

# Exhibit 41



## Research Report

Research Project 06-157

## Knowledge- and Skills-Based Pay Systems

Prepared for  
Adequacy Study Oversight Subcommittee  
of the  
Senate Committee on Education  
and the  
Adequacy Study Oversight Subcommittee  
of the  
House Committee on Education

August 22, 2006

BUREAU OF LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH

315 State Capitol Little Rock, Arkansas 72201 (501) 682-1937 [www.arkleg.state.ar.us](http://www.arkleg.state.ar.us)

## Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
<b>Introduction to the Issues .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Brief Context .....</b>	<b>1-2</b>
<b>What Makes a Quality Teacher? .....</b>	<b>2-3</b>
<b>Evidence Link Between Teaching Skills and Student Achievement .....</b>	<b>3-5</b>
<b>Contrasts Between the Three Major Systems of Paying Teachers .....</b>	<b>5-6</b>
<b>Quality Compensation Program (Q-Comp) as an Example .....</b>	<b>7-8</b>
<b>Conclusions .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>References .....</b>	<b>10-12</b>
<b>Appendices .....</b>	<b>13-15</b>
<b>A - Evaluation Framework .....</b>	<b>13-14</b>
<b>B - Hypothetical School Salary Schedule .....</b>	<b>15</b>

## Introduction to the Issues

Reviews of recent research on student learning indicate that teaching and the classroom environment are the two most important influences or predictors on student learning gains (Goldhaber, 2002; Odden, Borman, & Fermanich, 2004). These findings have bolstered interest among policymakers in the quality of teaching, a major accountability component of the recently ratified No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 (Simpson, LaCava, & Graner, 2004). This focus has inspired concerted discourse among legislators, researchers, and policymakers on how to improve the quality of teaching. The purpose of this report is to review proposed and implemented educational reforms that are being discussed in legislatures, research literature, and policy-making arenas. For the sake of brevity, the primary issues are presented and analyzed without attempting to specify all the details; more details can be found at [http://education.state.mn.us/mde/Teacher\\_Support/QComp/index.html](http://education.state.mn.us/mde/Teacher_Support/QComp/index.html) (Odden & Wallace, 2006).

The Quality Compensation for Teachers (Q-Comp) program (Minnesota Department of Education, 2006), in particular, is discussed as an example of a comprehensive education reform designed to improve the quality of teaching through mechanisms such as knowledge- and skills-based pay for teachers, standards-based assessments by multiple raters, job-embedded professional development, and use of teacher leaders. This more extensive education reform is presented in the context of more traditional incentive systems such as merit pay and salaries based on education and years of experience. These three approaches represent the major salary incentive systems used in education to recognize quality of teaching. Each of these systems has a set of assumptions that will be examined in the course of the discussion.

## Brief Context

Based on an extensive review of several studies over many years, Sanders (2000) has concluded that "differences in teacher effectiveness is the single largest factor affecting academic growth of populations of students" (p. 8). In other words, Sanders argues that teacher "effects" or influences are larger than such stalwart "effects" as class size, spending differences, and curriculum programs (Odden et al., 2004). Similarly, Webster, Mendro, Orsak, and Weerasinghe (1996) argue that their evidence shows that a school's effect on student learning actually could represent an aggregation of the individual effects of its teachers. In simpler terms, a school shows gains in student learning because of the quality of instruction of individual teachers. More specifically, Meyer (2001) reports that teachers account for more than twice the total variation in student test score changes compared to the effects of school programs. Several studies have shown that there are greater differences in student achievement among classrooms within schools (teacher effects) than between schools (school program effects) (Hanushek, Kain, & Rivkin, 1998; Meyer, 2001; Webster et al., 1996).

In summary, existing evidence indicates that individual teachers are more important to student achievement than factors traditionally viewed as essential to gains in achievement. Studies (Odden et al., 2004) reveal that (a) students show differential gains in learning during an academic year because of the teacher who is doing the instruction, and (b) individual teachers consistently produce the same student learning gains, whether low, medium, or high, across different academic years. In a frequently cited national survey, Rowan, Correnti, and Miller (2002) found that the

differences in student achievement can be nine months or more, essentially a full school year of learning, between the most effective and least effective teachers. Sanders (2000) and Webster, Mendro, Orsak, and Weerasinghe (1996, 1998) report similar effects for the top teachers (about one sixth of the total), and they found that students of the bottom group of teachers (about one sixth of the total) actually show a decline over the year in their relative achievement. Based on his research, Sanders maintains that a student who is taught by ineffective teachers for two years in a row may never recover the learning lost during those years.

### **What Makes a Quality Teacher?**

The preeminence of teaching in student achievement gains has inspired investigations of which characteristics or abilities differentiate "effective" from "ineffective" teachers (Odden, 2004). Recent research indicates that the following characteristics and abilities are key to student achievement gains: (a) graduation from a quality education program, (b) higher verbal and general ability (e. g., SAT), (c) a major in math and perhaps science (i. e., evidence for science is less definitive) for teachers of these subject areas, and (d) more than three years' teaching experience (Odden et al., 2004). However, evidence shows that the most robust predictor of student achievement is a teacher's knowledge and skills (Kimball, White, Milanowski, & Borman, 2004; Milanowski, 2004; Odden et al., 2004). These findings on the positive effects of individual teaching have stimulated renewed interest in constructing clearly articulated instructional standards and standards-based teacher performance evaluations to improve the quality of teaching and accountability (e. g., Kimball, 2002; Milanowski & Heneman, 2001). Most of the current standards-based evaluation systems are based on teaching standards and practices set forth either in the pioneering framework by Danielson (1996a,b) or in the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) (2006).

The most widely-used approach for standards-based teacher performance evaluation is Danielson's (1996a,b) Framework for Teaching (Milanowski, 2004; Odden & Wallace, 2006). Her evaluation framework (see Appendix A) begins with a comprehensive model or description of teacher performance, reflects the current consensus on "best practices" of teaching, and translates these practices into explicit standards and multiple levels of performance defined by detailed behavioral rating scales (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). Danielson's model stands in contrast to the more traditional evaluations that have been conducted for many years, when a principal observes a teacher on one or two occasions during the school year and writes an assessment that usually is based primarily on idiosyncratic preferences that are not explicitly articulated and are subject to change from one evaluation to another. These more traditional evaluations have been subjected to persistent criticism because they rest on the tenuous assumptions that administrators can evaluate teachers fairly and objectively and will present clear guidelines for improving teaching (Odden & Wallace, 2006).

Danielson and McGreal's evaluation requires a more intensive collection of systematic evidence, including frequent observations of classroom practices using validated rating criteria, more than one rater (e. g., administrator, peer, outside reviewer), and artifacts such as lesson plans and samples of student work to provide a broader representation of teacher performance. Unlike the more traditional teacher evaluations, standards-based teacher evaluation systems provide measurements of teacher practices that can be linked to student learning (Gallagher, 2004; Kimball

et al., 2004; Milanowski, 2004). Furthermore, standards-based teacher evaluation systems provide clear indicators or standards of what is expected of teachers and how they will be assessed, and serves as a roadmap for their lesson plans, teaching, professional development, and acquisition of knowledge and skills (Odden, 2004). It is postulated that the systematic nature of these standards-based evaluations augment efforts to recruit and retain high-quality teachers because applicants and teachers who remain in the district appreciate high standards and objective evaluation. In other words, it is assumed that teachers who want to work in a district that has adopted standards-based assessments place a premium on high-quality teaching.

The Consortium for Policy Research in Education (Milanowski, Kimball, & White, 2004) argues that standards-based teacher evaluation systems constitute a performance competency model with the potential to improve instruction by affecting teacher selection and retention, motivating teachers to improve their skills, and promoting a shared conception of good teaching. In essence, standards-based teacher evaluation systems provide both incentives and guidance for teachers to change their practices toward the model embodied in the standards.

### **Evidence for the Link between Teaching Skills and Student Achievement**

There are at least six different ways districts and states identify knowledge and skills: 1) a professional teaching license, 2) National Board Certification, 3) engagement in district or other professional development programs, 4) focused education degrees or additional units, 5) experience, and 6) scores on a standards-based evaluation. To briefly review, most states have a two-tiered license system whereby a preliminary teaching license is issued, and after one to three years of mentoring and demonstrating an adequate level of performance on some assessment (e.g., PRAXIS III in Arkansas), teachers receive a standard certificate. The assumptions underlying this approach are that mentoring and a summative assessment will instill and maintain quality teaching. Odden and Wallace (2006) report that there is no research on whether this two-tiered system is related to student achievement, which is the primary target of interventions designed to identify and augment a teacher's knowledge and skills.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) has created a rigorous performance assessment for experienced teachers (<http://www.nbpts.org/>). The various assessments devised by NBPTS are focused on subject content (e. g., math) as well as development level (e. g., middle or high school). In addition to performance on simulated exercises, each applicant submits an instructional portfolio. Teachers earn a National Board Certification if they are successful on these assessments. The primary assumption is that certification indicates a teacher has mastered skills that constitute quality teaching. There is evidence that student achievement is higher for teachers who have this certification in comparison to their counterparts (Goldhaber & Anthony, 2004).

Other states assume that professional development programs enhance a teacher's knowledge and skills, leading to student achievement gains. However, there is no empirical evidence presently to establish a link between participation in professional development and student achievement (Odden & Wallace, 2006).

The majority of districts in the country uses educational degrees and units as indicators of knowledge and skills (Odden & Wallace, 2006). There are various ways these indicators are used to determine pay increases by school districts, such as counting only degrees (and not units) or requiring degrees to be in the subject area in which the teacher instructs (e. g., math). There is evidence that these indicators are positively related to student learning gains (Wayne & Youngs, 2003). Hence, these indicators have been retained by almost all school districts that have incorporated standards-based assessments into teacher pay scales (or formulas).

Experience also continues to be a factor in determining pay increases; the assumption is that experience provides knowledge and skills in teaching. Evidence indicates that experience is related to student learning gains in a truncated fashion; teachers with more than three years of experience are more effective than an inexperienced teacher. Otherwise, there is not a significant relationship between teachers' experience and student achievement gains (Odden et al., 2004). Contrary to popular opinion, there is not a linear relationship between years of experience and improved student achievement.

A final method of determining knowledge and skill acquisition of teachers is the use of standards-based assessments that directly measure their teaching practices (Odden et al., 2004). That is, very specific performance standards are clearly articulated as expectations and are observed with validated measures in assessments of teachers.

The Consortium for Policy Research in Education (Consortium ) is engaged in a stream of research to validate the linkage between knowledge- and skill-based assessments and student gains in achievement (Gallagher, 2004; Kimball et al., 2004; Milanowski, 2004). The working premise or assumption is that if this linkage can be established, knowledge- and skill-based assessments could provide an objective basis for salary schedules intended to heighten quality of teaching and subsequent student learning gains (Milanowski, 2002; Odden & Wallace, 2006).

A foundational assumption of the Consortium (Milanowski, 2002; Odden et al., 2004) is that increased salaries provide incentives for teachers to develop specific knowledge and skills that can be linked to student gains in achievement (Milanowski, 2002, Odden et al., 2004). The Consortium also assumes that a well-developed knowledge- and skills-based pay (KSBP) system rests on a model of competence that will be used by teachers in their instructional plans, self-reflection, collegial discussions, and professional development pursuits. To the extent that this model resonates throughout the organizational processes and administrative structure, a norm of competence is institutionalized for students, teachers, administrators, and parents.

However, the Consortium also recognizes that simply offering teachers a pay increase or bonuses per se will not necessarily motivate them to acquire the needed knowledge and skills (Milanowski, 2002). Instead, it argues that in addition to extrinsic monetary rewards, teachers need to intrinsically endorse the standards and believe they can meet them. Teachers also must believe that the assessment measures and procedures will be fair and accurate (Milanowski, 2002).

The following conclusions from Kimball et al. (2004) seem to be a fair representation of general findings on the validity of standards-based assessments currently being studied:

The results of our study were mixed with respect to the question of whether teachers' scores on the Washoe County teacher evaluation system were related to the average achievement of those teachers' students, providing only tentative evidence for the criterion-related validity of the evaluation system and use of evaluation scores as measures of classroom effects for other research or educational intervention purposes. The estimated relationship of the teacher evaluation scores to student achievement was positive for each grade and subject and for the reading and math composite, but the coefficients were not statistically significant in all cases. For fourth-grade reading and for each test at Grade 5, the coefficient for the evaluation score was positive and statistically significant. For the other grades and exams, the corresponding coefficients were not significant. However, compared to education and experience as reflected in the district salary schedule, the teacher evaluation scores do help explain more variation in teacher effects (p. 70).

These conclusions should be placed in the context of existing research and understanding regarding criteria for making decisions about assessing teachers, salary schedules, and improving student learning. First, it should be noted that the research on assessing teaching and its linkage to student performance is in an embryonic stage of development; methodologically it is extremely challenging to conduct because very few school districts have implemented a comprehensive assessment system with clearly specified standards, objective measures, multiple raters, repeated observations, and sophisticated data entry and analyses procedures. As Kimball et al. (2004) observe, their study is limited due to district administrative restrictions on several methodological procedures, such as how many standards would be measured and analyzed. In addition, most studies are conducted in only one school district, which may not be representative of other districts, and they do not compare groups of districts that use different teacher assessments and pay systems.

### **Contrasts Between the Three Major Systems of Paying Teachers**

To have a fuller understanding of the KSBP system, one needs to contrast the KSBP system with the other two major teacher reward systems. Unlike the traditional single salary schedule, which is based on years of teaching or "steps" and educational units/degrees or "lanes", KSBP provides pay increases when teachers demonstrate on a standards-based assessment that they have acquired and can apply specified knowledge and skills in the classroom with students (Odden & Wallace, 2006). Ideally, pay progression is based on mastering a specific sequence of knowledge and skills that represent higher levels of expertise and teaching practices or strategies. The intent of KSBP is to supplement or replace the traditional "steps and lanes" pay schedules with a pay system that motivates teachers to acquire and demonstrate skills that are more directly linked to student achievement gains (Milanowski, 2002).

The primary contrast between KSBP and the more traditional "steps and lanes" approach to paying teachers is that KSBP assumes that the link between teacher skills and student achievement gains needs to be empirically established; while, the "steps and lanes" approach is based on the assumption that education and experience are evidence of knowledge and skills to teach.

Another major contrast is with merit pay programs. Merit pay typically entails providing individual teachers with increases in base pay of fixed amounts based on an administrator's judgment, usually based on implicit criteria, of a teacher's performance during the school year. KSBP systems also reward individuals, but they are based on explicit and detailed standards of practice. These standards guide both assessor ratings and teachers' efforts to demonstrate the knowledge and skills set forth in the standards. Since any teacher who demonstrates the stated skills receives the designated reward or pay increase, the problems associated with competition for merit pay do not exist. Merit pay too often has been based on highly competitive but ill-defined standards, when only a few teachers are rewarded. Proponents of KSBP believe that merit pay tends to discourage teachers over time because of the low probability of success and lack of explicit assessment criteria (Milanowski, 2002).

If caution is not exercised in planning and implementation, KSBP systems also can have negative effects (see Odden & Wallace, 2006). Indeed, Odden and Wallace (2006) identified a range within which KSBP systems can be implemented, from "complete makeovers" to "modest changes", with several permutations in between. For example, a complete makeover involving conversion to a KSBP system with no consideration of existing teachers' salaries could very likely mean teachers with low assessment ratings actually would experience a decline in salary with the institution of the new pay system. As a result, Odden and Wallace recommend that KSBP systems be instituted for future salaries with no affect on existing salary levels.

Complete makeovers involve new salary systems when a score on a standards-based teaching assessment determines a teacher's pay category within a specified number of levels. For example, Cincinnati has five categories with two to five pay steps within each category, and the highest step in each category is lower than the initial step in the next highest category. Most districts, such as Cincinnati, also provide additional salary increases for education degrees in a teacher's licensure area, for National Board Certification, and for teacher leadership roles (Odden & Wallace, 2006, pp. 16 & 17).

Research has demonstrated that inter-rater reliability and validity, or the relationship between assessment scores and student achievement gains, can be established for standards-based pay systems (Milanowski & Kimball, 2005; Milanowski, Kimball, & Odden, 2005).

In contrast, Menomonee Falls, Wisconsin, retained its "steps and lanes" salary schedule for a modest change in teacher pay and added three new elements for salary increases based on knowledge and skills. There was a five percent salary increase for taking the district-constructed mentoring course on teaching standards, a \$1,500 enhancement per year if teachers continued to take professional development courses for five years following the mentoring course, and a \$2,000 salary increase for earning a National Board Certificate (Odden & Wallace, 2006).

In summary, Odden and Wallace (2006) presented a myriad of combinations of traditional "steps and lanes" and KSBP systems between the complete makeover and modest changes.



## Quality Compensation Program (Q-Comp) as an Example

The Quality Compensation Program, or Q-Comp, in Minnesota is an example of an educational reform program that has made a transition from the traditional “steps and lanes” pay system to a KSBP system. Q-Comp is a comprehensive reform program that has five components: 1) job-embedded professional development, 2) standards-based assessments, 3) measures to determine student growth, 4) a career ladder for teachers, and 5) performance pay. Each district that applies for and is accepted to Q-Comp receives up to \$260 per student as part of the categorical funding formula. During the transition year to fully adopting Q-Comp, school districts are expected to develop job descriptions for lead teacher positions, standards-based assessment tools and procedures, training modules for instructional leaders and others responsible for assessing teachers, measures to determine student achievement for teacher compensation, and plans for transitioning off “steps and lanes” to a KSBP system.

A two-year contract may include transitional provisions, such as “frozen” steps and lanes with a cost of living increase and additional performance pay for student progress in the first year, followed by second-year contract with provisions for a KSBP salary schedule (see Odden & Wallace, 2006, for examples).

A school district implementing Q-Comp is expected to: hire instructional leaders; form school-based instructional leadership teams; initiate training of assessment teams; select a Q-Comp focused instructional strategy or program based on each site’s School Improvement Plan for job-embedded professional development, which is specific skills for particular classrooms; design and field test formative assessments; develop expertise using the state’s summative assessments; and create a staff development plan for each team that is aligned with the School Improvement Plan.

According to designers, for Q-Comp to be successful, it is critical that time be built into the school day for instructional leaders to provide professional development and for teachers to collaborate. They point out that a recent Harvard study found that teachers left public schools because of poor working conditions and a lack of collegial and administrative support (Moore & Birkeland, 2003).

Professional development is based on specific skills that are needed in particular classrooms, instead of assuming that general instruction or instructors will benefit teachers. Effective professional development must be specific and particularized for teachers in order to meet their individualized needs. Ultimately, this means that professional development should be informed by teachers receiving the training and by systematic data from their assessments. In other words, there should be clearly articulated linkages between learning goals and objectives, assessment measures, professional development, and pay incentives. This means that there have to be “nested goals” for learning in a district, whereby lesson goals are clearly aligned with course goals that in turn are nested within school goals, which logically flow from the district and state educational goals.

This systemic alignment of goals and accompanying procedures often requires changes in bureaucratic structures and responsibilities to make the organization more effective and to find more time for student and faculty learning. These changes include, but are not limited to, streamlining and modifying reports, decision-making, meetings, measures, policies, and

procedures. Senge (1999) provides guidelines and examples of organizational changes for school districts considering program reform. The primary goal is to end bureaucratic, hierarchical time and productivity inefficiencies by identifying which routines, procedures, and items are essential to student learning and by eliminating superfluous activities and materials. Changes include, but are not limited to, substituting e-mails for unnecessary meetings, team teaching and "resource days" to provide more time for professional development, and multi-age and multi-performance level groupings of students. More details concerning changes can be found at: [http://education.state.mn.us/mde/Teacher\\_Support/QComp/index.html](http://education.state.mn.us/mde/Teacher_Support/QComp/index.html).

Q-Comp also includes teacher leaders who are able to model best practices and to instruct less experienced teachers beyond professional development programs. Districts have the prerogative of identifying the title for each of the teacher leaders on a career ladder, such as mentors or instructional coaches.

Q-Comp uses the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) (2006), which recognizes teachers on a continuum of beginning, novice, proficient, and advanced practitioners. The different levels of development recognize that teachers are learners and have different needs within a range of career experiences and education. The professional continuum includes variations of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions required at each phase of learning to teach and the importance of mentoring, instructional coaching, and peer review.

The standards used to assess teaching in Q-Comp are embedded in the domains identified by Danielson (1996a,b), which include: 1) planning and preparation, 2) classroom environment, 3) instruction, and 4) professional responsibilities (see Appendix A). Examples of skills that are assessed under each domain are found on the NBPTS website ([http://www.nbpts.org/the\\_standards](http://www.nbpts.org/the_standards)). Finally, these teaching standards are used in Q-Comp to determine teacher salaries.

Q-Comp does not require school districts or charter schools to eliminate a formal salary schedule. Instead, the Minnesota Department of Education requires them to reform their existing "steps and lanes" salary schedule to an alternative teacher compensation system that is performance-based. This performance-based pay system cannot be simply placed on top of an existing "steps and lanes" salary schedule. Indeed, Q-Comp requires districts and charter schools to commit to providing 60% of teacher compensation increases for performance-based pay. This performance-based pay must include: 1) standards-based assessments, 2) school-based student achievement gains on state tests or a local standardized summative assessment, and 3) measures of student achievement. Student-to-teacher measures may include, where applicable, pre/post tests, formative assessments, diagnostic assessments, or other acceptable student achievements measures.

In conclusion, an example of a hypothetical school salary schedule, provided by the Minnesota Department of Education, is found in Appendix B. It may be observed that teachers' salaries depend on performance, levels attained, responsibilities, academic degrees, and certificates. It should also be noted that Q-Comp does not alter salaries that existed prior to its adoption, e.g., a teacher who was making \$50,000 a year would not drop below that figure under Q-Comp.

## Conclusions

There are three major teacher reward systems-- the traditional "steps and lanes" salary schedule, knowledge- and skills-based pay (KSBP), and merit pay. Q-Comp represents a blending of the first two of these systems. Indeed, Q-Comp requires school districts to reform their existing "steps and lanes" salary schedule by providing 60% of teachers' compensation increases for performance-based pay. Performance may be measured by student, teacher, and school gains in achievement on standardized summative exams. Two prominent contrasts between KSBP systems and the traditional "steps and lanes" salary schedule are the systematic standards and assessment measures used in KSBP to demonstrate a link between teaching quality and student achievement, whereas the traditional approach relies on education and experience as indicators of knowledge and skills to teach. Merit pay, by comparison, typically involves increases in base pay of fixed amounts based on an administrator's professional judgment. Merit pay has been criticized in several professional arenas because teachers seem discouraged by the low probability of being rewarded and the subjective nature of assessments of teaching. Merit pay historically has been limited in terms of recipients and it has promoted destructive competition between teachers and charges of favoritism because of the lack of systematic assessment criteria.

Reasons for adopting a KSBP system include: 1) linking salary to student performance, 2) rigorously and systematically defining and assessing teacher performance 3) providing quicker pay increases to younger, high-performing teachers, 4) offering salary increases to more experienced, high-performing teachers, who have reached the limit on "steps and lanes" salary schedules, 5) developing a competence model that permeates teachers' thinking, assessment standards and procedures, and 6) recruiting and retaining of teachers.

The traditional "steps and lanes" salary schedule has been under scrutiny because many educators are no longer willing to assume that education and years of experience are good proxy indicators of knowledge and experience. As empirical evidence accumulates showing a clear relationship between a teacher's knowledge and skills and student achievement gains, educators are raising questions about using this evidence to construct pay incentive systems based on systematic standards and measures in assessing teaching. School districts that are instituting KSBP systems are not discarding the traditional "steps and lanes" schedules. Instead, a variety of integrated systems have been created that typically use "steps and lanes" for base pay and KSBP for incentives to encourage teachers to acquire more knowledge and skills.

## References

- Danielson, C. (1996a). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Danielson, C. (1996b). Teacher evaluation instrument. Retrieved July 31, 2006, from <http://www.cesa11.k12.wi.us/Content/ProfessionalDevelopment/Initiatives/PI34/Pages/Danielson%20Rubric.pdf>
- Danielson, C., & McGreal, T. L. (2000). *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Gallagher, H. A. (2004). Vaughn Elementary's innovative teacher evaluation system: Are teacher evaluation scores related to growth in student achievement? *Peabody Journal of Education*, 79(4), 79-107.
- Goldhaber, D. D. (2002). The mystery of good teaching. *Education Next*, 2, 50-55.
- Goldhaber, D. D., & Anthony, E. (2004). *Can Teacher Quality be Effectively Assessed?* Seattle, WA: University of Washington, Evans School of Public Affairs, Center for Reinventing Public Education.
- Hanushek, E. A., Kain, J. F., & Rivkin, S. G. (1998). *Teachers, schools, and academic achievement* (Working Paper No. 6691). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Kimball, S. M. (2002). Analysis of feedback, enabling conditions and fairness perceptions of teachers in three school districts with new standards-based evaluation systems. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 16, 241-268.
- Kimball, S. M., White, B., Milanowski, A., & Borman, G. (2004). Examining the relationship between teacher evaluation and student assessment results in Washoe County. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 79, 54-78.
- Meyer, R. H. (2001). *Estimation of teacher and school performance in the Denver public schools: A feasibility study*. Madison: University of Wisconsin-Madison, Wisconsin Center for Educational Research.
- Milanowski, A. (2002). The varieties of knowledge and skill-based pay design: A comparison of seven new pay systems for K-12 teachers. Philadelphia, Pa: University of Pennsylvania, Graduate School of Education.
- Milanowski, A. (2004). The relationship between teacher performance evaluation scores and student achievement: Evidence from Cincinnati. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 79, 33-53.

Milanowski, A. T., & Heneman, H. G. (2001). Assessment of teacher reactions to a standards-based teacher evaluation system: A pilot study. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 15*, 193-212.

Milanowski, A. T., & Kimball, S. M. (2005). The relationship between teacher expertise and student achievement: A synthesis of three years of data. Paper presented at the American Education Research Association Meeting. Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

Milanowski, A. T., Kimball, S. M., & Odden, A. (2005). Teacher accountability measures and links to learning. In L. Stiefel, A. E. Schwartz, R. Rubenstein, & J. Sabel (Eds.). *Measuring school performance and efficiency: Implications for Practice and research* (pp. 137-161). Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Milanowski, A. T., Kimball, S. M., & White, B. (2004) Teacher evaluation scores and student achievement: Replication and extension at three sites. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Consortium for Policy Research in Education, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Minnesota Department of Education. (2006). Quality Compensation for Teachers (Q Comp). Retrieved August 7, 2006, from [http://education.state.mn.us/mde/Teacher\\_Support/QComp/index.html](http://education.state.mn.us/mde/Teacher_Support/QComp/index.html).

Moore, J. S., & Birkeland, S. E. (2003). Pursuing a "sense of success": New Teachers explain their career decisions. *American Educational Research Journal, 40*, 581-617.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) (2006). The Standards: The foundations for accomplished teaching. Retrieved July 31, 2006, from [http://www.nbpts.org/the\\_standards](http://www.nbpts.org/the_standards).

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425. (2002).

Odden, A. (2004). Lessons learned about standards-based teacher evaluation systems. *Peabody Journal of Education, 79*, 126-137.

Odden, A., Borman, G., & Fermanich, M. P. (2004). Assessing teacher, classroom, and school effects. *Peabody Journal of Education, 79*, 4-32.

Odden, A., & Kelley, C. (1997). *Paying teachers for what they know and do: New and smarter compensation strategies to improve schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Odden, A., & Wallace, M. (2006). New directions in teacher pay. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Center for Education Research, School of Education, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Rowan, B., Correnti, R., & Miller, R. J. (2002). What large-scale, survey research tells us about teacher effects on student achievement: Insights from the prospects study of elementary schools. *Teachers College Record, 104*, 1525-1567.

Sanders, W. L. (2000). *Value-added assessment from student achievement data*. Cary, NC: Create National Evaluation Institute.

Senge, P. (1999). *A fifth discipline resource: The dance of change. Challenges to sustaining momentum in learning organizations*. New York: Doubleday.

Simpson, R. L., LaCava, P. G., & Graner, P. S. (2004). The No Child Left Behind Act: Implications for education. *Intervention in School & Clinic, 40*, 67-75.

Wayne, A. J., & Youngs, P. (2003). Teacher characteristics and student achievement gains. *Review of Educational Research, 73*, 89-122.

Webster, W. J., Mendro, R. L., Orsak, T. H., & Weerasinghe, D. (1996, April). *The applicability of selected regression and hierarchical linear models to the estimation of school and teacher effects*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, New York.

Webster, W. J., Mendro, R. L., Orsak, T. H., & Weerasinghe, D. (1998, April). *An application of hierarchical linear modeling to the estimation of school and teacher effect*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.

Drafted 8.17.05

EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

To be finalized October 2005

Notice how all of the standards are embedded in the domains but are not always in the same domains.

<b>Domain 1. Planning and Preparation</b>		
<b>Danielson</b>	<b>Generic</b>	<b>Teacher Advancement Program (TAP)</b>
1a. Demonstrating knowledge of Content and Instructional Strategies 1b. Demonstrating Knowledge of Students 1c. Selecting Instructional Goals 1d. Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources 1e. Designing Coherent Instruction 1f. Assessing Student Learning	1a. Demonstrating knowledge of Subject Matter and MN Standards. 1b. Demonstrating Knowledge of Planning and Resources 1c. Designing Coherent Curriculum 1d. Selecting and Communicating Goals and Objectives 1e. Assessment as a Guide to Designing Lessons 1f. Demonstrating Knowledge of Student's Areas of Exceptionality 1g. Demonstrating Knowledge of Use of Student Data 1h. Assessment Informs Instruction	1a. Instructional Plans 1b. Student Work 1c. Assessment Plan

<b>Domain 2. Classroom Environment</b>		
<b>Danielson</b>	<b>Generic</b>	<b>Teacher Advancement Program (TAP)</b>
2a. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport 2b. Establishing a Culture for Learning 2c. Managing Classroom Procedures 2d. Managing Student Behavior 2e. Organizing Physical Space	2a. Creating a Classroom Climate 2b. Establishing a Culture for Learning 2c. Managing Classroom Procedures 2d. Persistence 2e. Use of Verbal and Nonverbal Language 2f. Managing Student Behavior and Classroom Expectations	2a. Expectations 2b. Managing Student Behavior 2c. Environment 2d. Respectful Culture

<b>Domain 3. Instruction</b>		
<b>Danielson</b>	<b>Generic</b>	<b>Teacher Advancement Program (TAP)</b>
3a. Communicating Clearly and Accurately 3b. Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques 3c. Engaging Students in Learning 3d. Providing Feedback to Students 3e. Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness	3a. Demonstrating variety of instructional strategies with flexibility and responsiveness 3b. Communicating clearly and accurately 3c. Engaging students in learning process 3d. Providing feedback to students 3e. Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques 3f. Demonstrating pacing and structure 3g. Communicating expectations	3a. Standards and objectives 3b. Motivating students 3c. Presenting instructional content 3d. Lesson structure and pacing 3e. Activities and materials 3f. Questioning 3g. Academic feedback 3h. Grouping students 3i. Teacher content knowledge 3j. Teacher knowledge of students 3k. Thinking 3l. Problem Solving
		Note: The Instructional Rubric is weighed more than the other 3 domains.

<b>Domain 4. Professional Responsibilities</b>		
<b>Danielson</b>	<b>Generic</b>	<b>Teacher Advancement Program</b>
4a. Reflecting on Teaching 4b. Maintaining Accurate Records 4c. Communicating with Families 4d. Contributing to the School and District 4e. Growing and Developing professionally 4f. Showing Professionalism	4a. Reflecting on Teaching 4b. Growing and Developing Professionally 4c. Demonstrating Use of Feedback 4d. Contributing to the School and District 4e. Demonstrating Standards of Conduct 4f. Family Interactions 4g. Maintaining Accurate Records	4a. Responsibilities based on Career Ladder.* <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Career Teacher--attendance at cluster team meetings, coming prepared to cluster team.</li> <li>• Mentor Teacher -- cluster team, TAP Leadership Team, Coaching and Evaluations.</li> <li>• Master Teacher--planning clusters, TAP Leadership Team, Coaching and Evaluations</li> </ul>
Note: Danielson's criteria are broken down further into sub-topics, e.g., 4a includes (4a1) Accuracy and (4a2) Use in Future Lessons		* Note: Teachers fill out rubric of other person(s) and score is averaged.

The language in the standard needs to be recognizable and clearly aligned with the criteria listed in each domain. The Minnesota Board of Teaching has a more specific list of criteria for each of the Minnesota Standards of Effective Practice, which can be found in the implementation guide's appendices.

**Designing Rubric**

Once the criteria have been established, the next step is to write a rubric based on the level of performance. There are two methods for developing a rubric.

The first model is based on an understanding of whether the performance demonstrates a level of proficiency or not. For example, the Danielson model identifies performance levels as: *Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient and Distinguished*. The Generic Model adapted from the Minneapolis Public Schools' Standards of Effective Instruction includes four levels: *Needs Improvement, Developing, Proficient and Exemplary*. The Teacher Advancement Model has three performance levels and uses a numeric scale: 1, 3, and 5.

The second model is based on the development stages of learning to teach and borrows from the work of the University of California, Santa Cruz: New Teacher Center (September 1997). This model distinguishes the level of professional development based on defined levels of performance that are labeled: *Beginning, Knowledgeable, Application, Integration, and Innovation*.



Drafted 8.17.05

To be finalized October 2005

\*\*\*THIS IS ONLY AN EXAMPLE\*\*\*

**HYPOTHETICAL SCHOOL SALARY SCHEDULE  
GOPHER SCHOOL DISTRICT**

**SALARY SCHEDULE CHANGE: STEPS AND LANES TO NEW SCHEDULE UNDER Q COMP**

Level	Description	Step	Salary Range	Salary Augmentation
Probationary	Probationary teachers are at the beginning of their teaching careers. The probationary teacher -- for the first three years -- is required to participate in the district's induction program and successfully complete the program at the end of the third year. Upon successful completion, the teacher becomes a career teacher and earns a larger increase in the fourth year. Probationary teachers receive step increases of 2.5% each year.	1	\$29,538	
		2	\$30,276	
		3	\$31,033	
Career	The career teacher is a regular or special education classroom teacher. The teacher does not provide coaching, supervision or conduct peer evaluations, but may take on additional responsibilities and receive additional compensation. Teachers at the top of the salary are still eligible for performance pay, but it is one-time compensation.		\$33,360 - \$58,282	<p><b>Annual Pay Increases:</b> Based on defined performance and other measures. District and union negotiate the amount that is permanent and one-time and measures used to determine performance. (See chart below for the measures.)</p> <p><b>Other Pay Increases:</b> Responsibility Pay: \$500 - \$1,500 per year (district negotiates specific duties and pay). Masters Degree - \$1,000 National Board Certification or American Board Certification - \$500</p>
Mentor	Mentor Teachers teach in the classroom .7 of their time and the remainder of their time outside of the classroom evaluating peers, coaching peers and providing support for new and career teachers. Mentor teachers work an additional 6 days during the calendar year.		\$40,910 - \$58,282	<p><b>Mentor Salary Stipend:</b> \$3,500 per year; teacher starts with base pay and adds mentor salary augmentation. The minimum starting point is \$43,910 plus \$3,500.</p> <p><b>Annual Pay Increases:</b> Based on defined performance and other measures. District and union negotiate the amount that is permanent and one-time and measures used to determine performance. (See chart below for the measures.)</p>
Master	Master Teachers teach in the classroom .5 of their time and spend the remainder of their time outside of the classroom leading group professional development teams, evaluating peers, providing support for career teachers and new teachers and direction to mentor teachers. Master teachers work an additional 12 days during the calendar year.		\$40,910 - \$58,282	<p><b>Mentor Salary Stipend:</b> \$7,000 per year; teacher starts with base pay and adds mentor salary augmentation. The minimum starting point is \$43,910 plus \$7,000.</p> <p><b>Annual Pay Increases:</b> Based on defined performance and other measures. District and union negotiate the amount that is permanent and one-time and measures used to determine performance. (See chart below for the measures.)</p>