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Dr. Dan Goldhaber, Director of the Center for Educational Data and Research (CEDR) at UW Bothell, is a nationally renowned educational economist. Dr. Goldhaber will review the impact of CEDR on the national debate on teacher effectiveness and school finance, an example of the engaged scholarship occurring at UW Bothell.

Professor of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences at UWB, Dan is also an Affiliated Scholar at the Urban Institute, co-editor of *Education Finance and Policy*, and a member of the Washington State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. He previously served as an elected member of the Alexandria City School Board from 1997-2002, and as an Associate Editor of *Economics of Education Review*.

Dan’s work focuses on issues of educational productivity and reform at the K-12 level, with a current focus on the broad array of “human capital” policies that influence the composition, distribution, and quality of teachers in the workforce. Topics of his published work in this area include studies of the value-added measures of teachers, the effects of teacher qualifications and quality on student achievement, and the impact of teacher pay structure and licensure on the teacher labor market. Previous work has covered topics such as the relative efficiency of public and private schools and the effects of accountability systems and market competition on K-12 schooling.

The findings from his published work have been covered in media such as National Public Radio, the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, *USA Today*, and *Education Week*.

Dan holds degrees from the University of Vermont (BA, Economics) and Cornell University (MS and PhD, Labor Economics).
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Who We Are

- Founded July 2010 to conduct high-quality, policy-relevant research and be an honest broker to education policymakers

- Work is guided by four principles:
  - Research is oriented around actionable policy issues
  - Research is independent and objective
  - Research meets high standards for scientific rigor
  - Research findings are made broadly accessible

- In addition to our research across the country, CEDR also focuses on education issues in Washington State
What We Do

- Based on support from a broad base of funders, our recent research includes:
  - Teacher training and certification in Washington State
  - Collective bargaining provisions and teacher quality
  - The implications of seniority-based teacher layoffs
  - Teacher compensation in Denver Public Schools
  - The stability of value-added performance measures

- We have also established a number of data sharing agreements with Washington school districts:
  - Allows us to answer questions that cannot be addressed with either state or local data alone
  - Relationship building key to understand concerns of local policymakers and build trust around research
Sample of Washington State Studies

• Determinants and implications of layoffs
  • What teacher and school context factors predict which teachers receive layoff notices?
  • Which students are affected by layoffs?
  • What are the implications of using an alternative (to seniority) layoff system?

• Teacher training and certification programs
  • How predictive are the agency credentials received of teacher effectiveness?
  • Do new in-service credentialing requirements influence teacher career paths?

• Influence of collective bargaining agreements on teacher effectiveness and distribution within school districts
**Selected Findings from Layoff Research**

- **MA + Seniority matter and are major drivers of RIFs**
  - A first-year teacher is about seven times as likely to receive a RIF notice than a teacher in her 4th–6th year in a district
  - Teachers holding an endorsement in a “high-needs area” are significantly (40-60%) less likely to receive layoff notices than those with, for instance, an endorsement in elementary education
  - Additional endorsements lower the probability of layoff
  - Little evidence that high poverty/minority schools are targeted for layoffs
  - Teacher effectiveness appears not to play a role in layoff decisions

- **Findings received a great deal of attention**
  - First quantitative study of achievement implications for students of RIFs
  - Stories about study appeared in over 200 media outlets
  - Reaction spurred legislation (e.g., SB 5399) in Washington State
Probability of RIF Notice By Endorsement Area and Seniority

- Health/PE: Probability of the average first-year teacher receiving a RIF notice (11.95%)
- Arts: Probability of the average fourth-year teacher receiving a RIF notice (3.22%)
- English: Difference of 6.6% pts
- Social Studies: First-year teachers
- Foreign Language
- Elementary: First-year teachers
- Math
- Science
- Special Ed

Difference of 6.6% pts
Actual Effectiveness-based RIF (Math)

Difference of 5.6% of a standard deviation of student performance
Simulation of Effectiveness-based RIF (Math)

Difference of 20% of a standard deviation of student performance

Difference of 5.6% of a standard deviation of student performance
Actual vs. Simulated Effectiveness-Based RIFs

- The systems result in very different groups of teachers being targeted
  - The overlap between the group of teachers who receive RIF notices under each system is less than 20%
  - Teachers receiving RIF notices under effectiveness-based system are more senior (by about 8 years on average) and consequently have higher salaries (by about $14,000 on average)
  - Thus the effectiveness-based system results in about 10% fewer layoffs than the seniority-driven system
Probability of a Student’s Teacher Receiving a RIF notice

- Actual:
  - All: 2.4%
  - White: 2.4%
  - Non-white: 2.4%
  - Black: 3.8%
  - Hispanic: 1.9%
  - Low-income: 2.6%

- Simulated:
  - All: 2.2%
  - White: 2.3%
  - Non-white: 2.0%
  - Black: 2.8%
  - Hispanic: 1.5%
  - Low-income: 2.3%