



Pay for Performance Comparison

	Denver, CO <i>ProComp</i>	Minnesota <i>Q-Comp</i>	New York City	North Carolina* <i>ABCs</i>	Oregon <i>CLASS Project</i>	Texas* <i>TEEG</i>
Implementation and Administration						
<i>Date Implemented</i>	January 1, 2006	July 2005	Fall 2007	1996	2007 (pilot program)	2006
<i>Partners/Players</i>	Denver Classroom Teachers Association [†] , Denver Public Schools	Gov. Pawlenty, State Legislature	Mayor Bloomberg, Chancellor Klein, Randi Weingarten (United Federation of Teachers [‡])	General Assembly, State Board of Education	Chalkboard Project (pilots in three school districts)	Governor Perry, Legislature
<i>Plan Development</i>	Designed by joint task force of teachers, admins and citizens. Based off of pilot program from 1999-2003	Began as a pilot program, developed by legislature and governor	Negotiated between and agreed to by NYC DOE and UFT	GA directed SBE to develop plan, State Board conducted study and took input, ran pilot program first in 1995	Created by Chalkboard after researching PFP, modeled after MN Q-Comp	Plans developed and approved by school staff, local education agency and local board of trustees
<i>Revenue Source</i>	\$25 million annually raised by mill levy, \$22 million from US DOE to expand program	\$86 million annually from state aid and local tax levies; funded up to \$260 per student	Private funds 1st year – \$15+ million; 2nd year publicly funded	State funded, \$103+ million for 2007-08 school year	Chalkboard Project – \$10K-\$30K planning phase grant, \$200-\$400 per student for 3 year pilot	State funded, \$100 million 06-07, \$97.5 million 07-08 and 08-09
<i>Mandatory/Opt-in</i>	Mandatory for all new teachers, prior to 2006 may opt-in	Voluntary; districts and unions design and collectively bargain plans that meet specific criteria	240 schools deemed “high-needs” invited to participate, 400+ eligible in 2nd year	All schools eligible	Three districts chosen from RFPs, plan developed with team (union sign-off required)	Invited schools that meet criteria eligible – top 50% of econ. disadv. & highest levels of perf.
<i>Participation Rate</i>	~41% (1,700/4,100) ¹	~12% of districts (39/336) ~16% of charter schools (21/132) ²	~85% (205/240) ³	~72% receive awards ⁴	Sherwood, Forest Grove, and Tillamook School Districts	~96% (1,148/1,201) of invited schools ⁵
<i>K-12 Finance Structure</i>	Federal, (11%), State (30%), Local (59%)	Federal (5%), State (79%), Local (16%)	Federal (11%), State (46%), Local (43%)	Federal (11%), State (64%), Local (25%)	Federal (10%), State (52%), Local (32%)	Federal (11%), State (36%), Local (53%)
<i>Data System</i>	Linkage of student growth to individual teachers	Linkage of student growth to individual teachers	Little data linking student growth to individual teachers	Linkage of student growth to school	Developing new data system	Some linkage of student growth to individual teachers
Incentive Structure						
<i>Reward Level</i>	Teacher	Teacher	School	Teacher	Teacher/Team ⁶	Teacher/Other ⁷
<i>Salary structure</i>	Bonuses/raises added to base salary ⁸	Alternative salary schedule ⁹	Individual bonuses set by committee	Indiv. bonuses based on school perf.	Differentiated compensation plan ¹⁰	Indiv. bonuses based on specific criteria
<i>Administrator Evaluation Based Pay</i>	Principal & peer Fall-to-spring Prob ¹¹ – 1%/year NonProb – 3%/3 yrs	2+ evaluators Multiple evals yearly Teaching-standards based ¹²			Based on improved growth and student learning ¹³	
<i>Skill/Knowledge Based Pay</i>		Career Ladder/ Adv. Options ¹⁴			New career paths and leadership roles	
<i>Student-Performance Based Pay</i>	Meet both annual obj. ¹⁵ – 1% increase Meet one annual obj. – 1% bonus Test scores ¹⁶ – 3% Distinguished schools ¹⁷ – 2%	Student achievement gains/growth, school-wide gains, prof. standards, classroom observes., prof. growth plan, other factors – 60%+ of increase	Meet school-wide student gains objectives – \$3,000 per UFT member Meet 75% of objectives – \$1,500 per UFT member ¹⁸	Schools making high growth ¹⁹ – up to \$1,000 per teacher, \$500 per TA Schools making expected growth ²⁰ – up to \$750 per teacher, \$375 per TA	Can be aspect of evaluation of teachers	Impact on student achievement ²¹
<i>Hard to Staff/ Serve Based Pay</i>	Staff ²² – 3% bonus Serve ²³ – 3% bonus each year eligible					Hard to staff/high turnover subject area – optional criteria ²⁴
<i>Professional Development/ Evaluation Based Pay</i>	PD – 2% on comp MA+/NBPTS – 9% \$1,000 tuition reimbursement	Job-embedded professional development ²⁵			Job-embedded prof. development Encourage membership in prof. assoc.	Collab. – required ²⁶ Prof. development, mentoring/induction – optional criteria ²⁷
Evaluation and Results						
<i>(Planned) Evaluations</i>	Third-party evaluation to be conducted in 2008	Annual program reviews, conducted by peer reviewers; not linked to compliance or continued funding	Third-party evaluation to be conducted, per the agreement	Evaluation conducted in 2004, led to development of new formulas External evaluation conducted by Vigdor	TBD	External, multi-year evaluation
<i>Results</i>	TBD	TBD	TBD	Some evidence of imp. in test scores, but not in closing achievement gap; higher turnover rate in low-perf. schools	TBD	Most participating teachers have positive reaction Effects on student achievement TBD

* Right to work state

† National Education Association affiliate

‡ American Federation of Teachers affiliate

¹ Mitchell, Nancy. "Feds give DPS pay plan a push." *Rocky Mountain News*, November 2, 2006.

² For the 2007-08 school year.

³ For the 2007-08 school year.

⁴ For the 2006-07 school year.

⁵ For the 2006-07 school year.

⁶ Rewards and raises can be given to individual teachers and/or teams of teachers. The pilot districts plan on awarding both.

⁷ Of funds awarded, 75 percent (Part I) must be given to teachers as incentive awards and the other 25 percent (Part II) may be used on additional incentives, mentoring and induction, professional development, signing bonuses, common planning time/curriculum development, and/or other promising practices meant to increase teacher quality and student achievement. Awards should range between \$3,000 and \$10,000 per teacher. Each school determines which teachers are eligible for Part I funds.

⁸ Salary index (base) for 2007-08 is \$35,568.

⁹ Includes reformed steps and lanes.

¹⁰ Districts participating in the pilot are creating modified or alternative salary schedules, where teachers' progress is based on years of service and professional advancement. This could include acquisition and demonstration of skills/knowledge, educational attainment, experience, and increased responsibilities.

¹¹ Probationary status for first 3 years of teaching

¹² Part of the 60%+ portion of salary increase.

¹³ Pilot district evaluations are to focus on measurable standards/behaviors that are known to lead to improved student growth. Cycle consists of goal setting, reviews and evaluation, which will lead to future goal setting. Assessments include multiple observations.

¹⁴ Related conditions and salary increases to be included in alternative salary schedule.

¹⁵ Set with administrators, based on multiple measures, can be modified. Not based on state standardized test scores.

¹⁶ Based on statistical projections of state standardized test scores. Only applicable to teachers in math, language arts and reading in grades 4-10.

¹⁷ Schools that meet or exceed district expectations for student growth, attendance and school satisfaction.

¹⁸ Four-member committees (two teachers, principal and principal's appointee) distribute bonuses as they see fit, but cannot be based on seniority.

¹⁹ Factors to calculate high growth include: growth of individual students on reading and math exams in grades 3-8, change in number of students completing college/voc tech prep courses, change in competency passing rates in grades 8-10, and change in ABCs dropout rate.

²⁰ Factors to calculate expected growth include: average growth on math and reading exams in grades 3-8, change in number of students completing college/voc tech prep courses, change in competency passing rates in grades 8-10, and change in ABCs dropout rate.

²¹ Required criteria of Part I plan. Measures used need be objective and quantifiable, and can include state standardized tests, Advanced Placement exams, benchmark exams, end-of-course exams, portfolio assessments, and/or other acceptable assessments.

²² Positions where supply of licensed professionals is low and turnover high. For 2007-08, includes ELA-S teachers and counselors, occupational and physical therapists, special education teachers, school nurses, secondary math teachers, school psychologists, bilingual teachers and speech language specialists.

²³ Schools with high percentage of students on free or reduced lunch, in special education center programs, and/or with ELA needs.

²⁴ Factors into individual teacher bonuses as funded through the Part I plan.

²⁵ Required, not a factor in determining salary increases, unless individual is in a leadership role as part of the Career Ladder/Advancement Options.

²⁶ Collaboration is a required criterion for the Part I plan. Indicators include team-teaching and classroom observation, teacher mentoring/induction/coaching, participating in professional development/planning/curriculum development, sharing and/or analyzing student data with other teachers, and developing/evaluating lesson plans with other teachers.

²⁷ Professionalism is part of the Part I plan, while professional development and mentoring/induction are part of the Part II plan.