that mentors (i) be classroom teachers who have achieved continuing contract status and who work in the same building as the teachers they are assisting or be instructional personnel who are assigned solely as mentors; (ii) be assigned a limited number of teachers at any time; (iii) assist teachers in the program by demonstrating, observing, referring, providing and assisting; (iv) serve in such capacity for no more than three years; and (v) receive adequate release time during the contract day.

Local school boards choosing to implement mentor teacher programs shall provide the Board with any information requested concerning such programs in a timely fashion.
B. The Board shall serve as fiscal agent for the participating school boards in matters concerning the mentor teacher programs. The Board shall allocate, from such funds as are appropriated, moneys to participating school divisions for the purpose of supporting such programs which shall include, but not be limited to, compensation for mentor teachers.

§ 23-9.2:3.4. Teacher education programs; reporting requirements.

A. The boards of visitors of those public institutions of higher education providing teacher education programs shall administer the entrance examination prescribed by the Board of Education pursuant to § 22.1-298 to all persons seeking entry into such teacher education programs.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this title to the contrary, such boards of visitors shall not deny candidates who fail to achieve the minimum score established by the Board entrance into the relevant teacher education programs solely on the basis of such failure, and shall require achievement of such minimum passing score as a condition of completing any approved teacher education program. Students failing to achieve the minimum passing score shall have the opportunity to address any deficiencies while enrolled in such teacher education program.

B. All Virginia public institutions of higher education that offer teacher education programs, master’s degree programs in education or master’s degree programs in administration shall submit annual performance reports as set forth in Board of Education guidelines and as required by § 22.1-298 F. Such reports shall include annual data on the pass rates of graduates of such Virginia institutions of higher education taking the state licensure examination and shall not include any information identifying individual graduates.
APPENDIX F
CHAPTER 1037


[H 2710]
Approved May 7, 1999

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia:


§ 22.1-60.1. Evaluation of superintendent.

Each local school board shall evaluate the division superintendent annually. The Board of Education shall develop guidelines for uniform performance standards and criteria to be used by local school boards in evaluating superintendents. These standards and criteria shall include, but not be limited to, assessing teacher and administrator skills and knowledge, improving student academic progress, providing for school safety and enforcing student discipline.


A. The General Assembly and the Board of Education find that effective educational leadership and personnel and appropriate programs of professional development and training are essential for the advancement of public education in the Commonwealth.

B. Each member of the Board of Education shall participate in in-service programs on personnel, curriculum and current issues in education as part of his service on the Board.

C. Consistent with the finding that leadership is essential for the advancement of public education in the Commonwealth, the Board of Education shall develop leadership standards for superintendents and principals, which standards shall include training in the implementation of the Standards of Learning and training in the evaluation and documentation of teacher and administrator performance based on student academic progress and the skills and knowledge of instructional personnel.

D. The Board of Education shall sponsor, conduct or provide advice on (i) training and
professional development of teachers, principals, supervisors, division superintendents and other school staff; (ii) training for all administrative and supervisory personnel in the evaluation and documentation of teacher and administrator performance based on student academic progress and the skills and knowledge of such instructional or administrative personnel; (iii) in-service programs for school board members on personnel, curriculum and current issues in education; and (iii) (iv) in cooperation with the Virginia Department for the Visually Handicapped, in-service programs in Braille for teachers of the blind and visually impaired. The Board shall provide technical assistance on professional development to local school boards designed to seek to ensure that all instructional personnel are proficient in the use of educational technology consistent with its Six-Year Educational Technology Plan for Virginia.

E. Each local school board shall require (i) its members to participate annually in in-service programs on personnel, curriculum and current issues in education as part of their service on the local board and (ii) require the division superintendent to participate annually in professional development activities at the local, state or national levels.

F. Each local school board shall provide (i) a program of professional development, as part of the license renewal process, to assist teachers and principals in acquiring the skills needed to work with gifted students and handicapped students and to increase student achievement, (ii) a program of professional development in educational technology for all instructional personnel, and (iii) a program of professional development for administrative personnel designed to increase proficiency in instructional leadership and management, including training in the evaluation and documentation of teacher and administrator performance based on student academic progress and the skills and knowledge of such instructional or administrative personnel.

§ 22.1-293. School boards authorized to employ principals and assistant principals; license required; powers and duties.

A. A school board, upon recommendation of the division superintendent, may employ principals and assistant principals. Persons employed in these positions shall hold licenses as prescribed by the Board of Education.

B. A principal shall provide instructional leadership in, shall be responsible for the administration of and shall supervise the operation and management of the school or schools and property to which he has been assigned, in accordance with the rules and regulations of the school board and under the supervision of the division superintendent.

C. A principal may submit recommendations to the division superintendent for the appointment, assignment, promotion, transfer and dismissal of all personnel assigned to his supervision. Beginning September 1, 2000, (i) principals must have received training, provided pursuant to § 22.1-253.13-5, in the evaluation and documentation of employee performance, which evaluation and documentation shall include, but shall not be limited to, employee skills and knowledge and student academic progress, prior to submitting such recommendations; and (ii) assistant principals and other administrative personnel participating in the evaluation and documentation of employee performance must also have received such training in the evaluation and
documentation of employee performance.

D. A principal shall perform such other duties as may be assigned by the division superintendent pursuant to the rules and regulations of the school board.

§ 22.1-294. Probationary terms of service for principals, assistant principals and supervisors; evaluation; reassigning principal, assistant principal or supervisor to teaching position.

A. A person employed as a principal, assistant principal or supervisor, including a person who has previously achieved continuing contract status as a teacher, shall serve three years in such position in the same school division before acquiring continuing contract status as principal, assistant principal or supervisor.

B. Each local school board shall adopt for use by the division superintendent clearly defined criteria for a performance evaluation process for principals, assistant principals, and supervisors that includes, among other things, an assessment of such administrators’ skills and knowledge; student academic progress and school gains in student learning; and effectiveness in addressing school safety and enforcing student discipline. The division superintendent shall implement such performance evaluation process in making employment recommendations to the school board pursuant to § 22.1-293.

C. Continuing contract status acquired by a principal, assistant principal or supervisor shall not be construed (i) as prohibiting a school board from reassigning such principal, assistant principal or supervisor to a teaching position if notice of reassignment is given by the school board by April fifteenth-15 of any year or (ii) as entitling any such principal, assistant principal or supervisor to the salary paid him as principal, assistant principal or supervisor in the case of any such reassignment to a teaching position.

D. No such salary reduction and reassignment, however, shall be made without first providing such principal, assistant principal or supervisor with written notice of the reason for such reduction and reassignment and an opportunity to present his or her position at an informal meeting with the division superintendent, the division superintendent's designee or the school board. The principal, assistant principal or supervisor shall elect whether such meeting shall be with the division superintendent, the division superintendent's designee or the school board. The school board, division superintendent or the division superintendent's designee shall determine what processes are to be followed at the meeting. The decision to reassign and reduce salary shall be at the sole discretion of the school board.

The intent of this section is to provide an opportunity for a principal, assistant principal or supervisor to discuss the reasons for such salary reduction and reassignment with the division superintendent, his designee or the school board, and the provisions of this section are meant to be procedural only. Nothing contained herein shall be taken to require cause, as defined in § 22.1-307, for the salary reduction and reassignment of a principal, assistant principal or supervisor.
E. As used in this section, "supervisor" means a person who holds a supervisory position as specified in the regulations of the Board of Education and who is required to hold a license as prescribed by the Board of Education.


A. The teachers in the public schools of a school division shall be employed and placed in appropriate schools by the school board upon recommendation of the division superintendent. In placing teachers, school boards shall fill positions with licensed instructional personnel qualified in the relevant subject areas.

B. School boards shall adopt employment policies and practices designed to promote the employment and retention of the highest quality instructional personnel and to effectively serve the educational needs of students. Such policies shall include, but need not be limited to, incentives for excellence in teaching, including financial support for teachers attending professional development seminars or those seeking and obtaining national certification. School boards shall develop a procedure for use by division superintendents and principals in evaluating instructional personnel that is appropriate to the tasks performed and addresses, among other things, student academic progress and the skills and knowledge of instructional personnel, including, but not limited to, instructional methodology, classroom management, and subject matter knowledge.

§ 22.1-298. Regulations governing licensure.

A. The Board of Education shall, by regulation, prescribe the requirements for licensure of teachers. Regardless of the authority of any other agency of the Commonwealth to approve educational programs, only the Board of Education shall have the authority to license teachers to be regularly employed by school boards, including those teachers employed to provide nursing education.

B. Such regulations shall include:

1. A requirement that every teacher seeking initial licensure take a professional teacher's examination prescribed by the Board;

2. A requirement that persons seeking licensure on and after July 1, 2000, complete study in attention deficit disorder and gifted education, including the use of multiple criteria to identify gifted students;

3. A requirement that persons seeking initial licensure on and after July 1, 2002, complete study in, among other things, (i) methods of improving communication between schools and families; (ii) ways of increasing family involvement in student learning at home and in school; and (iii) the Standards of Learning;

4. A requirement that, on and after July 1, 2000, persons seeking licensure with endorsements as
teachers of the blind and visually impaired demonstrate minimum proficiency in Braille; and

5. A requirement that persons seeking initial licensure on and after July 1, 2003, complete study in instructional methods tailored to promote student academic progress and effective preparation for the Standards of Learning end-of-course and end-of-grade assessments; and

6. A requirement that persons seeking licensure renewal on and after July 1, 2004, receive training in instructional methods tailored to promote student academic progress and effective preparation for the Standards of Learning end-of-course and end-of-grade assessments.

C. Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, the Board may provide for the issuance of a provisional license, valid for a period not to exceed three years, to any person who does not meet the requirements of this section or any other requirement for licensure imposed by law.

D. The Board's licensure regulations shall also require that licensure for superintendents and principals, on and after July 1, 2000, be contingent upon acquiring the skills established in the Board's leadership standards.

E. Persons seeking initial licensure who graduate from Virginia institutions of higher education shall, on and after July 1, 2002, only be licensed as instructional personnel by the Board of Education if the endorsement areas offered at such institutions have been assessed by a national accrediting agency or by a state approval process, with final accreditation by the Board of Education.

F. The Board shall prescribe a professional teacher's examination for administration by Virginia's public institutions of higher education as provided in § 23-9.2:3.4 to persons seeking entry into teacher education programs in such public institutions and shall establish a minimum passing score for such examination. The examination shall be sufficiently rigorous and the minimum score set as necessary to ensure that candidates have adequate academic and professional preparation to teach.

Candidates who fail to achieve the minimum score established by the Board shall not be denied entrance into the relevant teacher education programs solely on the basis of such failure and shall have the opportunity to address any deficiencies if enrolled in such program. Before completing any approved teacher education program, candidates must achieve the minimum score on the test prescribed by the Board.

The Board of Education, in consultation with the State Council on Higher Education, shall develop guidelines for performance reports to be submitted by the public institutions of higher education pursuant to § 23-9.2:3.4. Such reports shall include annual data on the pass rates, by institution, of graduates of Virginia's institutions of higher education taking the state licensure examination and shall not include any information identifying individual graduates.

§ 22.1-299.2. National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program and Fund.
A. From such funds as may be appropriated for such purpose and from such gifts, donations, grants, bequests, and other funds as may be received on its behalf, there is hereby established the National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program (the Program), to be administered by the Board of Education, and a special nonreverting fund within the state treasury known as the National Teacher Certification Incentive Reward Program Fund (the Fund). The Fund shall be established on the books of the Comptroller, and any moneys remaining in the Fund at the end of the biennium shall not revert to the general fund but shall remain in the Fund. Interest earned on such funds shall remain in the Fund and be credited to it.

The State Treasurer shall manage the Fund, subject to the authority of the Board of Education to provide for its disbursement. The Fund shall be disbursed to award incentive grants to public school teachers obtaining national certification from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

To the extent funds are available in the Fund, teachers who obtain national certification shall receive an initial state-funded award of $5,000 and a subsequent award of $2,500 each year for the life of the certificate. Such awards shall continue to be paid upon renewal of the certificate. The Board shall establish procedures for determining amounts of awards if the moneys in the Fund are not sufficient to award each eligible teacher $5,000.

B. The Board may issue guidelines governing the Program as it deems necessary and appropriate.


A. A probationary term of service for three years in the same school division shall be required before a teacher is issued a continuing contract. School boards shall provide each probationary teacher, except probationary teachers who have prior successful teaching experience, as determined by the local school board, a mentor teacher, as described by Board guidelines developed pursuant to § 22.1-305.1, during the first year of the probationary period, to assist such probationary teacher in achieving excellence in instruction. During the probationary period, such probationary teacher shall be evaluated annually based upon the evaluation procedures developed by the employing school board for use by the division superintendent and principals in evaluating instructional personnel as required by § 22.1-295 B. The division superintendent shall consider such evaluations, among other things, in making any recommendations to the school board regarding the nonrenewal of such probationary teacher’s contract as provided in § 22.1-305.

B. Once a continuing contract status has been attained in a school division in the Commonwealth, another probationary period need not be served in any other school division unless such probationary period, not to exceed one year, is made a part of the contract of employment. Further, when a teacher has attained continuing contract status in a school division in the Commonwealth, and separates from and returns to teaching service in a school division in Virginia by the beginning of the third year, such teacher shall be required to serve a probationary period not to exceed one year, if made a part of the contract for employment.
C. For the purpose of calculating the three years of service required to attain continuing contract status, at least 160 contractual teaching days during the school year shall be deemed the equivalent of one year in the first year of service by a teacher.

§ 22.1-303.1. Immunity from civil liability for certain individuals.

Any teacher who, in good faith, participates in conducting a peer review of another teacher or a person who conducts a review of a teacher under the Beginning Teacher Assistance Program as a mentor teacher shall be immune from civil liability for any act, omission or statement made in the performance of these duties unless such act, omission or statement was made in bad faith or with malicious intent.


A. Before a division superintendent recommends to the school board nonrenewal of the contract of a teacher who has not achieved continuing contract status, the division superintendent shall consider, among other things, the performance evaluations for such teacher required by § 22.1-303 and shall notify the teacher of the proposed recommendation. Upon written request of the teacher within five working days after receipt of such notice, the division superintendent or his designee shall orally provide the specific reasons, if any, for such recommendation, along with supporting documentation, including such performance evaluations, to the teacher and, if requested by the teacher, to his or her representative. Within ten days after receiving such reasons, the teacher may request, by notification in writing to the division superintendent, a conference before the division superintendent. Upon such request, the division superintendent shall set a date for the conference, which shall be within thirty days of the request, and shall give the teacher at least fifteen days' notice of the time and place of the conference.

B. The conference shall be before the division superintendent or his designee. No such designee shall have recommended to the division superintendent the nonrenewal of the teacher's contract. The teacher and the person or persons who recommended the nonrenewal of the teacher's contract to the division superintendent, or a representative of either or both, shall be allowed to participate in the conference, but no such representative shall be an attorney.

C. If the conference is before a designee of the division superintendent, the designee shall communicate his recommendations to the division superintendent and to the teacher.

D. The division superintendent shall notify the teacher, in writing, of his intention with respect to the recommendation within ten days after the conference.

E. In any case in which a teacher requests a conference as provided in this section, written notice of nonrenewal of the contract by the school board must be given within thirty days after the division superintendent notifies the teacher of his intention with respect to the recommendation and the provisions of § 22.1-304 requiring such notice on or before April fifteenth 15 shall not be applicable.
F. The conference shall be confidential and no written or oral communication of such conference shall be made to anyone other than the school board, in executive session, and employees of the school division having an interest therein; provided, however, that both the teacher and the division superintendent, upon request, may provide the reasons for the nonrenewal to a potential employer of the teacher.

G. The provisions of this section shall be inapplicable when a decrease in enrollment or the abolition of a particular subject or reduction in the number of classes offered in a particular subject causes a reduction in the number of teachers; provided, however, that a statement to that effect shall be placed in the personnel file of each teacher whose contract is nonrenewed for any such reason.

H. The intent of this section is to provide an opportunity for a probationary teacher to discuss the reasons for nonrenewal with the division superintendent or his designee, and the provisions of this section are meant to be procedural only. Nothing contained herein shall be taken to require cause, as defined in § 22.1-307, for the nonrenewal of the contract of a teacher who has not achieved continuing contract status nor shall the failure of the school board or the division superintendent to comply with any time requirement herein constitute a basis for continued employment of the teacher.

§ 22.1-305.1. Mentor teacher programs.

A. As part of the Beginning Teacher Assistance Program, the Board of Education may establish, from such funds as may be appropriated by the General Assembly, mentor teacher programs utilizing specially trained public school teachers as mentors to provide support, orientation and guidance for beginning teachers entering the profession and to improve the performance of experienced teachers who are not performing at an acceptable level.

The Board shall issue guidelines for such mentor teacher programs and shall set criteria for beginning and experienced teacher participation, including self-referral, and the qualifications and training of mentor teachers. Such guidelines shall provide that the mentor programs be administered by local school boards, with the assistance of an advisory committee made up of teachers and administrators, and that mentors (i) be classroom teachers who have achieved continuing contract status and who work in the same building as the teachers they are assisting or be instructional personnel who are assigned solely as mentors; (ii) be assigned a limited number of teachers at any time; however, instructional personnel who are not assigned solely as mentors should not be assigned to more than four teachers at any time; and (iii) guide teachers in the program through demonstrations, observations, and consultations to promote instructional excellence. Local school boards shall strive to provide adequate release time for mentor teachers during the contract day.

Local school boards choosing to implement mentor teacher programs shall provide the Board with any information requested concerning such programs in a timely fashion.
B. The Board shall serve as fiscal agent for the participating school boards in matters concerning the mentor teacher programs. The Board shall allocate, from such funds as are appropriated, moneys to participating school divisions for the purpose of supporting such programs which shall include, but not be limited to, compensation for mentor teachers.

§ 23-9.2:3.4. Teacher education programs; reporting requirements.

A. The boards of visitors of those public institutions of higher education providing teacher education programs shall administer the entrance examination prescribed by the Board of Education pursuant to § 22.1-298 to all persons seeking entry into such teacher education programs.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this title to the contrary, such boards of visitors shall not deny candidates who fail to achieve the minimum score established by the Board entrance into the relevant teacher education programs solely on the basis of such failure, and shall require achievement of such minimum passing score as a condition of completing any approved teacher education program. Students failing to achieve the minimum passing score shall have the opportunity to address any deficiencies while enrolled in such teacher education program.

B. All Virginia public institutions of higher education that offer teacher education programs, master’s degree programs in education or master’s degree programs in administration shall submit annual performance reports as set forth in Board of Education guidelines and as required by § 22.1-298 F. Such reports shall include annual data on the pass rates of graduates of such Virginia institutions of higher education taking the state licensure examination and shall not include any information identifying individual graduates.