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ABSTRACT

AN INVESTIGATION OF SUPPORT, GOALS, AND INCENTIVES AMONG MINORITY AND NONMINORITY NATIONAL BOARD CERTIFIED TEACHERS

by Melissa Salana Collins

May 2011

National Board Professional for Teaching Standards play a pivotal role in the classroom of National Board Certified Teachers (NBCT). NBCTs have been recognized for increasing student achievement. There are more than 90,000 NBCTs in schools across the United States, but the ratio of nonminority to minority NBCTs, according to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards report of 2004, was 89% to 11%. The intent of this study was to examine the levels of support among minority and nonminority NBCTs to determine which combination of support factors and incentives would best predict the successful completion of the NBCT process by minority vs. nonminority candidates.

To answer this question, the author used a survey designed by Dr. Vonda Benham, a graduate from the University of Sarasota, to collect the data needed to examine the level of support provided by six organizations. The support categories were: financial, moral, collaborative, and assistance with the portfolio and assessment center. The author also examined the goals and incentives categories such as, self-improvement, salary, recognition, opportunity for leadership roles, consultant roles, and certification reciprocity offered to NBCTs during their candidacy.
The survey also allowed the NBCTs the opportunity to provide additional written comments about the support, goals, and incentives received. The sample population of the study consisted of 246 NBCTs.

The results of the study suggest that there was no statistical difference in the levels of support, goals, and incentives received among minority and nonminority NBCTs during their candidacy.

The basic behavioral assumption of the research hypothesis, that minority and nonminority NBCTs hold different attitudes toward cognitive and abstract objects related to their occupational roles, was not supported.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background

Teacher preparation programs in the United States are being driven by student achievement test scores and the components of the law No Child Left Behind (NCLB) enacted in 1983 (Smith & Gorard, 2007). NCLB defined teachers as “highly qualified.” To be a “highly qualified” teacher, the individual needs to have a bachelor’s degree, be licensed by the state, and show competence in taught concept area (Dilworth, Aguerrebere, & Keller-Allen, 2006). Subsequently, the National Board of Professional Teacher Standards (NBPTS) process was designed to correct perceived inadequacies in teacher training. However, a huge gap in the successful completion of the National Board Certified Teachers of nonminority vs. minority teachers has developed. As it is written, NCLB (2001) contends that teachers will be better prepared to increase student achievement if they are highly qualified and prepared to effectively teach the knowledge associated with content standards.

A prospective teacher faced many challenges when attempting to enter the work force. One of the major challenges was teacher certification. The prospective teachers were required to successfully complete a program in an accredited college and pass testing requirements that demonstrated knowledge of pedagogy and content areas (Bennett, 2004). More pressures arose when the quality of the teacher work force began to gain nationwide attention and concern (Smith & Gorard, 2007). President George W. Bush’s administration attempted to address this issue by adding accountability to teacher quality and performance. The federal government hoped that in addressing teaching
quality that student achievement would increase and, in turn, schools would meet adequate yearly progress (AYP) (Smyth, 2008).

Not only does the responsibility for this preparation lie at the local level but also with programs provided at the federal level as well. No Child Left Behind (NCLB, 2001), a federal law presented by its advocates as a way of improving education, is an entity that responded to this call. In 1983, the government began focusing on the quality of teaching as the result of the findings of a national study on school effectiveness entitled *A Nation at Risk* (Anderson, 2005; Smith & Gorard, 2007; Smyth, 2008). This document stated that United States schools were seriously deficient academically and that something had to be done to eliminate this deficiency. NCLB legislation was one of the government’s responses to this study. One of the key requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act was that all teachers be “highly qualified” (p. 17). The law specifies that each teacher should have the minimum of a bachelor’s degree, secure state certification, and demonstrate knowledge in the core subjects that he or she teaches. In spite of the implementation of the NCLB indicators across the country, disadvantaged students continue to fall further behind (Dilworth et al., 2006).

The Carnegie Corporation’s Task Force on Teaching as a Profession released the report “A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century” (Childers-Burpo, 2002). This was an independent, nonprofit, nonpartisan, and nongovernmental organization that developed standards which focused on the teachers knowing the content and the students they teach. At the same time, National Board for Professional Teachers Standards (NBPTS) were developed to guide teachers on what to teach and how to teach (National Board Professional for Teacher Standards, 2008). NBPTS provided teacher standards on
how to implement various contents, established the importance of reflecting on one’s work, and focused on the importance of involving all stakeholders in the education of children.

To apply to be recognized as a National Board Certified Teacher (NBCT), the candidate is required to become familiar with the NBPTS standards before attempting the process. Teachers are also required to complete a portfolio that contains four entries in their areas of expertise. Entry 1 requires a teacher to select a limited number of students to evaluate his or her learning. Entries 2 and 3 are videotaped entries where teachers collaborate with the students. Each videotaped entry must be 15 minutes in length. The teacher must work as a facilitator. All candidates complete Entry 4, which permits the candidates to demonstrate the skills of a leader/collaborator and a learner and as an active member in a community. As an NBPTS candidate, the teacher is also required to complete an assessment center exercise by mid-July of each year. The assessment relates to the certification area and takes about three hours to complete. The assessment center allows the teacher an opportunity to demonstrate content knowledge related to his or her area of teaching. In order to become an NBCT, the candidate should score 275 or higher on the portfolio/assessment to become an “accomplished teacher.”

Goldhaber and Anthony (2004) revealed that African American teachers were less likely to complete the National Board process and that they were less likely to be successful. They also revealed that minority teachers were more likely to work with minority students. In this instance, the students who needed an effective teacher were not receiving an adequate education. In addition, this showed that students in NBCTs’ classrooms outperform students in non-National Board Certified Teachers’ classrooms.
A result of this study suggests that NBCTs may not be serving students in the underprivileged communities.

However, it was the intent of this study to analyze the support and motivation factors that minority teachers needed in order to be successful with the National Board process and whether or not it is different for nonminority teachers. Blair (2003) stated that African Americans are less likely to achieve than their counterparts who were NBC. The National Board has stated that NBCTs develop into leaders for their school and strive to create an environment where parents, lawmakers, and administrators can be a part of students’ learning (Yankelovich Partners, 2001). Clearly, National Board Certification is one of the most profound efforts that has been introduced to the education community, and it is certainly one which is accepted without question. NBCTs continue to grow at a vast rate as they continue to assume various roles in their schools and in their profession. They assist with mentoring new teachers, serving as role models for other educators, and leaders. Administrators, parents, policyholders see them as spokespeople for the profession and as teachers who improve student achievement (Castor, 2002). However, it was the intent of this undertaking to look at National Board Certification from the perspective of those who have successfully completed the process. More specifically, it was the concern of this researcher to examine the program in terms of its appeal, the types of teachers who would pursue such a program, the probability of acceptance in terms of teachers who applied, obstacles/hindrances, most difficult aspect, and the advice which would be given to a teacher interested in applying. In addition, it still remains as to whether or not those National Board Certified Teachers who were successful with the process were already considered to be influential people in their school, district, and
community. Secondly, after being National Board certified, were those teachers still active leaders?

Statement of the Problem

In the 21st century, it will be imperative for students to receive a quality education. They will be expected to raise the bar in the content areas of science, math, and reading. Technology will be the key to the future, and students will be expected and required to use it. Policyholders, the state departments of education, school systems, and districts will no longer accept a mediocre education for students. Educators will be expected to raise the bar academically among students. Despite the many challenges that they face such as low birth rate, hunger and malnourishment, the make-up of the family, school changes, school safety, and less parent availability, students will be expected to compete and excel at high levels; this is everyone’s main concern (Kopetz et al., 2006).

In order to best meet the students’ needs, educators are required to create an environment that is safe, supportive, caring, and positive while maintaining a structured curriculum with enriched instructional strategies (Kopetz et al., 2006). “No matter the student demographics or the curriculum, the bottom line is the same—an effective teacher who meets students’ needs has been and will be the critical factor in schools” (Outlaw, Clement, & Clement, 2007, p. 29).

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) attempted to address the quality of teaching by requiring that all teachers become “highly qualified” by 2005-2006. Teachers are now required to hold a bachelor’s degree and pass the Praxis exams (Anderson, 2005). With this principle in place, students, especially disadvantaged students, were still not making significant academic gains (Smith & Gorard, 2007).
The question has been posed: does NCLB have all the answers for what makes an effective teacher? The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) feels that NCLB left out an important factor—the student. As a result, the National Board has developed standards that all educators should integrate into their classrooms (NBPTS, 2010). These standards are based on the Five-Core Proposition that focuses on the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that make an effective teacher, an “accomplished teacher.” An “accomplished teacher” recognizes that his or her students are important along with content knowledge (NBPTS, 2008). National Board truly believes in these standards that they have established for educators. These standards are the cornerstone for advancing student achievement. Goldhaber and Anthony (2004) conducted a study where they showed that National Board Certified Teachers (NBCTs) helped students make significant gains in the areas of reading and math. However, the same study revealed that NBCTs did not work in the disadvantaged schools where they were needed most. Also, the study revealed that African American teachers were less likely to attempt the process or to achieve National Board Certification. However, the National Board noticed an adverse impact among minority NBCTs as well. They developed a team called the “Dream Team” which was devised with a team of NBCTs who would assist in recruiting minority National Board candidates. Also, NBCTs did not labor in the high-need schools. Needless to say, if NBCTs play an important role in student achievement, then this was an alarming finding due to urban schools’ need for the best teachers.

The National Board stated that they produce “accomplished teachers that lead to better teaching, better schools, and better learning” (Yankelovich Partners, 2001, p. 8). These teacher leaders collaborate with principals to manage the schools as well as sharing
of knowledge and skills with beginning teachers and other professionals. Additionally, NBCTs advocate for students by giving additional time outside school hours (Yankelovich Partners, 2001), yet there are mixed views about what makes an effective teacher or an accomplished teacher.

Purpose of the Study

This study examined the factors that impact National Board Certified Candidates and their attainment of National Board Certification status. It also compared leadership positions assigned following the certification process. National Board Certification is believed to be a worthwhile process that facilitates leadership skills needed by school communities as well as in the home (Childers-Burpo, 2002). Therefore, this study examined the support that impacted National Board Certified Teachers in pursuit of NBPTS certification. The categories of support included: (a) financial (e.g., fee payment, increase in salary, etc.), (b) moral support (e.g., encouragement, recognition, etc.), (c) collaboration (e.g., working with colleagues, mentors, etc.), and (d) preparation of portfolio and assessment (e.g., study group). Also, the study looked closely at goals and incentives (e.g., self-improvement, salary incentives, recognition, opportunity for leadership roles, consultant roles, reciprocity of certification, release time for portfolio, preparation, and financial scholarship) offered to NBCTs. Because there is a relatively small amount of literature that addresses the value of NBCTs in leadership roles within the school settings, this study examined any differences within and among minority and nonminority NBCTs serving within the leadership hierarchy of a school or school district.

It was the intent of this study to investigate the factors that influence teachers to pursue a leadership role such as National Board.
Research Questions

1. Are minority NBCTs supported financially (e.g., fee payment, increase in salary, etc.), morally (e.g., encouragement, recognition, etc.), collaboratively (e.g., working with colleagues, mentor, etc.), and in preparation of their portfolio and assessment (e.g., study group) differently than nonminority NBCTs?

H01: Nonminority NBCTs will recognize support more than minority NBCTs.

2. Are minority NBCTs’ goals and incentives (self-improvement, salary incentives, recognition, opportunity for leadership roles, consultant roles, reciprocity of certification, release time for portfolio, preparation, and financial scholarship) different than nonminority NBCTs?

H2: Nonminority NBCTs will recognize more self-improvement, salary incentives, recognition, opportunity for leadership roles, consultant roles, reciprocity of certification, release time for portfolio preparation, and financial scholarship than minority NBCTs

Definition of Terms

*Accomplished teacher* - When teachers demonstrate performance based on the assessments, which include videos, work samples, and analysis of their classroom teaching and student learning, National Board calls these teachers “accomplished teachers” (Blair, 2003, p. 3).

*Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)* - was a requirement under No Child Left Behind. Students had to show gains on standardized tests (Anderson, 2005).

*Candidate* - an educator becomes a candidate when attempting the National Board process (www.nbpts.org).
Choice schools - a school that received Title I funding and does not make annual gains in 2 years. These schools must provide an alternative school that meets adequate yearly progress (AYP) for students (Jacobson, 2004).

ESEA - the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was enacted in 1965. The act held schools accountable for receiving federal funds (Anderson, 2005).

Highly qualified teacher - in order to ensure students’ academic success, NCLB developed guidelines for all teachers. In order for a teacher to be highly qualified, he or she had to hold a bachelor’s degree and pass a test in order to be licensed by the state (Anderson, 2005).

National Board (NB) - the term used in completing the process by National Board Certified Teachers (www.nbpts.org).

National Board Certification (NBC) - National Board Professional for Teaching Standards administers National Board Certification (Lovingood, 2004).

National Board Certified Teacher (NBCT) - designation given to teachers who accomplish the certification provided by NBPTS (Lovingood, 2004).

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) - an independent, nonprofit, nonpartisan nongovernmental organization that was developed after a 1986 document, A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. These standards were developed for teachers to use as they prepared for the National Board process (www.nbpts.org).

National Defense Education Act (NDEA) - was implemented in 1965. This is an important component of NCLB due to its providing assistance to the first Elementary and Secondary Act. NDEA assisted with science and math programs as well as college loans
for students (Anderson, 2005).

*No Child Left Behind (NCLB)* - NCLB was passed by Congress in 2001 and signed by President George W. Bush on January 8, 2002 (Anderson, 2005).

*Portfolio* - National Board provides the portfolio that contains forms, checklists, and pertinent information that is sent to candidates (Lovingood, 2004).

**Delimitations**

National Board Certification is a relatively new process. As a result there is little information pertaining to the topic of support and leadership. The researcher examined studies located on the National Board for Professional Teacher Standard website for additional information. There are more than 82,000 NBCTs in various locations throughout the United States, and this writer did not encounter any problems locating NBCTs who were willing to participate in the study. Some subjects did not respond appropriately to the area of ethnic identity because it is an area of extreme sensitivity.

Technology is a convenient method of communicating with subjects. Surveys were sent via email through an electronic medium, “Survey Monkey.” Also, there were some limited responses to analyze if questions are not answered. This researcher did send weekly reminders to assist with the response rate.

To conclude, there may be some delimitations with the study. However, this study did not produce significant findings that can contribute to the literature and knowledge base of National Board Certified Teachers.

**Assumptions**

In this study, it was assumed that National Board Certified Teacher participants would be located in various geographical regions. It was also assumed that NBCTs
would receive the survey via email and would complete and return it to the researcher within three weeks of the distribution. It was also assumed that the NBCT experts would provide truthful responses on how they received support in order to ensure success during the process. It was assumed that they would give adequate responses on their continued leadership role inside and outside the classroom. Lastly, it was assumed that as responses were anonymous, there would be a greater level of comfort, thereby increasing the likelihood of honest responses. It was assumed that minority NBCTs’ responses would be different from nonminority NBCTs’ responses. It was also assumed that the years and experiences of NBCTs would be a deciding factor on how sample participants responded to the survey.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Humanism is an act to fulfill one’s potential (Humanism at Learning-Theories.com, 2009). “Humanists also believe that it is necessary to study the person as a whole, especially as an individual grows and develops over the lifespan” (Humanism at Learning-Theories.com, 2009, p. 1).

Malcolm Knowles (1913-1997) was an advocate for adult education. He began to think about “what it means to be a facilitator of learning rather than a teacher” (Smith, 2002, p. 13). The Modern Practice of Adult Education and The Adult were two books that he wrote that gave his position on adult education. At that time, he introduced the world to andragogy, which has five assumptions: (a) self-concept, (b) experience, (c) readiness to learn, (d) orientation to learning, and (e) motivation to learn (Smith, 2002).

Frederick Herzberg (1923-2000), a clinical psychologist, developed the motivational theory and hygiene factors. His theory first focused on motivation in the workplace. When people work, they want to be happy, but the happiness tends to wear off. Therefore, money is not the only reason people work, which is a hygiene factor. The other hygiene factors (maintenance factors) are policy, relationship with supervisor, work conditions, salary, company car, status, security, relationship with subordinates, and personal life. Herzberg believed “true motivators” motivate people to labor in a positive manner on their job such as achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement (Gawel, 1997).

Abraham Maslow (1943) wrote A Theory of Human Motivation. He believed that people’s actions are due to goal attainment. He developed Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs
Maslow also believed that individuals needed their lower-level needs to be met such as esteem and self-actualization (Learning Theories.com, 2010, p. 2).

National Board Certification is a process completed by educators on a voluntary basis. This process provides the educator with the opportunity to demonstrate his or her knowledge of instructing students as well as understanding content knowledge. This process allows teachers to grow professionally. According to Knowles (1973), adults who learn begin to understand themselves. “They should understand their needs, motivation, interest, capacities, and goals. They should be able to look at themselves objectively and maturely” (Smith, 2002, p. 5). In completing a portfolio, National Board Candidates have to demonstrate awareness of content in their students. A candidate must be willing to spend 200-300 hours on completing the portfolio. Candidates agree to work on their personal growth, which Herzberg states is a “hygiene” need.

Teachers begin to facilitate their learning through the development of their portfolio. Knowles (1973) believed that learning could be more meaningful if it is facilitated (Smith, 2002). National Board permits teachers to look closely at National Board Standards in order to interpret how learning should evolve in their classroom. Not only do teachers facilitate their own learning, but they also facilitate their students’ learning as well by asking higher-order questions. Teachers ask higher-order questions to challenge students to soar to new heights.

Knowles (1973) suggested that adult learners should understand themselves. When people begin to understand themselves, they can become motivated and set goals.
Teachers who pursue National Board Certification receive recognition, personal achievement, or advancement. However, it gives them an opportunity to advance in their career, which Herzberg identified as “true motivators.” The training is as extensive as individuals who undertake hours of training to receive the title of physician or dentist. A candidate who accomplishes National Board Certification receives the title National Board Certified Teacher (NBCT).

Herzberg (1966) believed that personal achievement was a form of recognition and that to some individual’s recognition was more important than money or having a job. Most states reward their teachers with merit pay for accomplishing National Board Certification. For example, North Carolina provides its teachers with a 12% increase in their current salary. Tennessee pays its teachers $5,000-$10,000, depending on the number of years taught. Teachers who pursue National Board want to grow professionally as they advance in the field of education. They want to be leaders not only for their classroom and school, but also for their community.

In Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs, it discusses a person meeting his or her physiological needs. In completing National Board Certification, teachers must want to meet their basic needs (physiological, safety, and belongingness) in order to pursue the process. Encouragement and support from administrators, colleagues, and family can be imperative in aiding candidates through the National Board process. Candidates must want to engage in their own professional growth in order to enhance their teaching. They understand that the reward can be financial or beneficial in increasing student
achievement. In doing this, they are meeting those higher-order needs of self-actualization and esteem.

Government’s Role in the Educational System

The federal government has played an active role in education since the Constitution was ratified. Beginning in 1958, the United States government decided to become more directly involved with education (Anderson, 2005). The legislation did not have a focal point at the time. However, it was realized that attention needed to be given due to the Sputnik War. The National Defense Education Act (NDEA) was put into place. According to Carlson, “NDEA is best remembered as a math and science program although it also provided loans to college students, fellowships to graduate students, and funds for foreign language instruction for elementary and secondary school students” (as cited in Anderson, 2005, p. 7). During this era, the United States did not want the Soviet Union to advance in education and technical support. The financial assistance from the government became known as “categorical aid.”

NDEA is imperative because it was a pivotal point in bringing No Child Left Behind (NCLB) into context. The federal support was increased due to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). NCLB was the seventh reauthorization of ESEA. This was the cornerstone of Congress playing an active role in education. ESEA was best known for Title I funding which assisted local income families in the school by supporting their academic achievement. However, ESEA still did not provide clearly defined guidelines, and the issues were labeled as the three R’s (race, religion, and reds) by spectators (Anderson, 2005). Race was not an issue due to the Civil Rights
Movement. The religious focus was on parochial schools. “Reds” were for “federal control” that they had over the schools due to Title I aid (Anderson, 2005).

Many feared that the federal government was becoming too controlling when ESEA was instituted (Anderson, 2005). It was brought to the legislators’ attention that a cabinet-level position needed to be consolidated into the Department of Education. In doing this, it assisted in centralizing the control. In 1994, Goals 2000 was implemented by the federal legislature. This was a turning point for the educational system. “As a condition of receiving Goals 2000 grants, states were directed to either adopt a ‘voluntary national model’ of curriculum and performance standards and ‘opportunity-to-learn strategies’ or to devise their own” (Anderson, 2005, p. 5). The legislature wanted to ensure that schools were held accountable. In turn, Congress set an assessment policy in order to hold schools responsible.

In 2002, the U.S. government passed the No Child Left Behind law (NCLB) (Smith & Gorard, 2007). President George W. Bush signed the law on January 8, 2002. It is the reauthorization of ESEA. The U.S. government heightened the level of accountability policy for public schools. Officials noticed that students were not Excelling in school. It was recognized that somehow the achievement gap needed to be closed, especially among disadvantaged students (Murray, 2006). NCLB wanted to hold schools more accountable in order to increase student achievement. Therefore, they established guidelines to reinforce their efforts (No Child Left Behind, 2004). States had to make sure those students in grades 3-8 were tested yearly by 2005-2006 in the areas of reading and math. By 2007-2008, students had to be assessed in science once during elementary, middle, and high school. Also, grades 4 and 8 had to participate in the
National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP). NAEP dictated that students must be assessed every other year in the areas of reading and math (Kaniuka, 2009).

Within the NCLB legislation and the NAEP assessments, the government expected students to show academic progress by requiring all students to be at the “proficient” level by the end of the 2013-2014 school year (Hanson, Burton, & Guam, 2006). The NCLB law mandated that schools meet “adequate yearly progress” (AYP). A formula spells out the gain that must be made within the school population and demographic subgroups. Individual schools that do not meet AYP were given opportunities to correct achievement. Schools that did not meet AYP in two years received educational support from state funding agencies. Also, according to NCLB, students should be provided the opportunity of school choice, not necessarily in their school district, if their home school was designated as a failing school. Schools that do not meet AYP within three years after being recognized as a needs improvement school must develop a plan to engage in additional or different educational services to improve student achievement scores, including providing tutoring for their students. If schools do not make progress in three years, the government will take measures to improve the school. An option of the state interventions would be to bring in outside personnel to monitor, assist, or take over the failing schools and/or school districts (Hanson et al., 2006).

In 2003, NCLB required that an annual report card be provided for schools and school districts based on disaggregated academic achievement data divided by subgroups according to subject area, grade level, race, socioeconomic status (SES), and special education or disadvantaged students. Additionally, this information was required
to be published. Results of the report cards showed that many students were not excelling in reading, especially the disadvantaged students (Hanson et al., 2006). Consequently, the U.S. government implemented a grant for $1.02 billion, which focused on primary age students, ages 3-5, to address the issues revealed through the school report cards. The bulk of the expenditures of this grant went to high priority areas.

President George W. Bush’s administration placed emphasis on teacher quality through the NCLB law. This was imperative due to the finding of a document called *A Nation at Risk* in 1983 (Lieberman & Walker, 2007; Smith & Gorard; 2007 Smyth, 2008). Student performance was an important factor; however, the quality of the teaching profession was just as essential (Smith & Gorard, 2007). The authors of the report were concerned that teachers were not knowledgeable of the content, the teachers came from the lowest quartiles in high school and college, and there was a shortage of teachers who displayed knowledge in science, math, and English.

Chiu and Khoo reported that “recent research using the PISA 2000 database has shown that students in countries with an unequal distribution of certified teachers typically have lower scores than those from countries with a more equitable distribution of teacher resource” (as cited in Smith & Gorard, 2007, p. 191). By the end of 2006, the U.S. government expected teachers to have a highly qualified certification status. This was to ensure that every child be taught by a qualified professional (Smith & Gorard, 2007). This meant that all teachers were expected to master a strong knowledge based pertaining to the subject areas they taught. Additionally, NCLB legislation expected educational obstacles to be minimized by “retooling” educational programs and opening up alternative routes for teacher certification (U.S. Department of Education, 2004).
Teachers were mandated to have the following credentials to be considered highly qualified:

1. Core academics licensure as required by the individual state
2. At least a bachelor’s degree
3. Competence in the subject areas they taught
4. Teacher evaluation based on high expectations and correlated to state standards. (Housse, 2002, p.193)

According to Housse (2002), states were free to set guidelines to meet these expectations as long as they addressed teachers’ knowledge of the subject and teaching practices. Elementary teachers were required to hold a bachelor’s degree in education and to pass a state test based on the knowledge and skills for elementary teachers. Secondary teachers were required to pass an academic test and complete coursework for the desired taught content area. Consequently, many educational programs began to heighten the requirements for their students to assist the nation’s schools, focusing on content areas and passing knowledge-based tests. A greater focus was placed on producing highly qualified teachers so that they would enter a classroom ready and prepared for helping students excel academically (Housse, 2002).

It is not clear what qualities make a good teacher. High verbal skills and strong subject knowledge may be among them, but any list is unlikely to be exhaustive. The research evidence is also unclear about the value of a teaching certificate, or the effectiveness of alternative routes into teaching. (Smith & Gorard, 2007, p. 203)
The NCLB act placed a lot of importance on educators being content specialists. At that point in the public eye the term *highly qualified* teacher merely meant a teacher who passed an entry-level exam (Dilworth, Aguerrebere, & Keller-Allen, 2006). In the meantime, highly qualified teachers were held accountable for student achievement. Teachers began to lose their freedom for creativity as they were expected to follow the curriculum established by state standards. Teachers began to kill and drill to the test (Smyth, 2008). Prior to NCLB, teachers were accustomed to making their own decisions about curriculum. After NCLB was instituted, the teachers’ main focus became meeting AYP in the areas of reading and math and high-stakes testing and accountability became the curricula focal point that schools followed for school reform while less attention was devoted to provisions made for “highly qualified” teachers (Kaniuka, 2007). Dilworth et al. (2006) shared that it was imperative for teachers to provide for student accommodations in order to empower the students that they teach to do their best on the standardized achievement tests.

According to Dilworth et al. (2006), the federal government has attempted to raise the standards for teachers in order to assist students in underperforming schools. Also, NCLB has not raised test scores among the racial and socioeconomic groups (Murray, 2006). Murray (2006) suggested that NCLB is actually leaving students behind. Students are not mentioned in the NCLB act. Therefore, “It holds good students hostage to the performance of the least talented at a time when the economic future of the country depends more than ever on the performance of the most talented” (Murray, 2006, p. 1). This could mean that students will not be well prepared for the 21st century. President Barack Obama (2010), on CNN during his Educate to Innovate announcement, stated
that, “The nation that out educates us today will lead us tomorrow.” Apparently this was an alarming statement because students may not be prepared for the ever-changing society.

Smith and Gorad (2007) proclaimed that students are not prepared today for these rigorous challenges and educators who interact with students daily should make a significant shift in their paradigm in order to effectively accommodate students’ academic and other needs to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

National Board Certification

In 1996, the Carnegie Corporation’s Task Force on Teaching as a Profession released the report “A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century.” The report recommended the establishment of a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (Childers-Burpo, 2002, p. 17). The National Board for Professional Teachers is administered by the NBPTS, an independent, nonprofit, nonpartisan, and nongovernmental organization. They wrote this report as a follow-up to another national report, “A Nation at Risk,” that focused on the conditions of education in the United States. The National Board wanted standards to be set that educators could follow. Those who successfully demonstrated knowledge of the standards would be called a National Board Certified Teachers (NBCT). National Board Certified Teachers developed a framework for their practice. Danielson (1996) suggested that a teacher’s framework is not only important to the professional but also to the community at large due to the fact that it holds the professional to the highest standards. The 2010 Guide to NBC reported that the standards were an “important facet of the art and science of your profession and they are densely interwoven and often occur simultaneously”
Teachers began to volunteer for the National Board process in 1987.

The mission of the National Board is to advance the quality of teaching and learning by:

1. Maintaining high and rigorous standards for what accomplished teachers should know and be able to do;

2. Providing a national voluntary system certifying teachers who meet these standards; and

3. Advocating related education reforms to integrate National Board Certification in American education and to capitalize on the expertise of National Board Certified Teachers. (www.nbpts.org)

Castor (2002) shared that teachers, school counselors, and other pertinent stakeholders developed National Board, a process by which teachers improve their teaching skills. Many NBCTs wanted to be recognized for their hard work and dedication for the rigorous process that they successfully accomplished (Castor, 2002). At that time, educators showed that they strived to perform superior in their classrooms.

The process was based on a voluntary system for teachers to accomplish the “NBCT” status by demonstrating the knowledge and skills of “what teachers should know and be able to do” (Dilworth et al., 2006, p. 3). National Board was created to focus on two chief concepts—students and academic content. The vision and beliefs of National Board for an accomplished teacher were framed by the Five Core Propositions (www.nbpts.org).
1. Teachers are committed to students and learning.

2. Teachers know the subject to teach and how to teach those subjects to students.

3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.

4. Teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience.

5. Teachers are members of learning communities.

According to National Board (1991), accomplished teachers must demonstrate knowledge of the academic content and their students as they address the Five Core Propositions (Dilworth et al., 2006). In completing National Board, educators are provided with the opportunity to partake with advance standards, “just as a medical doctor earns an initial license to practice medicine and then passes board certification” (Danielson, 1996, p. 9). National Board permits teachers to undergo an intensive assessment which provides teachers with an opportunity to advance in their practice. National Board does not replace teacher licensure requirements mandated by district, state, or university. However, it offers teachers an opportunity to grow professionally through self-evaluation. It is not solely the administrator’s responsibility to evaluate teachers. Teachers themselves should be responsible for analyzing and reflecting over their practice (Pitman & O’Neil, 2001). NBPTS provides educators with a rigorous process that will provide them with the opportunity to enhance their practice. National Board does not expect educators to be perfect; however, it provides them with a chance to reflect on their practice. Hoerr (2001) explained that making mistakes is a learning process that leads to excellence. Excellence is the goal, not perfection (Hoerr, 2001).
order for a teacher to apply for National Board Certification, he or she must have met the following guidelines:

1. Must have a bachelor’s degree from an accredited institution;
2. Must have 3 years of teaching experience; and
3. Verification of a valid state teaching license. (www.nbpts.org, n.p.)

Within the National Board Certification offerings, there are 25 certification areas for school counselors, subject area content specialists, and elementary and secondary teachers to pursue. In the future, there will be 28 certification areas. National Board has recently developed a National Board Certification for school administrators. When selecting a certification educators are expected to select an area where they can demonstrate knowledge of the content and of the students they teach. When preparing for National Board Certification, teachers are expected to demonstrate pedagogical and state standards knowledge that correlates to the age ranges of the students they teach. Specialists have to focus on higher level standards than generalist (NBPTS, 2008).

Legislators, the National Education Association, school districts, state boards of education, local school district administrators, and others support the National Board process. Currently, National Board works with 468 colleges and universities, which signifies more than one-third of the nation’s colleges of education (Castor, 2002). Moreover, districts and states offer support to National Board Candidates (NBC) such as scholarship incentives or a subsidy for participating in the process. Scholarships are offered from philanthropists, organizations, and various corporations. Most states and districts have candidate Subsidy Programs where a portion of the fees are paid for pursuing National Board. These programs require NBC to apply and pay the nonrefundable initial
fee for beginning the process. The Department of Veterans offers a reimbursement up to $2,000. The National Education Association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) offer loans as well (www.nbpts.org).

Five hundred schools across the United States offer incentives such as salary increases and initial fee support along with district incentives. Moreover, 37 states, along with the District of Columbia, provide financial incentives, such as the $2,500 application fee, in order to promote teachers to seek the NBC national recognition. Hundreds of school districts are also providing their own incentives (Jacobson, 2004). The state of Tennessee pays $1,250, which is half the application fee. North Carolina pays the entire fee when the candidates complete the process. Some states offer additional salary for mentoring candidates and working in low-poverty schools. To motivate and encourage educators to become National Board Certified, some states and school districts grant salary lane changes which result in substantially higher yearly salaries. According to the National Board website (www.nbpts.org), Louisiana pays $5,000; Kentucky pays $2,000; Arkansas pays $2,000; Memphis pays $6,000-$10,000, depending on the number of years; Massachusetts pays $5,000; North Carolina pays $7,500; California pays a one time stipend of $10,000, if candidates work in a high-need school; and Mississippi pays $6,000. Some stipends are one-time bonuses while others pay up to the duration of certification, which is 10 years. National Board Certified Teachers can renew the certification, starting at year eight. The requirements are not the same as for the initial process. However, they must demonstrate continuous professional growth.

The federal government is playing a pivotal role in the NBC process as well (Richard, 2004). The federal government has invested more than $129 million to assist
with developing the standards and the certification process. This is done due to believing in the worthiness of the National Board process. Nevertheless, incentives are as financially rewarding as those offered to specialists in professions other than education, especially for states that have an enormous number of NBCTs. For instance, Florida’s costs for incentives have increased from less than $100,000 in the early 1990s to more than $20 million in spite of the ever-increasing number of teachers applying for and achieving Nation Board Certification (Richard, 2004).

According to National Board of Professional Teachers Standards (1991), the standards guide teachers on what to teach and how to teach. They provide imperative information on how to implement various content areas, the importance of reflecting, and the importance of involving all stakeholders. Part of the NBC process, National Board Candidates are required to compile a portfolio. Educators who attempt National Board Certification receive the “box.” The box contains the requirements for the completion of the portfolio. The portfolio permits candidates to be reflective while engaging in reflective, analytical, and descriptive writing requirements. Within the portfolio, the educators must answer the questions for the four mandated entries. When answering the questions for the first three entries in the NBC portfolio, the educators must formulate an essay that clearly demonstrates an establishment of an effective learning environment where goals are set, planning is carried out, and objectives are met. Additionally, candidates must use a variety of strategies; show fairness, equity, and diversity among students; use a variety of assessments; and implement differentiated instructions. It is imperative to illustrate how well the teacher knows the students and the content during this process. The essays may range from 11-15 pages per entry. A person must be
committed to the process due to the fact that educators have to dedicate 200-400 hours for 4-10 months to complete the NBC process (www.nbpts.org).

Entry 1 of the NBC process causes a teacher to select a limited number of students to evaluate. According to Danielson (1996), educators can reflect over their practice by reviewing a videotaping of the teacher’s classroom and the interactions of the teacher with the students. Entries 2 and 3 are videotaped entries where teachers collaborate with the students. Each videotaped entry lasts approximately fifteen minutes. The teacher is expected to work as the learner’s facilitator during the NBC process. Students should be interacting with peers as they embark on inquiry-based learning. All candidates must complete Entry 4 in the same format. The format of Entries 1, 2, and 3 are completed according to the certification area.

Entry 4 permits the candidates to demonstrate themselves as a leader/collaborator, learner, or involve themselves in the community. This entry permits the educator to discuss what his or her accomplishments are, why they were significant to the educator, and how the students were impacted by this accomplishment. There is also a two-page reflective piece where the educator must evaluate his or her strengths and weaknesses as a leader/collaborator, learner, or involving himself or herself in the community. According to the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (2005), “Time spent in portfolio assessment is not time taken away from teaching or academics, but time refocused and redefined, with the portfolio viewed as a natural complement to learning” (Lombardi, 2008, p. 10).

By mid-July of the National Board Certification process, the National Board candidate completes an assessment center exercise. The assessment relates to the
certification areas. The assessment takes about three hours to complete. There are six
topics that the candidate must respond to in 30 minutes as he or she demonstrates
knowledge of the academic content. This assessment can be challenging as it was
designed for teachers by teachers who are well versed in the curricula subject areas. The
assessment center provides the candidates an opportunity to demonstrate knowledge
based on their selected area of investigation (www.nbpts.org).

Each entry and the assessments are scored on a 0.75-4.25 scale. The scores are
calculated to reach a collective total. In order to become a NBCT, the candidate should
achieve a combined total of 275 or higher which is compiled from the
portfolio/assessment. Assessors score the components of the portfolio or assessments.
The assessors consist of educators, school counselors, or administrators.

The National Board Certification process takes a full year to complete.
Candidates receive notification in the fall or at least by December 31 regarding their
results. A candidate is allowed three years to complete the process. However, candidates
who do not successfully complete all components are permitted to retake the parts they
did not successfully complete. National Board has reported that 40% of candidates
complete the National Board Certification process in the first year, while 65%
accomplish certification by the end of the third cycle. When scores have been issued for
the completion of the 10-component portfolio/assessment, National Board will allow
graduate credit to be earned for the process. The American Council of Education gives
credit hours equivalent to three semester hours (www.nbpts.org).
Impact of National Board Certified Teachers on the Classroom

“It’s no secret that the single most important factor in advancing children’s academic growth is the quality of the teacher in the classroom” (Castor, 2002, p. 1). Teachers who earn National Board Certification are understood to be topnotch teachers. In the brochure “Every Child Deserves a Great Teacher,” crated by National Board, students benefit from NBCTs in the following ways:

1. National Board Certified Teachers have proven that they know their subject matter and can successfully teach it;

2. National Board Certified Teachers help students find relevance in learning and engage them in the learning process; and

3. National Board Certified Teachers produce students who are stronger writers and comprehend classroom material better than students of noncertified teachers. (NBPTS, 2008, p. 3)

Edward B. Rust, Jr., Chairman and CEO of State Farm Insurance Companies, stated, “As increasing numbers of teachers achieve NBC, more students will experience how a highly qualified teacher can influence their learning and impact the quality of education across this country” (NBPTS, 2008, p. 4).

Anne L. Bryant, executive director, National School Boards Association, stated, Teaching is at the heart of education, and one of the most important roles of the school board is to support and encourage the ongoing professional development of teachers. National Board Certification offers a way to significantly strengthen teaching and learning in America’s schools. (NBPTS, 2008, p. 5)
To support National Board, research was conducted by Goldhaber and Anthony (2004); the focus was on North Carolina due to its significant number of NBCTs. The research focused on new and veteran NBCTs and noncertified teachers. The study examined more than 610,000 test scores in the areas of reading and math for grades 3, 4, and 5. Goldhaber and Anthony (2004) observed three school years, from 1996-1997 through 1998-1999. In addition, this research revealed that students who were taught by teachers who earned National Board Certification increased their student achievement scores an average of 7% by the end of the year than for those students taught by teachers who had failed to certify (Jacobson, 2004). Achievement tests for third grade students showed significant gains in reading, while math students only showed gains in fourth grade math. This study suggested that students who were taught by NBCTs in the earlier grades benefitted tremendously (Goldhaber & Anthony, 2004). This can eliminate some of the learning deficits that students tend to face in the upper grades.

SRI International (2004) examined California, Florida, Mississippi, North Carolina, Ohio, and South Carolina since, at that time, these states represented 65% of NBCTs. Of the 18,806 NBCTs who have earned certification since 1998, only 2,297, or 12%, NBCTs taught in schools with 75% more students eligible for free or reduced price lunch. Sixteen percent, or 3,076, NBCTs taught in schools serving 75% of more minority students. As a final point, 3,521, or 19%, of NBCTs worked at a low-performing school (Humphrey, Julia, & Hough, 2004). Several South Carolina NBCTs worked in affluent school districts. One suburban school district had 254 NBCTs, while 12 of the poorest rural schools only had 127 NBCTs combined (Richard, 2004).
This is alarming since the nation’s main concern is raising the bar among poor and disadvantaged students. When economically disadvantaged children from earlier grades were taught by NBCTs, they reaped the greatest benefits (Jacobson, 2004). This is the main concern of policy makers, school districts, and the states. Effective and quality teaching is definitely needed for these students. For Jacobson’s (2004) study, NBCTs were in great demand for at-risk schools. However, five out of six states were not well represented in the study.

California has a high concentration of NBCTs who work with high minority, low performing, and high poverty students. Los Angeles has 909 of the 2,261 NBCTs in the city; 48% of Los Angeles school districts were low performing (Humphrey et al., 2004). Nevertheless, Los Angeles numbers are enlightening. The monetary incentives that their NBCTs receive greatly impacted the number of teachers attaining NBCT status (Humphrey et al., 2004). “Educators have long sought to understand the dynamics of turning around low-performing schools, but interest in the subject has clearly intensified in the past decade, largely because of state and federal accountability initiatives” (Duke, 2006, p. 72).

Urban Schools Benefit From NBCTs

For many years, lawmakers have played a pivotal role in education. They have offered additional support for impoverished students through Title I funding, which was directed at improving academic achievement, especially poor urban students. Also, they have emphasized the importance of being taught by highly qualified teachers. However, “NCLB has not had a significant impact on overall test scores and has not narrowed the racial and socioeconomic achievement gap” (Murray, 2006, p. 1)
“Urban schools that were originally home to White and middle class students are now heavily populated by mostly children of color and child of the poor” (Kopetz et al., 2006, p. 77). This can be an issue when students lack exposure to other social classes. Ruby Payne (1996) called this the “Hidden Rules Among Classes.” In the meantime, “teachers are faced with educating students who have diverse needs and come from diverse, complex backgrounds” (Thompson, 2004, p. 1). Minority students come to school with issues such as being stricken with poverty, lack of parental support, lack of knowledge and skills, and frequent absenteeism. However, students living in poverty do not mean that students lack intelligence or ability (Payne, 1996). It is difficult for some educators to teach urban students due to these issues that the students face each day. Students are often found to be disruptive, which makes the working conditions exceptionally challenging to educators. In addition, students are being taught by teachers who are not prepared to deal with social, physical, emotional, and mental issues that students present. As a result, students who are taught by less qualified teachers will continue to fall between the gaps due to factors that preceded them. Also, “highly qualified” teachers tend to leave urban school settings. “According to data from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), teachers in schools with a minority enrollment of 50% or more transfer at twice the rate of teachers in schools with fewer minority students” (Humphrey et al., 2004, p. 7).

Students who are taught by qualified teachers tend to soar several grade levels above.
“‘Value added’ studies done in Tennessee have found that the difference between effective and ineffective teachers amounts to a 40-point gap of student test scores” (Castor, 2002, p. 1).

Hanushek stated:

All else equal, a student with a very high-quality teacher will achieve a learning gain of 1.5 grade level equivalents. Thus, the quality of an effective teacher is essential to a student’s academic growth. (as cited in Goldhaber & Anthony, 2004, p. 4)

“In schools and districts where kids perform well, doubts and complaints linger. It is not longer satisfactory to merely be at or above grade level” (Hoerr, 2001, p. 1). Therefore, it is imperative to have the best teachers to teach the low performing at risk students to assist with raising the bar among those groups of students, who are generally minority students. Hoerr (2001) believed that minority teachers who are National Board Certified could serve these students best. Minority students could identify with teachers who look like them as they exposed them to best practices. However, the truth of the matter is that African American teachers are less likely to complete the process and less likely to become certified (Blair, 2003). “Over the history of the certification process African American teachers have pursued National Board certification in greater numbers than any other group except White teachers, yet they attain certification at significantly lower rates than any other subgroup” (Howard et al., 2005, p. 3) (see Table 1).

Table 1 shows National Board Certified Teachers during 1993-2004. Minority teachers do not attempt or achieve National Board at the level of nonminority teachers. One of the disturbing inferences could be made by the low numbers is that “this group of
teachers lacks the knowledge, skills, and overall competence to be exemplary teachers”  
(Howard et al., 2005, p. 4)

Table 1

*Results of National Board Teacher Certification Assessments by Race*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Did Not Achieve</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>5,752</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>25,046</td>
<td>32,601</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>1,752</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Source: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (2001).*

Goldhaber, Perry, and Anthony’s (2003) research revealed that African American female teachers who scored high on the standardized state tests or younger teachers were likely to attempt National Board. Also, those teachers who worked in the “affluent” districts were more likely to be certified.

The racial imbalance among certificate holders is important and unfortunate for several reasons. It is important because it means that the benefits that accrue to National Board Certified Teachers are realized by a smaller percentage of minority teachers than of majority teachers. (Wayne et al., 2004, p. 2)
National Board recognized this concern and began to examine the process closely to analyze racial/ethnic bias. “In 2002, they issued a call for research to continue their search for possible bias and expand their efforts to increase the racial/ethnic diversity of NBC pool” (Humphrey et al., 2004, p. 3).

Howard et al. (2005) evaluated a grant project at UCLA for NBPTS. The UCLA NBPTS conducted a 4-day Summer Institute to aid prospective National Board candidates. The 4-day Institute focused on the process, address, and concerns and introduced them to conceptual and empirical research. The 4-day Institute focused on writing (analytical, descriptive, and reflective). National Board candidates were placed in learning communities, too. They met in whole groups and small groups once a month. In addition, National Board candidates were placed with a peer group, which consisted of five candidates and one mentor. In addition, they met face-to-face three hours per month. The project provided trained mentors as well as four African American mentors. The mentors and protégés collaborated with candidates through e-mails, journals, face-to-face, and phone conversations. In addition, they implemented technology in their program. Mentors and candidates received laptops to use throughout the process. This provided them with an opportunity to use the laptops during the process and assessment center exercise.

The UCLA NBPTS Grant Project (2005) discovered that the biggest challenge was recruitment. African American teachers were not aware of the process or knew others like them to pursue the process. One African American teacher stated, “This project, this particular one we have, because you see fellow black people, African Americans are going through the same thing” (Howard et al., 2005, p. 35). As they
collaborated with the African American teachers, they discovered that writing was an issue. One teacher replied, “I would . . . say the writing because it’s a lot of writing, and it’s intensive” (Howard et al., 2005 p. 24). Also, Burroughs and his colleagues (2001) completed a qualitative study to determine the use of NBC. They realized that even though National Board is knowledge based, NB candidates have to write three different kinds of writing (analytical, descriptive, and reflective). These types of writing can be challenging to those who do not write daily, using these different styles of writing. In the SRI International report, they discovered that writing was often weak for some candidates. Fifteen of the teachers reported this issue. Many African American candidates do not receive support from administrators, colleagues, and students. “One teacher said those two months before she completed her portfolio entries, her principal assigned her to a new more challenging group of students” (Howard, 2005, p. 22).

Time is also a factor for some NBCTs due to the NBC process taking several months to complete. Lovingood (2004), an NBCT, suggested that NBC “check with your hectic schedule, both at school and at home. You’ll need a lot of time to review your videos, analyze your teaching, and concentrate on your writing” (p. 4). Therefore, they had to balance their time with other responsibilities such as school and home obligations. Goldhaber and Hansen (2007) revealed in a study that applicants were likely to stay in the system so they could “recoup” the time invested with National Board. Also, NBCTs became more mobile in their district, and they tended to leave their school for another school in their district. NBCTs were also less likely to move to a school with a low percentage of minority students. It is readily understood how teachers are drawn away from urban schools by higher pay and safer working conditions (Thompson, 2004, p. 76).
According to Howard et al. (2008), most minority candidates participate in the NBCT process for the following reasons:

1. Encouragement of a family member, administrator, or colleague;
2. Portability of the certificate for license renewal and/or continuing professional development credit.
3. Access to professional networks and opportunities for advancement. (p. 15)

Minority teachers are successful when they have support through mentorship and support groups. In receiving mentor support, they assist with editing, written commentary drafts, observing videos, verbal support, and offering critiques. It is also imperative that administrators, district, and state provide the candidates with support and motivation (Wayne et al., 2004). “Many of the African American candidates stated that becoming certified would give them the professional recognition and acceptance that they felt was frequently not given to them from their peers” (Howard et al., 2005, p. 40).

Other support to assist NBC could come from courses, workshops, web resources, and printed materials to assist with portfolio and assessment support (Howard et al., 2005; Wayne et al., 2004). To assist with support, “Board officials have partnered with state education departments, teacher unions, businesses, and historically black colleges, and universities among others, to spread the message that accomplished minority teachers are needed, especially in high needs schools, and are in short supply” (Keller, 2007, p. 2).

Incentives are essential to motivating National Board candidates. Keller (2007) found that a few states—California, Georgia, and New York—have opted to pay nationally certified teachers’ bonuses only when they teach in high-needs schools. This
is not enforced by NBPTS. Keller (2007) also found that offering National Board candidates more money will inspire teachers to teach in high-poverty schools. South Carolina wants to offer newly certified teachers $7,500 more than they offered current NBCTs, while NBCTs who do not work in high-poverty schools will be offered $3,000. California stopped its $10,000 bonus for NBCT to teach in high-poverty schools and targeted high-needs schools by providing teachers who are certified with a $20,000 reward.

In 2007, National Board began to address the issue regarding the low number of minority NBCTs. Keller (2007) reported that the manager of state and local outreach for the NBC had expressed from the beginning that the board had many discussions regarding the high cost of the certification assessments and where teachers go to teach. Keller (2007) believed the suburbs would provide NBC to candidates, while the urban centers and rural areas would not. “But for some it seems beyond their reach in a practical sense and that speaks to a vexing problem for the national board which has gathered many more suburban teachers than urban or rural ones” (Keller, 2007, p. 3).

They implemented the Dream Team, which was underwritten by Hewlett-Packard Corporation. This was done in order to create a direct recruitment effort to attract minority teachers. Also, they wanted to attract high need districts to support NBC. NBCTs who assisted with this endeavor received a $1,500 stipend. NBCTs of color were encouraged to recommend a colleague of color to pursue National Board fully or part-take in the Take One. This campaign was called Each One/Reach One. In 2008, Each One/Reach One was launched. NBCTs were to encourage colleagues to “Take One,” which is one entry. The “Take One” permits teachers to partake in one entry that is
preselected by NBPTS. The entry is a video selection. At this time, teachers are provided with the opportunity to sample the process without completing the entire process. It also provides an opportunity for teachers to grow professionally as they look over their practice. If the teachers accomplish the entry, which is 2.75 or higher, they can use that accomplished entry and complete the rest of the portfolio and assessment in the next three windows. This is available to anyone in the educational profession such as pre-service teachers, administration, college professors, and principals. This process costs $395, and the payment must be submitted by December 31. The entry is not due until April 1. Scholarships are available for this process, and some schools may pay the fee as a professional development opportunity (www.nbpts.org, 2010).

Additionally, NBCTLink is a link where National Board Teachers can meet and use as a resource for NBCTs. NBCTs of all ethnic backgrounds can discuss pertinent information useful to them to better serve National Board Candidates (www.nbpts.org, 2010). Furthermore, Targeted High Need Initiative Comprehension Candidate Support Centers support school systems, college of education programs, and professional groups to NBC. “We will provide aid to a teacher from the beginning stages of board certification all the way to other growth as a leader,” said Joyce Loveless, the executive director for program access and equity at the NBPTS (Honawar, 2008, p. 1).

In addition, NBPTS has Accomplished Teacher by Smart Brief, which is a free online weekday daily news. Smart Brief keeps educators aware of educational issues not just pertaining to National Board. There is also an interactive online learning community to connect NBCTs. This serves as an outlet for a diverse group of teachers (www.nbpts.org, 2010).
National Board Expands Teacher Leadership

In the 21st century, the major focus has revolved around teacher leadership in the schools, homes, and the community. “Teacher leaders can change schools for the better” (Phels, 2008, p. 120). Now, administrators feel that teachers should collaborate by the side of the principals in a leadership role. “Principals need the help of the classroom teachers in order to fulfill their missions. Teacher leaders can serve as a catalyst for the school as they manage the school to assist with making decisions” (Hambright & Franco, 2007, p. 271). Teachers can serve as leaders in the school by chairing a committee, spearheading a faculty meeting, leading professional development activities, hosting study groups, being a mentor, demonstrating instructional strategies and technical skills, and writing grants, and in numerous other ways (Phelps, 2008).

Barth (2001) stated that “having a vision is an essential building block for teacher leadership” (as cited in Phelps, 2008, p. 1). Betty Castor, president of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) states that NBCTs are leaders in the classroom (www.nbpts.org, 2010, n.p.).

NBCTs have a vision to empower students’ success. They are active leaders in their profession and community and are advocates for their students (Childers-Burpo, 2002). They know the importance of working with others to convey their knowledge of the content and students. They are leaders who have been known to be vital to their school, community, district, state, and the nation.

Through the National Board process, NBCTs become teacher leaders. To help teachers become leaders, there must be a definite plan (Phelps, 2008). Therefore, they have been used to develop the curriculum for their district, and they have been called to
communicate to policyholders about education. “They will serve as models for others to emulate, mentors for new teachers, and leaders for the profession” (Castor, 2002, p. 3). New teachers will want to model after them as well as other professionals. They will definitely have a positive effect over their school, district, and the nation.

Moreover, they can host professional development opportunities to assist others who thirst for improvement. Also, they can inform others about the worthiness of the National Board process. NBCTs are teacher leaders who have a passion for education (Yankelovich Partners, 2001). According to Childers-Burpo (2002), every child deserves a teacher who is passionate and dedicated to the profession. In addition, Childers-Burpo suggested that NBCTs are active leaders in their community and advocates for families.

Furthermore, NBCTs continue to strive for excellence through other recognition. For instance, an Iowa NBCT was named National Teacher of the Year on April 28, 2010. This is the third time in the past five years that an NBCT has been recognized for this honor (www.nbpts.org). Also, other awards noted by NBCTs are National Teachers Hall of Fame, Presidential Awards for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching, Disney Teaching Award, and USA Today (NBPTS, 2008).
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The National Board of Professional Teaching Standards was developed to guide teachers for implementing higher levels of instruction that drive student achievement. These standards ensure that students taught by NBCTs tend to score higher on standardized achievement tests than non-NBCTs.

Achievement of the National Board Certification by minority candidates and Caucasian candidates based upon data collected by Keller (2007) indicated that the success ratio is 1:10. Wayne et al. (2004) and Howard et al. (2005) suggested that minority teachers need support from their families, administrators, and district-level and state-level colleagues. They also need motivation through incentives from colleagues, family, administrators, leadership roles, and financial support.

Therefore, it is the intent of this study to investigate the level of support and motivation between nonminority NBCTs and minority NBCTs who pursue National Board Certification.

Research Questions

1. Are minority NBCTs supported financially (e.g., fee payment, increase in salary, etc.), morally (e.g., encouragement, recognition, etc.), collaboratively (e.g., working with colleagues, mentor, etc.), and in preparation of their portfolio and assessment (e.g., study group) differently than nonminority NBCTs?
H01: Nonminority NBCTs will recognize support more than minority NBCTs.

2. Are minority NBCTs’ goals and incentives (self-improvement, salary incentives, recognition, opportunity for leadership roles, consultant roles, reciprocity of certification, release time for portfolio, preparation, and financial scholarship) differently than nonminority NBCTs?

H2: Nonminority NBCTs will recognize more self-improvement, salary incentives, recognition, opportunity for leadership roles, consultant roles, reciprocity of certification, release time for portfolio, preparation, and financial scholarship than minority NBCTs.

Instrumentation

The NBCTs’ support survey is a researcher-developed instrument that Vonda Benham (1999) designed (see Appendix A). It was used to measure the extent of support they received through the certification process in order to assist future National Board Candidates. The original survey included a demographic section and two main sections. After each main section, NBCTs can share additional comments. The demographic section focused on years of experience, age, ethnicity, gender, state, and current position.

The first section of the survey focused on the support system of NBCTs. There are six items that focused on professional organizations’ support, school district support, local support, state support, attended college/university support, and local colleges’/universities’ support.

The focus on section two is on goals and incentives that NBCTs perceived as resourceful while they completed the National Board process. There are 10 items in that
section. The emphasis is on self-improvement, salary incentives, recognition, opportunity for leadership roles, consultant roles, reimbursement, reciprocity of certification, release time for portfolio preparation, and financial scholarship.

The degree of support using the Likert rating scale for sections one and two choice options are *strong support*, *support*, *little support*, and *no support*. The survey also provided open-ended questions for the subjects in order to make additional comments for further findings not provided by the researcher.

**Validity/Reliability**

To ensure reliability and validity of the instrument, Benham (1999) read literature to assist with the factors that identified such as support and attitudes/belief on support systems, goals, and incentives. Implemented on the instrument were positive and negative variables.

Benham (1999) developed the instrument to address the issue of support. There were no previous surveys or data addressing the perception of support issue. Benham (1999) selected 20 teachers to complete the instrument for the pilot study. The researcher used an expert panel to assist with the development of the instrument. The members of the panel were the chairperson of the researcher’s dissertation committee; and Dr. Naomi Dorsey and Ms. Bobbi Sharp, consultants for Atlanta Public Schools who conducted professional development training for NBCTs. These individuals reviewed and assisted with evaluation, interpretation, and analysis of the survey instrument.

The instrument was used in the research study “Southeastern National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Certified Teachers: Perceptions of Support Systems Available to Teachers during the Certification Process.” The data from the research did
not show a statistically significant difference in each group of areas of support.

Participants

Participants were NBCTs from various geographical locations. One hundred and twenty NBCTs were contacted. NBCTs were recruited through the Memphis City Schools National Board Office. Also, NBCTs were recruited from the list of names obtained during the National Board Assessor Center exercises that were held in Jackson, Mississippi. Participants were also recruited during the Charlotte, North Carolina National Board Assessor Center exercises. The online National Board Support Groups were a way to recruit NBCTs as well. All participants were volunteers. All NBCTs who volunteered for this study were asked to recruit other NBCTs, creating a snowball effect. A reminder was sent one week later following the initial survey contact to facilitate a high response rate (see Appendix D).

Procedures

The questionnaire designed by Benham (1999) was modified by this researcher and sent for Institutional Review Board approval at The University of Southern Mississippi Human Review Committee in order to ensure the integrity of the research. Participants received an introductory letter via email which solicited their assistance with the completion of the survey. The participants were given three weeks to complete the survey. A reminder was sent one week later. The researcher took surveys for one month. Participants were also encouraged to share the letter with others. The letter contained a link to “Survey Monkey” where the survey instrument was located. Participants were assured of the confidentiality of their responses. The completed surveys were kept in a secured location. They were also notified of the fact that their
information would be used in data to assist with further implementations.

“Survey Monkey” compiled the data for evaluation, analysis, and interpretation. The data were downloaded to an Excel spreadsheet where codes were given in order to transfer over to the Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) program.

Data Processing and Analysis

The survey data were collected and downloaded onto an Excel spreadsheet. The data were coded for SPSS. A nominal data scale was used for gender, ethnicity, age, and experience. An interval scale was used to provide numerals to the Likert rating scale: *strong support, support, little support,* and *no support.* Two logistic regression tests were conducted for this study. The first test was availability of support. The dependent variables were minority and nonminority NBCTs. The independent variables for the first test were professional organization support, school district support, local support, state support, attended college/university support, and local colleges/university support. The second test was goals and incentives. The dependent variables were minority and nonminority NBCTs; and the independent variables were self-improvement, salary incentives, recognition, opportunity for leadership roles, consultant roles, reciprocity of certification, release time for portfolio, preparation, and financial scholarship.

Two logistic regression tests were conducted to determine if the model yielded statistical significance between the two groups (i.e., minority and nonminority teachers). To interpret results, the computed Beta and the critical value and the predictive probability value, Exp (B) were observed. If the Beta value met or exceeded the critical value (.05 level of significance), the null hypothesis was rejected. The Beta values did not meet the rejection criteria, and the highest Exp (B) values were not high enough to
substantially increase the probability of the model yielding the desired prediction(s).

Summary

National Board Certified Teachers (NBCTs) were recruited from all geographical locations to complete the modified survey instrument designed by Benham (1999). Snowballing sampling was used to locate participants. The data collected were retrieved from “Survey Monkey” for coding. SPSS was used to data analysis and interpretation. Then, two logistic regression tests were conducted to test the predictive values of the model variables. No statistically significant results were obtained.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF DATA

The study was designed to examine the level of support received by minority and nonminority NBCTs who accomplished NBPTS certification. The researcher also included an analysis of the goals, incentives, and strategies that NBCTs reported as essential during their National Board Candidacy. The survey used in this study was designed by Dr. Vonda Benham.

After receiving approval from The University of Southern Mississippi Institutional Review Board, the survey was e-mailed through Survey Monkey to NBCTs in various geographical location in the United States. They were sent to NBCTs from Memphis City Schools, and the NBC Assessment Center in Jackson, MS, and Charlotte, NC. NBCTs subjects were also located on NBCTLink for NBCTs and NBCTs Yahoo Support Groups. Through snowball sampling, other NBCTs were located. During the first week, a total of 86 NBCTs responded to the survey. A follow-up e-mail was sent encouraging the NBCTs to respond to the survey. The reminder resulted in an additional 171 surveys by October 4. The total number of surveys returned was 257. There were 11 missing cases, which the researcher deleted due to missing information. The majority of the returned NBCT surveys were from the following states: Tennessee (17.90%), North Carolina (15.56%), Georgia (2.72%), Mississippi (5.06%), Florida (22.18%), and California (7.78%).

The survey instrument (see Appendix B) began with a checklist that gathered demographic data. The purpose of the next section was to collect data about the type of support the NBCTs received while pursuing certification. This section also asked NBCTs
to identify the strength of the support received from a specific group or organization. The last section involved the collection of data about the goals and incentives that helped to motivate the NBCTs to pursue National Board Certification.

Demographic Data

The demographic questions asked of the study participants were gender, number of years teaching, ethnicity/cultural background, age, highest level of degree earned, current position, and state of residence. The greatest numbers of surveys returned were from females. Only 8.5% of the NBCTs surveys in this study were males (see Table 2).

Table 2

*Gender of Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers of years of teaching experiences ranged from 3-20 plus years (see Table 3).

Table 3

*Number of Years Teaching*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The intervals for years of teaching were with 3-5 years with maximum years of experience not at 20. The 3-5 year interval is based upon the rule which prohibits teachers with fewer than three years of teaching experiences from pursuing NB certification. Two surveys were omitted from the study because the participants had fewer than three years of teaching experience. The number of surveys received from Caucasian NBCTs outnumbered African American, Asia/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, Native American, and other. The other ethnic/culture group survey respondents constituted 17.6 % of the total 247. One of the NBCTs did not designate his or her ethnicity (see Table 4).

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonminority</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ethnicity was collapsed into two groups. Only NBCTs who identified themselves as Caucasian were included in the nonminority group. All other ethnic/culture NBCT respondents, for the purpose of this investigation, were placed in the nonminority group. Subjects ranged in age from 31-46 years. The majority of the respondents were 46 years or older (52 %). Two respondents did not report their age (see Table 5).

Table 5

Age of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46+</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The subjects were asked to indicate their present level of education. There were 17% NBCTs with bachelor degrees, 64.4% with master’s degrees, 11.3% NBCTs with specialist degrees and 7.3% NBCTs with doctorates. All respondents reported level of education (see Table 6).
Table 6

*Highest Degree or Level of Education Earned*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist’s</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>247</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 1: Degree of Support

Are the supports and levels of support for minority NBCTs different from those received by nonminority NBCTs? The independent variables that measured support for this study are as follows: financial (fee payment, increase in salary, etc.), moral support (encouragement, recognition, etc.), collaboration (working with colleagues, mentor, etc.), and preparation of portfolio and assessment (study group). The sample population of this study consisted of 225 females and 21 males. A total of 204 of the NBCTs were in the nonminority group (82.6%) and 43 NBCTs were in the minority group (17.4%). The degree of support was rated from 1 to 4, with 4 being *strong support*. The results indicated that all the NBCTs rated support from the state as being the strongest. The degree of support received from the attended college was reported as being the weakest (see Table 7).
Logistic regression was used to address the research question. NBCTs had six organizational levels (professional organization, school district, local school, state, attended college/university, and local college, and university) from which to identify the area form which they received support. NBCTs were asked to rank the level of support using the degree categories of strong support, support, little support, and no support. Each of these categories was given a numerous rating, ranging from 4 (strong support) to 1 (no support). The organizational level of state support received the highest rating mean value was 3.21 and a standard deviation of 0.61 (see Table 7). At the end of each section, the NBCTs were given an opportunity to make additional comments. Qualitative analysis was used to analyze the open-ended responses.

Table 7

Organizational Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended college</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local college</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State attended</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 247

Table 8 shows how many cases are correctly predicted. The dependent variable (minority and nonminority) were correctly predicted at 83.7. No minority cases were predicted.
The Chi-square Omnibus Test of the model coefficients was used to determine the best predictor of support levels for minority and nonminority NBCTs. The Chi Square value of 0.84, $p > .05$ indicates that the model is not statistically significant (i.e., the independent variables do not significantly differentiate between nonminority and minority groups). The logistic regression test of the data for the support variables did not yield any statistically significant values (see Table 9).

### Table 9

**Block 1: Variables in the Equation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Exp (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional organization</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>1.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School district support</td>
<td>-.227</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local support</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td>.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State support</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td>.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended college/university support</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>1.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local colleges/university support</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>1.205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Teachers’ Comments I

Teachers’ comments varied for the kinds of support that they received. There were 106 NBCTs who responded to this section. The NBCTs receiving financial support was 17.92%, mentor 11.32 %, support group 8.49 %, college 3.77 %, and North Carolina Association Education (NCAE) 3.77 %. The remaining NBCTs (54.72%) received a substantial amount of support from their district, school, and local union. The district and state support was most often in the form of time fee(s) reimbursements. District and state support also included workshops, video equipment, assigned mentors, and meeting places to NBCTs which they found to be very helpful. Some states gave candidates one-time bonuses for working in a low income school. One teacher commented, “San Diego provided financial support which was linked to mandatory attendance at several weekend meetings at the National University. The state and district covered the entire expensive.” Another teacher stated that the county department offered its candidates a support group. In addition, “The district paid for all fees, county support fees, and gave them 10 release days.” Three NBCTs teachers praised the NCAE (North Carolina chapter for NEA). They stated that the organization provided great support through workshops and support groups. In South Carolina, one teacher reported that the state provided candidates with a retreat and paid all the expenses.

The NBCTs found that mentors gave them a tremendous amount of support. They would read their entries and review their videotapes. One NBCT said, “I had a great mentor who basically read my portfolio entries and sent me back questions for me to ask myself. She made me work, work, work and think, think, and think!” Needless to say, three teachers raved about how they were recognized for accomplishing the National
Board. One NBCT was recognized at a Board Meeting and was invited to the governor’s home for a reception. The other NBCT received an engraved crystal trophy and was written up in the local newspaper. One NBCT was acknowledged with a medal.

Some of the NBCTs commented that their states no longer offer support to NBCTs. One NBCT said, “Unfortunately, that has been dismantled over the past 2 years. I do not think anyone would get much support from our district if they were currently attempting to get their National Board Certification.” Another said,

I certified in 2000 when the state paid the full cost of the NB process fee. However, I had to pay my own money to recertify while in my eighth year of my National Board Certification. Then I think that it is a professional slap in the face that now that I am more qualified as a teacher, have recertified, and have a number of leadership roles in my school and county that I am no longer eligible for the NB bonus. No wonder more teachers get out of the profession to seek jobs that pay them for their extra effort.

One NBCT’s comment indicates that she has grave concerns about Florida’s commitment to NBCT candidates.

Research Question 2: Goals and Incentives

Are the goals and incentives (self-improvement, salary incentives, recognition, opportunity for leadership roles, consultant roles, reciprocity of certification, and release time for portfolio, preparation, and financial scholarship) which induced minority NBCTs to pursue certification different from the goals and incentives that motivated nonminority NBCTs to pursue certification? Are the motivational goals and incentives received by minority NBCTs different from those of nonminority NBCTs?
There were nine areas from which the NBCTs identify as a goal or an incentive received during their pursuit of the National Board Certification: self-improvement, salary incentives, recognition, opportunity of leadership roles, consultant roles, reimbursement, reciprocity of certification, release time for portfolio preparation, and financial scholarship. The NBCTs could identify the significance of the goals and or incentive by rating them using the classifications of strong support, support, little support, and no support. These qualifiers were assigned numerical values ranging from 4 (strong support) to 1 (no support).

Chi-square and a significance level of $p > .05$ were the criteria chosen to evaluate the level of statistical significance of the null hypothesis. Comparisons were also made between variables of goals and incentives that were provided by the various organizations among minority and nonminority NBCTs. A logistic regression test was used to predict whether or not an NBCT was nonminority or minority.

At the end of each section, the NBCTs were given an opportunity to make additional comments. Qualitative analysis was used to analyze the open-ended responses.

Summary of the Findings of Support

The Descriptives Statistics mean values between the independent variables, goals and incentives revealed high mean values of 3.57 for self-improvement, 3.44 for salary incentives, and 3.09 for financial scholarship. The lowest mean value of 2.14 is associated with release time (see Table 10).
Table 10

**Goals and Incentives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals/Incentives</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultant roles</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial scholarship</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for leadership</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocity of certification</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release time</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary incentives</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-improvement</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Table 11 shows how many cases are correctly predicted. The dependent variable (minority and nonminority) was correctly predicted at 82.7. No minority cases were predicted (see Table 11).

Table 11

**Classification Table II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Nonminority</th>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>% correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonminority</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Logistic Regression data of the independent variables did not yield any statistical significant values.

The Chi-square omnibus test of the model coefficients was used to determine the best predictor of support levels for minority and nonminority NBCTs. The Chi-square value of 0.86, \( p > .05 \) indicates that the model is not statistically significant (i.e., the independent variables do not significantly differentiate between nonminority and minority groups) (see Table 12).

Table 12

*Variables in the Equation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables in the Equation</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Exp (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultant roles</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>1.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Scholarship</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td>.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for leadership</td>
<td>-.365</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>-.305</td>
<td>.884</td>
<td>.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocity of certification</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td>.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release time</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td>.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary incentives</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>1.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-improvement</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>1.469</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Teachers’ Comments II

NBCTs’ comments varied as it pertained to goals and incentives. There were 46 NBCTs who wrote comments in the goals and incentives section. The percentage of NBCTs who pursued NB for the salary increase and financial scholarship was 41.3%. 
One NBCT stated that she “couldn’t have done this with a new baby at the time without financial scholarship.” She stated, “I wish there would have been a scholarship offered for the renewal process.” The percentage of NBCTs who listed self-improvement as their incentive was 8.7%. An equal percentage (6.52%) of respondents indicated that leadership and/or release time was the principal motivating factor. North Carolina teachers received a 12% pay increase. Some NBCTs did it for their own personal and professional development. Another NBCT said, “By far the greatest incentive for me to pursue Board Certification was the desire for a complete and pedagogically sound evaluation of my professional work; something the current teacher evaluation system did not provide.” Another NBCT stated, “I was looking forward to the self-improvement but underestimated how valuable it was until after I completed my boards.” Two NBCTs reported that their principal did not support the process; however, their superintendent supported them. Also, some NBCTs have been placed in leadership roles. However, one NBCT stated that she was not in the “socially acceptable group” and that she would rather impress her students than the administrators. Two teachers participated in Take One First before pursuing National Board.

Summary of All Findings

An examination of the data from research questions 1 and 2, the availability of support, and for goals and incentives showed that there were no statistically significant differences.

Chapter V summarizes Chapter IV results. Conclusions will address the findings of the study as well as discuss implications and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

The first section of Chapter V includes a summary of the problem and type of information collected, provides a brief synopsis of the literature review, and describes the survey used to conduct the study. The second section includes the conclusions, implications, and recommendations.

In the 1996, The Carnegie Corporation Task Force on Teaching as a Profession launched the report, “A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century.” This organization implemented National Board of Professional Teaching Standards, which focused on the pedagogy knowledge of teaching as well as the students. Educators are to use the standards to determine what to teach and how to teach the students and content. To become a National Board Certified Teacher, one has to become familiar with the standards, complete a portfolio that consists of four entries and a 3-hour assessment center that provides six 30-minute prompts have to be completed by the candidate. The purpose of the prompt is to determine the candidates’ level of pedagogy.

The literature also discussed how NBCTs’ students excel in the classroom and are not found in high-need schools where they are needed most. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards recognized that minority teachers are not applying to the program nor successfully completing the process following application as are their nonminority counterparts. Goldhaber and Anthony (2004) determined that there was a racial imbalance among the NBCTs. NBCTs began to formulate support groups to assist with this dilemma and heighten the message about pursuing the National Board process.
The basic behavioral assumption of this research hypothesis is that minority and nonminority educators who have achieved NBCT holds different attitudes toward cognitive and abstract objects related to their occupational roles. The term “cognitive object” is defined as any monetary gain, promotion, etc. and “abstract thing” is defined as greater knowledge, academic scholarship, self-improvement, etc. that is known by the individuals in the occupational field (Kerlenger, 1956). The completion of the NBCT is, in part, a function of based upon reward. The success of NBCTs appears to center on the support received from various organizations as well as the goals and incentives available following certification.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify whether minority and nonminority individuals who had obtained National Board Certified Teaching status held perceptual differences in the kinds of support, as well as the degree of support, given by the various agencies and institutions identified as providers at the national, state, and local level. The study also investigated the motivational goals and incentives that NBCTs perceived as most beneficial and a determining factor for the completion of the National Board process.

The study was designed with three sections for NBCTs to complete. The first section looked closely at NBCTs’ demographics. The second section evaluated the various support groups that offered assisted during the National Board process. The last section focused on the various goals and incentives offered during the process.

A survey questionnaire developed by Dr. Vonda Benham was sent to educators in the United States who hold National Board Certification according to the database of the
National Board for Professional Teaching Standards for NBCTs. The survey consisted of three sections. The first section focused on demographic data. The second section had questions pertaining to the degree of support from six organizations. The level of support included, but was not limited to, financial support, moral support, collaborative support, and assistance with the portfolio and assessment exercises. The third section focused on the goals and incentives that the NBCTs received during their candidacy. At the end of Sections 2 and 3, the NBCTs were permitted to given additional written comments about the support, goals, and incentives received.

The survey was sent to NBCTs in various areas in the United States through Survey Monkey. NBCTs were located in Memphis City School district, at assessment centers in Jackson, MS, and Charlotte, NC, NBCTLink, and Yahoo Support Groups. A snowballing technique was used to locate other NBCTs. After 2 weeks, a reminder e-mail was sent to encourage teachers to return the survey.

A total of 257 instruments were returned. The relationship of minority to nonminority NBCTs was 43:204. The minority classification group in this study included all NBCTs who identified their Ethnic/Cultural Background as other than Caucasian. The largest gender category was from females at 91%. The largest category of teaching experience was 16-20 years at 40%. The largest category for age was 46 or older at 53%. Most of the NBCTs (64%) had a master’s degree.

Logistic Regression was used for analysis because it has fewer assumptions than multiple regressions. The principal difference as it relates to this study is that Logistic Regression does not require the adherence to the assumptions about the distribution of the predictor variables. Secondly, Logistic Regression is also the best fit to the relational
analysis as the independent variables in the study are coded using ordinal scale values. Lastly, the dependent variables in this study are discrete (dichotomous) variables.

Research Question 1

Are the supports and levels of support for minority NBCTs different from those received by nonminority NBCTs? Independent variable that measure support for this study are as follows: financially (fee payment, increase in salary, etc.), moral support (encouragement, recognition, etc.), collaboration (working with colleagues, mentor, etc.), and preparation of portfolio and assessment (study group).

The Chi Square Omnibus Test of Model Coefficients did not meet the criterion for statistical significance ($\chi^2 = 2.74$), suggesting that the variables in the research model are not significant and/or important predictors for the dependent variable of Ethnic/Culture background.

The results of the Classification Table I (Table 8), which compares the predicted values for the dependent variables with the actual observed values by computing the probability for a particular case for the dependent variable with the actual observed values from the data, indicated that the model was accurate in classifying subjects. It yielded an overall percentage correct value of 83.7%.

The support categories were scaled using ordinal values of 4 for strong support to 1 for no support. The descriptive statistics for the six independent variable indicate that state support, $X= 3.21$, $SD = 0.96$, and school district support, $X=3.09$, $SD=1.01$, were viewed as most beneficial. It is noted that all NBCTs, based upon the descriptive data, received some level of support, as all mean values are greater than 1.00.
The Exp (B) value of 1.205 for independent variables of attended college in the Variables in the Equation Table (Table 9) indicates that a 1 unit change in the attended college support variable would increase the log odds of correctly predicting membership in the nonminority group. This value does not meet the statistical significance criteria of $\alpha = 0.05$. The support variable of Professional Organization was also positive, Exp (B) = 1.048, but it, too, was not statistically significant.

Research Question 2

Are the goals and incentives (self-improvement, salary incentives, recognition, opportunity for leadership roles, consultant roles, reciprocity of certification, and release time for portfolio, preparation, and financial scholarship) which induced minority NBCTs to pursue certification different from the goals and incentives that motivated nonminority NBCTs to pursue certification?

The Chi square omnibus test of model coefficients did not meet the criterion for statistical significance ($x^2= 4.68$) suggesting that the variables in the research model were not significant and/or important predictors for the dependent variable of Ethnic/Culture background.

The results of the Classification Table II (see Table 11), which compares the predicted values for the dependent variables with the actual observed values by computing the probability for a particular case for the dependent variable with the actual observed values from the data, indicated that the model was accurate in classifying subjects. It yielded an overall percent correct value of 82.7%.

The goals and incentives categories were scaled using ordinal values of 4 for strong support to 1 for no support. The descriptive statistics for the 10 independent
variable indicate that self-improvement, $X = 3.21$, $SD = 0.67$, and salary incentives, $X=3.45$, $SD= 0.90$, were viewed as most beneficial. It is noted that all NBCTs, based upon the descriptive data, received goals and incentives, as all mean values are greater than 2.00.

The Exp (B) value 1.469 for the independent variable of self-improvement in the Variables in the Equation Table (see Table 12) indicates that a 1 unit change in the self-improvement variable would increase the log odds of correctly predicting membership in the minority group. The consultant role variable of goals and incentives was Exp (B) = 1.193 above minimum value of 1.000 suggesting that it, too, has minimal predictive value. The salary incentive variable of goals and incentives was Exp (B) 1.102 and is the third highest value of the model.

Conclusion

The results of the data from this study revealed that the NBCTs received the greatest level of support from the state and the school district. One may suggest that the level of support is strongest is these areas due to financial support from the subsidy that pays for some or all of the National Board process and the bonuses that NBCTs can receive from their district or state. The least amount of support came from attended college and local college. The data revealed that most of the respondents were at least 46 years of age or older. The finding raises the question regarding the availability and costs involved in college or university programs. The late age may not just be a factor of this study. The data also revealed that there was no significant difference in the perceptual levels of support among minority and nonminority.
The findings indicate that the goal and incentives that may motivate NBCTs to pursue the National Board Process were salary incentives and self-improvement. The salary incentives could have been offered from the state or local level. A majority of the NBCTs may have seen National Board Certification as a way to grow professionally as well as a means of increasing their pedagogical knowledge in order to increase student achievement.

The National Board has recognized that the National Board Certification may not hold the same promise of professional advancement for minority teachers as it does for nonminority teachers. This study consisted of significantly more Caucasian respondents than nonminority respondents. The ratio of nonminority NBCTs to minority NBCT teachers was approximately 5:1. This relational difference in representation of ethnicity may in part be responsible for the failure of the model. There is also the possibility that there are stronger factors than those used in this study that need to be examined that would yield greater statistical differences. It may be a fact, however, that more nonminority teachers hold NBCT status and that that relationship is also approximately 5:1. One may also speculate that the method used to obtain responses to the survey may in part be responsible for the smaller number of returns by minority subjects. Workshops which employ surveys of the attendees may yield more conclusive results.

Implications

In the 21st century, school systems across the country are being called upon to engage actively in educational reform. It has become incumbent upon policymakers at the state and local level, along with school districts, to improve teacher effectiveness such that there is a marked increase in student achievement at all a grade level. The schools
that need effective teachers are those in highly populated and poor urban school settings. Schools in rural areas are also showing greater academic instructional needs. School settings in these areas often do have an underrepresentation of effective minority teachers working with their student populations. In addition, it is now increasingly more difficult for colleges and universities to attract potential candidates into the field of education. Lastly, school districts are experiencing problems retaining new teachers and some of the most effective teachers.

This study suggests that there is a low percentage of minority teachers and younger teachers who are not seeking National Board Certification. The potential long-term effect, unless answers can be found, is that there will be a continued shortage of minority and younger teachers seeking certification. As a result, National Board may want to continue to encourage minority educators to participate in the National Board process by using minority NBCTs as spokespersons. Also, they should motivate school districts to bring awareness to minority educators by hosting seminars and having administrators to encourage these educators. National Board could also host retreats for minority educators in order to provide support. The majority of the NBCTs responding to the survey in this study were aged 46 or older. This may be due to the fact that veteran educators want to challenge themselves professionally or they may have reached the top of their pay scale. This finding also suggests that the requirements for certification may have changed such that the requirements needed are more strenuous and that pursuit of higher graduate-level degrees from colleges and universities are more desirable. The responses to the survey indicate that support groups were found to be most beneficial signaling that states and local districts should be actively engaged in establishing them
for potential NBCT candidates. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards may wish to set as a priority target nonminority educators to coincide with the changing complexity of the classroom and the needs of the varying student populations. Workshops should be implemented to obtain the necessary data that may help them achieve this goal. When educators enter the teaching profession, the state, local level, and school districts should inform educators about the offered support through e-mails, personal mail, and/or workshops.

The results of this study indicate that NBCTs received low levels of support from the attended colleges and local colleges. This finding suggests that colleges and local universities need to be more active in bringing awareness of the National Board process to their students in education programs, as well as offering support and assistance to students who have graduated from their teaching programs who may have an interest in obtaining NBCT status. The incentive of professional growth was the strongest of the nine. National Board candidates do benefit from support from institutions such as colleges and universities through instructional support and mentorship.

The state and the school district offered the NBCTs a substantial amount of support through the process. To motivate and encourage prospective NBCTs, the state and school districts need to continue to offer these candidates support. Increased awareness of the differing types of support can play an integral role in enticing minority teachers to become willing candidates. Greater levels of communication about the different kinds of support being offered are very important.

In summarizing the comment section, some NBCTs stated that their policy holders, state, and district were no longer offering financial support or bonuses to
educators for becoming NBCTs. If this is a fact, educational reform and the need for effective teachers may increase proportionally with the withdrawal of the goals and incentives.

Future Research

The following recommendations are offered to assist with future investigation related to the disparity in the number of minority educators seeking and/or successfully completing the National Board process.

1. The model used in the study may possibly be a more effective predictor of ethnic/cultural background if the support variables were collapsed into three categories. State support, school(s) support would include assistance received from the following entities: college/university, attended college, and school district. Professional organization would include union(s) as well as the National Board of Certification. The categories of strength would be changed to financial, mentor(s), workshops/retreat, and release time.

2. Survey local college and university to determine how they are currently supporting National Board Candidates and then use the data to determine which are most desirable to prospective teachers entering the profession.

3. Survey minority NBCTs to see what if any advancements were realized as a direct result of the achievement of National Board Certification.

4. Survey policyholders, school districts, and the state to see which incentives they are able to continue to provide candidates.
Closing Summary

The quality of teacher leadership is becoming a greater determining component in the public and private school environments. Demands at both the local and state level are changing. Policy makers at the district and state level are working diligently in the attempts to identify which factors are needed to create the most effective and efficient classroom teacher. This paradigm shift gained significant attention at the federal government level in 1958 as the direct result of a specific event which took place during the Cold War era. Russia placed a satellite into orbit before the United States was able accomplish this feat. At that time, there were few strategies for reforming education, but one plan of action was to make needed funding more available for education (Anderson, 2005). Funding was channeled into postsecondary curricular areas related to teaching itself, as well as instruction in the areas of science and mathematics. This country needs and wants high-quality teachers, scientists, and mathematicians. Individual states increased the mandatory educational level requiring classroom teachers to earn a bachelor of arts or bachelor of science degree in order to attain full licensure. Classroom teachers were also required to achieve sizeable amounts of training before they would be given recertification licenses. In 1983, the No Child Left Behind Act was passed. The legislation specified that all classroom teachers teaching grades 6 through 12 earn “highly qualified status.” Highly qualified status required that classroom teachers pass competency exams in their instructional areas or provide college/university transcripts evidencing scholarship in the specified number of curricular class hours (Dilworth et al., 2006)
The Carnegie Corporation’s Task Force on Teaching as a Profession released the report “A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century in 1996.” This was done as a follow-up to the Nation At Risk report. They recommended the establishment of standards (Childers-Burpo, 2002). The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards is an independent, nonprofit, nonpartisan, and nongovernmental organization. The standards were developed to raise the bar and set expectations for teachers. The standards gave the teachers direction about essential concepts required at the different grade levels and what and how to teach them to students at differing levels of achievement. Educators who accomplish this goal were then given the title of “accomplished teacher.” To receive this designation, the teacher had to complete a portfolio that consist of four written entries and complete an assessment exercise that consisted of six 30-minute exercises. A raw score of 275 was required to become an accomplished teacher.

Most states and districts support National Board candidates by providing a subsidy that could be used to pay for some or all of the processes, retreats, professional days, workshops, and a mentor. Also, some states provide annual stipends for becoming a NBCT. States support this endeavor because it has been reported in various education achievement studies by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards that students who are taught by NBCTs excel in the classroom. It is also noted in these studies that high-need schools lack the needed instruction from NBCTs and NBPTS. Goldhaber and Anthony (2004) reported that minority teachers were not attempting or accomplishing the National Board process. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards began to implement various strategies to recruit minority teachers such as the
“Dream Team” and the Targeted High Need Initiative Comprehension Candidate Support Centers which support school systems, college of education programs, and professional groups to National Board Certification. Howard et al. (2005) of UCLA were given a grant to study National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. They conducted a 4-day Summer Institute to aid prospective National Board candidates. Their intent was to provide assistance and mentorship to minority teachers.

The goal in this study was to investigate the level of support, goals, and incentives among minority and nonminority National Board Certified Teachers. This study had three dimensions. The first dimension asked for demographic data. The second dimension investigated the level of support received by NBCTs. The third dimension investigated goals and incentives received by the NBCTs during their process. The data from the availability of support data did not yield statistically significant values for any of the variables. In looking at the data for goals and incentives received, the analysis did not reveal statistically significant differences for any of the variables.
July 26, 2010

Dr. Vonda Benham
27 Gore Rd.
Dallas, GA 30132

Dear Ms. Melissa Collins,

I am writing in response to your request asking permission to use my survey of the support and perceived support among National Board Certified Teacher candidates. I grant my permission to use the survey in your study.

When your study is completed, I would be interested in reading your findings concerning the perceived support among minority and non-minority National Board Certified Teachers. Please feel free to contact me at (770) 505-7631 or email me at drvbenham@cs.com.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr. Vonda Benham
APPENDIX B
NATIONAL BOARD SURVEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Board Certified Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Demographic Data</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Gender</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Number of Years Teaching</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ 3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ 6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ 11-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ 15-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ 20 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Ethnic/Cultural Background</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Native American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Age</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ 21-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ 26-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ 31-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ 36-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ 41-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ 46-older</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Board Certified Teacher

5. Please check your highest level of degree.
   - Bachelor's
   - Master's
   - Specialist
   - Doctorate

* 6. Current position

* 7. Where do you live?
   State:
   [ ]

8. If you want to be in the drawing for a $25 visa card, please add your e-mail address.

Thanks

2. Support

Below organizations that may have supported you in your pursuit of NBPTS certification. Categories of support include: financial (e.g., fee payment, increase in salary, etc.); moral support (e.g., encouragement, recognition, etc.); collaboration (e.g., working with colleagues, mentor, etc.); and preparation of portfolio and assessment (e.g., study group). Also, you can reveal additional information that could be imperative to this study by completing the comment box.

1. In this section, you should rate the level of support that you received from each group/organization. Please respond to all.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Organization Support</th>
<th>Strong Support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Little Support</th>
<th>No Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School District Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended College/University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local College/University Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Comment

3. Goal and Incentives
National Board Certified Teacher

These are some goals and incentives that may have helped you in pursuing National Board Certification. Please indicate your belief of how each of these factors helped you by rating them on the scale below. Also, you can reveal additional information that could be imperative to this study by completing the comment box.

1. In this section, you should rate the level of support that you received. Please respond to all.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Strong Support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Little Support</th>
<th>No Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Incentives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocity of Certification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release Time for Portfolio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Scholarship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Comment
APPENDIX C

INTRODUCTION LETTER

September 13, 2010

Dear Educators:

I would appreciate your participation in a study I am conducting for my doctoral dissertation. The purpose of this study is to determine specific measures associated with being successful in completing National Board Certification. The information you provide is of tremendous value to those in the profession who are contemplating becoming involved in this process, as well as those who have completed the process.

As a National Board Certified Teacher, I am asking that you complete a survey on-line through Survey Monkey. The link is: www.surveymonkey.com/s/XNRHCN7. The survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. The survey will be available September 1- September 14. Your identity will be kept confidential. The data will be used for the sole purpose of identifying those factors that made you successful and, in turn, will benefit other potential candidates.

There are no risks associated with this study. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the researcher. The number is (901) 690-4781.

Whereas no assurance can be made concerning results that may be obtained (since results from investigational studies cannot be predicted), the researcher will take every precaution consistent with the best scientific practice. Participation in this project is completely voluntary, and participants may withdraw from this study at any time without penalty, prejudice, or loss of benefits. Questions concerning the research should be directed to Melissa Collins at 901-690-4781. This project and this consent form have been reviewed by the Institutional Review Board, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as research participant should be directed to the Chair of the Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, 118 College Drive # 5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001, (601) 266-6820.

Sincerely,

Melissa Collins
September 27, 2010

Dear NBCTs,

Not too long ago, you received a survey in which you were asked to respond to questions about the level(s) of support you received during your candidacy. If you have completed and returned the survey, I wish to thank you.

If, on the other hand, you have not returned the survey, I would very much appreciate your input and comments about these most important issues. Your answers are critical to a study directed at examining these variables so that other potential candidates may benefit. A high return is needed.

If you have any question or have misplaced the survey link, you can contact me at melissascollins@juno.com or call 901-690-4781.

Sincerely,

Melissa S. Collins, NBCT 2005
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