

Key Issue: Performance-Based Pay

Table of Contents

SCENARIO	6
BENEFITS	8
TIPS & CAUTIONS	11
STRATEGY 1	12
Create your instructional improvement strategy first. See that a new teacher assessment system and pay program will fit within it.	12
Resource 1: Teacher performance-based pay	12
Resource 2: Developing a performance pay plan for teachers	12
Resource 3: From the headlines to the frontlines	13
Resource 4: Teacher Advancement Program	13
STRATEGY 2	14
Make several decisions prior to designing the pay system:	14
Resource 5: Building a professionally rewarding career path for teachers	14
Resource 6: The varieties of knowledge and skill-based pay design	14
Resource 7: Credit where it's due	14
Resource 8: Developing a performance pay plan for teachers	15
Resource 9: Knowledge and skill based pay	15
...SUBSTRATEGY 2.1	16
Compile several years of baseline/background data on areas that affect rewards and assessments (of teachers or students).	16
Resource 10: Southeast Center for Teaching Quality	16
Resource 11: Alternative teacher compensation	16
Resource 12: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future	16
Resource 13: MetLife survey of the American teacher	17
...SUBSTRATEGY 2.2	18
Choose what kinds of non-academic achievements and/or benchmarks that you want to reward, if any.	18
Resource 14: Performance pay plan for teachers	18
Resource 15: Incentive program to attract and retain teachers	18
...SUBSTRATEGY 2.3	19
Consider using increased or additional incentives that recognize improved performance specifically in at-risk schools.	19

Resource 16: Incentive program to attract and retain teachers	19
Resource 17: More teachers graded for their pay.....	19
Resource 18: Teacher Advancement Program.....	20
STRATEGY 3.....	21
Pay attention to transitions – from one pay system to another, one data system to another, one evaluation system to another, etc.	21
Resource 19: LaCrescent, Minnesota pay-for-performance plan	21
Resource 20: What went wrong in Cincinnati	21
STRATEGY 4.....	22
Expect costs.	22
Resource 21: The varieties of knowledge and skill-based pay design.....	22
Resource 22: Eyes on the prize	22
Resource 23: Building a Rewarding Career for New Mexico’s teachers.....	22
...SUBSTRATEGY 4.1.....	23
What is your funding source? Sources that are built into operating budgets are more stable and decrease chances that a pay program will be terminated due to cut-off funding.....	23
Resource 24: Performance pay in Arizona	23
Resource 25: Iowa's move toward pay-for-performance on verge of collapse	23
Resource 26: Knowledge and skill based pay (KSBP)	23
Resource 27: What went wrong in Cincinnati?	23
Resource 28: Statewide Teacher Career Ladders.....	24
STRATEGY 5.....	25
Pay systems depend on good, or visibly improving, working conditions in schools.....	25
Resource 29: Incentive program to attract and retain teachers	25
...SUBSTRATEGY 5.1.....	26
Professional development must address gaps in skills as well as new or emerging knowledge and skills.	26
Resource 30: <i>LaCrescent, Minnesota pay-for-performance plan</i>	26
Resource 31: Teacher Advancement Program.....	26
...SUBSTRATEGY 5.2.....	27
Improve working conditions and support teachers so they can succeed at improving student learning.	27
Resource 32: Distractions from teaching and learning	27
...SUBSTRATEGY 5.3.....	28

Develop and enhance leadership skills for principals and administrators	28
Resource 33: Building Capacity of School Leaders to Support Teachers	28
Resource 34: The Kentucky school-based performance award program	28
Resource 35: Three-tiered licensure system	28
... SUBSTRATEGY 5.4	29
Incorporate a teacher development system	29
Resource 36: Performance-based teacher compensation in Iowa	29
Resource 37: Better Educated Students and Teachers.....	29
STRATEGY 6	31
Include all parties	31
Resource 38: Alternative teacher compensation	31
Resource 39: Developing a performance pay plan for teachers	31
... SUBSTRATEGY 6.1	32
Forge agreement on valued results and goals	32
Resource 40: What went wrong in Cincinnati?	32
Resource 41: The Kentucky school-based performance award program	32
... SUBSTRATEGY 6.2	33
Ask teachers – especially those in at-risk schools	33
They must value and believe in the structure, rewards, rationale, and goals of the program	33
Resource 42: Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	33
Resource 43: Developing a performance pay plan for teachers	33
Resource 44: What went wrong in Cincinnati?	34
STRATEGY 7	35
Use fair and respected, validated, high quality, rigorous assessments of students and teachers. Teachers have to believe in the possibility of improvement in order for their practice, and their students’ learning, to change	35
Resource 45: Reliability and validity of performance evaluation systems.....	35
Resource 46: Teachers’ incentives	35
Resource 47: Reliability and validity of performance evaluation systems.....	36
... SUBSTRATEGY 7.1	37
Discuss the teacher assessment system with teachers and parents	37
Ask teachers if they think the student assessment tools and yearly goals are achievable (e.g., tests, portfolio reviews)	37
Resource 48: Rewards for high student achievement	37

Resource 49: What went wrong in Cincinnati?	37
...SUBSTRATEGY 7.2.....	38
Make sure your system has <i>data</i> and a strong <i>data system infrastructure</i>.	38
Resource 50: Lessons from North Carolina	38
Resource 51: Developing a performance pay plan for teachers	38
Resource 52: Building a Rewarding Career for New Mexico’s teachers.....	38
...SUBSTRATEGY 7.3.....	39
Evaluate the pay program and build in flexibility to make adjustments along the way. 39	
Resource 53: Performance pay in Arizona	39
Resource 54: What went wrong in Cincinnati?	39
...SUBSTRATEGY 7.4.....	40
Have a specific, concrete rating scale and rubrics that measure improvement and not only absolute achievement levels.	40
Resource 55: INTASC.....	40
Resource 56: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.....	40
Resource 57: Enhancing professional practice.....	40
Resource 58: A framework for teaching English learners	41
STRATEGY 8.....	42
Publicize the program and communicate extensively with teachers, administrators, parents, and the public to ensure that important stakeholders understand the project and its impact on salaries, low-performing schools, and school improvement.	42
Resource 59: A-Plus plan offers bonus.....	42
Resource 60: What went wrong in Cincinnati?	42
Resource 61: Developing a performance pay plan for teachers	42
Resource 62: Denver ProComp	43
Resource 63: New Mexico’s three-tiered licensure system	43
STRATEGY 9.....	44
Consider relationships of performance pay to licensure.	44
Resource 64: Performance-based teacher compensation in Iowa	44
Resource 65: 3-Tiered Licensure.....	44
Resource 66: Better Educated Students and Teachers.....	44
Resource 67: National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future.....	45
STRATEGY 10.....	46
Agree on who is included in the new pay system.	46

Resource 68: Incentive program to attract and retain teachers	46
Resource 69: New Mexico’s Three-tiered Licensure System	46
Resource 70: IPS chief’s pay tied to success of students.....	46
REAL-LIFE EXAMPLE 1:	48
REAL-LIFE EXAMPLE 2:	50
REFERENCES.....	52

SCENARIO

Brown Middle School teachers finally agreed to sign on to the district's new school-based award program. After a year of information sessions, individual conversations, and visits from teachers in other performance-rewarded schools in the district, Kathy Lu, a science teacher at Brown, led the staff to the 75% approval vote to try the new bonus rewards in their school. In order to win bonuses for themselves and for their school, which was rated "low-performing" last year, Ms. Lu and her colleagues would have to work together on their teaching and pay more attention to student growth – at a deeper level than the monthly staff round-up, which barely scratched the surface of teachers' issues.

The principal agreed to support the bonus program because she could earn some additional money as well. She worked with Kathy to get the bonus program started in Brown Middle School.

Each team met to look over how they could together boost their students' learning. Kathy urged her group of science teachers to coordinate their lesson plans and to include some real-world experiences in student activities. The first thing all the science teachers agreed to do was to use more experiments for students in class. Some of the more engaged teachers also scheduled field studies that took the students out into the neighborhood.

The principal also used the district's technology and professional development plans to buy new computers to start a teachers' resource room. Kathy and other team leaders used this room to search the Internet for ideas and topics, learn how to incorporate videos into PowerPoint, post fliers on meetings or useful resources, and to watch some videos of other classrooms around the country. Kathy took walks with some other science teachers to find out which parks in the neighborhood had resources relevant to the middle school science curriculum. She even received tips on teaching seventh grade concepts from the eighth grade science teacher for the first time in the four years she had been at the school.

As the year progressed and teachers got adjusted to weekly team-work groups, they began to see the achievement of students rise. More students were attending after-school help sessions offered three times per week – for which participating teachers would receive a second \$1,500 bonus. Even the struggling students were catching up. A generally negative science teacher suggested working with school literacy specialists for the first time to strategize on how to help the students who couldn't read at grade level keep up with the middle school curriculum. All the science teachers agreed to do the same, and passed the idea on to the social studies team.

Standardized test scores came in August. The moment of truth had arrived. The principal called Kathy to let her know that she wanted to start the new school

year with an assembly to celebrate Brown Middle School's growth! Scores had jumped 10% from the year before – 12% for students in subgroups; and average daily student attendance had improved by 10%. In October, Kathy and all the other staff in the school each received bonuses of \$2,000, as well as \$10,000 for the school. The teachers who had run the after-school program received a total of \$3,500. It was a satisfying addition to celebrating with the students.

Kathy and her principal were looking forward to the new school year. The teachers had agreed to set school-wide goals together, in addition to team goals. Three science teachers were inviting some local scientists to discuss the students' experiments with them. Parents even called the principal to offer positive feedback – they could see that Brown Middle School was changing for the better.

Could performance-based pay work in your school? What kinds of gains in achievements would you reward? Would the rewards be all or nothing or would the rewards be increased to an agreed-upon maximum depending on the gains in student achievement? How could these agreements be made and communicated widely?

BENEFITS

Performance-based pay systems are important to quality teaching in at-risk schools because they:

- 1. Respond to calls for accountability and measurement of the quality of teaching and schools.**

Standards-based education reform and the No Child Left Behind Act have created an environment in which performance – of students and of teachers – is the focus of improvement strategies.

In a 1998 survey, the National Association of Elementary School Principals found that about 15% of elementary school principals work under incentive contracts. Of these, more than one in five are based on student achievement.

- 2. Address how effectively and equitably the district/schools allocate money.** Teacher salaries make up the largest part of districts' operating budgets, so it is important to make sure that this cost is accountable for quality and equity. General across-the-board raises are not linked to improved teacher quality.

Performance-based pay systems can cost more than traditional salary systems, but they are focused on skills, results, and improvement. Schools that spend more on salaries and retain their teachers year after year can use performance-based evaluation to guarantee that the quality of their teaching is worth the cost. On the other hand, schools that spend comparatively less money on teacher salaries because they have a teacher staff with higher turnover and less experience can use performance-based systems to hire teachers who can show a record of better teaching. In addition, some performance-pay systems that reward teamwork can (initiate the process of breaking down) (reduce?) teacher isolation in schools. Finally, school systems can use performance-based pay to retain high-performing teachers and leaders in at-risk schools through public recognition, bonuses, and higher salaries.

- 3. Improve retention of effective teachers and draw accomplished teachers to at-risk schools.**

Teachers have the single greatest within-school impact on student learning. However, pay is not the only thing that will attract excellent teachers to high-need schools. Significant salary increases, strong leadership, and investment in school working/learning conditions are also central strategies, not only for attracting good teachers, but for retaining quality teachers in at-risk schools. In addition, performance-based pay gives teachers goals and challenges to

meet and focuses them on continuous professional development, two major aspects of improving the teaching/learning environment.

- 4. Motivate teachers, administrators, and other staff through recognition for supporting their students' success.** Other professions commonly use bonuses, raises, and/or promotions to recognize and reward quality work done by employees. Good teachers can be motivated to become great teachers when rewards shake up stagnant career salary options.

"I think good teachers want to be recognized for their effort, and good teachers also want to continually improve their skills. ... And when you have those two things joined together I think ultimately it improves student achievement," says Alice Seagren, Minnesota Commissioner of Education. One study found significant increases in teacher effort when incentives and rewards were in place (especially for individual awards).

- 5. Align district human resources, evaluation and assessment, and professional development strategies.**

Recruitment, hiring, induction, training, and performance become measurable and related. Districts will hire quality candidates (and distribute them across all schools) to meet NCLB requirements as well as to ensure that their performance-based salary monies are well spent. In at-risk schools, pay for performance can catalyze the alignment process, though it cannot be the sole aspect of the reform plan.

- 6. Can enhance collaboration, school morale, and team work.**

Rewards and recognition given to outstanding teachers, teams, or schools can significantly enhance enthusiasm for improvement. School morale in at-risk schools can be very low; but as in other professions with tangible monetary rewards for improvement, success often breeds success. Rewarding educators increase chances that teachers and leaders will continue to improve, learn, and set goals. Finally, rewards give teachers and staff the opportunity to focus on shared goals and to work together to make sure everyone is working toward higher achievement.

REFERENCES:

Consortium for Policy Research in Education at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. (undated). Emerging findings in teacher compensation [website]. Retrieved 9/19/05 from <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/tcomp/research/general/findings.asp#strategy>.

Lavy, V. (2004, November 19). Teachers' incentives: Theory and practice [powerpoint]. Presentation prepared for OECD conference, Amsterdam,

Netherlands. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Retrieved 9/19/05 from http://www.minocw.nl/congres_ocw-oecd/doc/keynote_address_victor_lavy.pdf.

Pugmire, T. (2005, August 14). State, school districts prepare for changes in teacher pay. *Minnesota Public Radio News & Features*. Retrieved 9/19/05 from http://news.minnesota.publicradio.org/features/2005/08/15_pugmiret_comp/.

Roza, M., & Hill, P.T. (2004). How Within-District Spending Inequities Help Some Schools to Fail. *Brookings Papers on Education Policy*. Retrieved 9/28/05 from <http://www.crpe.org/pubs/pdf/InequitiesRozaHillchapter.pdf>.

TIPS & CAUTIONS

DON'T BOTHER Designing a Performance-based Pay System IF YOU DON'T:

- Include the new pay system in the *larger reform strategy*.
- *Clearly and frequently communicate* with teachers, the public/taxpayers, and other educators.
- Have *quality assessment* benchmarks and tools that can evaluate teachers and students where they are.
- Set realistic performance goals with adequate support to maintain improvement over the long term, especially when working in at-risk schools.
- Proceed carefully and collaboratively, with flexibility. If you fail once, it's *unlikely you'll get a second chance*.
- *Reward everyone* who makes his/her goal.
- *Strategize on the timing* and schedule of the pay system's implementation. Make sure that it coordinates with human resources hiring schedules.
- *Align or redesign your professional development system* to enhance the knowledge and skills of teachers to ratchet up their capacity to achieve the desired results in student achievement.

STRATEGY 1

Create your instructional improvement strategy first. See that a new teacher assessment system and pay program will fit within it.

- Pay is a central component to improvement, but it is not the whole solution.
- Designate additional rewards for hard-to-staff subjects and/or at-risk schools (these schools have more needs than can be solved with salary increases).
- Align the goals, values, and calendars of human resources, professional development, and induction systems.
- Know your teacher market (e.g., do you need to increase base pay? Do you need better prepared science teachers in particular disciplines, such as chemistry or better prepared science teachers in general?)

Resource 1: Teacher performance-based pay

Odden, A., & Wallace, M. (2004, November 11). Teacher performance-based pay – the next steps [powerpoint]. Presentation at 2004 CPRE National Conference on Teacher Compensation and Evaluation. Retrieved 9/19/05 from <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/conference/conference/Nov04/OddenWallacekeynote/oddenwallace.pdf>.

Slide 8, “Getting Strategic with Teacher Pay”:

“Getting Strategic Requires a Concern with Three Elements of Teacher Quality...

1. Ensure Teachers Have Instructional Knowledge and Skills
2. Eliminate Staff ‘Shortage Areas’ (e.g. Math, Science, Technology) and Hard To Staff Schools (e.g. High Poverty, Geographically Isolated)
3. Recruit and Retain High Quality Teacher Work Force – pay market-based wages.”

Resource 2: Developing a performance pay plan for teachers

Hartman, D.B., & Weil, R. (1997, January 30). *Developing a performance pay plan for teachers: A process, not an event*. Submitted to American Federation of Teachers Research Department. Retrieved 9/26/05 from <http://www.aft.org/topics/teacher-quality/downloads/perfplan.pdf>.

Douglas County (CO) Federation of Teachers led the evolution of the district’s alternative compensation plan. On page 8, the authors say, “... performance pay plans are not a quick fix to the ills that afflict particular school districts or public education as a whole. Developing and implementing a performance pay plan for teachers is not an event, it is a process. To expect that such a plan will right any problems other than those directly related to the issue of compensation creates a false expectation and will assure the plans failure by any and all measures.”

Resource 3: From the headlines to the frontlines

Murphy, P.J., and DeArmond, M.M. (2003, July). *From the headlines to the frontlines: The teacher shortage and its implications for recruitment policy*. Seattle, WA: Center on Reinventing Public Education. Retrieved 9/6/05 from http://www.crpe.org/pubs/pdf/TeacherShortage_reportweb.pdf.

p. 2: "... [D]istricts favored broad policies such as district-wide teacher salary increases that, given the uneven impact of the problem, may have done little to meet the goal of placing a quality teacher in every classroom."

Resource 4: Teacher Advancement Program

Teacher Advancement Program. (undated). Elements of TAP: Performance-based compensation [website]. Retrieved 9/26/05 from <http://tapschools.org/tap/tap.taf?page=element4>.

TAP teachers are compensated based on increased responsibilities in differentiated positions, how well they perform in those positions, the quality of their instructional performance, and by their students' achievement growth. All teachers in a TAP school are eligible for financial awards based on these factors. The system also encourages districts to offer competitive salaries to those who teach in "hard-to-staff" subjects and schools.

STRATEGY 2

Make several decisions prior to designing the pay system:

1. What you want to achieve through performance-based pay.
2. What elements already exist in your [district/school/state] that can support or feed into a performance-based pay program.
3. What you want to reward.
4. How the pay program directly addresses improving quality and equity (of teaching/learning for at-risk schools).
5. How much time you have for the creation/design process, keeping in mind collaboration and negotiations, as well as the need to keep momentum.
6. Whether to supplement the traditional pay scale or to replace it.

Resource 5: Building a professionally rewarding career path for teachers

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (2004, November 14-15). Meeting materials from "Building a professionally rewarding career path for teachers," regional meeting, Seattle, WA [website]. Retrieved 9/27/05 from <http://www.nctaf.org/article/index.php?q=0&c=5&sc=41&ssc=&a=291&navs=>.

Resources on this page include: self-assessment worksheets for states that are considering performance-based pay or licensure; definitions, articles, and quick information sheets; and powerpoint presentations by expert practitioners.

Resource 6: The varieties of knowledge and skill-based pay design

Milanowski, A. (2003, January 29). The varieties of knowledge and skill-based pay design: A comparison of seven new pay systems for K-12 teachers. *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 11(4). Retrieved 9/26/05 from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v11n4/>.

"... For state-level policy makers who desire to use salary dollars more strategically to improve student achievement, one implication is that it may be useful to provide a comprehensive and coherent model of knowledge and skills that are directly related to improving instruction for local organizations to adapt and customize.... The model could also be linked to state standards for students. Integration of the model with a multi-level licensing system and providing funds to increase pay for teachers with higher-level licenses could be another way for state-level policy makers to focus the system on strategically important goals."

Resource 7: Credit where it's due

Rotherham, A. (2005, March 30). Credit where it's due. *Education Week* 24(29): 34, 48. Retrieved 9/6/05 from http://www.ppionline.org/ppi_ci.cfm?knlgAreaID=85&subsecID=65&contentID=253264.

One resource that school districts might have are National Board Certified Teachers (NBCTs). This article discusses NBCT stipends, pay differentials, and expanding the roles of NBCTs to improve performance and equity in at-risk schools.

Resource 8: Developing a performance pay plan for teachers

Hartman, D.B., & Weil, R. (1997, January 30). *Developing a performance pay plan for teachers: A process, not an event*. Submitted to American Federation of Teachers Research Department. Retrieved 9/26/05 from <http://www.aft.org/topics/teacher-quality/downloads/perfplan.pdf>.

Hartman, D., McGraw, P., & Goetz, M. (2004, November 10). Performance pay plan for teachers: A decade of experience implementing performance based compensation [powerpoint]. Presentation prepared for the 2004 CPRE National Conference on Teacher Compensation and Evaluation. Douglas County, CO: Douglas County Federation of Teachers. Retrieved 9/27/05 from <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/conference/conference/Nov04/DouglasCty/Douglascounty.pdf>.

The Douglas County system has two major parts. First, there is the *Professional Base Salary* – longevity and knowledge work weighted by evaluation ratings. Second, there are *Bonus Incentive Components* – 5 types of mostly one-time bonuses that are separate from salary and are voluntary:

1. Outstanding Teacher – a one-year designation/bonus based on National Board certification;
2. Master Teacher – a five-year designation/bonus linked to student growth, leadership, community partnership, and other elements;
3. Skills Blocks;
4. Group Incentive Plans; and
5. Responsibility Pay.

Resource 9: Knowledge and skill based pay

Simms, C. (2004, November 14). Knowledge and skill based pay (KSBP) plan in Steamboat Springs, Colorado. Presentation at the NCTAF Regional Meeting, “Building Professionally Rewarding Careers for Teachers.” Retrieved 9/27/05 from <http://www.nctaf.org/article/index.php?g=0&c=5&sc=41&ssc=&a=291&navs>.

In many knowledge- and skills-based pay designs, salary raises occur every 1-3 years, depending on meeting evaluations of “excellence” or “proficiency.” Some programs, such as Steamboat Springs, do not increase salary (including cost of living increases) until teachers show improvement.

...SUBSTRATEGY 2.1

Compile several years of baseline/background data on areas that affect rewards and assessments (of teachers or students).

Some suggestions: student achievement scores, teacher turnover rates, teacher surveys, and teacher and student attendance rates.

Resource 10: Southeast Center for Teaching Quality

Southeast Center for Teaching Quality. (2004). *Summary of findings: Governor Easley's teacher working conditions initiative*. Prepared for Governor Mike Easley. Retrieved 9/26/05 from http://www.teachingquality.org/resources/pdfs/TWC_SummaryofFindings.pdf.

This study compiles Teacher Working Conditions Survey responses, organized by school. Among the findings, teachers stated that leadership, empowerment, and professional development were the most important working conditions for teachers. The study found that if these three conditions were strong, then teachers were more likely to stay in a school. The Teacher Working Conditions Survey is available for other states and school districts to use at no charge. Visit <http://twc.learnnc.org/>.

Resource 11: Alternative teacher compensation

Goorian, B. (2000). Alternative teacher compensation: ERIC digest number 142 (ED446368). Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. Retrieved 9/29/04 from <http://www.ericfacility.net/ericdigests/ed446368.html>.

Jupp, B., Gonring, P., Ursetta, K., & Woodward, L. (2005, July 11). Building a coalition for professional teacher compensation in Denver. Presentation at the 2005 NCTAF Partners' Symposium, "Creating and Sustaining High-Performing Schools for Every Child."

Language makes a difference: for example, the term "merit pay" has negative connotations for subjective raises given to evaluators' favored teachers (Goorian 2000). In Denver, the design team found that, "When you ask general questions, you get general answers" (Jupp, et al. 2005). Teachers there rejected "pay for performance," but wanted to "improve teacher compensation for results."

Resource 12: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (2004, May 14). *Fifty years after Brown v. Board of Education: A two-tiered education system*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved 9/28/05 from <http://www.nctaf.org/article/index.php?q=0&c=4&sc=17&ssc=&a=244&navs>

This report analyzes teacher surveys in New York, California, and Wisconsin. The survey revealed differences reflecting the divides of color and poverty in teaching quality, working conditions, and resources. The website links to original surveys and data broken down by state and to organizations in each state that are working on improving school equity and quality.

Resource 13: MetLife survey of the American teacher

MetLife, Inc. (2005). *MetLife survey of the American teacher: Transitions and the role of supportive relationships*. New York: Harris Interactive, Inc. Retrieved 9/5/05 from http://www.metlife.com/WPSAssets/34996838801118758796V1FATS_2004.pdf.

The report focuses on teachers in several high-need, urban school districts. Teachers in these districts reported similar working conditions, missing resources/supports, and teacher turnover levels. The survey questions could be posed to teachers in any district.

...SUBSTRATEGY 2.2

Choose what kinds of non-academic achievements and/or benchmarks that you want to reward, if any.

Resource 14: Performance pay plan for teachers

Hartman, D., McGraw, P., & Goetz, M. (2004, November 10). Performance pay plan for teachers: A decade of experience implementing performance based compensation [powerpoint]. Presentation prepared for the 2004 CPRE National Conference on Teacher Compensation and Evaluation. Douglas County, CO: Douglas County Federation of Teachers. Retrieved 9/27/05 from <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/conference/conference/Nov04/DouglasCty/Douglascountry.pdf>.

Extra credits/pay for leadership roles, called “Responsibility Pay.”

Resource 15: Incentive program to attract and retain teachers

Virginia Department of Education. (undated). Incentive program to attract and retain teachers in Virginia’s hard-to-staff schools [website]. Retrieved 8/29/05 from <http://141.104.22.210/VDOE/Instruction/OCP/hard-to-staff.html>.

Virginia’s plan rewards at-risk schools with \$150 per student to start, but this bonus can rise to \$200 or more per student for improvement in: school environment and/or working conditions; hiring additional instructional assistants; additional training for teachers; purchase of classroom materials; improved attendance; or a 10% reduction in failure rate from the previous year. At least 50% of these funds must be used as salary incentives for all faculty members of the school. At-risk schools meet at least four categories of an eight-part definition to be considered “hard-to-staff.”

...SUBSTRATEGY 2.3

Consider using increased or additional incentives that recognize improved performance specifically in at-risk schools.

Resource 16: Incentive program to attract and retain teachers

Virginia Department of Education. (undated). Incentive program to attract and retain teachers in Virginia's hard-to-staff schools [website]. Retrieved 8/29/05 from <http://141.104.22.210/VDOE/Instruction/OCP/hard-to-staff.html>.

Virginia's plan rewards at-risk schools with \$150 per student to start, but this bonus can rise to \$200 or more per student for improvement in: school environment and/or working conditions; hiring additional instructional assistants; additional training for teachers; purchase of classroom materials; improved attendance; or a 10% reduction in failure rate from previous year. At least 50% of funds must be used as salary incentives for all faculty members of the school. At-risk schools meet at least four categories of an eight-part definition to be considered "hard-to-staff."

Resource 17: More teachers graded for their pay

More teachers graded for their pay. (2002, September 9). *CNN.com*. Retrieved 2/17/04 from <http://www.cnn.com/2002/US/09/09/b2s.02.scoring.teachers/index.html>.

"Becky Malone has been teaching 16 years and she knows her job. But unlike most teachers, this year Malone left a prestigious suburban school to teach at Clifton Hills, a struggling inner-city school in Tennessee. She'll get a \$5,000-a-year bonus for three years to do it.

"Malone is one of 12 teachers in Chattanooga who have made the move to at-risk schools. But to earn a bonus, these teachers have to make the grade: their students have to make 15 percent above a normal year's progress as measured by state tests.... [P]rincipals whose schools get good marks are paid an extra \$10,000 a year."

Resource 18: Teacher Advancement Program

Teacher Advancement Program. (undated). Elements of TAP: Performance-based compensation [website]. Retrieved 9/26/05 from <http://tapschools.org/tap/tap.taf?page=element4>.

TAP teachers are compensated based on increased responsibilities in differentiated positions, how well they perform in those positions, the quality of their instructional performance, and by their students' achievement growth. All teachers in a TAP school are eligible for financial awards based on these factors. The system also encourages districts to offer competitive salaries to those who teach in "hard-to-staff" subjects and schools.

STRATEGY 3

Pay attention to transitions – from one pay system to another, one data system to another, one evaluation system to another, etc.

- Transitions require persistence and flexibility to make constant adjustments.

Resource 19: LaCrescent, Minnesota pay-for-performance plan

Kimball, S.M. (2005, May). *LaCrescent, Minnesota pay-for-performance plan: Revised and still running*. Madison, WI: Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Retrieved 9/19/05 from www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/papers/pdf/LaCrescent%20update1.pdf.

This district's pay program has changed over time to address concerns of flexibility. The teacher assessment system no longer uses student test scores to measure performance for pay. Instead, teachers conduct action research projects that are discussed in teams of colleagues and approved and evaluated by an Oversight Committee. The pay program's team will now move on to address concerns over varying depth and quality of the action research projects that determine pay raises.

Resource 20: What went wrong in Cincinnati

Delisio, E.R. (2003, January 30). What went wrong in Cincinnati? *Education World*. Retrieved 9/26/05 from http://www.education-world.com/a_issues/issues374b.shtml.

The author gathered several transitional problems during interviews conducted across the district. These included reasons such as:

- The tight timetable for approval and implementation did not leave enough time to address teacher concerns about the compensation plan;
- Teachers did not have enough time to adjust to the more rigorous and complex assessment system, and so were not confident in the objectivity of the evaluations;
- Teachers also felt the evaluation and professional development programs had not been adequately aligned with the compensation plan;
- Associate superintendent Kathleen Ware stated, "... We lost time negotiating because teachers felt the board had breached a cooperative agreement [on another issue]; and
- Allen Odden, of CPRE at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, added, "The major reason for the defeat was in the implementation.... There was not enough communication. Some issues were unresolved."

STRATEGY 4

Expect costs.

- Adequately fund with a long-term plan for resources.

Resource 21: The varieties of knowledge and skill-based pay design

Milanowski, A. (2003, January 29). The varieties of knowledge and skill-based pay design: A comparison of seven new pay systems for K-12 teachers. *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 11(4). Retrieved 9/26/05 from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v11n4/>.

“... [T]he transition costs to even a fairly extensive knowledge and skill-based pay structure can be low. It is, however, likely that administrative costs will be higher where an extensive system of internal skill assessment is used, and that payroll costs may significantly increase in the long term. So it is advisable to plan for ways to cover these costs.”

Resource 22: Eyes on the prize

Bushweller, K. (1999, August). Eyes on the prize: Performance pay for principals and teachers who produce results. *American School Board Journal*. Retrieved 9/15/05 from <http://www.asbj.com/199908/0899coverstory.html>.

The program can “die of its own bureaucratic weight.”

Resource 23: Building a Rewarding Career for New Mexico’s teachers

Winograd, P., Ball, J., Mitchell, R., Bowyer, C., & Moulton, R. (2004, November 14). Building a Rewarding Career for New Mexico’s teachers [powerpoint]. Presentation prepared for 2004 NCTAF Regional Meeting, “Building a Professionally Rewarding Career Path for Teachers,” Seattle, WA. Retrieved 9/27/05 from <http://www.nctaf.org/article/index.php?g=0&c=5&sc=41&ssc=&a=291&navs> =.

“Data gathering on the number of teachers at the different levels must improve in order to inform the Legislature on needed funding for the system annually.”

On November 1, 2005 Denver voter approved \$25M to implement the ProCom pay-for-performance plan. This needs appropriate documentation., but the ProCom plan needs more play in this document, since it really eclipses the Douglas County plan as being the most innovative in the country – and it does provide an incentive (small) for teaching in low performing schools.

...SUBSTRATEGY 4.1

What is your funding source? Sources that are built into operating budgets are more stable and decrease chances that a pay program will be terminated due to cut-off funding.

Resource 24: Performance pay in Arizona

Aportela, A. (2005). *Performance pay in Arizona as a result of Proposition 301*. Madison, WI: Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Retrieved 9/19/05 from www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/papers/pdf/AZ%20Prop%20301%20Minicase.pdf.

Proposition 301 increased the Arizona state sales tax by 6/10 of 1% for 20 years. It directed funds to education programs. 55% of the funds (\$266 million in FY 2004) went to the Classroom Site Fund, which is limited to three uses: 20% for base pay increases for teachers; 40% for performance-based pay for teachers; and 40% for struggling students (e.g., dropout prevention, class size reduction, and professional development). Proposition 301 trades more money for more accountability to student achievement (such as through teacher performance-based pay).

Resource 25: Iowa's move toward pay-for-performance on verge of collapse

Reid, K.S. (2003, September 10). Iowa's move toward pay-for-performance on verge of collapse. *Education Week* 23(2): 1, 22. Retrieved 9/28/05 from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2003/09/10/02iowa.h23.html>.

The implementation of Iowa's comprehensive plan for teaching quality has been stalled at phase 1 (first tier of licensure and a mentoring/induction program) because of the state budget. It is up for debate as to whether the three-tiered, performance-based licensure plan is "on hold" or if it has been dropped.

Resource 26: Knowledge and skill based pay (KSBP)

Simms, C. (2004, November 14). Knowledge and skill based pay (KSBP) plan in Steamboat Springs, Colorado. Presentation at the NCTAF Regional Meeting, "Building Professionally Rewarding Careers for Teachers." Retrieved 9/27/05 from <http://www.nctaf.org/article/index.php?g=0&c=5&sc=41&ssc=&a=291&navs>
=.

The Steamboat Springs, CO, plan is "on hold" – though pessimists would say terminated – because the district is uncertain whether the tax increase approved for the pilot will cover the growth in cost indefinitely.

Resource 27: What went wrong in Cincinnati?

Delisio, E.R. (2003, January 30). What went wrong in Cincinnati? *Education*

World. Retrieved 9/26/05 from http://www.education-world.com/a_issues/issues374b.shtml.

“Union members' fears that tough economic times could mean the diversion of performance pay funds to balance the district budget also made the plan a tough sell. ‘They were not convinced the school district had the resources to fund the system,’ Taylor added. The plan also had more incentives for beginning teachers than those in the second half of their careers, she said.”

Resource 28: Statewide Teacher Career Ladders

National Association of State Boards of Education. (undated). Statewide Teacher Career Ladders. *NASBE Policy Update 10(9)*. Retrieved 9/25/05 from http://www.nasbe.org/Educational_Issues/New_Information/Policy_Updates/10_09.html.

“Several programs that were created in the late 1980s to early 1990s were never adequately funded, and this has been seen as one of the chief reasons for their eventual demise Districts are wary of signing up for voluntary programs that are not securely funded.”

STRATEGY 5

Pay systems depend on good, or visibly improving, working conditions in schools.

- Build in assistance, resources, and professional development for those teachers and schools that are not meeting progress goals.
- Improving working conditions, leadership, and pay in at-risk schools can support and attract excellent teachers.

Resource 29: Incentive program to attract and retain teachers

Virginia Department of Education. (undated). Incentive program to attract and retain teachers in Virginia's hard-to-staff schools [website]. Retrieved 8/29/05 from <http://141.104.22.210/VDOE/Instruction/OCP/hard-to-staff.html>.

Areas of improvement emphasize both student achievement and working conditions: school environment and/or working conditions; hiring additional instructional assistants; additional training for teachers; purchase of classroom materials; improved attendance; or a 10% reduction in failure rate from previous year. At-risk schools meet at least four categories of an eight-part definition to be considered "hard-to-staff."

...SUBSTRATEGY 5.1

Professional development must address gaps in skills as well as new or emerging knowledge and skills.

Resource 30: *LaCrescent, Minnesota pay-for-performance plan*

Kimball, S.M. (2005, May). *LaCrescent, Minnesota pay-for-performance plan: Revised and still running*. Madison, WI: Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Retrieved 9/19/05 from www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/papers/pdf/LaCrescent%20update1.pdf.

The performance-based pay system in this district measures student outcomes while implementing teacher professional development. Teachers complete action research projects that are approved and evaluated by the compensation Oversight Committee, but the system also uses rigorous teaching observations and portfolios. Furthermore, the research projects are prepared, guided, and reviewed by “learning communities” – teams of teachers grouped by subject or grade that meet throughout the school year.

Resource 31: Teacher Advancement Program

Teacher Advancement Program. (undated). Elements of TAP: Performance-based compensation [website]. Retrieved 9/26/05 from <http://tapschools.org/tap/tap.taf?page=element4>.

TAP teachers are compensated based on increased responsibilities in differentiated positions, how well they perform in those positions, the quality of their instructional performance, and by their students' achievement growth. All teachers in a TAP school are eligible for financial awards based on these factors. The system also encourages districts to offer competitive salaries to those who teach in "hard-to-staff" subjects and schools.

...SUBSTRATEGY 5.2

Improve working conditions and support teachers so they can succeed at improving student learning.

Resource 32: Distractions from teaching and learning

Abelmann, C.H., & Kenyon, S.B. (1996, April 12). Distractions from teaching and learning: Lessons from Kentucky's use of rewards. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, New York, NY. Retrieved 9/27/05 from <http://www.wested.org/pub/docs/261#1>.

In at-risk schools, working conditions and leadership (see substrategy below) go hand in hand. Excellent teachers choose to work with good colleagues, resources, and leaders. This study finds that, "A second assumption – that intrinsic rewards (e.g. quality of working environment) are more important than extrinsic rewards (e.g. financial incentives) in motivating people, was found to be true. In these cases, extrinsic awards were less important or conflicted with the intrinsic value teachers felt about their professions."

...SUBSTRATEGY 5.3

Develop and enhance leadership skills for principals and administrators.

Resource 33: Building Capacity of School Leaders to Support Teachers

See [Building Capacity of School Leaders to Support Teachers](#).

Resource 34: The Kentucky school-based performance award program

Kelley, C. (1997, March). The Kentucky school-based performance award program: School-level effects. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, Chicago, IL. Retrieved 9/27/05 from <http://www.wested.org/pub/docs/261#contents>.

Out of a sample of 16 elementary, middle, and high schools, the study observed different behaviors in high-performing vs. low-performing schools. High-performing schools had the “enabling conditions” of organizational capacity, alignment of resources with goals, strong professional teachers, and *facilitative leadership* [emphasis added] that took advantage of teachers’ skills.

Low-performing schools, however, did not align their curriculum or resources to achievement goals; viewed lower student achievement as a reflection of the students, rather than the quality of teaching; and principals indicated lower goals, such as merely improving scores, rather than improving scores enough to earn a reward.

Resource 35: Three-tiered licensure system

Teach New Mexico. (undated). Three-tiered licensure system: Online training modules for reviewing dossier [website]. Retrieved 9/29/05 from http://teachnm.org/3-tiered_licensure/modules/index_content.html

The Teach New Mexico site has online support modules for both teacher and administrator perspectives. Information includes the process, rationale, and rules of professional development plans (required for every teacher) and professional development dossiers (online work portfolios reviewed by independent evaluators, required for licensure advancement). The administrator module gives tips on how to use, support, and manage working on professional development plans.

...SUBSTRATEGY 5.4

Incorporate a teacher development system.

Resource 36: Performance-based teacher compensation in Iowa

White, B. (2002, September). *Performance-based teacher compensation in Iowa*. Madison, WI: Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Retrieved 9/28/05 from <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/papers/pdf/iowa%20KSBP%209-02.pdf>.

Reid, K.S. (2003, September 10). Iowa's move toward pay-for-performance on verge of collapse. *Education Week* 23(2): 1, 22. Retrieved 9/28/05 from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2003/09/10/02iowa.h23.html>.

“... Iowa approved the nation’s first statewide performance-based teacher compensation initiative.... Iowa's Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Act includes mentoring and induction programs for new teachers, a new professional development strategy, school-based variable pay incentives, statewide teaching standards, and teacher evaluations and career paths based on these standards. ... 99 percent of the state’s schools have opted to participate in the initial implementation phase.”

Note: The implementation has been stalled at phase 1 (first tier of licensure) because of the state budget.

Resource 37: Better Educated Students and Teachers

Florida State Legislature. (2003). Better Educated Students and Teachers: Excellent teachers in Florida classrooms [website]. Retrieved 9/8/05 from <http://www.leg.state.fl.us/data/house/best/index.html>.

Florida’s Better Educated Students and Teachers Florida Teaching Act of 2003 (B.E.S.T.) aims to empower teachers in Florida's classrooms through a program of recruitment, retention, and rewards. The state will fund a statewide salary career ladder for teachers with four career categories (with bonuses):

- *Associate teacher* (approximately 15% of current teachers) – have not achieved full certification or are low-performing;
- *Career teachers* (approximately 77% of current teachers) – have full certification of competencies. These teachers receive annual bonuses of up to \$3,000 when their students achieve “outstanding” learning gains.
- *Lead teachers* (the highest performing 5% of classroom teachers per district) – have demonstrated improved student achievement and lead other teachers. These teachers will be paid an additional salary supplement of \$5,000 each year.

- *Mentor teachers* (the highest performing 3% of teachers per district) – will be paid an additional salary supplement of \$10,000 each year.

STRATEGY 6

Include all parties.

- Focus on building, mending, or using relationships between management and labor (the district, the board, and the union).
- Strong working relationships will determine how well the program can respond to needed changes or unintended consequences.

Resource 38: Alternative teacher compensation

Goorian, B. (2000). Alternative teacher compensation: ERIC digest number 142 (ED446368). Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. Retrieved 9/29/04 from <http://www.ericfacility.net/ericdigests/ed446368.html>.

Jupp, B., Gonring, P., Ursetta, K., & Woodward, L. (2005, July 11). Building a coalition for professional teacher compensation in Denver. Presentation at the 2005 NCTAF Partners' Symposium, "Creating and Sustaining High-Performing Schools for Every Child."

Language makes a difference: for example, the term "merit pay" has negative connotations for subjective raises given to evaluators' favored teachers (Goorian 2000). In Denver, the design team found that, "When you ask general questions, you get general answers" (Jupp, et al. 2005). Teachers there rejected "pay for performance," but wanted to "improve teacher compensation for results."

Resource 39: Developing a performance pay plan for teachers

Hartman, D.B., & Weil, R. (1997, January 30). *Developing a performance pay plan for teachers: A process, not an event*. Submitted to American Federation of Teachers Research Department. Retrieved 9/26/05 from <http://www.aft.org/topics/teacher-quality/downloads/perfplan.pdf>.

p. 7: "Finally, we believe our process was successful because of the commitment by all participants to look at the issues objectively, setting other agendas aside, and approach them in a manner that allowed for tremendous flexibility within the design process."

...SUBSTRATEGY 6.1

Forge agreement on valued results and goals.

Teachers should not be caught between different priorities of their colleagues, human resources, union leaders, professional development offices, school board members, and the superintendent.

Resource 40: What went wrong in Cincinnati?

Delisio, E.R. (2003, January 30). What went wrong in Cincinnati? *Education World*. Retrieved 9/26/05 from http://www.education-world.com/a_issues/issues374b.shtml.

The author gathered several transitional problems during interviews conducted across the district. These included reasons such as:

- Teachers also felt the evaluation and professional development programs had not been adequately aligned with the compensation plan;
- Associate superintendent Kathleen Ware stated, "... We lost time negotiating because teachers felt the board had breached a cooperative agreement [on another issue]; and
- Allen Odden, of CPRE at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, added, "The major reason for the defeat was in the implementation.... There was not enough communication. Some issues were unresolved."

Resource 41: The Kentucky school-based performance award program

Kelley, C. (1997, March). The Kentucky school-based performance award program: School-level effects. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, Chicago, IL. Retrieved 9/27/05 from <http://www.wested.org/pub/docs/261#contents>.

Out of a sample of 16 elementary, middle, and high schools, the study observed different behaviors in high-performing vs. low-performing schools. High-performing schools had the "enabling conditions" of organizational capacity, *alignment of resources with goals* [emphasis added], strong professional teachers, and facilitative leadership that took advantage of teachers' skills.

Low-performing schools, however, did not align their curriculum or resources to achievement goals; viewed lower student achievement as a reflection of the students, rather than the quality of teaching; and principals indicated lower goals, such as merely improving scores, rather than improving scores enough to earn a reward.

...SUBSTRATEGY 6.2

Ask teachers – especially those in at-risk schools.

They must value and believe in the structure, rewards, rationale, and goals of the program.

Resource 42: Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service

Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. (undated). Interest-based bargaining: Are you looking for an alternative to traditional collective bargaining [website]? Retrieved 9/25/05 from <http://www.fmcs.gov/internet/itemDetail.asp?categoryID=131&itemID=15804>.

Known by many names and practiced in many variations and settings, interest-based bargaining (IBB) can offer more flexibility than traditional bargaining. Rather than entering negotiation with predetermined issues and positions, IBB begins a process of understanding a shared problem and jointly identifying the interests that underlie each side's issues and positions.

Resource 43: Developing a performance pay plan for teachers

Hartman, D.B., & Weil, R. (1997, January 30). *Developing a performance pay plan for teachers: A process, not an event*. Submitted to American Federation of Teachers Research Department. Retrieved 9/26/05 from <http://www.aft.org/topics/teacher-quality/downloads/perfplan.pdf>.

Hartman, D., McGraw, P., & Goetz, M. (2004, November 10). Performance pay plan for teachers: A decade of experience implementing performance based compensation [powerpoint]. Presentation prepared for the 2004 CPRE National Conference on Teacher Compensation and Evaluation. Douglas County, CO: Douglas County Federation of Teachers. Retrieved 9/27/05 from <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/conference/conference/Nov04/DouglasCty/Douglascounty.pdf>.

The pay-for-performance system of Douglas County has been in place for 10 years. Three years into implementation, the plan already had great support from teachers. "... Participation in each of the past three years in all of the plan's bonus incentive components has been high [T]he fall of 1995, only one year after the initial implementation of the plan, found a high level of awareness and confidence in the plan as a whole, and its various component parts [T]he fact that the last four contracts that have included the performance pay plan have passed by margins of greater than 95 percent of the teachers is a clear indication of the level of support this plan currently enjoys among the teachers of Douglas County" (Hartman & Weil, p. 6).

Resource 44: What went wrong in Cincinnati?

Delisio, E.R. (2003, January 30). What went wrong in Cincinnati? *Education World*. Retrieved 9/26/05 from http://www.education-world.com/a_issues/issues374b.shtml.

The author gathered several transitional problems during interviews conducted across the district. These included reasons such as:

- Teachers did not have enough time to adjust to the more rigorous and complex assessment system, and so were not confident in the objectivity of the evaluations; and
- Teachers felt the evaluation and professional development programs had not been adequately aligned with the compensation plan.

STRATEGY 7

Use fair and respected, validated, high quality, rigorous assessments of students and teachers. Teachers have to believe in the possibility of improvement in order for their practice, and their students' learning, to change.

- Performance indicators must be measurable.
- Measure improvements and not only absolute achievements.
- Include “subgroups” and at-risk student populations.
- Schools need to have tools to make long-term plans and to change their practices. Provide data software, strategic planning assistance, assistance teams, or examples of successfully improving schools.
- Train evaluators for reliable and consistent rating behaviors.
- Emphasize and disseminate best practices from schools within your state or district.

Resource 45: Reliability and validity of performance evaluation systems

Milanowski, T., & Kimball, S. (2004, November 11). Reliability and validity of performance evaluation systems for teachers [powerpoint]. Presentation prepared for 2004 CPRE National Conference on Teacher Compensation and Evaluation. Madison, WI: Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Retrieved 9/19/05 from http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/conference/conference/Nov04/PE_validity.asp.

Criterion-related validity is important because it:

- Defends decisions that are based on ratings
- Responds to demands for accountability from outside the system
- Supports the use of evidence in the evaluation system and the underlying model of teacher performance.

Resource 46: Teachers' incentives

Lavy, V. (2004, November 19). Teachers' incentives: Theory and practice [powerpoint]. Presentation prepared for OECD conference, Amsterdam, Netherlands. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Retrieved 9/19/05 from http://www.minocw.nl/congres_ocw-oecd/doc/keynote_address_victor_lavy.pdf.

Discusses design challenges as revealed by evaluations of performance-pay in Israel: though the program there was a “ranking tournament” (i.e., competitive), the design issues that arose are relevant to programs in the U.S. One issue Lavy discusses that is not as common in literature from the U.S. is “spillover effects,” or unforeseen impact on a variety of measurables such as students' work/effort for other classes.

Resource 47: Reliability and validity of performance evaluation systems

Milanowski, T., & Kimball, S. (2004, November 11). Reliability and validity of performance evaluation systems for teachers [PowerPoint]. Presentation prepared for 2004 CPRE National Conference on Teacher Compensation and Evaluation. Madison, WI: Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Retrieved 9/19/05 from http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/conference/conference/Nov04/PE_validity.asp.

Slide 29 of 31 states the researchers' conclusions that:

- “Standards-based evaluation systems can have useful level of criterion-related validity
- “Evaluation ratings do not *just* depend in who does the evaluating or when the evaluator observes
- “So ratings *can* tell us something meaningful about teacher performance
- “But even standards-based evaluation is not an exact science.”

...SUBSTRATEGY 7.1

Discuss the teacher assessment system with teachers and parents.

Ask teachers if they think the student assessment tools and yearly goals are achievable (e.g., tests, portfolio reviews).

Resource 48: Rewards for high student achievement

Scafidi, B. (undated). Rewards for high student achievement and interventions for persistently low student achievement. Atlanta, GA: Andrew Young School of Policy Studies. Retrieved 9/6/05 from http://frp.aysps.gsu.edu/frp/frpreports/brief_reports/brief21.html.

See section, "Issues in the Design and Implementation of an Accountability System."

Resource 49: What went wrong in Cincinnati?

Delisio, E.R. (2003, January 30). What went wrong in Cincinnati? *Education World*. Retrieved 9/26/05 from http://www.education-world.com/a_issues/issues374b.shtml.

The author gathered several transitional problems during interviews conducted across the district. These included reasons such as:

- Teachers did not have enough time to adjust to the more rigorous and complex assessment system, and so were not confident in the objectivity of the evaluations;
- Teachers also felt the evaluation and professional development programs had not been adequately aligned with the compensation plan;
- Allen Odden, of CPRE at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, added, "The major reason for the defeat was in the implementation.... There was not enough communication. Some issues were unresolved."

...SUBSTRATEGY 7.2

Make sure your system has *data* and a strong *data system infrastructure*.

Resource 50: Lessons from North Carolina

Ladd, H. (2004, March). Lessons from North Carolina's school-based accountability system. Albany, NY: Education Finance Research Consortium, The University at Albany. Retrieved 9/6/05 from <http://www.albany.edu/edfin/Ladd%20EFRC%20Symp%2004%20Single.pdf>.

p. 1: "By rewarding teachers for gains in student performance that are based on annual test scores for all students in grades 3-8, North Carolina minimizes, but does not eliminate, the possibility of simply rewarding teachers who happen to be teaching in schools serving more affluent students."

Resource 51: Developing a performance pay plan for teachers

Hartman, D.B., & Weil, R. (1997, January 30). *Developing a performance pay plan for teachers: A process, not an event*. Submitted to American Federation of Teachers Research Department. Retrieved 9/26/05 from <http://www.aft.org/topics/teacher-quality/downloads/perfplan.pdf>.

p. 7: "... [W]ithout solid baseline data to help understand how such a compensation system influences teachers in their practice, much less accurate high stakes assessments that are truly reflective of student learning and achievement, it may never be possible to rate this plan, or any other for that matter, as an unqualified success."

Resource 52: Building a Rewarding Career for New Mexico's teachers

Winograd, P., Ball, J., Mitchell, R., Bowyer, C., & Moulton, R. (2004, November 14). Building a Rewarding Career for New Mexico's teachers [PowerPoint]. Presentation prepared for 2004 NCTAF Regional Meeting, "Building a Professionally Rewarding Career Path for Teachers," Seattle, WA. Retrieved 9/27/05 from <http://www.nctaf.org/article/index.php?g=0&c=5&sc=41&ssc=&a=291&navs=>.

"Data gathering on the number of teachers at the different levels must improve in order to inform the Legislature on needed funding for the system annually."

...SUBSTRATEGY 7.3

Evaluate the pay program and build in flexibility to make adjustments along the way.

Resource 53: Performance pay in Arizona

White, B.R., & Henemann, H.G. (2002, February). *A case study of Proposition 301 and performance-based pay in Arizona*. Madison, WI: Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Retrieved 9/25/05 from <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/papers/pdf/Arizona%20KSBP-SBPA%202-02.pdf>.

Aportela, A. (2005). *Performance pay in Arizona as a result of Proposition 301*. Madison, WI: Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Retrieved 9/19/05 from www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/papers/pdf/AZ%20Prop%20301%20Minicase.pdf.

p. 13, White & Henemann: The final language of the performance-based pay component in Proposition 301 was purposely vague to allow local districts and charter schools to design plans that best met their needs. However, the strategy also led to many questions about implementation that lacked definitive answers.

p. 4, Aportela: "Because there is no requirement for the state to track or document the structure of districts' performance-based pay plans, there is no consistent or periodic collection of information To date, there has been no effort by the state or others to systematically collect this information or analyze it in light of other measures of school or student performance Due to the varied nature of performance-based pay plans, it is not possible to measure the impact of performance-based pay on the academic achievement of students, even if data on the plans were consistently collected."

Resource 54: What went wrong in Cincinnati?

Delisio, E.R. (2003, January 30). What went wrong in Cincinnati? *Education World*. Retrieved 9/26/05 from http://www.education-world.com/a_issues/issues374b.shtml.

The author gathered several transitional problems during interviews conducted across the district. These included reasons such as:

- The tight timetable for approval and implementation did not leave enough time to address teacher concerns about the compensation plan; and
- Teachers did not have enough time to adjust to the more rigorous and complex assessment system, and so were not confident in the objectivity of the evaluations.

...SUBSTRATEGY 7.4

Have a specific, concrete rating scale and rubrics that measure improvement and not only absolute achievement levels.

- Many experts recommend using pre-existing standards, assessment benchmarks, or evaluation systems. Creating your own standards rubric and assessment system is also an option, albeit a lengthy one.

Resource 55: INTASC

Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Standards Consortium. Website:

[http://www.ccsso.org/projects/Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium/](http://www.ccsso.org/projects/Interstate_New_Teacher_Assessment_and_Support_Consortium/).

See also, INTASC. (1992). *Model standards for beginning teacher licensing, assessment and development: A resource for state dialogue*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers. Retrieved 9/27/05 from <http://www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/corestrd.pdf>.

Drafted by a committee of teachers, teacher educators, and state agency officials, INTASC's *Model Standards for Beginning Teacher Licensing, Assessment and Development* (1992) represents a shared view among the states and within the profession of what constitutes competent beginning teaching. These standards are being translated for specific subject matter areas and student populations (so far, standards have been created for the areas of elementary, arts, science, mathematics, foreign languages, and special education).

Resource 56: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Website:

<http://www.nbpts.org>.

See also, NBPTS. (undated). Standards & National Board certification [website]. Retrieved 9/27/05 from <http://www.nbpts.org/standards/index.cfm>.

The National Board has developed a series of rigorous standards that require extensive documentation and student work evidence. National Board certification has become recognized as a symbol of excellence, and early studies show that students achieve at higher levels with National Board Certified Teachers.

Resource 57: Enhancing professional practice

Danielson, C. (1998). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

See also, Danielson, C. (2000). *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Framework for Teaching was based on standards created by Danielson for the Educational Testing Service in the Praxis III exam. It has become a widely used tool for knowledge- and skill-based pay systems. There are also frameworks of standards for teaching published by other organizations.

Resource 58: A framework for teaching English learners

WestEd. (2004). A framework for teaching English learners. *R&D Alert* 6(3). Retrieved 9/27/05 from http://www.wested.org/online_pubs/rd-06-03.pdf.

A brief that introduces a framework for teaching English language learners, both preschool and K-12.

STRATEGY 8

Publicize the program and communicate extensively with teachers, administrators, parents, and the public to ensure that important stakeholders understand the project and its impact on salaries, low-performing schools, and school improvement.

Resource 59: A-Plus plan offers bonus

Hirschman, B. (2000, April 11). A-Plus plan offers bonus, not pay cut, Bush says. *South Florida Sun-Sentinel* [Broward Metro Edition]: 6B. Retrieved 9/26/05 from <http://www.sun-sentinel.com/>.

Hirschman, B. (2000, April 10). Bush defends A-Plus plan, says teacher bonuses misunderstood [press release]. Retrieved 9/26/05 from http://www.myflorida.com/myflorida/government/governorinitiatives/aplusplan/articles/bush_defends_a+plan-4-10-00.htm.

In an example that demonstrates the need for a rigorous, grassroots communications strategy, rumors and fears advanced that Governor Jeb Bush's A-Plus education plan would penalize teachers with pay cuts if their students failed to perform.

Resource 60: What went wrong in Cincinnati?

Delisio, E.R. (2003, January 30). What went wrong in Cincinnati? *Education World*. Retrieved 9/26/05 from http://www.education-world.com/a_issues/issues374b.shtml.

In the article, associate superintendent Kathleen Ware stated, "I'm not sure the teachers completely understood the plan.... We lost time negotiating because teachers felt the board had breached a cooperative agreement [on another issue]."

Resource 61: Developing a performance pay plan for teachers

Hartman, D.B., & Weil, R. (1997, January 30). *Developing a performance pay plan for teachers: A process, not an event*. Submitted to American Federation of Teachers Research Department. Retrieved 9/26/05 from <http://www.aft.org/topics/teacher-quality/downloads/perfplan.pdf>.

Hartman, D., McGraw, P., & Goetz, M. (2004, November 10). Performance pay plan for teachers: A decade of experience implementing performance based compensation [powerpoint]. Presentation prepared for the 2004 CPRE National Conference on Teacher Compensation and Evaluation. Douglas County, CO: Douglas County Federation of Teachers. Retrieved 9/27/05 from

<http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/conference/conference/Nov04/DouglasCty/Douglascounty.pdf>.

The pay-for-performance system of Douglas County has been in place for 10 years. Three years into implementation, the plan already had great support from teachers. "... Participation in each of the past three years in all of the plans bonus incentive components has been high [T]he fall of 1995, only one year after the initial implementation of the plan, found a high level of awareness and confidence in the plan as a whole, and its various component parts [T]he fact that the last four contracts that have included the performance pay plan have passed by margins of greater than 95 percent of the teachers is a clear indication of the level of support this plan currently enjoys among the teachers of Douglas County" (Hartman & Weil, p. 6).

Resource 62: Denver ProComp

Denver ProComp. (undated). Community Forum [website]. Retrieved 9/29/05 from <http://denverprocomp.org/communityforum>.

"The Community Forum is a bi-monthly meeting of community members interested in public schools and educational excellence in Denver. Its original purpose was to engage leaders from all parts of Denver—including the business and nonprofit communities, elected officials and representatives of organized labor—in a dialogue about the issues surrounding the Pay for Performance Pilot. Following the end of the pilot, the Community Forum has continued to play an important role as a citizen sounding board as the Joint Task Force on Teacher Compensation developed the new ProComp plan."

Resource 63: New Mexico's three-tiered licensure system

Teach New Mexico. New Mexico's three-tiered licensure system. Website: <http://www.teachnm.org>.

"The State Board of Education built in some time for educators in New Mexico to develop and get to know the changes that the 3-tiered licensure system will introduce; The Public Education Department will be developing and implementing training for teachers and administrators, so that by the effective date, everyone will have had a chance to learn about New Mexico's 3-tiered teacher licensure system and how it affects them."

Note: The system went into effect on July 1, 2004.

STRATEGY 9

Consider relationships of performance pay to licensure.

- Do you want licensure to be tiered and performance-based?
- Do you want salary to be tied to licensure?

Resource 64: Performance-based teacher compensation in Iowa

White, B. (2002, September). *Performance-based teacher compensation in Iowa*. Madison, WI: Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Retrieved 9/28/05 from <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/papers/pdf/iowa%20KSBP%209-02.pdf>.

Reid, K.S. (2003, September 10). Iowa's move toward pay-for-performance on verge of collapse. *Education Week* 23(2): 1, 22. Retrieved 9/28/05 from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2003/09/10/02iowa.h23.html>.

“... Iowa approved the nation’s first statewide performance-based teacher compensation initiative.... Iowa's Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Act includes mentoring and induction programs for new teachers, a new professional development strategy, school-based variable pay incentives, statewide teaching standards, and teacher evaluations and career paths based on these standards. ... 99 percent of the state’s schools have opted to participate in the initial implementation phase.”

Note: The implementation has been stalled at phase 1 (first tier of licensure) and has not moved to phases (tiers) 2 and 3 because of the state budget. It is up for debate as to whether the plan is “on hold” or if it has been dropped.

Resource 65: 3-Tiered Licensure

Teach New Mexico. (2004). 3-Tiered Licensure – Overview [website]. Retrieved 10/20/04 from http://www.teachnm.org/3-tiered_licensure/3-tiered_licensure.htm.

The new tiered licensure system went into effect on July 1, 2004. It links teachers’ licensure levels and salaries to their accomplishments in the classroom. It also encourages and supports ongoing professional development in the nine NM teaching competency areas. Progress through the system guarantees minimum salary levels for teachers at different licensure levels. As minimum salaries increase, so will the expectations for teachers’ performance.

Resource 66: Better Educated Students and Teachers

Florida State Legislature. (2003). Better Educated Students and Teachers: Excellent Teachers In Florida Classrooms [website]. Retrieved 9/8/05 from <http://www.leg.state.fl.us/data/house/best/index.html>.

Florida's Better Educated Students and Teachers Florida Teaching Act of 2003 (B.E.S.T.) aims to empower teachers in Florida's classrooms through a program of recruitment, retention, and rewards. Under the B.E.S.T. initiative, the state will fund a statewide salary career ladder for teachers with four career categories (with bonuses):

- *Associate teacher* (approximately 15% of current teachers) – have not achieved full certification or are low-performing;
- *Career teachers* (approximately 77% of current teachers) – have full certification of competencies. These teachers receive annual bonuses of up to \$3,000 when their students achieve “outstanding” learning gains.
- *Lead teachers* (highest performing 5% of classroom teachers per district) – have demonstrated improved student achievement and lead other teachers. These teachers will be paid an additional salary supplement of \$5,000 each year.
- *Mentor teachers* (highest performing 3% of teachers per district) – will be paid an additional salary supplement of \$10,000 each year.

Resource 67: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (2003). *No dream denied: A pledge to America's children*. Washington, DC: Author.
Retrieved 9/27/05 from <http://www.nctaf.org>.

Three strategies (high quality teacher preparation, rewarding professional career, and create strong learning communities) work on creating a quality teacher continuum from preparation through career development, emphasizing changing school organization for success.

STRATEGY 10

Agree on who is included in the new pay system.

- Will you include administrators, classified staff, teachers' aides, counselors, nurses, teachers?
- What about teachers outside "core" subjects?
- Does the performance pay include all schools, only at-risk schools, or only high-performing schools?

Resource 68: Incentive program to attract and retain teachers

Virginia Department of Education. (undated). Incentive program to attract and retain teachers in Virginia's hard-to-staff schools [website]. Retrieved 8/29/05 from <http://141.104.22.210/VDOE/Instruction/OCP/hard-to-staff.html>.

In addition to funds (\$150-\$200 per student) for student achievement and to improve working conditions, this program gives salary incentives to all faculty members in a school.

Resource 69: New Mexico's Three-tiered Licensure System

Teach New Mexico. New Mexico's Three-tiered Licensure System. Website: <http://www.teachnm.org>.

Winograd, P., Ball, J., Mitchell, R., Bowyer, C., & Moulton, R. (2004, November 14). Building a Rewarding Career for New Mexico's teachers [powerpoint]. Presentation prepared for 2004 NCTAF Regional Meeting, "Building a Professionally Rewarding Career Path for Teachers," Seattle, WA. Retrieved 9/27/05 from <http://www.nctaf.org/article/index.php?g=0&c=5&sc=41&ssc=&a=291&navs> =.

New Mexico's new teacher licensure and pay system, which is performance-based, has caught the interest of administrators, instructional support specialists, and educational assistants, who have asked to be included in the system as well. The state is exploring a tiered licensure or performance-based system for school and district administrators.

Resource 70: IPS chief's pay tied to success of students

Hooper, K.L. (2005, July 21). IPS chief's pay tied to success of students. *IndyStar.com*. Retrieved 9/19/05 from <http://www.indystar.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20050721/NEWS01/507210468>.

Performance-based Bonuses for Administrators: Indianapolis, Cincinnati, Dallas,

Denver, and Illinois have negotiated contracts with top administrators based on meeting academic goals across the district. The Palm Beach County, Florida, superintendent can earn a bonus of 15% of salary if test scores dramatically improve, suspensions drop, and graduation rates go up.

REAL-LIFE EXAMPLE 1:

IN DOUGLAS COUNTY, COLORADO, TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS SUPPORT PERFORMANCE PAY SYSTEM

The principal of Cresthill Middle School works with a group of 70 low-achieving seventh-graders, tracking how they are doing and developing plans for boosting their achievement. Her performance bonus is contingent on the academic progress of those students.

“With this, I can really hone in on a specific target,” says the Cresthill principal. “I find myself perhaps more willing to do extra ... because I know there's a little bit in it for me, too.”

The performance pay system for the Douglas County Federation of Teachers (DCFT) has both stability and longevity. A committee composed of community members, teachers, and administrators developed the ten-year-old system. The president of DCFT, Patrick McGraw, sees support for the program arising from the teachers' investment in its design: “They all were part of the development system. It works because of the attention to detail district administrators and teachers put into it.”

Multiple assessments have replaced traditional salary increases based on years of experience. Teachers only receive increases if they earn a rating of “proficient” or better on their annual evaluation. Principals evaluate teachers based on classroom observations rather than test scores. Teachers develop personal growth plans every two years. Taking on additional responsibilities also can earn a teacher more money; building administrators decide on the payment for the extra tasks. Annual bonuses also are awarded to teachers considered outstanding performers. Finally, group incentives are also a popular aspect of the program.

Projects used to earn bonuses must be data-driven—supported by hard evidence. No money is given unless participants present data showing that what they did improved student achievement. The Cresthill middle school principal, said, “Personally, I find it very, very motivating.”

There are concerns over group incentives that give money across the board to teachers in a school, including those who do nothing and ride on the hard work of their colleagues. Also of concern are the outstanding teachers in low-performing schools that might not have the environment or support to meet group goals. This is where individual recognition and evidence of success can support those excellent teachers who work to improve their schools as well as their students' learning.

A teacher at Fox Creek Elementary School says she was initially skeptical of the district's "outstanding teacher" program. But as she participated in the program (and received the \$1,000 bonus), she began reflecting more on how to improve her teaching, she says. Some teachers say the prospect of a performance bonus doesn't really motivate a teacher to work harder. But this teacher says, "It definitely does."

Sources:

Delisio, E.R. (2003, January 29). Pay for performance: It *can* work – here's how. *Education World*. Retrieved 9/28/05 from http://www.education-world.com/a_issues/issues374c.shtml.

Hartman, D.B., & Weil, R. (1997, January 30). *Developing a performance pay plan for teachers: A process, not an event*. Submitted to American Federation of Teachers Research Department. Retrieved 9/26/05 from <http://www.aft.org/topics/teacher-quality/downloads/perfplan.pdf>.

Bushweller, K. (1999, August). Eyes on the prize: Performance pay for principals and teachers who produce results. *American School Board Journal*. Retrieved 9/15/05 from <http://www.asbj.com/199908/0899coverstory.html>.

REAL-LIFE EXAMPLE 2:

NEW MEXICO FORGES AHEAD WITH NEW TIERED LICENSURE SYSTEM

Recently, New Mexico passed legislation implementing a three-tiered licensure system for its teachers. Teachers must compile and submit evidence of their skills, their students' learning, and their professional development in order to advance to a new career level.

In addition to this career development, the new licensure system guarantees minimum pay levels. Performance-based licensure now translates to pay.

Finally, the licensure system is entirely online. Principals and other district observers log their evaluations on the teacher's online professional development dossier. The teachers submit their evidence online to their dossier. Independent evaluators review teacher dossiers online. Training modules for developing dossiers and for evaluating (scoring) them are also available on the Teach NM website.

Early results have been that the system is motivating teachers to pursue professional development and evidence of results. Furthermore, the system is opening a treasure trove of data about teacher skills, teacher turnover, equity of distribution of quality teachers, and principal turnover.

Teacher preparation programs also feel the tug of the licensure program. More students are enrolling for their programs, crowding classes and student teacher placements. The state will have to adjust to the interest in teaching that has resulted from the salary and professional investments.

Now other school staff roles are asking what benefits they can earn as well. The teacher licensure system is comprehensive – it advances career responsibilities, status, and embeds induction for beginning teachers, professional development, and salary raises. Principals and classroom assistants want these advantages too.

But what about funding? Though the state has a large investment ahead, it is using part of its land grant permanent fund (a trust fund set up by the state) to support the program. It has state funds committed by the legislature. And national interest in the program has spurred commitment at all levels of the state – from the governor's office down to professional development support from universities – to take notice.

"It's very exciting," one state official from the Public Education Department commented. "It's a little scary, too. What we are doing is entirely new. We don't have a guide telling us what to do next. But with every step, we continue getting

support, so we are going to take this as far as we can go to ensure all New Mexico students have excellent teachers.”

Sources:

Ball, J. (2004, November). Personal communication.

New Mexico State Investment Council. (2005). Land grant permanent fund [website]. Retrieved 10/17/05 from http://www.state.nm.us/nmsic/permanent_funds.htm.

Teach New Mexico. (2004). 3-Tiered licensure – overview [website]. Retrieved 10/20/04 from http://www.teachnm.org/3-tiered_licensure/3-tiered_licensure.htm.

Teach New Mexico. (2004). Three-tiered licensure system: Online training modules for reviewing dossier [website]. Retrieved 9/29/05 from http://teachnm.org/3-tiered_licensure/modules/index_content.html

Winograd, P. (2005, July). Personal communication.

REFERENCES

- Abelmann, C.H., & Kenyon, S.B. (1996, April 12). Distractions from teaching and learning: Lessons from Kentucky's use of rewards. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, New York, NY. Retrieved 9/27/05 from <http://www.wested.org/pub/docs/261#1>.
- American Federation of Teachers. (undated). Professional compensation [website]. Retrieved 9/29/04 from <http://www.aft.org/topics/teacher-quality/comp.htm>.
- Aportela, A. (2005). *Performance pay in Arizona as a result of Proposition 301*. Madison, WI: Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Retrieved 9/19/05 from www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/papers/pdf/AZ%20Prop%20301%20Minicase.pdf.
- Atkinson, A., Burgess, S., Croxson, B., Gregg, P., Propper, C., Slater, H., & Wilson, D. (2004, December). *Evaluating the impact of performance-related pay for teachers in England*. Bristol, England: University of Bristol. Retrieved 9/19/05 from <http://www.bris.ac.uk/Depts/CMPO/workingpapers/wp113.pdf>.
- Bushweller, K. (1999, August). Eyes on the prize: Performance pay for principals and teachers who produce results. *American School Board Journal*. Retrieved 9/15/05 from <http://www.asbj.com/199908/0899coverstory.html>.
- Consortium for Policy Research in Education at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. (undated). Emerging findings in teacher compensation [website]. Retrieved 9/19/05 from <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/tcomp/research/general/findings.asp#strategy>.
- Consortium for Policy Research in Education at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. (undated). 2004 National Conference on Teacher Compensation & Evaluation November 11-12, 2004 [website]. Retrieved 9/19/05 from <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/conference/conference/Nov04/agenda.asp>.
- Consortium for Policy Research in Education at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. (undated). Compensation design process [website]. Retrieved 9/19/05 from <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/tcomp/research/strategy/design.asp>.
- Dale, J.D. (2004, October). Redesigning work and compensation to fit NCLB. *The School Administrator* Web Edition. Retrieved 10/15/04 from http://www.aasa.org/publications/sa/2004_10/dale.htm.

- Danielson, C. (1998). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Danielson, C. (2000). *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Delisio, E.R. (2003, January 29). Pay for performance: It *can* work – here's how. *Education World*. Retrieved 9/28/05 from http://www.education-world.com/a_issues/issues374c.shtml.
- Delisio, E.R. (2003, January 30). What went wrong in Cincinnati? *Education World*. Retrieved 9/26/05 from http://www.education-world.com/a_issues/issues374b.shtml.
- Denver ProComp. (undated). Community forum [website]. Retrieved 9/29/05 from <http://denverprocomp.org/communityforum>.
- Douglas County Federation of Teachers. (undated). Performance pay: Executive summary of plan for teachers [website]. Retrieved 9/19/05 from http://www.dcft.net/performance/general/exec_summary.htm.
- Education Commission of the States. Pay-for-performance: Key questions and lessons from five current models. *Issue Brief*. Denver, CO: Author. Retrieved 10/6/04 from <http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/28/30/2830.htm>.
- Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. (undated). Interest-based bargaining: Are you looking for an alternative to traditional collective bargaining [website]? Retrieved 9/25/05 from <http://www.fmcs.gov/internet/itemDetail.asp?categoryID=131&itemID=15804>
- Florida State Legislature. (2003). Better Educated Students and Teachers: Excellent teachers in Florida classrooms [website]. Retrieved 9/8/05 from <http://www.leg.state.fl.us/data/house/best/index.html>.
- Goldhaber, D., & Player, D. (2004, March). What different benchmarks suggest about how financially attractive it is to teach in public schools. *The Journal of Education Finance*. Retrieved 10/8/04 from http://www.crpe.org/workingpapers/pdf/JEF_Benchmarks&Figures.pdf.
- Goorian, B. (2000). Alternative teacher compensation: ERIC digest number 142 (ED446368). Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. Retrieved 9/29/04 from <http://www.ericfacility.net/ericdigests/ed446368.html>.
- Hartman, D., McGraw, P., & Goetz, M. (2004, November 10). Performance pay plan for teachers: A decade of experience implementing performance based compensation [powerpoint]. Presentation prepared for the 2004 CPRE National Conference on Teacher Compensation and Evaluation.

- Douglas County, CO: Douglas County Federation of Teachers. Retrieved 9/27/05 from <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/conference/conference/Nov04/DouglasCty/Douglascounty.pdf>.
- Hartman, D.B., & Weil, R. (1997, January 30). *Developing a performance pay plan for teachers: A process, not an event*. Submitted to American Federation of Teachers Research Department. Retrieved 9/26/05 from <http://www.aft.org/topics/teacher-quality/downloads/perfplan.pdf>.
- Hassel, B. (2002). *Better pay for better teaching: Making teacher compensation pay off in the age of accountability*. Washington, DC: Progressive Policy Institute. Retrieved 9/19/05 from http://www.ppionline.org/documents/Hassel_May02.pdf.
- Hill, T.L., & Dozier, T. (2003, March). Multi-tiered, performance-based licensure. *ECS Briefing Paper*. Retrieved 10/15/04 from <http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/51/22/5122.htm>.
- Hirschman, B. (2000, April 10). Bush defends A-Plus plan, says teacher bonuses misunderstood [press release]. Retrieved 9/26/05 from http://www.myflorida.com/myflorida/government/governorinitiatives/aplusplan/articles/bush_defends_a+plan-4-10-00.htm.
- Hirschman, B. (2000, April 11). A-Plus plan offers bonus, not pay cut, Bush says. *South Florida Sun-Sentinel* [Broward Metro Edition]: 6B. Retrieved 9/26/05 from <http://www.sun-sentinel.com/>.
- Hooper, K.L. (2005, July 21). IPS chief's pay tied to success of students. *IndyStar.com*. Retrieved 9/19/05 from <http://www.indystar.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20050721/NEWS01/507210468>.
- Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. (1992). Model standards for beginning teacher licensing, assessment and development: A resource for state dialogue. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers. Retrieved 9/27/05 from <http://www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/corestrd.pdf>.
- Jupp, B., Gonring, P., Ursetta, K., & Woodward, L. (2005, July 11). Building a coalition for professional teacher compensation in Denver. Presentation at the 2005 NCTAF Partners' Symposium, "Creating and Sustaining High-Performing Schools for Every Child," Denver, CO.
- Kelley, C. (1997, March). The Kentucky school-based performance award program: School-level effects. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, Chicago, IL. Retrieved 9/27/05 from <http://www.wested.org/pub/docs/261#contents>.

- Kelley, C. (2002, September). *Financial incentives in state accountability systems: Performance pay for teachers*. Madison, WI: Consortium for Policy Research in Education at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Retrieved 9/19/05 from <http://www.k12.wa.us/accountability/reports/FINANCIAL%20INCENTIVES%20FINAL%209%2010%2002.pdf>.
- Kimball, S.M. (2005, May). *LaCrescent, Minnesota pay-for-performance plan: Revised and still running*. Madison, WI: Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Retrieved 9/19/05 from www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/papers/pdf/LaCrescent%20update1.pdf.
- Ladd, H. (2004, March). *Lessons from North Carolina's school-based accountability system*. Albany, NY: Education Finance Research Consortium. Retrieved 9/6/05 from <http://www.albany.edu/edfin/Ladd%20EFRC%20Symp%2004%20Single.pdf>.
- Lavy, V. (2002, December). *Paying for performance: The effect of teachers' financial incentives on students' scholastic outcomes*. Jerusalem, Israel: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem and CEPR. Retrieved 9/19/05 from <http://www.cid.harvard.edu/bread/papers/working/022.pdf>.
- Lavy, V. (2004, November 19). Teachers' incentives: Theory and practice [PowerPoint]. Presentation prepared for OECD conference, Amsterdam, Netherlands. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Retrieved 9/19/05 from http://www.minocw.nl/congres_ocw-oecd/doc/keynote_address_victor_lavy.pdf
- Leigh, A., & Mead, S. (2005, April). Lifting teacher performance. *Policy Report*. Washington, DC: Progressive Policy Institute.
- MetLife, Inc. (2005). *MetLife survey of the American teacher: Transitions and the role of supportive relationships*. New York: Harris Interactive, Inc. Retrieved 9/5/05 from http://www.metlife.com/WPSAssets/34996838801118758796V1FATS_2004.pdf.
- Milanowski, A. (2003, January 29). The varieties of knowledge and skill-based pay design: A comparison of seven new pay systems for K-12 teachers. *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 11(4). Retrieved 9/26/05 from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v11n4/>.
- Milanowski, T., & Kimball, S. (2004, November 11). Reliability and validity of performance evaluation systems for teachers [PowerPoint]. Presentation prepared for 2004 CPRE National Conference on Teacher Compensation and Evaluation. Madison, WI: Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Retrieved 9/19/05 from

http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/conference/conference/Nov04/PE_validity.asp.

More teachers graded for their pay. (2002, September 9). *CNN.com*. Retrieved 2/17/04 from <http://www.cnn.com/2002/US/09/09/b2s.02.scoring.teachers/index.html>.

Murphy, P.J., and DeArmond, M.M. (2003, July). *From the headlines to the frontlines: The teacher shortage and its implications for recruitment policy*. Seattle, WA: Center on Reinventing Public Education. Retrieved 9/6/05 from http://www.crpe.org/pubs/pdf/TeacherShortage_reportweb.pdf.

National Association of State Boards of Education. (undated). Statewide teacher career ladders. *NASBE Policy Update 10(9)*. Retrieved 9/26/05 from http://www.nasbe.org/Educational_Issues/New_Information/Policy_Updates/10_09.html.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (undated). Standards & National Board certification [website]. Retrieved 9/27/05 from <http://www.nbpts.org/standards/index.cfm>.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (2004, November 14-15). Meeting materials from "Building a professionally rewarding career path for teachers," regional meeting, Seattle, WA [website]. Retrieved 9/27/05 from <http://www.nctaf.org/article/index.php?g=0&c=5&sc=41&ssc=&a=291&navs=>.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (2003). *No dream denied: A pledge to America's children*. Washington, DC: Author, pp. 134-139. Retrieved 9/27/05 from <http://www.nctaf.org>.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (2004, May 14). *Fifty years after Brown v. Board of Education: A two-tiered education system*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved 9/28/05 from <http://www.nctaf.org/article/index.php?g=0&c=4&sc=17&ssc=&a=244&navs=>.

North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. (2000). *Critical issue: Rethinking the use of educational resources to support higher student achievement*. Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates/NCREL. Retrieved 9/19/05 from <http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/envrnmnt/go/go600.htm>.

Odden, A. & Kelley, C. (2002). *Paying teachers for what they know and do: New and smarter compensation strategies to improve schools*, 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

- Odden, A., & Wallace, M. (2004, November 11). Teacher performance-based pay – the next steps [powerpoint]. Presentation at 2004 CPRE National Conference on Teacher Compensation and Evaluation. Retrieved 9/19/05 from <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/conference/conference/Nov04/OddenWallacekeynote/oddenwallace.pdf>.
- Odden, A. & Wallace, M. (2004, October). Experimenting with teacher compensation. *The School Administrator* Web Edition. Retrieved 10/14/04 from http://www.aasa.org/publications/sa/2004_10/odden.htm.
- Odden, A., Kelley, C., Henemann, H., & Milanowski, A. (2001, November). Enhancing teacher quality through knowledge- and skills-based pay. *CPRE Policy Briefs* RB-34. Retrieved 10/14/04 from <http://www.cpre.org/Publications/rb34.pdf>.
- Pugmire, T. (2005, August 14). State, school districts prepare for changes in teacher pay. *Minnesota Public Radio News & Features*. Retrieved 9/19/05 from http://news.minnesota.publicradio.org/features/2005/08/15_pugmiret_comp/.
- Reid, K.S. (2003, September 10). Iowa's move toward pay-for-performance on verge of collapse. *Education Week* 23(2): 1, 22. Retrieved 9/28/05 from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2003/09/10/02iowa.h23.html>.
- Rotherham, A. (2005, March 30). Credit where it's due. *Education Week* 24(29): 34, 48. Retrieved 9/6/05 from http://www.ppionline.org/ppi_ci.cfm?knlgAreaID=85&subsecID=65&contentID=253264.
- Roza, M., & Hill, P.T. (2004). How Within-District Spending Inequities Help Some Schools to Fail. *Brookings Papers on Education Policy*. Retrieved 9/28/05 from <http://www.crpe.org/pubs/pdf/InequitiesRozaHillchapter.pdf>.
- Scafidi, B. (undated). Rewards for high student achievement and interventions for persistently low student achievement. Atlanta, GA: Andrew Young School of Policy Studies. Retrieved 9/6/05 from http://frp.aysps.gsu.edu/frp/frpreports/brief_reports/brief21.html.
- Simms, C. (2004, November 14). Knowledge and skill based pay (KSBP) plan in Steamboat Springs, Colorado. Presentation at the NCTAF Regional Meeting, "Building Professionally Rewarding Careers for Teachers." Retrieved 9/27/05 from <http://www.nctaf.org/article/index.php?q=0&c=5&sc=41&ssc=&a=291&navs>
=.

- Southeast Center for Teaching Quality. (2004). *Summary of findings: Governor Easley's teacher working conditions initiative*. Prepared for Governor Mike Easley. Retrieved 9/26/05 from http://www.teachingquality.org/resources/pdfs/TWC_SummaryofFindings.pdf.
- Teach New Mexico. (2004). 3-Tiered licensure – overview [website]. Retrieved 10/20/04 from http://www.teachnm.org/3-tiered_licensure/3-tiered_licensure.htm.
- Teach New Mexico. (2004). Three-tiered licensure system: Online training modules for reviewing dossier [website]. Retrieved 9/29/05 from http://teachnm.org/3-tiered_licensure/modules/index_content.html
- Teacher Advancement Program Foundation. (undated). Elements of TAP: Performance-based compensation [website]. Retrieved 9/26/05 from <http://tapschools.org/tap/tap.taf?page=element4>.
- Business Roundtable & National Alliance of Business. (2000). *Pay-for-performance in education: An issue brief for business leaders*. Washington, DC: Authors. Retrieved 10/7/04 from <http://www.businessroundtable.org/pdf/403.pdf>.
- Virginia Department of Education. (undated). Incentive program to attract and retain teachers in Virginia's hard-to-staff schools [website]. Retrieved 8/29/05 from <http://141.104.22.210/VDOE/Instruction/OCP/hard-to-staff.html>.
- Washington State Professional Educator Standards Board. (2003). *Getting and keeping the teachers we need: Paying for what we value*. Olympia, WA: Author. Retrieved 10/12/04 from <http://www.pesb.wa.gov/Policybriefs/Compensation.pdf>.
- WestEd. (2004). A framework for teaching English learners. *R&D Alert* 6(3). Retrieved 9/27/05 from http://www.wested.org/online_pubs/rd-06-03.pdf.
- White, B. (2002, September). *Performance-based teacher compensation in Iowa*. Madison, WI: Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Retrieved 9/28/05 from <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/papers/pdf/iowa%20KSBP%209-02.pdf>.
- White, B.R., & Henemann, H.G. (2002, February). A case study of Proposition 301 and performance-based pay in Arizona. Madison, WI: Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Retrieved 9/25/05 from <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/papers/pdf/Arizona%20KSBP-SBPA%202-02.pdf>.

Winograd, P., Ball, J., Mitchell, R., Bowyer, C., & Moulton, R. (2004, November 14). Building a Rewarding Career for New Mexico's teachers [powerpoint]. Presentation prepared for 2004 NCTAF Regional Meeting, "Building a Professionally Rewarding Career Path for Teachers," Seattle, WA. Retrieved 9/27/05 from <http://www.nctaf.org/article/index.php?g=0&c=5&sc=41&ssc=&a=291&navs=>.