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Why Don’t People Choose Teaching?

- Salaries not competitive
- Costs of training not warranted by salary
- Start career and retire with same title and same job description
- Rarely do supervisors try to see how effective you are
- Few opportunities to get better at what you do
- Everyone with same experience and credits gets same pay
- Women have more career opportunities now
- Little collegiality
- Sometimes little respect from community
- Often unpleasant, dangerous environment
GOAL OF TAP:
- Increased Student Achievement

METHOD FOR GETTING THERE:
- Maximize Teacher Quality

HOW TO DO THAT:
- Comprehensive Reform to Attract, Develop, Motivate and Retain High Quality Teachers
To Some:
TAP is a professional development program that makes successful hard work pay off.

To Others:
TAP is a performance pay program that provides a great deal of support to teachers

Message:
Do not implement performance pay in a vacuum – please!
Why Do Performance Pay Plans Fail?

- Imposed on Teachers
- Do not provide mechanism for poorly performing teachers to get better
- Teachers not prepared to be assessed
- Not perceived as fair
- Fear of bias, nepotism of evaluators, don’t trust the principal
- Evaluation criteria not fair (student test scores vs. value added) or justified by research
Why Do Performance Pay Plans Fail?

- Process adds work for teachers and bonuses too small to justify the extra effort
- Some teachers lose money
- Zero-sum game causes competition
- Fear that the program will not be sustainable
Performance Pay

- Performance pay alone is not enough
- Must be supported by strong, transparent and fair teacher evaluation system
- Need professional development to deal with areas of improvement
- Teachers are willing to be evaluated if they are prepared for it
- Bonuses keep them willing to do extra work
TAP is a Comprehensive Reform

ELEMENTS OF THAT REFORM:

1. Multiple Career Paths
2. Instructionally Focused Accountability
3. Ongoing, Applied Professional Growth
4. Performance-Based Compensation
TAP: Multiple Career Paths

- Career continuum for teacher.
- Compensation commensurate with qualifications, roles, & responsibilities.
- Excellent teachers remain connected to the classroom.
TAP: Instructionally Focused Accountability

- Comprehensive system for evaluating teachers.

- Based on clearly defined instructional standards and rubrics.

- Teachers held accountable for their classroom instructional practice, and achievement growth of students in classroom and school.
TAP: Ongoing Applied Professional Growth

• Restructures school schedule so teachers can meet regularly during the school day.

• Focus on improving instruction.

• Uses student data to identify instructional needs.
Higher pay is granted for:

- Excellent teacher performance, as judged by experts
- Different functions/additional duties
- Student achievement gains (Value-added)

Our model would support higher pay:

- If the teacher’s primary field is difficult to staff, or if the teacher is in a hard-to-staff school
- For teacher training & relevant degrees (e.g. National Board Certification)
Performance Awards

- Bonus earned each year, not cumulative
- Amount constrained by available funds
- At least $2,500 or more
- No one earns less than traditional system
- Masters: $5,000 to $15,000 on top of bonus
- Mentors: $3,000 to $7,000 on top of bonus
- Best teachers could earn $20,000 more
Performance Awards

- All teachers can get bonus of some amount
- Everyone meeting a standard gets bonus
- Eliminates “zero sum game” mentality and competition
- Teachers who score well on skills can earn bonuses even if student scores do not improve, and vice versa
Skills and Knowledge

- 50% of bonus for skills and knowledge
- Can get over nepotism/favoritism worry with clear evaluation system and multiple classroom visits with multiple trained/certified evaluators
- Possibility of creeping grade inflation
- Followed up by efforts to help get better
Student Achievement

- 50% of bonus is based on student achievement (value-added)
- 20-30% school-wide for all teachers (gives incentive to help others get better)
- 20-30% based on achievement of individual teacher’s students
- Value-added eliminates problem of having smarter students
Expected Final Outcome

Improved Student Achievement
Intermediate Outcomes

- Teachers opt for new system vs. existing system
- Changes in characteristics of individuals applying
- Number of applicants
- Differences in characteristics of people hired
- Changes in teacher retention rates
- Changes in which teachers stay in classroom
- Survival rates in the first five years
- Stakeholder perceptions of staff quality & professionalism
- Teacher satisfaction data
TAP Teachers Move to Low SES

- Talented teachers in Arizona move from high SES schools not doing TAP to low SES TAP schools.
  - In the past 3 years, 61 teachers have started working at 2 lowest SES schools in the Madison School District.
  - 21% of these teachers have come from high SES schools in Madison or other nearby districts.
TAP Schools Outperform Controls (2002-03)

- 68% of TAP schools outperformed their controls
- 50% of Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) schools outperformed their controls in math
- 47% of CSR schools outperformed their controls in reading
## TAP School Testing from 02-03 to 03-04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Improved</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Declined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana*</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana (IOWA)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana (LEAP-21)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total # schools/category</strong></td>
<td><strong>123</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% schools/category</strong></td>
<td><strong>66.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2002-03 to 2003-04 TAP School Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Improving</th>
<th>% Improving</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Declining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Poverty</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level of Acceptance: Multiple Career Paths

![Graph showing the level of acceptance over years for Cross Sectional and Longitudinal approaches.](image)
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Collegiality is very strong in TAP schools

- Cluster groups facilitate collegiality
- Rewards for school wide gains also inspire collegiality
- Not a zero sum game
Level of Acceptance: Collegiality
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Achievement Gap as Wide as Ever: NAEP 9-Year-Old Reading Trends

Source: NAEP Long-Term Trends, 1999
U.S. Math Performance Compared to Other Nations

- **Nations scoring higher than the U.S.**
- **Nations scoring the same as the U.S.**
- **Nations scoring below the U.S.**

Grade 4

Grade 8

Grade 12

Source: Third International Mathematics & Science Study (TIMSS), 1999
Research on Importance/Impact of Teacher Quality

- Home and Family: 49%
- Teacher Qualifications: 43%
- Class Size: 8%

Source: Marzano
Student Performance
5th-grade Math Students
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Percent of Students That Would Pass a High-Stakes Test in Different Quality Teachers’ Classrooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Quality</th>
<th>% Pass Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Effective</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Ineffective</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Marzano, 2003; Schacter, 2003
Higher quality teaching is the best way to increase student learning.

Most people want to spend more money on effective teachers.

Teacher compensation is low compared to other professions (but look at days worked and fringe benefits).

Salary based on teachers’ years experience and units earned -- both poor predictors of student achievement.

It would be too expensive and politically impractical to raise salaries of all teachers to levels competitive with other professions.
In developing the Teacher Advancement Program, we thought through the requirements for successful reform, and addressed each of them:

- Human Capital Focus
- Comprehensive Approach
- Based on Sound Research
- Effective Design and Implementation
- Effective Measures and Commitment to Evaluate the Reform
- Continuity and Sustainability
Danielson’s (1996) served as a valuable resource for defining the teaching competencies at each level of teacher performance.

- Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC)
- National Board for Professional Teacher Standards
- Massachusetts’ Principles for Effective Teaching
- California’s Standards for the Teaching Profession
- Connecticut’s Beginning Educator Support Program
- New Teacher Center’s Developmental Continuum of Teacher Abilities.
## Average TAP Professional Development Per Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours per Week</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluations</td>
<td>1 hr</td>
<td>x 5</td>
<td>= 5 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post conference</td>
<td>2 hr</td>
<td>x 5</td>
<td>= 10 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster</td>
<td>2 hrs</td>
<td>x 30 weeks</td>
<td>= 60 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>3 hrs</td>
<td>x 30 weeks</td>
<td>= 90 hrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total: 165 hrs**

Over 20 days spent in professional development activities that are focused on teacher’s specific students’ needs and his/her instructional strengths and weaknesses.

Most TAP teachers also receive traditional off-site professional development days ranging from 4-5 days per year.
Value-Added

- Improved student achievement
- Value-added assessment
  - Statistical model to measure growth in student achievement from pre-to-post-testing
- Value-added eliminates problem of having students with different levels of ability
- Each student must have 2 consecutive years of test data from reliable & valid test
- Data needs to be linked to school, and ideally to teachers each year
The Cost of TAP

- Incremental costs depend on a number of factors: $150-400
- Can be done for less if certain things are already available (training days, specialists, master teacher positions)
- Funds can be found
- A serious commitment to TAP may require ending other programs that have been shown to be unsuccessful
- Cannot continue to add reform on reform and never stop doing anything
New Sources of Funds

- Current district/school budgets
- New state appropriations
- Ballot initiatives
- Private foundations
- Federal Funds
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>State/Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>Arkansas, Colorado (Eagle), Florida, Indianapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>Minnesota, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Next Texas, Wyoming, Charter Schools in DC, Las Vegas, and Colorado Springs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lags In the Effects of Education Reform Policy

We must wait a reasonable amount of time before expecting “results”

- Recognition lag
- Policy selection lag
- Legislation lag
- Regulation lag
- Appropriation lag
- Litigation lag
- Implementation lag
- Buy-in lag
- Learning lag
- Impact lag
- Measurement lag
- Reporting lag
- Interpretation lag
- Methodology lag
Why Teachers Accept TAP

- “Bottom up” not “top down”
- Involves teachers at every step
- Require 60-75% of faculty accepting
- TAP seen as fair
- Does not replace traditional salary schedule
- Any teacher who qualifies can get award
- Implement slowly, gain confidence of teachers
- TAP is a whole program
Rationale For TAP

- NCLB requires all teachers to be “highly qualified” soon
- Too many teachers come from the bottom of their classes
- Too many teachers not experts in subjects they teach
  - Out of field teaching is rampant
- Pedagogical classes not based on research, and often are faddish, politically motivated
- Projected shortage of qualified teachers
- Too many of best new teachers leave too soon