

**REPORT OF THE VIRGINIA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Feasibility Study on the
Implementation of a Program
to Track Teacher Turnover in
the Commonwealth of Virginia
(SJR 218, 2015)**

**TO THE GOVERNOR AND
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA**



SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 6

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
RICHMOND
2016**



**Feasibility Study on the
Implementation of a Program to
Track Teacher Turnover
in the Commonwealth of Virginia**

JANUARY 4, 2016

***DIVISION OF TEACHER EDUCATION AND LICENSURE
VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION***

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Virginia Department of Education expresses appreciation to the individuals and professional organizations contributing their invaluable time and input into this study.

Dr. Beth Ackerman, Associate Dean of Assessment, School of Education, Liberty University; and President, Virginia Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (VACTE)

Ms. Sandra Barnstead, Specialist, Office of Teaching and Learning, Virginia Education Association (VEA)

Ms. Jane Brooks, President, Virginia Parent Teacher Association (Virginia PTA)

Ms. Donna Eagle, Senior Professional in Human Resources (SPHR), Director of Human Resources, Winchester Public Schools

Dr. Lyle Evans, Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources and Administrative Services, Chesterfield County Public Schools

Dr. Tameshia V. Grimes, Assistant Director of Student Support Services, Chesterfield County Public Schools; and Board Member, Virginia Association of Secondary School Principals (VASSP)

Ms. Meg Gruber, President, Virginia Education Association (VEA)

Dr. Jane Huffman, Associate Professor, University of Mary Washington; and Past-President, Association of Teacher Educators in Virginia (ATE-VA)

Ms. Pamela Johnson, Principal, Falling Creek Elementary School, Chesterfield County Public Schools; and 2015 National Distinguished Principal, representing the Virginia Association of Elementary School Principals (VAESP)

Ms. Kirsten Nelson, Director of Communications and Government Relations, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia

Dr. Monica Osei, Assistant Director for Academic Affairs and Student Programs, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV)

Ms. Jaelyn Roller Ryan, Teacher, Signal Knob Middle School, Shenandoah County Public Schools; and Virginia Teacher of the Year 2015

Mr. Andy Stamp, Associate Executive Director, Virginia Association of School Superintendents (VASS)

Dr. E. Herbert Thompson, Professor Emeritus, Emory and Henry College; and President, Association of Teacher Educators in Virginia (ATE-VA)

Mr. Donald Vale, Principal, Thomas Harrison Middle School, Harrisonburg City Public Schools; and Board Member, Virginia Association of Secondary School Principals (VASSP)

Dr. Roy H. Walton, Jr., Assistant Superintendent, Nottoway County Public Schools; and representative from the Virginia Association of School Personnel Administrators (VASPA)

Ms. Camilla Washington, Chairman, Fluvanna County School Board; and representative of the Virginia School Boards Association (VSBA)

Mr. Vern Williams, Teacher, Longfellow Middle School, Fairfax County Public Schools; and executive board member of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL)

The Virginia Department of Education also values the assistance provided by the following individuals who responded to e-mail and telephone requests for information:

Mr. Bill Bowen, Executive Director of Finance, Poquoson City Public Schools (Virginia)

Dr. Sara Calveric, Director of Human Resources, Spotsylvania County Public Schools (Virginia)

Dr. Amy Colley, Assistant Superintendent of Instruction and Support Services, Poquoson City Public Schools (Virginia)

Ms. Julie Covington, Reference Librarian, Legislative Library, North Carolina General Assembly

Ms. Shan Davis, Executive Director, Louisiana Board of Elementary and Secondary Education

Ms. Elizabeth Foster, Vice President of Strategic Initiatives, National Commission on Teaching and America's Future

Mrs. Lisa Frye, Executive Director of Finance, Frederick County Public Schools (Virginia)

Dr. Tabitha Grossman, Director of Education Policy and Partnerships, Hope Street Group

Dr. Mariana Haynes, Senior Fellow, Alliance for Excellent Education

Mr. Dennis Jarrett, Chief Financial Officer, York County Public Schools (Virginia)

Ms. Ann Maddock, Senior Policy Advisor, New Teacher Center

Dr. Yvette A. Stewart, Assistant Director, Educator Effectiveness Division, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction

Ms. Carol Sylvester, Title II Specialist, Virginia Department of Education

Dr. Thomas Taylor, Superintendent, Middlesex County Public Schools (Virginia)

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Dr. Steven R. Staples

Superintendent of Public Instruction

Mrs. Patty S. Pitts

Assistant Superintendent

Division of Teacher Education and
Licensure

Dr. Cynthia A. Cave

Assistant Superintendent

Division of Policy and Communications

Dr. Kendra Crump

Director of Licensure and School Leadership

Division of Teacher Education and
Licensure

Ms. Susan B. Williams

Director of Policy

Division of Policy and Communications

Dr. Joan Johnson

Director of Teacher Education

Division of Teacher Education and Licensure

CONSULTANT

Dr. Linda M. Wallinger

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	8
Background.....	12
The Faces of Teachers Across the Nation.....	13
Characteristics of Teachers Who Switch Schools and/or Leave Teaching.....	14
Turnover Among Beginning Teachers.....	15
Impact of Teacher Turnover	16
Factors Contributing to Employee Turnover in General	17
Voluntary and Involuntary Turnover	17
Push Factors and Pull Factors	18
Exit Interviews and Surveys	18
Pros and Cons of Exit Interviews and Surveys.....	19
Reconceptualization of Exit Interviews and Surveys	20
Teacher Surveys and Interviews in Other States	21
Arizona.....	21
Colorado.....	22
Delaware	22
Illinois	23
Louisiana.....	24
New Hampshire	24
North Carolina	25
Ohio.....	25
Texas.....	25
Teaching, Empowering, Leading and Learning (TELL) Survey	26
TELL as a Working Conditions Survey.....	26
TELL Data as a Predictor of Teacher Retention.....	28
Cost of a TELL Survey	29
Teacher Surveys and Reports in North Carolina	30
North Carolina School Report Card.....	30
Educator Effectiveness Report.....	30
North Carolina Teacher Working Conditions Survey (NC TWC)	31

North Carolina Institutions of Higher Education Educator Preparation Program Report
Cards 31
Fiscal Impact of North Carolina Teacher Surveys and Reports 33

States with a Legislative Requirement to Report Teacher Exit Survey Data at the State
Level 33
North Carolina Annual Report on Teachers Leaving the Profession 33
 How Teacher Turnover Is Determined for the North Carolina State Report Card..... 36
 Timeline for Data Collection 37
Louisiana Teacher Exit Survey and Attrition Report 37

The Cost of Teacher Turnover 39
NCTAF’S Study on the Cost of Teacher Turnover 39
 Teacher Data Used for the NCTAF Study 40
 Cost Categories Used for the NCTAF Study 41
 Findings Related to the Ability of Schools and School Districts to Calculate the
 Cost of Teacher Turnover 42
NCTAF’s Teacher Turnover Cost Calculator..... 44

Status of Teacher Exit Surveys and Cost of Teacher Turnover Calculations in Virginia 46
Teacher Surveys in Virginia’s School Divisions 46
Efforts of Virginia School Divisions to Calculate the Cost of Teacher Turnover..... 47

Recommendation on the Feasibility of Implementing a Teacher Turnover Tracking
Program in the Commonwealth of Virginia..... 48

References..... 52

Appendix A..... 55
 Senate Joint Resolution No. 218..... 55

Appendix B 58
 Delaware Education Employee Exit Survey 58

Appendix C 65
 New Hampshire Department of Education Sample Questions for Exit Interviews..... 65

Appendix D..... 66
 Ohio Teacher Exit Survey (TEx S)..... 66

Appendix E 71
 New Teacher Center Teaching and Learning Conditions Survey States and School
 Districts 2008-2014..... 71

Appendix F..... 74
 North Carolina Teacher Turnover Reasons Codes 74

Appendix G..... 77
 NCTAF Teacher Turnover Calculator 77

Feasibility Study on the Implementation of a Program to Track Teacher Turnover in the Commonwealth of Virginia

Executive Summary

The 2015 Virginia General Assembly passed Senate Joint Resolution 218 (see [Appendix A](#)), which requested that the Virginia Department of Education study the feasibility of implementing a program in the Commonwealth to track teacher turnover by developing exit questionnaires and other means. In conducting the study, the Department was to consider and make recommendations regarding (i) an exit questionnaire for teachers separating from service or choosing early retirement that includes reasons for leaving as a function of school climate, comparative salaries of neighboring school divisions, job demands as a reflection of teacher time, nonteaching duties, student behavior, classroom management, autonomy in the classroom, opportunities for growth and improvement, and health and family considerations in conjunction with (ii) use of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) Teacher Turnover Cost Calculator and its associated background information to estimate the dollars spent on teacher turnover for a specific school or school division in the Commonwealth or enable school leaders to design and conduct their own detailed teacher turnover cost analyses.

The Virginia Department of Education conducted research on statewide teacher surveys in nine states through Web site searches, personal interviews, and reviews of documents received from individuals who have responsibility for the surveys. The Department also conducted research on teacher turnover, with a specific emphasis on means of determining the cost of teacher turnover. The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future's (NCTAF) 2007 report, *The Cost of Teacher Turnover in Five School Districts: A Pilot Study* (Barnes, G., Crowe, E., & Schaefer, B., 2007), along with NCTAF's Teacher Turnover Cost Calculator, were carefully reviewed as they were specifically mentioned in the legislation.

Finally, the Department convened a group of Virginia stakeholders to review the legislation, research, and information from other states and provide feedback on the feasibility of implementing a program in the Commonwealth to track teacher turnover by developing exit questionnaires and other means. The stakeholders group took into consideration and made recommendations regarding the use of exit surveys and the NCTAF Teacher Turnover Cost Calculator and its associated background information or enabling school leaders to design and conduct their own detailed teacher turnover cost analyses.

Based on reviewed practices from other states, information provided by Virginia's school divisions, and input from the stakeholder group, the group offers the following recommendations:

Exit Questionnaires

- Consider Virginia's participation in a working conditions survey that includes questions that may help inform schools and divisions about a "predicted teacher retention rate." The cost for a valid and reliable survey would need to be determined through Virginia's procurement process. One example of a working conditions survey is the TELL Survey; the New Teacher Center indicates that the cost to administer a statewide TELL Survey is approximately \$150,000 during the year of administration.

Rationale: A survey provides a broad view of working conditions within schools and school divisions, not focusing only on teachers who leave, but also providing data on a number of topics related to conditions in schools that, if addressed, might encourage more teachers to remain in the profession.

- Consider developing a model exit questionnaire that Virginia schools and school divisions may administer to their exiting teachers in multiple formats, including at a minimum, on paper and online.
 - The development of a model questionnaire or survey should be developed with consideration given to best practices within the human resources field as well as stakeholder input from Virginia's school divisions.
 - Use of the survey instrument by school divisions should be optional or they should have a phase-in period if use is required by the state.
 - School divisions also should be able to determine the manner in which the survey is administered to their teachers (i.e., paper, online, interview, etc.)
 - Consideration should be given to fund a project to work with stakeholders on the development of an exit survey instrument that is valid and reliable in the context of the intended purpose.

Rationale: Over half of Virginia's school divisions indicated they already administer exit surveys or conduct exit interviews with departing employees; however, there is great variation in the survey/interview instruments.

Teacher Turnover Cost Calculator

If being able to determine the cost of teacher turnover is deemed critical to reduce the teacher attrition rate in Virginia:

- Consider development of an online teacher turnover cost calculator specific to Virginia's needs; and

Rationale: The NCTAF Web-based Teacher Turnover Cost Calculator, mentioned in the legislative resolution, was developed in 2007, and the underlying assumptions have not been reviewed or updated since that time. If the cost of teacher turnover is viewed as a key component in reducing teacher attrition, consideration should be given to issuing a Request for Proposals to determine the proposed cost of developing such a tool unique to Virginia's needs. However, there likely would be an additional cost to update on a regular basis the underlying assumptions in a cost calculator, and the use of a cost calculator still would require school divisions to disaggregate cost data for entry into the cost calculator. Recommendations noted below cite concerns by many school divisions about the time and effort required to collect and report such data.

- Consider funding a study of the cost of teacher turnover in a representative sample of Virginia school divisions to establish an average cost of teacher turnover in Virginia.

Rationale: School division staff expressed concern about their capacity to isolate and disaggregate the cost data required to use a teacher turnover cost calculator and indicated that time, funding, and additional guidance would need to be provided to establish uniformity across the state. A study of the cost of teacher turnover in a representative sample of Virginia school divisions may establish a base-line metric to provide data to legislators, the public, and other stakeholders for future information and planning without the need to collect such data from all school divisions.

A Program to Track Teacher Turnover in the Commonwealth of Virginia

- Consider providing funding to add several fields to the teacher work force database administered by the Virginia Department of Education to enable calculation of a state-level teacher turnover rate and to determine why instructional personnel leave.
 - The VDOE already collects teacher work force information at the state level, including each teacher's name, school, license type, teaching assignments, endorsement areas, federal highly qualified status, and route to endorsement,

which includes the higher education institution where the teacher completed his or her teacher preparation if he or she followed a “traditional” route to licensure as opposed to an alternate route.

- Additional data of interest might include the teacher’s age, teaching experience in the school and school division, the number of instructional personnel who separate from a school or school division each year, and their reasons for leaving.

Rationale: Research suggests that these additional data points may be useful in conducting analysis of trends in Virginia’s teaching work force. Additionally, Virginia’s *Plan to Ensure Excellent Educators for All Students* (Virginia Department of Education, 2015), submitted to the United States Department of Education in June 2015, indicates that several of these data points are under consideration for inclusion in future data collections. However, school divisions expressed concerns about the time and effort necessary to respond to an already lengthy list of state reporting requirements.

- Use of an exit survey should remain optional.
 - An exit survey likely would contain more information than just why an employee left. It has the potential to provide information to a school or school division to help address broader issues.
 - Actions to address school- or division-level issues are best developed at the local level.

Rationale: The need for teachers in specific content areas as well as the teacher turnover rate vary across school divisions, and each division benefits from adopting strategies that best suit its needs and capabilities. Concern was expressed by school divisions about having the ability to track down responses from all separating personnel if a statewide requirement to administer exit surveys and report data collected was implemented.

Feasibility Study on the Implementation of a Program to Track Teacher Turnover in the Commonwealth of Virginia

Background

The 2015 Virginia General Assembly passed Senate Joint Resolution 218 (see [Appendix A](#)), which requested that the Virginia Department of Education study the feasibility of implementing a program in the Commonwealth to track teacher turnover by developing exit questionnaires and other means. In conducting the study, the Department was to consider and make recommendations regarding (i) an exit questionnaire for teachers separating from service or choosing early retirement that includes reasons for leaving as a function of school climate, comparative salaries of neighboring school divisions, job demands as a reflection of teacher time, nonteaching duties, student behavior, classroom management, autonomy in the classroom, opportunities for growth and improvement, and health and family considerations in conjunction with (ii) use of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) Teacher Turnover Cost Calculator and its associated background information to estimate the dollars spent on teacher turnover for a specific school or school division in the Commonwealth or enable school leaders to design and conduct their own detailed teacher turnover cost analyses.

The Virginia Department of Education conducted research on statewide teacher surveys in nine states through Web site searches, personal interviews, and reviews of documents received from individuals who have responsibility for the surveys. Several states administer working conditions surveys to teachers, but only two (North Carolina and Louisiana) were identified as having a *legislative* requirement to survey or interview *teachers who leave employment*.

The Department of Education also conducted research on teacher turnover, with a specific emphasis on means of determining the cost of teacher turnover. The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future's (NCTAF) 2007 report, *The Cost of Teacher Turnover in Five School Districts: A Pilot Study* (Barnes, G., Crowe, E., & Schaefer, B., 2007), along with NCTAF's Teacher Turnover Cost Calculator, were carefully reviewed as they were specifically mentioned in the legislation.

Finally, the Department convened a group of Virginia stakeholders to review the legislation, research, and information from other states and provide feedback on the feasibility of implementing a program in the Commonwealth to track teacher turnover by developing exit

questionnaires and other means. The stakeholder group took into consideration and made recommendations regarding the use of exit surveys and the NCTAF Teacher Turnover Cost Calculator and its associated background information or enabling school leaders to design and conduct their own detailed teacher turnover cost analyses. The stakeholders group represented teachers, principals, superintendents, school personnel administrators, central office administrators, school boards, and institutions of higher education.

The Faces of Teachers Across the Nation

According to Ingersoll, Merrill, and Stuckey in their updated 2014 report, *Seven Trends: The Transformation of the Teaching Force*, America's teaching force is becoming larger, grayer, greener, more female, and more diverse; remaining consistent in academic ability; and becoming less stable. Using seven cycles of longitudinal survey data (25 years' worth) from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), specifically the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) and its supplement, the Teacher Follow-Up Survey (TFS), the researchers explored how characteristics of the teaching force in the United States have changed from 1987-1988 to 2011-2012. The report provides some interesting analyses, one of which relates to the stability of the teaching force. Briefly, the researchers found the teaching force during this timeframe became:

- **Larger**
The number of teachers has increased faster than the number of students. While the total K-12 student enrollment increased by 19.4 percent from 1987-1988 to 2011-2012, over the same period, the teaching force increased by 46.4 percent.
- **Grayer (Older)**
The teaching force has become older, and teacher retirements have increased. However, this trend appears to be largely over, with the most common age of teachers (41 in 1987-1988) increasing to 50 by 2007-2008 and decreasing to 30 in 2011-2012. The number of teacher retirements peaked in 2004-2005, and has been decreasing.
- **Greener (More Inexperienced)**
As the proportion of veteran teachers has increased, so has the proportion of beginning teachers. In 1987-1988, the modal school teacher had 15 years of teaching experience, decreasing to one year of experience in 2007-2008. The economic downturn beginning in 2007-2008 resulted in a number of layoffs, usually of beginners, thus slowing the "greening" effect, with the modal teacher having four to five years of experience by 2011-2012.

- **More Female**

Both the number of women entering teaching and the proportion of teachers who are female have increased. The change in the male-to-female ratio is not due to a decline in the number of males entering the profession, which also has grown, but rather to the increased number of females entering teaching.
- **More Diverse, by Race-ethnicity**

Despite efforts to recruit minority teachers, teaching remains a largely white workforce. Since the teaching force has grown dramatically in number, *numerically* there are more minority teachers than before. “Growth in the number of minority teachers outpaced growth in minority students and was over twice the growth rate of white teachers. So, although the proportion of minority students is still far greater than the proportion of minority teachers, the teaching force has rapidly grown more diverse.” (Ingersoll, R., Merrill, L., & Stuckey, D., Updated 2014) The data also show that the rate at which minority teachers leave schools is significantly higher than that of white teachers, increasing by 28 percent from the late 1980s to 2008-2009.
- **Consistent in Academic Ability**

The researchers used Barron’s six-category ranking of colleges and universities attended by beginning teachers as a measure of academic ability. Based on the selectivity or competitiveness of teachers’ undergraduate institutions, researchers found that about a tenth of newly hired first-year teachers come from top tier institutions of higher education, about 20 to 25 percent come from the bottom two categories, and about two-thirds come from middle-level institutions. While researchers found some fluctuation from year to year, there has been little long-term change in recent years.
- **Less Stable**

The rate of attrition among teachers (those leaving the profession entirely) is similar to that of police officers, higher than that of nurses; and far higher than turnover in fields such as law, engineering, architecture, and academia. Annual attrition from the teaching force has increased from 6.4 percent in 1988-1989 to 9 percent in 2008-2009.

Characteristics of Teachers Who Switch Schools and/or Leave Teaching

While an increase in the rate of teacher attrition of three percentage points in 20 years may not seem very high, Ingersoll, Merrill, and Stuckey (Updated 2014) disaggregated the data further to find that overall data mask differences in turnover among different types of teachers and different locales. Teacher departures are not equally distributed across states,

regions, school districts, and schools. For example, in 2004-2005, 45 percent of all public school teacher turnover took place in just one quarter of public schools – those that were high-poverty, high-minority, urban, and/or rural.

Additionally, the rates of teachers who both move between schools and those who leave teaching altogether differ by the race/ethnicity of the teacher. Minority teachers have significantly higher rates of turnover than white teachers, with the gap widening in recent years. Data indicate that minority teachers value positive school working conditions, in particular, the degree of autonomy and discretion teachers are allowed in the classroom and the level of faculty influence over schoolwide decisions that affect teachers' jobs. Minority teachers often begin teaching in hard-to-staff schools that have less desirable working conditions, and low student performance often contributes to the implementation of programs that offer less autonomy, discretion, and influence to teachers.

Turnover Among Beginning Teachers

Beginning teachers, regardless of race/ethnicity, have the highest rates of turnover of any group of teachers. In 2003, Ingersoll estimated that between 40 and 50 percent of those who enter teaching leave teaching within five years. This figure was widely reported and used in many reports, news articles, justifications for teacher mentoring programs and professional development, and further studies. More recent reports show a decline in the number of new teachers leaving the profession. In 2013, using national longitudinal data, Perda provided an updated estimate that approximately 41 percent of new teachers leave teaching within the first five years. Following the 1987-1988 school year, approximately 6,000 first-year teachers left the profession. Twenty years later, in 2007-2008, about 25,000 left. The most frequently cited reasons for leaving teaching included dissatisfaction with school and working conditions, salaries, classroom resources, student misbehavior, accountability, opportunities for development, input into decision making, and school leadership. Following the 2007-2008 school year, a significant number of new teachers (20 percent) also were laid off or terminated, presumably due to the economic downturn.

In September 2014, after the report by Ingersoll, Merrill, and Stuckey (Updated 2014) cited above, the United States Department of Education released data from a 2012-2013 follow up study, which the Center for American Progress (CAP) analyzed for a report issued in January 2015. Hanna and Pennington (2015) analyzed four years of data, from 2003-2004 through 2006-2007 and found that after five years of teaching, about 70 percent of teachers remained in their original schools, 10 percent had changed schools, and only 17 percent had left the

profession. Furthermore, they found that beginning teachers in high-poverty schools were staying at statistically similar rates as all beginning teachers. The researchers point out that there were few major changes in the teaching profession during that time, with teacher salaries growing by less than the rate of inflation and the economy strong during that time, which was prior to the economic downturn. They also note that national numbers mask local differences.

In spring 2015, Richard Ingersoll responded to the findings in the CAP report (Brown, 2015), since the turnover estimate calculated by the CAP researchers differed substantially from findings in his own research. He noted that the figures in his studies were an estimate, a “crude approximation.” He also pointed out that his estimate was based on data from both public and private school teachers, while the new data included only teachers in public schools. His research reported on attrition occurring after the fifth year of teaching, while the new data reported on attrition after the fourth year of teaching. Neither Ingersoll’s nor Hanna and Pennington’s research contained substantiated reasons why the degree of teacher turnover might seem to be decreasing, leaving those questions for future study.

Impact of Teacher Turnover

Regardless of inconsistencies in the research, studies clearly identify an issue with turnover in the teaching profession. Some degree of turnover is expected in any profession. Retirements, illnesses, career changes, and family circumstances such as moves among employees are inevitable. A certain degree of turnover helps to mitigate stagnancy in an organization. However, high employee turnover can signal underlying problems in an organization and can result in high costs and other negative consequences.

Some of the consequences, both positive and negative, of teacher turnover include:

- **Loss of teachers before they peak professionally**
Evidence supports the fact that teachers’ effectiveness increases significantly during their first several years on the job as they gain more experience, not only in content areas but also in addressing student behavior problems, students with diverse backgrounds and abilities, communication with parents, etc.
- **Continued teacher shortages in specific areas**
Ingersoll, Merrill, and Stuckey (Updated 2014) report that “contrary to conventional wisdom, the growth in the new supply and employment of qualified mathematics and science teachers has not only more than kept pace with increases in mathematics and

science student enrollments, but also with mathematics and science teacher retirement increases. . . .” Data indicate that in the areas of mathematics and science, in particular, the main source of staffing inadequacies is pre-retirement voluntary departures of licensed teachers.

- **Lack of veteran teachers**
Veteran teachers play an important role in schools as they serve as mentors and role models for younger or beginning teachers and use their experience and expertise in leadership roles.
- **Costs to high-needs schools and school districts**
Teacher turnover is disproportionately high in high-poverty, high-minority, urban, and/or rural schools and school districts. As such, these schools and districts spend a large amount of their available funds to recruit, hire, and provide professional development over and over again to each new set of beginning teachers rather than directing these funds to other instructional programs. Thus, the schools and districts that have the least funds are spending them repeatedly for the same purpose.
- **Other financial implications**
A teaching force with a large number of beginning teachers is less expensive. Also, a large number of beginning teachers entering the profession are contributing to the retirement systems. However, because such a large number are exiting the profession after fewer than five years of experience, those leaving early will never withdraw funds from their pension plans.

Factors Contributing to Employee Turnover in General

For turnover in any profession, several factors should be considered, regardless of the occupation, business, or industry.

Voluntary and Involuntary Turnover

Voluntary turnover occurs when an *employee* willingly makes the decision to leave the organization. Voluntary turnover could be a result of a better job offer or lack of opportunities in career advancement.

Involuntary turnover occurs when the *employer* makes the decision to discharge an employee and the employee unwillingly leaves his or her position. Involuntary turnover could be a result of poor performance or staff conflict.

Push Factors and Pull Factors

Pull factors include those that attract an employee away from his or current job and make alternative employment options seem inviting. These may be external factors such as the labor market, alternative job opportunities, or competitive factors that the employer feels it cannot address.

Push factors include conditions internal to the organization and perceptions that affect an employee's decision to leave. They may include job satisfaction, the extent to which the employee feels valued, and affective attitudes towards the job due to work setting, policies, leadership, culture, etc. (Daniel, 2013) Examples offered by separating employees in one research study (Williams, D., Harris, C., & Parker, J., 2008) included more flexible hours, better communication, staffing and training, better working hours, opportunity to use skills, etc.

Exit Interviews and Surveys

In business and industry, exit interviews and surveys are often conducted with employees who voluntarily or involuntarily leave the organization. Typically, employees are asked about their overall impressions and experiences during their time with the organization, their reasons for leaving, and recommendations they may have for improvement of the organization. Supporters of such interviews and surveys note that exiting employees can be good sources of insight about both the effective and ineffective operations of the company. Information gleaned from these interviews and surveys can be used to help improve various aspects of the business's operations, inform future hiring and induction practices, uncover unfair supervision and business practices, and identify compensation issues. The organization likely hopes that through the exit survey it can determine causes of employee dissatisfaction so changes can be made and costs associated with unwanted employee turnover can be reduced. (Giacalone, R. A., Knouse, S .G., & Montagliani, A., 1997)

Many organizations opt to use an exit survey rather than an interview. Interviews are time-consuming, and the face-to-face discussion may lead exiting employees to provide responses that are less complete than if they were able to respond to anonymous written surveys or questionnaires. (Daniel, 2013) However, the validity and reliability of both exit interviews and surveys have been questioned because of the manner and timing of administration, potential bias in responses, the accuracy of feedback provided to management, and the failure of businesses to actually use the data gathered.

Pros and Cons of Exit Interviews and Surveys

Researchers note that separating personnel may not be motivated to provide the organization with honest responses to exit interviews and survey questions because of personal or professional concerns. In follow-up questionnaires administered to former employees *after* they had left the organization, research has found little correlation with the reasons given for leaving at the time of the exit interview or survey. For example, in one study, separating employees did not mention conflict with management at all during exit interviews, yet in the follow-up questionnaire, 14 percent noted conflict with management as an important factor in their departure. The same was true for dissatisfaction with advancement opportunities. (Giacalone, R. A., Knouse, S .G., & Montagliani, A., 1997)

Separating personnel are more likely to distort information about controversial, personal, or inside information that could endanger future opportunities than they are about issues such as quality of medical benefits or retirement plans. Additionally, responses differ between voluntarily and involuntarily separating employees.

Exiting employees may provide biased responses for several reasons:

- They may perceive no benefit of offering descriptions of problems or concerns or providing honest responses to questions asked at the point of departure. Some may feel that they have already tried to address issues as an employee, to no avail.
- They may fear retaliation either for themselves (such as negative recommendations to future employers) or their co-workers (such as changes in work conditions or threats to co-workers' job security).
- They may believe that feedback they provide will never be used to change policies or improve workplace conditions.

The National Union of Teachers in the United Kingdom (2014) found that if an exit survey system is administered with impartiality, confidentiality, and professionalism, teachers will have greater confidence that the information gathered will be used to effect improvement in teacher working conditions. The National Union recommended that an effective exit survey model should:

- Secure the confidence of those participating in the process;
- Help to consolidate and improve employment practices across the district; and
- Provide procedures for dealing with and safeguards for those subject to false and malicious allegations made via exit interviews.

Further, the Union found that a confidential questionnaire was a better option than a formal interview in order to preserve the anonymity of the exiting teachers. The primary purposes for the exit survey are:

- To determine the specific reasons of employees leaving;
- To provide an opportunity to review employment practices (working conditions, job content, induction, training, etc.);
- To strengthen and maintain good workplace relationships; and
- To provide an opportunity to thank people for their valuable service.

Researchers (Giacalone, R. A., Knouse, S .G., & Montagliani, A., 1997) have suggested ways to reduce or prevent bias in responses offered by exiting employees during interviews or surveys, including:

- Avoiding topics in which distorted information is likely to occur;
- Standardizing the format of exit surveys;
- Having a member of the human resources department (rather than the immediate supervisor) or an outside party conduct the interview; and
- Conducting exit surveys after the individual has been away from the organization, although it may be difficult to locate former employees once they have left the organization.

Reconceptualization of Exit Interviews and Surveys

Some research suggests that employers focus too often on the immediate reasons employees are leaving rather than on the attitudinal and organizational causes for turnover, thus leading to a review of the types of questions to be asked on exit surveys. Questions might be asked about the nature of training and expectations employees had before starting their work with the organization and if/how these expectations were met, exceeded, or frustrated by particular aspects of the organization.

Rather than focusing on departing employees, employers may consider a broader view of employee retention noting that the quality and longevity of the employment relationship begins with the start of the recruitment phase and continues all the way to the moment the employee leaves the organization. Rather than conducting a single survey at the point of departure, employers might consider a continuum of employee feedback options that engage workers from the moment they join their organization, including annual climate surveys, confidential Internet surveys and chat rooms, regular semi-structured interviews with human

resources managers, and employee forums (Williams, D., Harris, C., & Parker, J., 2008). The National Union of Teachers in the United Kingdom (2014) came to the same conclusion with the suggestion that a modified form of the proposed exit survey be offered to full-time teachers transferring to other schools in the district, teachers moving to a part-time contracts, teachers taking early retirement, or even to all teachers within a school district, with the belief that information gathered might inform discussions about stress, workload, and lack of work-life balance among teachers. Daniel (2014) also suggested that a school or district might survey the departing teachers' remaining peers, noting that teachers who quit likely have discussed their reasons for quitting with their peers.

Teacher Surveys and Interviews in Other States

Research identified a number of states that either choose to or are required to administer surveys to teachers, although most are not administered as exit surveys to departing teachers. The following is a summary of identified states that administer teacher surveys of some sort (Education Commission of the States).

Arizona

Survey of the state's certified teachers to identify working condition impediments
--

Executive Order 2005-11 - Governor's Committee for Teacher Quality and Support – Issued 6-1-2005 – URL no longer active

Creates and defines membership of the Governor's Committee for Teacher Quality and Support, the purpose of which is to: (1) develop a teacher training delivery system to address the lack of uniform access to quality induction, mentoring, and ongoing professional development; (2) identify opportunities and obstacles in teacher preparation programs to recruit highly qualified students; (3) identify pay gaps and systems concerns that lead to pay disparities across counties and districts for the same performance and experience; (4) identify possible governance issues and solutions related to teacher quality and support; and (5) *facilitate a survey of the state's certified teachers and identify working condition impediments*. Committee is to report preliminary recommendations for action or additional study by December 1, 2005, and every September 1 thereafter.

Colorado

Biennial teaching and learning conditions survey to all teachers

H.B. 1384 – Improving Teaching Quality Policies – Signed into Law 5-21-08 –

http://www.leg.state.co.us/CLICS/CLICS2008A/csl.nsf/fsbillcont3/3F0A9B2C4243EFAF8725740200640346?Open&file=1384_enr.pdf

Requires the Department of Education to *administer a biennial teaching and learning conditions survey to all teachers* to be used for planning and designing future programs; provides stipends to certain teachers employed by a school district, a board of cooperative services, or a charter school who holds national teaching standards certification or based on certain school performance data; creates an exchange teacher interim authorization for participants who are able to teach in another country.

Delaware

Commitment to a statewide teacher exit survey by 2016 in its 2015-2025 Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators for All Students, developed as part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) requirements for Title II, Part A.

Delaware's proposed exit survey is available online at

<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/titleiparta/equitable/deequityplan060115.pdf>, p. 491, Appendix N

The Delaware Department of Education identified teacher turnover as one of its priority equity gaps during analyses to revise its ESEA, Title II, Part A, Teacher Equity Plan (Delaware Department of Education, 2015). As such, it has committed to creating a *statewide approach to conducting exit surveys*. A similar pledge was made in 2011, but the Department hesitated to be the entity ultimately responsible for a process that was so directly linked to the local employer. Recent feedback from stakeholders indicates that many are comfortable with the Department identifying resources, developing a survey instrument, and contracting external partners and capacity to deliver a teacher exit survey statewide. Delaware has stated that by 2016, it will establish a statewide approach to exit surveys and build the data collected into the educator effectiveness data that have been used to inform its plan. See [Appendix B](#) for Delaware's model survey.

Illinois

Statewide survey of students (grades 6-12) and teachers
on the instructional environment in their school

S.B. 7 – Statewide Survey on Learning Conditions – Signed into Law 6-13-11 –
<http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/publicacts/97/PDF/097-0008.pdf> (Pages 2-4)

Directs the state board to *select an instrument to survey, statewide, students in grades 6-12 and teachers on the instructional environment in a school* after giving consideration to the recommendations of the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council. Subject to appropriation by the state board, each district, beginning with the 2012-2013 school year, must administer the instrument in every public school attendance center, and data must be provided to the state board. Requires the state superintendent to publicly report on selected indicators of learning conditions resulting from administration of the instrument at the individual school, district and state levels. Provides that in any year in which the appropriation is insufficient for statewide administration of the survey, the state board must give priority to districts with low-performing schools and a representative sample of other districts.

H.B. 5546 – Alternate Surveys of Learning Conditions – Signed into Law 6-13-14 –
<http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/publicacts/98/PDF/098-0648.pdf> (Pages 1-8)

Authorizes a district to use, at school district expense, an alternate survey of learning conditions instrument than the statewide survey instrument, provided the district provides notice to the state board along with certification indicating that the alternate survey has been agreed to by the teachers' exclusive bargaining representative and the school board, and that data from the survey can be used on school report cards and the State School Report Card website. Directs the state superintendent to administer an approval process for alternate survey of learning conditions instruments; requires any approved instrument to meet specified criteria. Directs the state superintendent to periodically review the list of approved alternate survey instruments.

Provides that the requirement that a report card include indicators of the school environment also include two or more indicators from any school climate survey selected or approved (rather than developed) by the state, with the same or similar indicators included on school report cards for all surveys selected or approved by the state.

Louisiana

Adopt rules requiring local school boards to conduct exit interviews for teachers who leave their employ and annually report the findings to the Senate and House Education Committees. This report is discussed in greater detail in a [following section](#).

S.B. 548 – Teacher Exit Interviews – Signed into Law 6-26-08 –
<http://www.legis.la.gov/Legis/ViewDocument.aspx?d=503472>

Requires the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education *to adopt rules requiring local school boards to conduct exit interviews for teachers who leave their employ*; provides that such interviews shall be for the purpose of ascertaining reasons for leaving and to assist in developing strategies to improve teacher retention rates.

S.C.R. 28 – Louisiana Teacher Empowerment, Learning and Leading Survey (LA TELLS) Initiative – Passed 6-6-13 –
<http://www.legis.la.gov/legis/ViewDocument.aspx?d=851755&n=SCR28%20Enrolled>

Requests that the department of education plan and *conduct the Louisiana Teacher Empowerment, Learning and Leading Survey (LA TELLS) Initiative [which includes a survey of teachers]*. Urges the department of education to (1) establish a Teacher and Administrator Advisory Board to oversee implementation of recommendations from the survey, (2) support the collaboration of public schools and districts in providing customized analysis to incorporate in school improvement plans; and (3) promote the collaboration of public school teachers and administrators in developing professional development designed to enhance teachers' instructional and student assessment skills.

New Hampshire

Includes potential exit interview questions as part of an online toolbox for educators

The New Hampshire Department of Education has posted a list of potential exit interview questions on its Web site, “[New Hampshire Educators Online: An Educator’s Resource for Curriculum Planning and Professional Development](#).” See [Appendix C](#).

North Carolina

Annual report on the decisions of teachers to leave the teaching profession. Data are collected via a survey. This report is discussed in greater detail in a [following section](#).

GS 115C-12(22) – Annual Report on the State of the Teaching Profession in North Carolina – Enacted 1993; Revised 2015 –

<http://www.ncleg.net/Sessions/2015/Bills/Senate/PDF/S333v6.pdf>

Requires the State Board of Education to monitor and compile an annual report on the state of the teaching profession in North Carolina. The State Board shall adopt standard procedures for each local board of education to collect the information from teachers *[which includes an exit survey]* who are not continuing to work as teachers and report the information to the State Board.

Ohio

Model online teacher exit survey for use by its school districts

Ohio used Race to the Top funds to develop an interactive resource tool for collecting data on teacher retention and attrition. The Teacher Exit Survey is intended to support local education agency needs in gathering both qualitative and quantitative data when a teacher leaves the district. Analysis of the data can help inform the district's planning process.

The survey is interactive and, once completed by the teacher, can be emailed to or printed and mailed to the designated district staff person. Local education agencies also can download the survey to a district application survey tool. A copy of Ohio's exit survey is available in [Appendix D](#).

Texas

Online survey to be administered statewide at least every other year to superintendents, principals, supervisors, classroom teachers, counselors, and other appropriate certified, full-time professionals on various teaching conditions

H.B. 2012 – Teaching and Learning Conditions Survey – Signed into Law 6-14-13 –

<http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/tlodocs/83R/billtext/pdf/HB02012F.pdf#navpanes=0>

(Pages 2-4)

Directs the commissioner of education to *develop an online survey to be administered statewide at least every other year to superintendents, principals, supervisors, classroom teachers, counselors, and other appropriate certified, full-time professionals*. Requires that the survey be designed to elicit information on:

- (1) Teaching and learning conditions as predictors of student achievement and growth;
- (2) The relationship between teaching and learning conditions and teacher retention;
- (3) The influence of school leadership on teaching and learning conditions, including meaningful teacher involvement in determining professional development needs and campus decisions/initiatives;
- (4) The relationship between teaching and learning conditions and student attendance and graduation;
- (5) Appropriate time of day for collaborative instructional planning;
- (6) Facilities resources needs; and
- (7) Other supports needed for educators to be successful in the classroom.

Directs the commissioner to make the survey results available to the public and provide survey results to districts and schools. Requires each district and school to use the survey results to review and revise, as appropriate, district-level or campus-level improvement plans, and for other purposes, as appropriate, to enhance the district and campus learning environment. Directs the commissioner to use the survey results to develop, review, and revise agency professional development offerings, agency teacher retention initiatives, and standards for principals and superintendents.

Teaching, Empowering, Leading and Learning (TELL) Survey

TELL as a Working Conditions Survey

A number of states listed above use New Teacher Center's (NTC) Teaching, Empowering, Leading and Learning (TELL) Survey (New Teacher Center, 2015) to seek information from teachers about working conditions in their schools. The TELL Survey began in North Carolina in 2001 as a result of work pioneered by Governor Mike Easley and the North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards Commission. The survey has been replicated in more than 18 states across the nation as well as in numerous school districts (Maddock, A. & Shephard, D., 2015, Spring). In 2013, NTC published the results of a cross-state analysis based on nine states and/or school districts that participated in the 2012-2013 TELL Survey (New Teacher Center, 2013). States include Colorado, Illinois, Kentucky, Maryland,

Massachusetts, North Carolina, and Tennessee. School districts include Alexandria City Public Schools and Fairfax County Public Schools, Virginia. The results of Alexandria City's participation in the TELL Survey may be found at <http://www.tellacps.org/>. Fairfax County's results are also available online at <http://www.fcpswcs.org/>. A list of all states and school districts that participated in the TELL Survey from 2008 through 2015 is available in [Appendix E](#). There are close to 1.5 million TELL Survey responses in the NTC database from surveys administered during that time.

NTC works with a broad group of state stakeholders, policymakers, and practitioners to:

1. Design a Teaching and Learning Conditions Survey and Communications Plan; The survey is designed to collect the views of teachers, principals, and other licensed educators. Respondents share perceptions related to student achievement and teacher retention by answering questions focused on teaching conditions across key areas including:
 - Time – Available time to plan, collaborate, provide instruction, and eliminate barriers in order to maximize instructional time during the school day;
 - Facilities and Resources – Availability of instructional, technology, office, communication, and school resources to teachers;
 - Community Support and Involvement – Community and parent/guardian communication and influence in the school;
 - Managing Student Conduct – Policies and practices to address student conduct issues and ensure a safe school environment;
 - Teacher Leadership – Teacher involvement in decisions that impact classroom and school practices;
 - School Leadership – The ability of school leadership to create trusting, supportive environments and address teacher concerns;
 - Professional Development – Availability and quality of learning opportunities for educators to enhance their teaching;
 - Instructional Practices and Support – Data and support available to teachers to improve instruction and student learning; and
 - New Teacher Support – The perceptions of teachers in their first three years of teaching related to teaching conditions and induction support.

Generally, the questions on the TELL Survey remain static from state to state, thus permitting cross-state analyses. School districts and states may have some latitude in adding a few questions that are of specific interest to them.

2. Administer an anonymous, online Teaching and Learning Conditions Survey;
Every school-based educator receives an anonymous login code that identifies the school in which he or she works and ensures that each is able to take the survey only once. NTC works with partners to promote the survey and encourage participation.
3. Produce, publish, and help communicate Teaching and Learning Conditions Survey results;
If a sufficient response rate is received, NTC produces individual school and district results, as well as an aggregated state report that allows for comparison of teaching conditions at the school, district, and state level.
4. Analyze Teaching Conditions Survey results and explore connections; and
The data and information from the survey permit the exploration of connections between positive teaching environments and other variables such as student achievement and teacher retention. Specific analyses are provided for subsets of schools or educators.
5. Design training materials that facilitate use of the data.
NTC designs training materials that can be utilized by stakeholders to understand and use the Teaching and Learning Conditions Survey results for school improvement planning and informed decision-making around policy and practice.

Policymakers have used TELL Survey data in various ways to change teaching and learning conditions, including:

- Development and adoption of state teaching conditions standards (NC, KY);
- Inclusion of TELL data in principal evaluation programs (DE, KY, NC, TN);
- Use in principal professional learning (CO, DE, KY, MD, NC, TN);
- Integration into the design and evaluation of school and district improvement plans (CO, DE, KY, MD, NC, TN);
- Use for evaluation of new teacher support (CO, KY, MD, OR); and
- Developing assistance for persistently low-performing schools (KY, NC, MD, TN).

(Haynes M., 2014)

TELL Data as a Predictor of Teacher Retention

While the TELL Survey is generally considered a working conditions survey, some state reports (Hirsch, E., Sioberg, A., & Dougherty, P., 2011) include a “predicted teacher

retention rate” based on responses to the question, “Which of the following best describes your immediate professional plans?” Responses are grouped into four categories:

- “Stayers” responded that they would remain teaching in their schools.
- “Movers” responded that they want to continue teaching, but either leave their current school and remain in their district or teach in a different district.
- “Leave Classroom” includes teachers who indicate they are going to leave teaching for another position in education.
- “Leave Education” refers to those educators intending to leave the profession entirely.

Teachers are then asked “which single teaching condition” they perceive to be most important to their future employment plans. Choices include instructional practices and support, time, facilities and resources, community support and involvement, managing student conduct, teacher leadership, school leadership, and professional development. Further analysis is conducted to determine within which categories there is the greatest disparity between Stayers and Movers. In the 2011 Kentucky TELL report (Hirsch, E., Sioberg, A., & Dougherty, P., 2011), for example, the greatest disparity occurred in the category of school leadership. Additional statistical analyses were conducted to document correlations between the estimated teacher retention rate and the available survey choices, revealing that there also was a strong relationship between Movers and the areas of community support and involvement and managing student conduct.

More information about New Teacher Center’s TELL Survey is available online at <http://www.newteachercenter.org/teaching-empowering-leading-and-learning-tell-survey>.

Cost of a TELL Survey

Information from New Teacher Center indicates that the cost to administer a statewide TELL Survey is approximately \$150,000 during the year of administration. This fee may be offset by a \$25,000 grant from the National Education Association (NEA) pending available funds. Included in the fee is development of the survey in collaboration with a coalition of state partners; online administration of the survey; development of e-mail messages, news releases, FAQs, flyers, and webinars to advertise the survey to teachers; letters to each teacher statewide providing a personal response code so responses remain anonymous; reminder messages to ensure a strong response rate; reporting and analysis of the data on a public Web site; and presentations to state boards of education and other stakeholder groups.

Some states contract with NTC for a second year of assistance with the development of state policies based on the data and training of Department of Education staff on how to use the data in their own work with school districts. The cost of the second year of NTC assistance varies from \$40,000 to \$150,000 depending on the needs of the state. Some states then choose to repeat the survey during the third year to measure progress, thus repeating the \$150,000 cost for a year of survey administration.

NTC indicates that states have used various funding sources to pay for the TELL Survey administration, including state funds (CO, MD, NC); ESEA Title II, Part A, funds (KY); and Race to the Top funds (DE, MA, TN).

Teacher Surveys and Reports in North Carolina

Of the states identified in research for this report, North Carolina appears to collect and report the most extensive data on teacher quality, teacher working conditions, and teacher preparation. These data are then used to produce a number of reports. Of greatest interest to this feasibility study is the *Annual Report on Teachers Leaving the Profession*, which is discussed in the next section. Other North Carolina reports related to teachers include the following:

North Carolina School Report Card

North Carolina, like all states, produces an annual School Report Card (SRC) for its schools, districts, and the state (<http://www.ncpublicschools.org/src/>). The data reported on teaching personnel in each of these entities include average number of classroom teachers; percentage of fully licensed teachers; percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers; percentage of teachers with advanced degrees; number of National Board Certified teachers; percentage of teachers with 0-3 years, 4-10 years, and more than 10 years teaching experience; and one-year teacher turnover rates (from one year to the next).

Educator Effectiveness Report

North Carolina reports on the effectiveness of teachers and administrators across the state (<http://www.ncpublicschools.org/effectiveness-model/data/>). Current reports show ratings of the performance of teachers who were evaluated in the 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013 school years.

- During the 2010-2011 school year, mostly new teachers and some veteran teachers received evaluations. All principals and assistant principals received evaluations.
- During the 2011-12 and 2012-13 school years, all teachers, principals, and assistant principals received evaluations.

This database provides data on educator effectiveness at the state, district, and school levels. In North Carolina, educator effectiveness is gauged through the use of the North Carolina Educator Evaluation System and other informal means.

North Carolina Teacher Working Conditions Survey (NC TWC)

(<http://www.ncteachingconditions.org/>)

The North Carolina Teacher Working Conditions Survey is a biannual statewide survey of school-based licensed educators to determine if they have the supports necessary for effective teaching. Developed in the Office of the Governor as part of the Governor's Teacher Working Conditions Initiative (2002-2008), the Teaching, Empowering, Leading and Learning Survey is conducted by the New Teacher Center on behalf of the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. The results of this survey are one component of the ongoing process for collaborative school and district improvement plans. Results also are used as artifacts in the educator and administrator evaluation instruments in the state.

During the four-week window during which the survey is administered, educators may complete the survey any time, from any Internet location, using an anonymous password. Results from the survey are posted online for schools and districts that meet the minimum threshold of 40 percent response and at least five respondents. These results, as well as the results for the state, are posted approximately five weeks after the survey closes.

North Carolina Institutions of Higher Education Educator Preparation Program Report Cards

The North Carolina Institutions of Higher Education (IHE) Educator Preparation Program Report Cards offer a snapshot of information about college/university teacher and principal preparation programs. Much of the data provided in the report cards are reported annually in the IHE Performance Reports in accordance with §115C 296 (b).

§ 115C-296. Board sets licensure requirements; reports; lateral entry and mentor programs.

.....

(b1) The State Board of Education shall require teacher education programs, master's

degree programs in education, and master's degree programs in school administration to submit annual performance reports. The performance reports shall provide the State Board of Education with a focused review of the programs and the current process of accrediting these programs in order to ensure that the programs produce graduates that are well prepared to teach, as follows:

- (1) Report contents. - The performance report for each teacher education program and master's degree program in education and school administration in North Carolina shall follow a common format and include at least the following elements:
 - a. Quality of students entering the schools of education, including the average grade point average and average score on preprofessional skills tests that assess reading, writing, math and other competencies.
 - b. Graduation rates.
 - c. Time-to-graduation rates.
 - d. Average scores of graduates on professional and content area examination for the purpose of licensure.
 - e. Percentage of graduates receiving initial licenses.
 - f. Percentage of graduates hired as teachers.
 - g. Percentage of graduates remaining in teaching for four years.
 - h. Graduate satisfaction based on a common survey.
 - i. Employer satisfaction based on a common survey.
 - j. Effectiveness of teacher education program graduates.
- (2) Submission of annual performance reports. - Performance reports shall be provided annually to the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina, the State Board of Education, and the boards of trustees of the independent colleges. The State Board of Education shall review the schools of education performance reports and the performance reports for master's degree programs in education and school administration each year the performance reports are submitted.
- (3) Educator preparation program report card. - The State Board shall create a higher education educator preparation program report card reflecting the information collected in the annual performance reports for each North Carolina institution offering teacher education programs and master of education programs. The report cards shall, at a minimum, summarize information reported on all of the performance indicators for the performance reports required by subdivision (1) of this subsection.
- (4) Annual State Board of Education report. - The educator preparation program report cards shall be submitted to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee on an annual basis by November 15.
- (5) State Board of Education action based on performance. - The State Board of Education shall reward and sanction approved teacher education programs and master of education programs and revoke approval of those programs based on the performance reports and other criteria established by the State Board of Education.

....

The IHE Performance Reports are available at <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/ihe/reports/>.

Fiscal Impact of North Carolina Teacher Surveys and Reports

The collection and reporting of such extensive data require significant human and fiscal resources. Conversations with staff at the North Carolina Department of Instruction (NCDPI) indicated that while the Office of Educator Effectiveness has primary responsibility for collecting and reporting the data for the four reports mentioned above, other offices share the responsibility. For example, for the Annual Report on Teachers Leaving the Profession, the Financial and Business Services Division provides each personnel administrator in North Carolina's school districts a list of teachers who left teaching, i.e., they were employed in the previous year but not in the current year. The school districts return the data to the Financial and Business Services Division in an Excel spreadsheet. Staff in the division then aggregate the data and produce the tables, charts, and graphs the Office of Educator Effectiveness uses to prepare the reports.

For the North Carolina Working Conditions Survey, the NCDPI contracts with New Teacher Center to collect and analyze data using the NTC's TELL Survey.

States with a Legislative Requirement to Report Teacher Exit Survey Data at the State Level

A number of states conduct surveys on teacher working conditions or support their school districts in administering exit surveys; however, only two states – North Carolina and Louisiana – were found to have a legislated statewide annual report on the reasons teachers leave the teaching profession based on surveys administered in their school districts.

North Carolina Annual Report on Teachers Leaving the Profession

The North Carolina General Statutes requires the North Carolina Board of Education to monitor and compile an annual report on the decisions of teachers who leave the teaching profession. The legislation was first passed in 1993, with amendments (shown in underlined text below) made during the 2015 session:

Section 115C-12. Powers and duties of the Board generally.

The general supervision and administration of the free public school system shall be vested in the State Board of Education. The State Board of Education shall establish policy for the system of free public schools, subject to laws enacted by the General Assembly. The powers and duties of the State Board of Education are defined as follows:

....

(22) Duty to Monitor the Decisions of Teachers to Leave the Teaching Profession. – State of the Teaching Profession in North Carolina. – The State Board of Education shall monitor and compile an annual report on the state of the teaching profession in North Carolina that includes data on the decisions of teachers to leave the teaching profession. The State Board shall adopt standard procedures for each local board of education to use in requesting the information from teachers who are not continuing to work as teachers in the local school administrative unit and shall require each local board of education to report the information to the State Board in a standard format adopted by the State Board.

- a. The annual teacher transition report shall include data on the following:
1. The number of teachers who left the profession without remaining in the field of education and the reasons for teachers leaving the profession.
 2. The number of teachers who left their employment to teach in other states.
 3. The number of teachers who left their employment to work in another school in North Carolina, including nonpublic schools and charter schools.
 4. The number of teachers who left a classroom position for another type of educational position.
 5. The number of teachers who left employment in hard-to-staff schools. A hard-to-staff school shall be any school identified as low-performing, as provided in G.S. 115C-105.37.
 6. The number of teachers who left employment in hard-to-staff subject areas. A hard-to-staff subject area is either of the following:
 - i. As defined by the United States Department of Education.
 - ii. A subject area that has resulted in a long-term vacancy of 16 months or more at a particular school in a local school administrative unit.
- b. The annual teacher transition report by the State Board of Education shall disaggregate the data included in sub-subdivision a. of this subdivision by teacher effectiveness status at a statewide level. The report shall not disaggregate data on teacher effectiveness status at a local school administrative unit level.
1. Notwithstanding Article 21A of this Chapter, local school administrative units shall provide to the State Board of Education for the purposes of this report any North Carolina Educator Evaluation System (NCEES) effectiveness status assigned to teachers who left employment.
 2. The State Board of Education shall not report disaggregated data that reveals confidential information in a teacher's personnel file, as defined by Article 21A of this Chapter, such as making the effectiveness status personally identifiable to an individual teacher.

SECTION 2. This act is effective when it becomes law and applies beginning with the annual report compiled in 2017 using data from the 2016-2017 school year.

Beginning in 2016, the annual report compiled as required by G.S. 115C-12(22) shall be titled "State of the Teaching Profession in North Carolina."

.....

The earliest North Carolina Teacher Turnover Survey available online is for the 2000-2001 school year. It reported the total number of teachers employed in the system; the total number of teachers leaving the system between July 1, 2000, and June 30, 2001; the number of teachers with tenure who were leaving; and the reason for leaving given by teachers. The annual surveys since then, through 2013-2014, are available online at <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/educatoreffectiveness/surveys/leaving/>. The length and complexity of the reports have evolved over time along with the specificity of questions asked.

In the most recent report, turnover data are summarized by individual school districts and at the state level for the current year (2013-2014). The information is self-reported by teachers, using one of 28 reasons for leaving. These 28 reasons are further categorized into five headings that are used to report a five-year trend analysis (2009-2014) noting the top reasons for teacher departure in each of the five years. School districts are notified a year in advance of any changes to the data to be collected so they can incorporate that information into the exit procedures they use for nonreturning personnel.

The five broad headings used to report teacher turnover are:

- Remained in education
- Personal reasons
- Initiated by the Local Education Agency (LEA)
- Beyond LEA control
- Other reasons

The complete list of all 28 reasons and definitions is included in [Appendix F](#). The report does not include teachers who moved from one school to another school within a school district or teachers who are on approved leave; they continue as active and current employees. It does not include information regarding local vacancies, teacher effectiveness data, or any statewide salary/cost analysis. Lastly, charter school data are not reflected in the report.

How Teacher Turnover Is Determined for the North Carolina State Report Card

Each LEA reports teacher turnover for the North Carolina School Report Card (SRC). These data are calculated based on a snapshot of employment for teachers employed in the LEA as reflected in the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (DPI) Licensure/Salary database. The snapshot shows teachers who were employed in March of the previous year but were not employed in the LEA as teachers in March of the current year. The Financial and Business Services Division at the DPI provides personnel administrators in the LEAs a list of individuals employed as teachers within the March date range, and they are asked to provide summative data on the reasons these teachers left teaching. This information is self-reported to the personnel administrators during exit interviews or surveys and/or taken from factual information in their human resources database.

1. For the 2014 NC SRC, teacher turnover is based upon employed March 2013 classroom teachers and their employment status in March 2014. Payroll data are used for the determination.
2. Classroom teachers are determined by [Purpose Codes](#) beginning with 51 (Regular Instructional Services), 52 (Special Populations Services), or 53 (Alternative Programs and Services and [Object Codes](#) 121 (Teacher), 123 (JROTC Teacher), 124 (International Faculty Exchange Teacher), or 128 (Master Teacher). Purpose and Object Codes are part of the payroll budget code.
3. Classroom teachers employed in March 2013 are determined using March 2012 payroll and the criteria in step #2.
4. Once the roster from step #3 is determined, the Social Security Numbers (SSNs) of the classroom teachers are queried against all certified employee budget codes in the March 2014 payroll data. If teachers with these SSNs are not found to be employed in the same LEA in March 2014 as they were in March 2013, they are classified as turnover at the LEA level.
5. The following numbers are not captured in the State Report statistics at this time:
 - Teachers on approved leave;
 - Teachers in charter schools; and
 - Teachers who moved from one school to another school within the LEA.

(Public Schools of North Carolina State Board of Education and Department of Public Instruction, 2014)

Timeline for Data Collection

In mid-May, the personnel administrator in each of North Carolina's school districts receives the list of teachers no longer employed in the LEA based on the process outlined in Step #4 above. The LEAs must return the data on why these individuals left teaching to the NCDPI by July 1. The agency's Financial and Business Services Division receives the data, prepares the disaggregated reports needed for the full state report, and provides them to the Office of Educator Effectiveness by early September. The Office of Educator Effectiveness prepares the report and presents it for first review to the State Board of Education in October. The State Board approves the report in November, and in December, it is sent to the Governor and the General Assembly, prior to the beginning of the next legislative session.

Louisiana Teacher Exit Survey and Attrition Report

Louisiana Revised Statute 17:7, enacted in 2008, requires the Louisiana Board of Elementary and Secondary Education to collect information on why teachers have left the classroom and annually report the findings to the Senate and House Education Committees.

R.S. 17:7

§7. Duties, functions, and responsibilities of board

In addition to the authorities granted by R.S. 17:6 and any powers, duties, and responsibilities vested by any other applicable laws, the board shall:

....

- (28) (a) By the beginning of the 2008-2009 school year, develop and adopt rules and regulations requiring city, parish, and other local school boards to implement a system to conduct exit interviews for teachers who leave their employ to ascertain their reasons for leaving and to gather information that could prove useful in developing strategies to improve teacher retention rates.
- (b) The board shall appoint a task force to assist in developing forms and questions to be utilized in the exit interview.
- (c) Each city, parish, and other local public school board annually shall report on the information gathered during the teacher exit interviews conducted in its system to the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education in a manner that assures complete anonymity and confidentiality for the teacher.
- (d) The State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education shall compile and analyze the teacher exit interview information submitted by each city, parish, and other local public school system each year and make a comprehensive report to the Senate Committee on Education and the House Committee on Education not later than January fifteenth of each year regarding the information collected during the prior year.

In 2013-2014, the Louisiana Teacher Exit Survey (Louisiana Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2013-2014) used teacher self-reported data in the following categories for why teachers left the classroom, starting with the most frequently mentioned reasons:

- Retirement;
- Employment in the education field/accepted another job in a Louisiana district or school;
- Personal reasons;
- Family/personal relocation;
- Homemaking/caring for a family member/maternity leave;
- Employment in the education field – accepted a position in an out-of-state district or school;
- Employment outside of the field of education;
- Certification issue – non-standard certificate holder not re-employed because a certified teacher was hired;
- Illness/disability;
- Discharge due to unsuitability;
- Reduction in force/layoff;
- Change of assignment within the district – accepted a non-teaching position in the same district;
- No response/unable to contact;
- Dissatisfaction with school or district climate/discipline/classroom control;
- Salary;
- No response/refused interview;
- Death;
- Dissatisfaction with school or district climate/duties incompatible with educational training;
- Dissatisfaction with school or district climate/poor curriculum planning; and
- Lost credential.

The Louisiana Teacher Exit Survey and Attrition Report reports data only at the state level and does not further disaggregate it by parish or school. In addition to the reasons that teachers identify for leaving the profession, the report also provides a contextual analysis of Louisiana's data vis-à-vis national trend data along with a trend analysis of top reasons for leaving over the last five years.

The Cost of Teacher Turnover

The cost of employee turnover in any occupation is substantial. In addition to the obvious costs associated with recruitment and hiring come additional costs associated with training new employees, the loss of institutional knowledge of those being replacing, and the somewhat invisible costs associated with back office support such as in payroll offices. Business and industry have used various formulas to estimate the cost of employee attrition, and attempts have been made to apply those algorithms to the area of teacher turnover. Most studies of teacher turnover costs have been based on incomplete methodologies and estimated rather than actual data, resulting in cost estimates ranging from 20 percent to 200 percent of the leaving teacher's salary (Barnes, G., Crowe, E., & Schaefer, B., 2007, pp. 9-10). However, all acknowledge that the school districts are structured differently than are corporations, with a product and outcomes that are very different from a profit/loss ledger.

In 2006, Shockley, Guglielmino, and Watlington were among the first to use real cost data in a study conducted in two Florida school districts, estimating the cost of teacher turnover in St. Lucie County School District at \$4,631 per teacher, and in Broward County School District at \$12,652 teacher. Interestingly, St. Lucie had a high turnover rate with a relatively low cost of replacing a teacher. Broward's turnover rate was much lower, but with a higher cost of teacher replacement. The researchers speculated that this phenomenon resulted from Broward County's healthy financial investment in a teacher induction/support program, which enabled it to keep more new teachers but resulted in a higher per capita cost for those who did leave.

NCTAF'S Study on the Cost of Teacher Turnover

To date, the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) 2007 study, *The Cost of Teacher Turnover in Five School Districts: A Pilot Study* (Barnes, G., Crowe, E., & Schaefer, B., 2007) remains the most comprehensive study of costs associated with teacher turnover. The researchers used actual cost data from the five school districts participating in the pilot: Chicago Public Schools (IL), Milwaukee Public Schools (WI), Granville County Schools (NC), Jemez Valley Public Schools (NM), and Santa Rosa Public Schools (NM), representing a range of communities, large and small, urban and rural. The study was as much a test of the feasibility of collecting turnover costs as it was an attempt to calculate the actual cost. The results reflected as much variation in the cost estimates as in the school

districts themselves. The following were the resulting estimates for cost per leaver for each of the participating school districts:

- Chicago Public Schools - \$9,500.02
- Milwaukee Public Schools - \$861.48 (Information on the cost of training for teachers was not available, thus contributing to the low estimate.)
- Granville County Public Schools - \$6,233.24
- Jemez Valley Public Schools - \$5,885.82
- Santa Rosa Public Schools - The district was not able to complete the study, so no cost estimates are available.

Teacher Data Used for the NCTAF Study

The research began with the development of a clear definition of teacher turnover to be sure the school districts captured comparable data. For the study, they reported data in three categories:

- *Within-District Movers:* Teachers employed in a classroom teaching role in a school in Year 1 who were employed as classroom teachers at a *different school in the same district* in Year 2;
- *Cross-District Movers:* Teachers employed in a classroom teaching role in a school in Year 1 who were employed as classroom teachers at a *different school and a different district* in Year 2; and
- *Leavers:* Teachers employed in a classroom-teaching role in a school in Year 1 and *not employed as classroom teachers in any district* in Year 2.

The pilot school districts were asked to collect and report cost data as they related to these groups of teachers. “Some costs, such as recruitment, are only incurred when a teacher leaves the district, while other costs are incurred for both movers and leavers. For instance, school-based orientation programs for new hires are necessary for all new teachers, even if they move from one school in a district to another school in the same district. This is not true of professional development costs at the district level. Movers carry their professional development training from one school to another and such a move does not cost the district additional professional development funds, although changes in teaching assignments and other activities unique to a new school may alter the nature and content of professional development that teachers will require. The cost categories are more rigid than the reality at

the school and district level, and this presented a challenge to collecting accurate costs.” (Barnes, G., Crowe, E., & Schaefer, B., 2007, pp. 13-14)

Cost Categories Used for the NCTAF Study

The NCTAF researchers identified eight cost factors to consider when calculating the actual cost of teacher turnover. Some costs are direct expenditures (e.g., advertising, recruiting, and hiring incentives), while others are a proportional value of time spent by school or district administrators interviewing teacher candidates, doing outplacement, etc. Some costs occur at the school level, while others occur at the district level; therefore, the cost of a teacher’s departure may vary between the school and the district, with the district’s cost inclusive of the school costs. The eight cost categories are:

1. *Recruitment and Advertising*, including the cost of advertising space, the cost of travel to job fairs and interview sites, the design of advertising formats, Web site design and development costs, posting information on recruitment Web sites, responding to inquiries from prospective candidates, coordinating recruitment activities with state programs, working with teacher preparation programs to identify strong candidates, training student teachers, special costs associated with overseas recruiting, etc.
2. *Special Incentives*, including signing bonuses, payment of moving expenses, salary supplements, housing allowances, rent subsidies, relocation bonuses, day care subsidies, reduced teaching loads, testing reimbursement, etc.
3. *Administrative Processing* of new hires and costs associated with separation, including criminal background checks, health record checks, reference checks, meeting with candidates and members of search committees, completing affirmative action paperwork, corresponding with applicants, drafting letters of acceptance/rejection, setting up interview and visitation schedules, conducting interviews, purchasing equipment for digital fingerprinting, archiving teacher records, adding new teachers to payroll and benefit programs, conducting exit surveys, removing teachers from payroll and health plans, processing refunds of retirement contributions that may be due, etc.
4. *Training for New Hires*, including introducing new hires and teacher transfers to school goals and governance procedures; integrating new hires into the community of other teachers, staff, parents, and students; explaining benefit programs; conducting tours of facilities and school resources; etc.

5. *Training for First-Time Teachers*, including mentoring programs and related forms of structured induction, stipends for mentors, payments to substitutes who replace mentors with reduced teaching loads, travel to training sessions, etc.
6. *Training for All Teachers*, including instruction on the goals and specific elements of the state's testing programs, training mentor teachers, workshops and professional development activities, salaries for substitutes used to cover for teachers at training activities, tuition and fees reimbursements, travel to professional meetings, etc.
7. *Learning Curve*, including the cost to student learning at the school that results from having new teachers each year and from having a teaching staff with little experience. (It proved difficult, if not impossible, to capture this information.)
8. *Transfer*, including paperwork to change a teacher's school sites, time and effort spent matching a teacher with a new school, salaries for substitutes used to cover for teachers who transfer during the school year, etc.

“These categories were designed to help districts identify costs tied to turnover and to assist with the allocation of costs. For example, all new teachers in a school participated in orientation activities. However, only first-time teachers participated in induction activities. Therefore, training costs for first-time teachers (induction) were allocated based on the number of leavers in a district. Training costs for new hires (orientation) were allocated based on the number of turnovers in a district. A catchall category for training costs would not have allowed for this type of allocation.” (Barnes, G., Crowe, E., & Schaefer, B., 2007, pp. 69-70)

Findings Related to the Ability of Schools and School Districts to Calculate the Cost of Teacher Turnover

The NCTAF teacher turnover cost study determined that turnover costs can be identified, aggregated, and analyzed at the district and school level, but current data systems make this process difficult for schools and school divisions. The researchers determined that three databases were needed to house data:

- Teacher Database, which includes personnel information on each teacher and a teacher identifier to link with other school district databases;
- Schools Database, which holds information on each school in the study, including the numerical school identification codes for each school, which links each school to the

federal Common Core of Data (CCD) at the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), containing a wide range of information about each school.

- Costs Database, which contains the disaggregated components of turnover costs. Sorted by cost category, the database permits project researchers to derive total annual costs of turnover at the school and district level. It also enables various other calculations important to the determination of turnover costs.

To determine the cost of teacher turnover, a school district must be able to collect and connect teacher, school, and cost information. In addition to the cost information detailed above and the demographic data available on schools, certain information related to teachers was considered essential. The table below shows the teacher data the NCTAF study collected.

Teacher Data Used in the NCTAF Study on the Cost of Teacher Turnover

Field
1. Teacher ID number
2. Race/ethnicity
3. Gender
4. Teacher's age
5. Undergraduate major
6. Full-time or part-time
7. Total years' experience
8. Years' experience in current school
9. Licensure area of endorsement
10. Subject assignment
11. Grade level
12. Mentoring role, i.e., currently serves as a mentor or is being mentored
13. Own classroom
14. Highly qualified under NCLB
15. Highest earned degree
16. Student contacts per week
17. Salary/compensation
18. Licensure test scores

The NCTAF teacher turnover cost study found that in 2007, few school districts or states currently had the tools to track teacher turnover and fewer still had the tools to track or measure their turnover costs. At both the school and district levels, collecting cost data

proved to be difficult for a variety of reasons. Some of the smaller school districts had to collect the information by hand because the information was not available electronically. Even in larger school districts with more sophisticated databases, researchers found that the information was not documented in a systematic way. The larger districts found it especially difficult to determine costs as they related to the proportional value of time spent by school or district administrators in areas such as recruiting, hiring, professional development, and processing administrative work such as payroll and other personnel activities because the costs were spread across numerous different offices within the district. In many cases, each office had its own database or system created for specific purposes such as payroll, retirement, school and classroom assignments, but the databases were not connected in a way that allowed relational use of the data.

The NCTAF study also revealed that there is a cost associated with the tracking and reporting of teacher turnover and its effects. While savings may eventually occur if the constant churn of teachers is reduced, up-front investments must be made to ensure that the appropriate data are being collected and the systems that house the data are capable of relational analyses. Additionally, the collection of data alone is not likely to stem the outflow of teachers from the profession. Investments must be made concurrently in other strategic areas such as compensation, new teacher induction and mentoring, school leadership, and improved school climate in order to make teaching an attractive profession for young people to pursue and provide an environment sufficiently supportive to encourage veteran teachers to stay.

NCTAF's Teacher Turnover Cost Calculator

Following the publication of the NCTAF cost of teacher turnover report in 2007, NCTAF developed a Web-based teacher turnover cost calculator that was intended to estimate the cost of teacher turnover to a school or district. The cost calculator is available online at <http://nctaf.org/teacher-turnover-cost-calculator/>. There are two versions of the calculator. The first version is intended for the general public, who may not have ready access to teacher turnover and cost data. The second version is intended for school and district personnel, who may have specific data on teacher turnover and its costs. The steps involved in using the school and district personnel cost calculator are outlined in [Appendix G](#).

Education personnel must first determine the number of teachers leaving their school or district using one of the following methods:

- Number of teachers who left the previous year;
- Number of new hires (replacements); or
- Number of teachers in the school/district multiplied by the national average teacher leaver rate, calculated at 16.5 percent for schools and 12.5 percent for districts.

Users must then enter cost data in the overall areas of recruitment, hiring incentives, administrative processing, induction, and professional development, which are reflective of the categories used in the teacher turnover cost study. School and district personnel must derive these data from across the schools and offices within the district to obtain a total amount for each category, making an effort to account for both obvious costs (such as cost of professional development, hiring incentives, etc.) and proportional costs of time spent by personnel in areas such as recruiting, interviewing, administrative processing, etc.

In the absence of cost estimates specific to the school or school district, those entering the data may indicate whether the school or district is in an urban or non-urban environment. Mathematical assumptions for the selected environment are applied behind the interface of the cost calculator, although there is no indication how these assumptions are calculated.

Due to NCTAF staff turnover since the cost calculator’s release in 2007, it appears that little maintenance, revision, or updates have occurred in recent years, including updates to the national average teacher leaver rate or the mathematical assumptions projecting the turnover costs of urban versus non-urban areas. For example, if a school or school district chooses to use the automated assumptions, the following amounts will populate the cost calculator:

Cost Per Leaver	School		School District	
	Urban Estimate	Non-Urban Estimate	Urban Estimate	Non-Urban Estimate
Recruitment	\$500	\$400	\$1,600	\$1,600
Hiring Incentives	\$0	\$0	\$2,150	\$2,150
Administrative Processing	\$2,000	\$0	\$700	\$700
Induction	\$5,800	\$2,900	\$600	\$1,300
Professional Development	\$100	\$300	\$3,700	\$500

Several members of the Virginia stakeholder group who reviewed these figures felt that they underestimated actual costs in today’s dollars.

Status of Teacher Exit Surveys and Cost of Teacher Turnover Calculations in Virginia

The Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) conducted an online survey of the human resources directors in Virginia's school divisions to determine whether they currently administer exit surveys to teachers who are leaving their employ and whether they attempt to calculate the cost of teacher turnover for their divisions. The survey was open for 24 days from July 24 through August 17, 2015. The VDOE received responses from 92 of Virginia's 132 school divisions (70 percent).

Teacher Surveys in Virginia's School Divisions

Forty-nine school divisions (53 percent of respondents) stated that they currently administer exit surveys to teachers, while 43 (47 percent of respondents) indicated that they do not. Several indicated they were considering starting the practice or reinstating surveys they had administered in the past.

Thirteen school divisions shared their surveys with the VDOE, revealing survey instruments that varied widely in both length and format. The shortest was one page with four questions; the longest was nine pages with 24 questions. All files were available electronically, although it was not always clear if teachers were asked to respond electronically or in print copy. Some school divisions conducted their surveys using electronic survey tools such as Survey Monkey. Most, but not all, of the sample surveys offered the respondents the opportunity to withhold their names. At least one asked the respondent to sign the survey, granting permission for it to be filed in the departing employee's personnel file.

School divisions were not asked if or how they used the information gathered from the exit surveys; however, several human resources directors did express concerns about being able to collect honest and accurate exit data from all teachers leaving their employ. They also expressed concern about whether their school divisions had the capacity to analyze the data and whether the school divisions alone would be able to address some of the reasons teachers leave, for example, the demographics in high-poverty and high-minority schools were not expected to change, and school divisions likely already were paying teachers as much as their budgets would allow.

Efforts of Virginia School Divisions to Calculate the Cost of Teacher Turnover

The survey revealed that only six (7 percent of respondents) of Virginia's school divisions attempt to calculate the cost of teacher turnover, while 85 divisions (93 percent of respondents) do not. One school division skipped this question.

In addition to the survey, contact was made with the finance or human resources directors in seven school divisions to determine their capacity for isolating salary, operations, and other costs associated with teacher turnover that were outlined in the NCTAF study on teacher turnover costs. Most indicated that while they accounted for these expenditures overall, their school divisions did not currently capture complete data in a way that would allow them to easily disaggregate the cost data to be used as the basis for calculating teacher turnover costs. They indicated that if such a calculation were to become a state requirement, time, funding, and additional guidance would need to be provided to establish uniformity across the state.

In general, some divisions stated that they felt being able to conduct a teacher turnover cost analysis would be beneficial in terms of budgeting and making decisions about their teacher recruitment and retention processes. They were not so much interested in an exact cost per teacher as much as having a cost approximation to tell "the story" to the public and decision makers about what it takes to bring a new teacher on board and "get her up to speed," only to lose her to another school division or see her leave the profession altogether within a matter of a few years. They also thought having specific information would encourage decision makers to support teachers with stronger mentoring and induction programs and higher salaries and to justify other incentives such as signing bonuses and strategic compensation programs.

Other human resources and finance directors felt that the time and money required to make these calculations would not be justified. According to such personnel, while the cost of teacher turnover is felt in dollars, it also is felt in classroom instruction and teacher interactions with students. Just knowing how much teacher turnover costs does not address the problem. They felt that adequate research already exists to highlight the reasons why teachers leave the classroom. Unless policy and decision makers actually intended to allocate the funding required to address the issues that have already been outlined in research, such as low salaries, concerns about school leadership and student discipline, lack of autonomy in the classroom, etc., school divisions felt there was little reason to put the time, effort, and expense into pulling together the information required to calculate the cost of teacher turnover.

Recommendation on the Feasibility of Implementing a Teacher Turnover Tracking Program in the Commonwealth of Virginia

The 2015 General Assembly requested a study on the feasibility of implementing in the Commonwealth a program to track teacher turnover by developing exit questionnaires and other means. This study and a companion 2015 study requested by the Virginia General Assembly, *The Shortage of Qualified Teachers in the Commonwealth of Virginia and Recommended Strategies for Addressing These Shortages*, found that teacher turnover is of concern to Virginia school divisions, especially in critical shortage areas, and they, along with teacher preparation programs at Virginia's institutions of higher education, the Virginia Department of Education, and the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, have implemented a number of strategies and initiatives to attract and retain teachers.

The legislative resolution requested recommendations regarding:

- (i) An exit questionnaire for teachers separating from service or choosing early retirement that includes reasons for leaving as a function of school climate, comparative salaries of neighboring school divisions, job demands as a reflection of teacher time, nonteaching duties, student behavior, classroom management, autonomy in the classroom, opportunities for growth and improvement, and health and family considerations in conjunction with
- (ii) Use of the NCTAF Teacher Turnover Cost Calculator and its associated background information to estimate the dollars spent on teacher turnover for a specific school or school division in the Commonwealth or enable school leaders to design and conduct their own detailed teacher turnover cost analyses.

Based on reviewed practices from other states, information provided by Virginia's school divisions, and input from the stakeholder group, the group offers the following recommendations:

Exit Questionnaires

- Consider Virginia's participation in a working conditions survey that includes questions that may help inform schools and divisions about a "predicted teacher retention rate." The cost for a valid and reliable survey would need to be determined through Virginia's procurement process. One example of a working conditions survey is the TELL Survey; the New Teacher Center indicates that the cost to administer a statewide TELL Survey is approximately \$150,000 during the year of administration.

Rationale: A survey provides a broad view of working conditions within schools and school divisions, not focusing only on teachers who leave, but also providing data on a number of topics related to conditions in schools that, if addressed, might encourage more teachers to remain in the profession.

- Consider developing a model exit questionnaire that Virginia schools and school divisions may administer to their exiting teachers in multiple formats, including at a minimum, on paper and online.
 - The development of a model questionnaire or survey should be developed with consideration given to best practices within the human resources field as well as stakeholder input from Virginia's school divisions.
 - Use of the survey instrument by school divisions should be optional or they should have a phase-in period if use is required by the state.
 - School divisions also should be able to determine the manner in which the survey is administered to their teachers (i.e., paper, online, interview, etc.)
 - Consideration should be given to fund a project to work with stakeholders on the development of an exit survey instrument that is valid and reliable in the context of the intended purpose.

Rationale: Over half of Virginia school divisions that responded to the VDOE survey indicated they already administer exit surveys or conduct exit interviews with departing employees; however, there is great variation in the survey/interview instruments.

Teacher Turnover Cost Calculator

If being able to determine the cost of teacher turnover is deemed critical to reduce the teacher attrition rate in Virginia:

- Consider development of an online teacher turnover cost calculator specific to Virginia's needs; and

Rationale: The NCTAF Web-based Teacher Turnover Cost Calculator, mentioned in the legislative resolution, was developed in 2007, and the underlying assumptions have not been reviewed or updated since that time. If the cost of teacher turnover is viewed as a key component in reducing teacher attrition, consideration should be given to issuing a Request for Proposals to determine the proposed cost of developing such a tool unique to Virginia's needs. However, there likely would be an additional cost to update on a

regular basis the underlying assumptions in a cost calculator, and the use of a cost calculator still would require school divisions to disaggregate cost data for entry into the cost calculator. Recommendations noted below cite concerns by many school divisions about the time and effort required to collect and report such data.

- Consider funding a study of the cost of teacher turnover in a representative sample of Virginia school divisions to establish an average cost of teacher turnover in Virginia.

Rationale: School division staff expressed concern about their capacity to isolate and disaggregate the cost data required to use a teacher turnover cost calculator and indicated that time, funding, and additional guidance would need to be provided to establish uniformity across the state. A study of the cost of teacher turnover in a representative sample of Virginia school divisions may establish a baseline metric to provide data to legislators, the public, and other stakeholders for future information and planning without the need to collect such data from all school divisions.

A Program to Track Teacher Turnover in the Commonwealth of Virginia

- Consider providing funding to add several fields to the teacher workforce database administered by the Virginia Department of Education to enable calculation of a state-level teacher turnover rate and to determine why instructional personnel leave.
 - The VDOE already collects teacher workforce information at the state level, including each teacher’s name, school, license type, teaching assignments, endorsement areas, federal highly qualified status, and route to endorsement, which includes the higher education institution where the teacher completed his or her teacher preparation if he or she followed a “traditional” route to licensure as opposed to an alternate route.
 - Additional data of interest might include the teacher’s age, teaching experience in the school and school division, the number of instructional personnel who separate from a school or school division each year, and their reasons for leaving.

Rationale: Research suggests that these additional data points may be useful in conducting analysis of trends in Virginia’s teaching workforce. Additionally, Virginia’s *Plan to Ensure Excellent Educators for All Students* (Virginia Department of Education, 2015), submitted to the United States Department of Education in June 2015, indicates that several of these data points are under consideration for inclusion in future data collections. However, school divisions expressed concerns about the time and effort necessary to respond to an already lengthy list of state reporting requirements.

- Use of an exit survey should remain optional.
 - An exit survey likely would contain more information than just why an employee left. It has the potential to provide information to a school or school division to help address broader issues.
 - Actions to address school- or division-level issues are best developed at the local level.

Rationale: The need for teachers in specific content areas as well as the teacher turnover rate vary across school divisions, and each division benefits from adopting strategies that best suit its needs and capabilities. School divisions expressed concern about having the ability to track down responses from all separating personnel if a statewide requirement to administer exit surveys and report data collected was implemented .

References

- Barnes, G., Crowe, E., & Schaefer, B. (2007). *The Cost of Teacher Turnover in Five School Districts: A Pilot Study*. Retrieved June 29, 2015, from <http://nctaf.org/wp-content/uploads/CTTFullReportfinal.pdf>
- Brown, E. (2015, April 30). *Study: Far fewer new teachers are leaving the profession than previously thought*. Retrieved July 9, 2015, from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/news/local/wp/2015/04/30/study-new-teacher-attrition-is-lower-than-previously-thought/>
- Daniel, C. (2013, October 9). *Why Do Teachers Quit?: How Exit Interviews and Exit Surveys Can Help Retain Good Teachers*. Retrieved July 1, 2015, from www.k12hrsolutions.com/2013/10/09/why-do-teachers-quit-how-exit-interviews-and-surveys-can-help-retain-good-teachers/
- Delaware Department of Education. (2015, June 1). *Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators for All Students 2015-2025*. Retrieved July 10, 2015, from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/titleparta/equitable/deequityplan060115.pdf>
- Education Commission of the States. (n.d.). *50-State Analysis From the ECS State Policy Database-Teacher Attitudes*. Retrieved July 7, 2015, from <http://b5.caspio.com/dp.asp?AppKey=b7f93000695b3d0d5abb4b68bd14&id=a0y70000000CbtbAAC>
- Giacalone, R. A., Knouse, S. G., & Montagliani, A. (1997, July). Motivation for and Prevention of Honest Responding in Exit Interviews and Surveys. *The Journal of Psychology*, 131(4), 438-448.
- Hanna, R. & Pennington, K. (2015, January 8). *Despite Reports to the Contrary, New Teachers Are Staying in Their Jobs Longer*. Retrieved July 1, 2015, from <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/news/2015/01/08/103421/despite-reports-to-the-contrary-new-teachers-are-staying-in-their-jobs-longer/>
- Haynes, M. (2014, July). *On the Path to Equity: Improving the Effectiveness of Beginning Teachers*. Retrieved June 29, 2015, from <http://all4ed.org/reports-factsheets/path-to-equity/>

- Hirsch, E., Sioberg, A., & Dougherty, P. (2011). *TELL Kentucky: Creating Supportive School Conditions for Enhancing Teacher Effectiveness*. Retrieved July 1, 2015, from http://2011.tellkentucky.org/sites/default/files/attachments/KY11_Final_Report.pdf
- Ingersoll, R. (2003). *Is There Really a Teacher Shortage?* Retrieved July 21 2015, from http://repository.upenn.edu/gse_pubs/133/
- Ingersoll, R., Merrill, L., & Stuckey, D. (Updated 2014, April). *Seven Trends: The Transformation of the Teaching Force*. Retrieved July 2, 2015, from <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/1115249-cpre-seven-trends-the-transformation-of-the.html>
- Louisiana Board of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2013-2014). *2013-2014 Teacher Exit Survey and Attrition Report*. Retrieved July 10, 2015, from <http://www.boarddocs.com/la/bese/Board.nsf/Public>
- Maddock, A. & Shephard, D. (2015, Spring). *TELL Policy Update*. Santa Cruz, CA: New Teacher Center.
- National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (n.d.). *Teacher Turnover Cost Calculator*. Retrieved June 29, 2015, from <http://nctaf.org/teacher-turnover-cost-calculator/>
- National Union of Teachers (United Kingdom). (2014, October 11). *Exit Interviews*. Retrieved July 6, 2015, from www.local.teachers.org.uk/templates/asset-relay.cfm?frmAssetFileID=6476
- New Teacher Center. (2013, September 25). *Cross-State Analyses of Results of 2012-13 Teaching Empowering Leading and Learning (TELL) Survey Research Report*. Retrieved July 7, 2015, from <http://www.newteachercenter.org/products-and-resources/teaching-and-learning-conditions-reports/cross-state-analyses-results-2012-13>
- New Teacher Center. (2015, July 7). *Teaching, Empowering, Leading and Learning (TELL) Survey*. Retrieved July 7, 2015, from <http://www.newteachercenter.org/teaching-empowering-leading-and-learning-tell-survey>
- New Teacher Center. (2015, July 7). *Using Survey Results to Inform Policy and Practice*. Retrieved July 7, 2015, from <http://www.newteachercenter.org/teaching-learning-conditions-survey/using-survey-results-inform-policy-and-practice>

- North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (n.d.). *Teachers Leaving the Profession Data*. Retrieved June 29, 2015, from www.ncpublicschools.org/educatoreffectiveness/surveys/leaving/
- Perda, D. (2013). *Transitions Into and Out of Teaching: A Longitudinal Analysis of Early Career Teacher Turnover*. Philadelphia: Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Public Schools of North Carolina State Board of Education and Department of Public Instruction. (2014, November). *2013-2014 Annual Report on Teachers Leaving the Profession G.S. 115C-12 (22)*. Retrieved June 29, 2015, from www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/educatoreffectiveness/surveys/leaving/2013-14turnoverreport.pdf
- Shockley, R., Guglielmino, P., & Watlington, E. (2006). *A National Crisis in Teacher Education: What Are the Costs?* Retrieved June 29, 2015, from <http://hub.mspnet.org/exit.cfm?url=http%3A%2F%2Fassets%2Epearsonglobalschools%2Ecom%2Fasset%5Fmgr%2Flegacy%2F200727%2F2006%5F11ShockleyGuglielminoWatlington%5F558%5F1%2Epdf>
- Virginia Department of Education. (2015, June). *Virginia's Plan to Ensure Excellent Educators for All Students*. Retrieved July 6, 2015, from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/titleiparta/equitable/va.html>
- Williams, D., Harris, C., & Parker, J. (2008). I Love You - Goodbye: Exit Interviews and Turnover in the New Zealand Hotel Industry. *New Zealand Journal of Employment Relations*, 33(3), 70-90.

Appendix A**Senate Joint Resolution No. 218**

Requesting the Department of Education to study the feasibility of implementing a program in the Commonwealth to track teacher turnover by developing exit questionnaires and other means.

Agreed to by the Senate, February 25, 2015

Agreed to by the House of Delegates, February 24, 2015

WHEREAS, America's schools are struggling with a growing teacher dropout problem that is draining resources, diminishing teaching quality, and undermining our ability to close the student academic achievement gap; and

WHEREAS, high teacher turnover adversely affects public education in the Commonwealth while accountability for costs and reasons for teacher turnover go unreported to taxpayers and members of the General Assembly; and

WHEREAS, the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) estimates that the annual cost of public school teacher turnover could be over \$7.3 billion nationwide; and

WHEREAS, this new estimate is significantly higher than the most recent estimate of \$4.9 billion in annual costs presented in a report by the Alliance for Excellent Education in 2005 and takes into account recent increases in the size of the teacher workforce and the rate of teacher turnover; and

WHEREAS, the NCTAF estimate, which is based on the cost generated by teachers who leave their school or district during a given year, does not include (i) the district's cost for teachers who move from school to school within a district in search of a better position or (ii) any federal or state investments that are lost when a teacher leaves the profession. Accordingly, if all of these costs were taken into account, the true cost to the nation would be far in excess of \$7 billion; and

WHEREAS, the attrition rate among public school teachers has grown by 50 percent over the past 15 years. Nationally, the annual teacher turnover rate has risen to 16.8 percent, while in urban schools the annual teacher turnover rate is over 20 percent, and in some schools and districts the teacher dropout rate is actually higher than the student dropout rate; and

WHEREAS, in 1994, former U.S. Secretary of Education Richard W. Riley warned the nation that we would need to hire two million teachers within 10 years to offset the

retirement of teachers of the “Baby Boom” generation. Over the next decade, we exceeded that goal by hiring approximately 2.25 million teachers, but during that same decade 2.7 million teachers withdrew from public education, over 2.1 million of whom left the profession before their expected age of retirement; and

WHEREAS, the Commonwealth has reported the retirement of record numbers of teachers, including individuals who choose to retire before reaching full retirement age; and

WHEREAS, on average, teachers today do not remain in the profession as long as previous generations of teachers did, and the attrition rate among new teachers has increased by more than 40 percent during the past 16 years; and

WHEREAS, because our school divisions have historically relied on a steady supply of new teachers, virtually no school division in the country has systems in place to track or control the teacher turnover rate; in the absence of systems of measurement, our school divisions have no way of knowing how much money they are losing, the caliber of teachers they are losing, or which schools are suffering the most adverse consequences of turnover; and

WHEREAS, because the odds of young teachers departing the profession are 184 percent higher than those of middle-aged teachers, the customary practice of continually hiring new teachers does not provide a reliable solution to the staffing challenges confronting our school divisions and undermines our efforts to improve teaching effectiveness; as the attrition rate of new teachers steadily increases, the country continues to pursue recruitment practices that place underprepared, inexperienced individuals alone in the classroom and often in the most challenging schools and classrooms; and

WHEREAS, it is worth noting that the increase in teacher turnover in the mid-1990s came at the same time that school divisions throughout the country increased efforts to expand the pool of potential teachers via alternative pathways into the profession, and, ironically, although the influx of more new teachers increased the speed of the revolving door into the teaching profession, the new teachers did not stabilize the teaching workforce and teaching quality in high-need schools did not measurably improve; and

WHEREAS, our leaders in public education are in need of clear, current, and accurate data on teacher turnover and its costs in formats that make it possible to analyze, manage, and control those costs as a first step toward reducing the turnover rate among our teachers and in order to make sound investments in teaching quality; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED by the Senate, the House of Delegates concurring, That the Department of Education be requested to study the feasibility of implementing a program in the Commonwealth to track teacher turnover by developing exit questionnaires and other means.

In conducting its study, the Department of Education shall consider and make recommendations regarding (i) an exit questionnaire for teachers separating from service or choosing early retirement that includes reasons for leaving as a function of school climate, comparative salaries of neighboring school divisions, job demands as a reflection of teacher time, nonteaching duties, student behavior, classroom management, autonomy in the classroom, opportunities for growth and improvement, and health and family considerations in conjunction with (ii) use of the NCTAF Teacher Turnover Cost Calculator and its associated background information to estimate the dollars spent on teacher turnover for a specific school or school division in the Commonwealth or enable school leaders to design and conduct their own detailed teacher turnover cost analyses.

All agencies of the Commonwealth shall provide assistance to the Department for this study, upon request.

The Department shall complete its meetings by November 30, 2015, and shall submit to the Governor and the General Assembly an executive summary and a report of its findings and recommendations for publication as a House or Senate document. The executive summary and report shall be submitted as provided in the procedures of the Division of Legislative Automated Systems for the processing of legislative documents and reports no later than the first day of the 2016 Regular Session of the General Assembly and shall be posted on the General Assembly's website.

Appendix B

Delaware Education Employee Exit Survey

Available online at <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/titleiparta/equitable/deequityplan060115.pdf>, p. 491, Appendix N.

This survey is designed to capture your experiences in the school you recently exited and the factors that impacted your transition out of your previous location. Please answer the survey in its entirety as your answers will help us to improve teaching and learning conditions in our schools. No identifying information will be published or released. Thanks for your participation.

Section I. Background and Demographic Information

1. Gender
 - Male
 - Female
2. Race/Ethnicity: select all that apply
 - White/Caucasian
 - Hispanic/Latino(a)
 - African American
 - Native American
 - Asian
 - Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
3. What is your age?

<input type="checkbox"/> 20-25	<input type="checkbox"/> 31-40	<input type="checkbox"/> 51-60
<input type="checkbox"/> 26-30	<input type="checkbox"/> 41-50	<input type="checkbox"/> Over 60
4. What is your highest degree attained?
 - Associates' or 2-year college degree
 - Bachelors' or 4-year college degree
 - Masters' degree
 - Doctoral degree
 - Other (explain)

For the next selection of questions your "exited" school or position is the one you are leaving or most recently left. If you have worked at more than one school in the past year, please answer the questions for the school you were employed with the longest.

5. What school are you currently exiting?
6. How many total years have you been employed as an educator?

<input type="checkbox"/> First year	<input type="checkbox"/> 4-6 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 11-20 years
<input type="checkbox"/> 2-3 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 7-10 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 20 or more years
7. How many total years had you been employed in the school you exited?
 - First year
 - 2-3 years
 - 4-6 years
 - 7-10 years
 - 11-20 years
 - 20 or more years

8. How would you best describe the position you exited?
- Full time
 - Part time
 - Itinerant
9. How would you best describe your role at the school you exited?
- Teacher (including instructional coaches, department heads, vocational, literacy specialist, etc.)
 - Principal
 - Assistant Principal
 - Other Education Professional (school counselor, psychologist, social worker, etc.)
10. At what grade level(s) did you teach in school you are exiting?: select all that apply (TEACHERS ONLY)
- | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Kindergarten | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade 11 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade 7 | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade 12 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade 8 | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (explain) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade 9 | |
11. What subject(s) did you teach in the school you are exiting?: select all that apply (TEACHERS ONLY)
- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agrisciences | <input type="checkbox"/> Science |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Business, Finance and Marketing | <input type="checkbox"/> Skilled and Technical Sciences |
| <input type="checkbox"/> English as a Second Language | <input type="checkbox"/> Social Studies |
| <input type="checkbox"/> English Language Arts | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology Education |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family and Consumer Sciences | <input type="checkbox"/> Visual and Performing Arts |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Health and/or Physical Education | <input type="checkbox"/> World Languages |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mathematics | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (explain) |

Section II. Thoughts on Previous School Year (Example shown for Teachers)

1. Please think back to the most recent school year spent at the institution you exited. Rate each of the following on how much you agree or disagree with the statement (select

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
a) Teacher compensation is appropriate for their level of responsibility and education.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) The school environment is clean and well-maintained.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) School administrators support teachers' efforts to maintain discipline in the classroom.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) The school maintains clear, two-way communication with the community.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Community members support teachers, contributing to their success with their students.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Class sizes are reasonable such that teachers have the time available to meet the needs of all students.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Procedures for teacher evaluation are consistent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Teachers have sufficient access to appropriate instructional materials (textbooks, content references, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Teachers are trusted to make sound professional decisions about instruction.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Teachers have an appropriate level of influence on decision making in the school.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k) Teachers have autonomy to make decisions about instructional delivery (e.g. pacing, materials and pedagogy).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l) Teachers have access to reliable communication technology, including computers, printers, software and internet access.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m) Teachers have time available to collaborate with colleagues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
n) Teachers are recognized as educational experts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
o) Teachers have sufficient access to a broad range of professional support personnel.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
p) An appropriate amount of time is provided for professional development.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
q) Professional development is differentiated to meet the needs of individual teachers.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
r) Professional development enhances teachers' abilities to improve student learning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please use the space below to elaborate on any responses.

2. Please think back to the most recent school year spent at the institution you are exiting, especially your relationship with your school leader. Rate each of the following statements on how much you agree or disagree with their characterization of your supervisor's performance.

My school leader is effective at _____	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
a) Creating an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect in the school.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Communicating the respect and value of teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Consistently supporting teachers.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Developing broad agreement among the teaching staff about the school or department's mission	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Holding teachers to high professional standards for delivering instruction.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Assessing teacher performance objectively.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Providing teachers with feedback that can help them improve teaching.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Using data to improve student learning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Encouraging dissenting opinions and constructive criticism	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Working with staff to develop and attain curriculum standards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k) Utilizing shared leadership	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please use the space below to elaborate on any responses.

Section III. Future Employment Plans (Teachers only)

1. Do you feel that your decision to leave your position was...
 - Voluntary
 - Involuntary (RIF, firing)
 - Other (please explain) _____
2. What are your new employment plans after leaving this position?
 - Teaching (K-12) elsewhere in the same district
 - Teaching (K-12) in a different public or charter school elsewhere in Delaware
 - Teaching (K-12) in a private school elsewhere in Delaware
 - Teaching (K-12) out of the state
 - ◊ Where? _____
 - Teaching in pre-kindergarten or post-secondary level
 - Working non-teaching occupation in the field of education (e.g. administration, district or central office or Department of Education)
 - Returning to school for advancement *within* the field of education
 - Returning to school for advancement *outside* the field of education
 - Career change
 - Caring for family members
 - Military service
 - Retiring
 - Unemployed and seeking work
 - Other (please explain): _____
3. Please take some time to think about your decision to exit your school, and the different factors you considered. Please rate each of the following items below on how important it was to your decision to leave your school.

	Not at all important	Slightly important	Important	Very important	Not Applicable
a) Legal or ethical conflict	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Salary or benefits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Access to better/more affordable housing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Commute was too far	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Wanted to teach in different community	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Dissatisfied with support received from the community	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Dissatisfied with support from colleagues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Dissatisfied with support from school administrator	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Dissatisfied with job description or responsibilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

j) Dissatisfied with <i>changes</i> in job description or responsibilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k) Dissatisfied with the education own children were receiving	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l) Did not feel prepared to implement new reform measures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m) Did not agree with new reform measures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
n) Inadequate mentoring	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
o) Lack of recognition	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
p) New position better aligned with interests/abilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
q) School policies and procedures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
r) Student behavioral or discipline problems	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
s) Too high of workload	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
t) Administration's willingness to make corrections or changes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
u) Personal or family health considerations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
v) Pension or retirement considerations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please elaborate on any very low or very high responses.

4. Please rate any of the following on how likely they would have been to persuading you to remain at the school you are exiting.

	Definitely Not	Probably Not	Probably	Definitely
a) Better salary or benefits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) More school support from the community	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) More support from colleagues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) More support from school administrator	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Better preparation to implement new reform measures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Different or no new reform measures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) More effective mentoring	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) New forms of recognition	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

i) More flexibility to align with interests/abilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Better/different school policies and procedures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k) Fewer student behavioral or discipline problems	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l) Smaller workload	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m) More willingness from the administration to make corrections or changes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please discuss any other factors that could have persuaded you to remain at the school you have exited below:

Thank you for your participation in this Exit Survey. Your responses are helping to improve teaching and learning conditions in Delaware schools. No identifying information will be published or released. If you would like to discuss your responses further, please provide your contact information below.

Name: _____

Email: _____

Phone: _____

Appendix C

New Hampshire Department of Education Sample Questions for Exit Interviews



Attract, Hire & Support Quality Educators for Student Achievement

A Guide for Improving Recruitment and Retention

Available on the New Hampshire Department of Education's Web site at
http://www.nheon.org/prof_dev/RetainRecruit/Sample%20Exit%20Questions.doc.

Some Sample Questions to be used in Exit Interviews

Did you get an accurate sense of the school and what it would be like to work here before you took the job?

What factors contributed to your decision not to continue teaching at this school?

Would anything have kept you at this school longer?

What were you (will you be) looking for in a new school/district?

Did you consider changing to another job other than teaching?

At what point in the year did you decide to pursue a job at another school/district?

How would you compare this year to last year?

Was the interaction with other teachers at this school helpful to you as a teacher?

What support did you get at this job that helped you?

What support do you wish you had gotten that would have helped you in this teaching position?¹

What was most satisfying about your job?

What was least satisfying about your job?

Did anything trigger your decision to leave?

Did you feel prepared to do your job effectively?

What should we do differently to help the person who takes your place?

What would you improve to make this a better place to teach?

How satisfied were you with your pay, benefits and other incentives?

Did any school or district policies or procedures make your job more difficult?

Would you recommend working at this school or district to your family and friends?

¹ Adapted from Johnson, Susan Moore & The Project on the Next Generation of Teachers. (2004). *Finders and Keepers: Helping New Teachers Survive and Thrive in Our Schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Appendix D

Ohio Teacher Exit Survey (TEx S)

Available online at http://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Equity/Teacher-Exit-Survey/Teacher_exit_survey_finalmay_2011.pdf.aspx.

By responding to this survey, you will help our district better understand teacher mobility and attrition. Thank you for your participation!

1. Will you be returning to the same position you held during the past school year?
 (Note: If you have been transferred within or outside of your home district, please select "No" for this question.) Yes No

Please tell us a little about yourself and your teaching experience.

2. What is your gender? Female Male

3. How old are you?
 21 or under 26-30 36-40 46-50 56-60
 22-25 31-35 41-45 51-55 61+

4. What is your ethnicity
 American Indian or Alaskan Native Black or African-American, non-Hispanic White or Caucasian, non-Hispanic
 Asian or Pacific Islander Hispanic Other _____

5. Please select the highest degree you have been awarded.
 High School diploma or GED Master's PhD
 BA/BS Specialist None

6. Did you receive most (four years or more) of your college-level education training in Ohio?
 Yes No

7. Including this year, how many years of teaching experience do you have?
 0-3 years 7-10 years 16-20 years 26-30 years
 4-6 years 11-15 years 21-25 years 31+ years

8. If you have a preferred email address that you would like to share, please provide it here. _____

In this section, we are asking a series of questions to better understand your decision to leave this position. If you have been transferred or are simply moving to a new school, we also are interested in hearing your experiences.

9. When did you start the position you are now leaving? (month/day/year) _____

10. When will you officially leave the position? (month/day/year) _____

11. How would you classify the position you are leaving? (If you have more than one position, please describe your primary position. In subsequent questions, please refer to that primary position for your answers.)
 Regular Education Student Teacher Long-term Sub Administrator
 Special Education Educational Aide Short-term Sub Other
 Resource Room Teacher Itinerant Teacher (teach in more than one school)

12. How many years did you teach in the school you are leaving?

0-3 years 7-10 years 16-20 years 26-30 years
 4-6 years 11-15 years 21-25 years 31+ years

13. What grade band below best captures the position you are leaving?

Elementary (K-5) High School (9-12) Other _____
 Middle (6-8) Multiple Grades/Levels

14. Considering the position you are leaving, what best represents the subject area(s) for your primary teaching assignment?

<input type="checkbox"/> Art/Drama/Dance	<input type="checkbox"/> English as a Second Language	<input type="checkbox"/> History	<input type="checkbox"/> Science
<input type="checkbox"/> Business Education	<input type="checkbox"/> Foreign Language	<input type="checkbox"/> Mathematics	<input type="checkbox"/> Special Education
<input type="checkbox"/> Computer Technology	<input type="checkbox"/> Health	<input type="checkbox"/> Music	<input type="checkbox"/> Speech
<input type="checkbox"/> English Language Arts	<input type="checkbox"/> Physical Education	<input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	

15. How was your position classified?

Full-time Part-time

16. For how many years did you anticipate staying when you first started in this position?

0-3 years 7-10 years 16+ years
 4-6 years 11-15 years

17. Are you leaving this position because of a transfer or because you chose to leave?

Transfer Own choice

18. For how long did you consider leaving this position? (If you were transferred, please indicate how much notice you were given.)

Less than one month 4-6 months One year or more
 1-3 months 6-12 months

Using the categories below, please indicate whether each item was a major, moderate or minor factor in your decision to leave this position.

19. Career change (higher pay, return to school) Major Moderate Minor Not a reason for leaving

20. If you indicated that a career change was a major reason for leaving, which of the following best explains the reason for your career change?

Return to school to improve career WITHIN education field To secure a job with higher salary
 Return to school to improve career OUTSIDE education Other _____

21. Commute is too far Major Moderate Minor Not a reason for leaving

22. Competitive salary elsewhere OUTSIDE the field of education Major Moderate Minor Not a reason for leaving

23. Competitive salary elsewhere WITHIN the field of education Major Moderate Minor Not a reason for leaving

24. Dissatisfied with reassignment or changes in position Major Moderate Minor Not a reason for leaving

25. Did not support reform measures Major Moderate Minor Not a reason for leaving

Using the categories below, please indicate whether each item was a major, moderate or minor factor in your decision to leave this position.

26. End of contract/temporary assignment Major Moderate Minor Not a reason for leaving

27. Lack of advancement in the teaching profession Major Moderate Minor Not a reason for leaving

28. Inadequate mentoring Major Moderate Minor Not a reason for leaving

29. Inadequate support Major Moderate Minor Not a reason for leaving

30. Lack of supportive working environment Major Moderate Minor Not a reason for leaving

31. Inadequate training to support current position Major Moderate Minor Not a reason for leaving

32. Recruited for another position Major Moderate Minor Not a reason for leaving

33. Reduction in force (RIF) Major Moderate Minor Not a reason for leaving

34. Unclear opportunities for advancement Major Moderate Minor Not a reason for leaving

35. Career Break Major Moderate Minor Not a reason for leaving

36. Which of the following best captures the main reason for your career break?
 Sabbatical Personal health Remain at home to care for family Other _____

37. Culture of school Major Moderate Minor Not a reason for leaving

38. Did you feel prepared to teach in a multicultural setting? Yes No I did not teach in a multicultural setting

39. Do you feel you received the requisite training and skills needed to successfully manage the classroom(s) you are now leaving?
 Yes No

40. What would have better prepared you to work in the school you are now leaving?

Using the categories below, please indicate whether each item was a major, moderate or minor factor in your decision to leave this position.

41. Administrative leadership Major Moderate Minor Not a reason for leaving

42. Lack of autonomy Major Moderate Minor Not a reason for leaving

43. Lack of support from supervisor Major Moderate Minor Not a reason for leaving

Using the categories below, please indicate whether each item was a major, moderate or minor factor in your decision to leave this position.

44. Administrator's actions did not support teaching staff Major Moderate Minor Not a reason for leaving
45. Poor relationship with supervisor Major Moderate Minor Not a reason for leaving
46. Supervisor incompetence Major Moderate Minor Not a reason for leaving
47. Lack of shared leadership Major Moderate Minor Not a reason for leaving
48. Unethical treatment Major Moderate Minor Not a reason for leaving
49. Relocation Major Moderate Minor Not a reason for leaving

50. Which of the following best describes where you are relocating?

- Within Ohio Outside Ohio

51. Was there any other major reason for leaving?

- Yes No

52. Please describe major reason for leaving.

The following questions will help us understand your future career plans in the context of your decision to leave.

53. From the list below, please select up to two factors that might have encouraged you to remain in your position. If none exists, select none of the above.

- | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pay increase | <input type="checkbox"/> More time to plan or prepare | <input type="checkbox"/> Better facilities | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Different administrator | <input type="checkbox"/> Opportunities for collaboration with colleagues | <input type="checkbox"/> Opportunities for advancement | <input type="checkbox"/> None of the above |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Smaller classes | | | |

54. What are your plans for next year?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Teach in a different school | |
| <input type="radio"/> Accept another position WITHIN education | <input type="radio"/> Stay at home to take care of family |
| <input type="radio"/> Accept another position OUTSIDE of education | <input type="radio"/> Retire |
| <input type="radio"/> Return to school to improve career WITHIN education | <input type="radio"/> Unemployed and seeking employment |
| <input type="radio"/> Return to school to improve career OUTSIDE education | <input type="radio"/> Other _____ |

55. Is your new position a promotion?

- Yes No Other

56. Are you moving to a new district?

- Yes No Other

57. What category best captures the type of district you will be working in next year?

Rural - high-poverty, low median income Major urban - very high poverty
 Rural - low-poverty, low-moderate median income Urban/suburban, high median income
 Rural/small town - moderate to high income Urban/suburban, very high median income, very low poverty
 Urban - high-poverty, low median income Other _____

58. Will you be teaching a different subject than you did in the position you are now leaving?

Yes, I will be teaching a different subject area. My next position is administrative and not instructional.
 No, I will be teaching the same subject area. Other _____

59. What is the primary subject of your new teaching position?

<input type="checkbox"/> Art/Drama/Dance	<input type="checkbox"/> English as a Second Language	<input type="checkbox"/> History	<input type="checkbox"/> Science
<input type="checkbox"/> Business Education	<input type="checkbox"/> Foreign Language	<input type="checkbox"/> Mathematics	<input type="checkbox"/> Special Education
<input type="checkbox"/> Computer Technology	<input type="checkbox"/> Health	<input type="checkbox"/> Music	<input type="checkbox"/> Speech
<input type="checkbox"/> English Language Arts		<input type="checkbox"/> Physical Education	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

60. Is there anything else you would like to share regarding your decision to leave?

Print Form

Appendix E

New Teacher Center Teaching and Learning Conditions Survey States and School Districts 2008-2014

Statewide Surveys are in **Bold Font**.

Survey Year	State	Total School-Based Licensed Educators Surveyed	Number of Respondents	Response Rate	Schools with Sufficient Response Provided Data
2015	Hillsborough County Public Schools (Tampa)	To be determined summer 2015 when all surveys are complete and data has been cleaned			
2015	Colorado				
2015	Kentucky				
2015	Maryland *†				
2015	Indiana (TIF Participants)				
2015	Pittsburgh, PA				
2014	Fairfax County, VA*†	16,723	13,752	82.23%	196
2014	Massachusetts	79,381	38,217	48.14%	971
2014	New Mexico	32,736	3,952	12.07%	52
2014	Hillsborough County Public Schools (Tampa)	15,021	12,019	80.01%	208
2014	Metro Nash Public Schools	6,204	4,912	79.17%	151
2014	Alexandria, VA	1,428	1,010	70.73%	23
2014	Oregon	32,609	19,373	59.41%	784
2014	Ohio (Cincinnati Public Schools)	2,333	1,366	58.55%	55
2014	North Carolina	105,136	93,178	88.63%	2,527
2014	Texas	425,160	82,979	19.52%	1,270
2014	Indiana (TIF Participants)	1,829	1,577	86.22%	51
2014	Pittsburgh	2,350	2,152	91.57%	56
2013	Vermont†	12,337	6,699	54.74%	225
2013	Tennessee*	74,676	61,341	82.14%	1,627
2013	Ohio	134,230	21,057	15.69%	382
2013	Pittsburgh	2,291	2,084	90.96%	56

Survey Year	State	Total School-Based Licensed Educators Surveyed	Number of Respondents	Response Rate	Schools with Sufficient Response Provided Data
2013	Maryland*†	86,440	50,272	58.16%	1,050
2013	Kentucky*	50,496	43,759	86.66%	1,245
2013	Delaware	10,392	6,153	59.21%	173
2013	Hillsborough County Public Schools (Tampa)	15,777	10,408	65.97%	208
2013	Colorado*	60,891	33,200	54.52%	1,083
2013	Indiana (TIF Participants)	1,791	1,544	86.21%	47
2012	RI/NY (Innovation districts)	5,467	2,923	53.47%	127
2012	Pittsburgh*†	2,676	2,515	93.98%	63
2012	Ohio (Priority Schools RtT)	912	620	67.98%	17
2012	North Carolina	116,025	100,042	86.22%	2,589
2012	MetroNash Public Schools	6,236	4,389	70.38%	138
2012	Massachusetts*	80,906	42,404	52.41%	1,077
2012	Indiana (TIF Participants)	1,694	1,412	82.91%	45
2012	Fairfax County, VA*	15,471	12,406	80.19%	200
2011	Tennessee	74,614	57,391	76.92%	1,500
2011	Pittsburgh†	2,900	2,699	93.07%	66
2011	Oakland	2,258	1,380	61.12%	76
2011	Maryland*†	88,488	45,901	51.87%	869
2011	Kentucky	52,349	42,025	80.28%	1,100
2011	Colorado*	62,984	29,466	46.78%	850
2011	Austin	9,492	8,289	87.33%	236
2010	North Carolina*	119,038	105,688	88.79%	2,500
2010	Gates Measures of Effective Teaching Initiative	35,000	12,798	36.57%	250
2010	Fairfax County, VA	14,362	10,761	74.93%	200
2009	Vermont†	9,535	4,221	44.27%	166
2009	Maryland	70,021	43,400	61.98%	1,000
2009	Colorado	64,494	23,108	35.83%	624

Survey Year	State	Total School-Based Licensed Educators Surveyed	Number of Respondents	Response Rate	Schools with Sufficient Response Provided Data
2008	West Virginia	22,699	9,842	43.36%	400
2008	North Carolina	120,159	104,249	86.76%	2,300
2008	Massachusetts	85,702	39,811	46.45%	1,200
2008	Maine	19,167	5,136	26.80%	150
2008	Kansas	39,231	16,656	42.46%	700
2008	Illinois	9,207	2,977	32.33%	100
2008	Fairfax County, VA	14,976	8,642	57.71%	200
2008	Alabama	59,792	28,188	47.14%	1,000
	TOTAL (surveys conducted by NTC)	2,376,086	1,280,343 (prior to start of 2015)	53.88%	32,183

*Surveys conducted more than one time in these locales. The indicated iteration had the highest response.

†Surveys included Educational Support Professionals (ESPs) or Paraprofessionals. In 2009, Vermont conducted a concurrent but separate ESP survey.

(Maddock, A. & Shephard, D., 2015, Spring)

Appendix F

North Carolina Teacher Turnover Reasons Codes

Reporting Code	Reason for Leaving
Remained in education	
58	Resigned to teach in another NC public school system
	Teachers leaving LEA to accept a teaching position in another NC system
	Teachers leaving LEA to accept a teaching position in a NC Charter School
	Teachers obtaining another teaching job on their own initiative (as opposed to spouse relocation)
59	Moved to a non-teaching position in education in another LEA or Agency
	Teachers moved to counselor, media coordinator, or non-teaching duties in another LEA or Agency
	Teachers moved to administrative positions (school-based) in another LEA or Agency
	Teachers moved to supervisory, director, or coordinator positions in another LEA or Agency
	Teachers accepted non-teaching support or administrative positions in another LEA or Agency
70	Resigned to teach in a NC charter school*
	Teachers leaving LEA to accept a teaching position in a NC Charter School
	Teachers obtaining another teaching job on their own initiative (as opposed to spouse relocation)
71	Resigned to teach in a NC non-public/private school
	Teachers leaving LEA to accept a teaching position in a NC non-public/private school
	Teachers obtaining another teaching job on their own initiative (as opposed to spouse relocation)
75	Moved to a non-teaching position in the LEA
	Teachers moved to counselor, media coordinator, or non-teaching duties in current LEA of employment
	Teachers moved to administrative positions (school-based) in current LEA of employment
	Teachers moved to supervisory, director, or coordinator positions in current LEA of employment
	Teachers accepted non-teaching support or administrative positions in current LEA of employment
Personal Reasons (formerly Reasons that Might be Reduced)	
57	Resigned – Family responsibility/Child care
	Teachers resigning for maternity/family leave
	Teachers resigning to care for ill parents or members of the immediate family
	Teachers resigning to care for family business or personal needs
60	Resigned – To continue education/Take a sabbatical (moved from Remained to Personal Reasons)
	Teachers resigning to return to school
	Teachers resigning to pursue an educational leave of absence

Reporting Code	Reason for Leaving
61	Resigned – Family relocation
	Teachers resigning due to spouse’s relocation
	Teachers resigning as a result of marriage and relocation
	Teachers resigning due to family relocation
62	Resigned – To teach in another state
	Teachers leaving NC to teach in a public school in another state
	Teachers leaving NC to teach in a private school in another state
63	Resigned – Dissatisfied with teaching
	Teachers resigning due to dissatisfaction with teaching
64	Resigned – Because of health/disability
	Teachers resigning due to personal disability or health related issues
68	Retired with reduced benefits
	Teachers retiring after age 50 with reduced benefits
	Teachers retiring with less than full benefits
72	Resigned – Career Change
	Teachers resigning to pursue another employment opportunity
	Teachers resigning to pursue interests outside teaching
73	Re-employed Retired Teacher Resigned
	Teacher who had retired, was re-employed and subsequently resigns
Initiated by LEA	
50	Dismissed
	Teachers demoted or dismissed under GS 115C-325(h)
	Probationary teachers dismissed during the school year under GS 115C-325(m)
	Teachers dismissed under GS 115C-325 (Below standard ratings)
	Teachers reported to the dismissed teacher list
	Teachers dismissed and the ruling upheld by case manager
53	Non-Renewed – Probationary Contract Ended
	Probationary teachers whose contract is not renewed after the end of the year
54	Interim Contract – Not Rehired (<i>Report only for interim contracts of 6 months or more</i>)
	Interim teachers not rehired under retirement cap
	Teachers not rehired under a term contract with specific employment dates
	Teachers not rehired due to return of a permanent teacher from a leave of absence
55	Resigned in lieu of dismissal
	Teachers resigned to avoid placement on dismissed teacher list
	Teachers resigned rather than go through full dismissal hearing
	Teachers resigned during an active investigation regarding performance/behavior as a professional educator

Reporting Code	Reason for Leaving
78	Resigned In Lieu of Non-Renewal (new)
56	Did not obtain or maintain license (moved from Personal Reasons to Initiated by LEA)
	Teachers not renewed due to failure to fulfill lateral entry requirements
	Teachers not renewed due to failure to earn 15 renewal credits
	Teachers failed to meet Praxis or provisional license requirements
	Teachers let license expire
	Teachers' license was revoked
Beyond LEA Control	
51	Reduction in Force
	Teachers not rehired due to loss of enrollment, funding, or programming
	Teachers covered under local "RIF" policies
66	Retired with full benefits (moved from Personal Reasons to Beyond LEA Control)
	Teachers age 60 with 25 years of creditable service
	Teachers with 30 years of creditable service
	Teachers age 65 with at least 5 years of creditable service
	Teachers retiring with full/unreduced retirement benefits
67	Deceased
	Teachers who die while in active service in a NC public school
74	Resigned – End of Visiting International Faculty (VIF) Term
	Teachers whose cultural visas have expired and are no longer eligible to be employed in North Carolina
76	Resigned – Moving Due to Military Orders
	Teachers resigning due to being moved under military orders
77	Resigned – End of Teach for America (TFA) Term
Other Reasons	
65	Resigned – Other reason
	Teachers resigning or leaving teaching for reasons not listed on the survey
	<i>Please specify (text box):</i> _____
69	Resigned – Reason unknown
	Teachers resigning; however, there is no information on reason

*Not included in the report. Charter schools do not report turnover data to the state as teachers employed by North Carolina charter schools are at-will employees and only 50 percent of their staffs are required to hold teacher licenses, according to State Board Policy 115C-238.29F(e)(1).

Appendix G

NCTAF Teacher Turnover Calculator

The following text captures the script from the various screen views of NCTAF's (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future) online Teacher Turnover Cost Calculator. This information was retrieved on June 29, 2015, from <http://nctaf.org/teacher-turnover-cost-calculator/>.

There are two versions of the calculator. The first version is intended for the general public, who may not have ready access to teacher turnover and cost data. The second version is intended for school and district personnel, who may have specific data on teacher turnover and its costs.

The information below is from the version intended for school and district personnel. This Microsoft Word-based version is not an active calculator. The user must access the online version to submit and receive active calculations.

Welcome to the Teacher Turnover Cost Calculator. When teachers leave their schools and districts, new teachers must be recruited, hired, and trained. This calculator will help you estimate the cost of teacher turnover to a school or district.

There are two versions of the calculator. The first version is intended for the general public, who may not have access to teacher turnover and cost data. The second version is intended for school and district personnel, who may have specific data on teacher turnover and its costs.

For School and District Personnel*School's Cost of Teacher Turnover*

Step 1: Calculate the number of leavers by entering:

- The number of teachers who left your school last year
or
- The number of new hires (replacements)
or
- The number of teachers in your school multiplied by the national average school leaver rate (16.5%)

Number of Leavers =

Number of teachers who leave the school from one year to the next.

Step 2: Calculate the cost of each teacher who left your school by:

- Entering an estimated cost, if known.
- or
- Selecting "Urban" or "Non Urban" to generate an estimate.*

**Note: Cost estimates are based studies of a limited number of actual school districts*

School Cost per Leaver

Recruitment: \$

Urban estimate Non Urban estimate
 (Ex. travel to job fairs, training student teachers, responding to inquiries from prospective candidates)

Hiring Incentives: \$

Urban estimate Non Urban estimate
 (Ex. salary supplements, day care subsidies, payment of moving expenses, housing subsidies)

Administrative Processing: \$

Urban estimate Non Urban estimate
 (Ex. corresponding with applicants, setting up interviews, checking references)

Induction: \$

Urban estimate Non Urban estimate
 (Ex. orientation, mentoring, reduced teaching load, related forms of structured induction)

Professional Development: \$

Urban estimate Non Urban estimate
 (Ex. training activities, workshops, salaries for substitutes)

School Cost of Turnover

This estimate does not include district-level costs, the costs to student learning, and many other hidden costs that are the result of teacher turnover.

\$0

Step 3: Reduce teacher turnover costs in your school

A 30% reduction in school turnover will save:

\$0

What You Can Do

- Learn about how new teacher induction programs reduce teacher turnover. [Click here.](#)
- Investigate how creating strong learning communities improves teacher retention. [Click here](#)
- Investigate how quality teacher preparation improves teacher retention. [Click here](#)
- Investigate how providing teachers with professionally rewarding careers improves teacher retention. [Click here](#)
- Learn about school districts that have reduced turnover.
- Find out more about the new study on the cost of teacher turnover from the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.
- Ask school leaders to publicly report the annual costs of teacher turnover.
- Monitor turnover costs annually.
- Conduct surveys of teachers to find out why they stay or leave.
- Write a letter or an editorial to your local paper about the costs of teacher turnover.

District's Cost of Teacher Turnover

A district experiences teacher turnover costs at two levels: 1) the central office expends resources when recruiting, hiring, processing, and training teachers; and 2) schools incur costs when employees interview, hire, process, orient, and develop new teachers.

To calculate the cost of teacher turnover to your district, you will begin by calculating central office costs. You will then calculate the school-level costs of teacher turnover. The calculator will add the school-level costs and the central office costs to generate an estimate of the total cost of teacher turnover to your district.

Step 1: Calculate the number of leavers by entering:

- The number of teachers who left your district last year
- or**
- The number of new hires (replacements)
- or**
- The number of teachers in your district multiplied by the national average district leaver rate (12.5%)

Number of Leavers =

Number of teachers who leave the district from one year to the next.

Step 2: Calculate the central office costs of each teacher who leaves your district by:

- Entering an estimated cost, if known.
- or
- Selecting "Urban" or "Non urban" to generate an estimate.*

Central Office Cost per Leaver

Recruitment: \$

Urban estimate Non Urban estimate
(Ex. travel to job fairs, training student teachers, responding to inquiries from prospective candidates)

Hiring Incentives: \$

Urban estimate Non Urban estimate
(Ex. salary supplements, day care subsidies, payment of moving expenses, housing subsidies)

Administrative Processing: \$

Urban estimate Non Urban estimate
(Ex. corresponding with applicants, setting up interviews, checking references)

Induction: \$

Urban estimate Non Urban estimate
(Ex. orientation, mentoring, reduced teaching load, related forms of structured induction)

Professional Development: \$

Urban estimate Non Urban estimate
(Ex. training activities, workshops, salaries for substitutes)

Central Office Cost of Turnover

This estimate does not include school-level costs, the costs to student learning, and many other hidden costs that are the result of teacher turnover.

\$0

Step 3: Calculate the average cost of teacher turnover to a school in your district by:

- Entering an estimated cost, if known.
- or
- Selecting "Urban" or "Non Urban" to generate an estimate.*

**Note: Cost estimates are based studies of a limited number of actual school districts*

Average School Cost of Turnover

\$ Urban estimate Non urban estimate

Step 4: Enter the number of schools in your district

Number of Schools in the District

School-Level Cost of Turnover

\$0

Total District Cost of Turnover

This estimate is the central office cost of turnover plus the school-level cost of turnover. The estimate does not include the costs of teacher turnover to student learning.

\$0

Step 5: Reduce teacher turnover costs in your district

A 30% reduction in district turnover will save:

\$0

What You Can Do

- Learn about how new teacher induction programs reduce teacher turnover. [Click here.](#)
- Investigate how creating strong learning communities improves teacher retention. [Click here](#)
- Investigate how quality teacher preparation improves teacher retention. [Click here](#)
- Investigate how providing teachers with professionally rewarding careers improves teacher retention. [Click here](#)
- Learn about school districts that have reduced turnover.
- Find out more about the new study on the cost of teacher turnover from the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.
- Ask school leaders to publicly report the annual costs of teacher turnover.
- Monitor turnover costs annually.
- Conduct surveys of teachers to find out why they stay or leave.
- Write a letter or an editorial to your local paper about the costs of teacher turnover.

