

Alternative Compensation Models And Our Members

Voices from the Field:
Stories from Seven Districts

**National Education Association
Teacher Quality Department**

Written by
Linda Davin and Sarah Ferguson

Contributors

David Schlein
Marcy Magid
Segun Eubanks
Bill Raabe



Great Public Schools for Every Student

Table of Contents

Introduction 2

Implications and Limitations of the Report 3

Program Summaries and Key Findings 4

 Denver Classroom Teachers Association 4

 Eagle County Education Association 9

 Hamilton County Education Association 13

 Helena Education Association..... 16

 Manitowoc Education Association..... 19

 Portland Education Association..... 23

 Education Minnesota..... 28

Overall Observations 31

Recommendations and Policy Implications 33

Appendix A: At-a-Glance Overview of Sites Visited 34

Appendix B: Visited Sites’ Award/Bonus Overview 36

Appendix C: Denver Tentative Agreement Economic Summary 37

Appendix D: Eagle County Article from the *Vail Daily* 39

Appendix E: Portland’s Living Contract Provision..... 43

Appendix F: Portland Contract - Salary Placement Provisions Summary 44

Appendix G: Hamilton County Article from *Education Week*..... 46

Appendix H: Glossary of Teacher Compensation Terms 48

Appendix I: General Recommendations from NEA Collective Bargaining 51

Appendix J: Value-Added Assessment: What You Should Know 53

Appendix K: Performance Incentives Conference – Staff Reflections 56

Acknowledgements 58

Introduction

In support of the Salary Campaign (National Education Association’s Strategic Goal #3), Teacher Quality (TQ) — with guidance and support from Collective Bargaining and Member Advocacy (CB&MA) — was charged with the following activity:

Document affiliate practices and provide relevant information on alternative compensation to enhance affiliates' capacity to advocate for quality compensation systems.

With this charge, NEA staffers Linda Davin, Sarah Ferguson, and David Schlein traveled to seven affiliates to interview members, staff, and leaders about their experiences with alternative compensation systems. The seven sites—Denver, Colorado; Eagle County, Colorado; Hamilton County, Tennessee; Helena, Montana; Manitowoc, Wisconsin; Minnesota and Portland, Maine—were selected because of their varied and relatively well-established alternative compensation systems. This report, intended for NEA leaders and staff only, aims to portray how alternative compensation is affecting our members.

Our Methodology

The primary questions we sought to answer were: “How are NEA members experiencing alternative compensation systems?” and “What do they think of the affiliates’ role within such systems?”

Member participants in the structured discussion groups were identified by local leaders. We requested groups with differing views on the programs, but we did not make the specific participant selections. Examples of the questions we asked include:

- ◆ Has your experience with the new compensation system been mostly positive or mostly negative?
- ◆ Do you think the system has had an effect on your relationship with school and district leadership?
- ◆ Has it affected your relationships with your colleagues?
- ◆ Has it affected how you do your work? If so, how?
- ◆ Has the new system made a difference in the amount of compensation you received in the last few years? If so, in what way?
- ◆ Do you think the system has affected recruitment and retention in your school or district?

Implications and Limitations of the Report

The findings in this report reflect information gathered from a limited number of interviews. The small number of sites and the small number of teachers sampled at each site limit the ability to generalize our findings. It is difficult to know if the same patterns would be observable in other districts with alternative compensation programs. In order to validate these findings, a more definitive research study—using scientifically selected focus groups or a survey research effort—would be necessary.

It is important to note that our findings about “members” and “teachers” are limited to the groups with whom we met and may not reflect the experience of all teachers in each district.

Program Summaries and Key Findings

Denver Classroom Teachers Association

Denver Public Schools

Program Summary and Key Findings

NEA staff met with 20 local association members and leaders from the Denver Classroom Teachers Association (DCTA). An additional meeting was held with the Operations Team of Denver Public Schools (DPS), which oversees the administration of the compensation program. NEA staff also met with Denver's superintendent and other DPS staff, but their comments are not reflected here.

In 2004, the Denver Classroom Teachers Association and the Denver Public Schools (DPS) collectively bargained the Professional Compensation System for Teachers, widely known as ProComp, which DCTA members voted to adopt.

Participation in ProComp is mandatory for all new teachers and voluntary for teachers hired before January 1, 2006. Once teachers opt-in, they must remain in the system for the rest of their DPS careers. The district also maintains the traditional salary schedule for teachers who do not opt-in. (As of late 2007, 49 percent of DCTA teachers were enrolled in ProComp, including new teachers for whom participation is mandatory.)

Teachers have a variety of ways to earn compensation bonuses. Bonuses are calculated as a percentage of an index, currently equal to the base salary of the traditional salary schedule.

ProComp Program Components

In 2007–2008, teachers were eligible for the following:

Knowledge and Skills

- \$711 per year for completing their Professional Development Units (PDUs)
- \$3,201 per year after achieving a graduate degree or National Board Certification
- A \$1,000 “lifetime account” for tuition reimbursement, which does not build salary.

Professional Evaluation

- Probationary teachers are paid \$356 per year for earning a satisfactory evaluation, and are evaluated every year for the first three years.
- Non-probationary teachers are paid \$1,067 every three years for earning a satisfactory evaluation, and are evaluated once every three years.

Market Incentives

- \$1,067 per year for working in a hard-to-serve school
- \$1,067 per year for working in a hard-to-staff assignment.

Student Growth

- \$356 per year for achieving two student growth objectives, and this builds as salary
- \$356 as a one-time bonus for achieving only one student growth objective, and this does not build as salary
- \$1,067 per year for teachers at schools that show exemplary performance on the Colorado Student Assessment Program (CSAP)
- \$711 per year for teachers at a Distinguished School.

KEY FINDINGS

Although DCTA members voted to adopt ProComp, teachers believe the program eroded solidarity.

Member Comments:

- “It feels like there is a split throughout the union. The feelings towards the union became polarized. Some people did revoke their membership.”
- “When ProComp passed, it really divided the membership.”
- “I saw a big split between elementary and secondary. Elementary teachers were ready to take in ProComp and high school teachers were not.”

Teachers had mixed feelings about the program’s Professional Development Units (PDUs).

Member Comments:

- “With ProComp, I am able to do PDUs to advance my salary for things I would already do to assess student success.”
- “I personally did two individual PDUs. I felt my energy was going to the PDU, rather than focusing on my kids and my new curriculum ... It takes my focus away from the kids.”
- “[The PDU process] has allowed teachers to better their practice. The overarching goal for PDUs is to help teachers be more creative and innovative.”
- “It is not enough money to be significant. You are doing PDUs more for yourself.”

- “When I opted-in to ProComp, I was going to sit there and let nothing happen. Then I was [evaluated]; I got a satisfactory evaluation, and I got that money. I did the PDUs after that, and I am seeing more and more that I can do. It motivates me. At the beginning I wasn’t motivated at all by it.”
- From a first-year teacher: “Right now, I would rather have the step raise than focus on PDUs to get a raise.”

Administration of the system is expensive and cumbersome.

DPS Operations Team Comments:

- “Data systems need to be fixed and developed to work with ProComp.”
- “There is room for improvement. We have to reach compromises as to what can be done in a timely manner. It is not perfect. It is approximately 90 percent accurate. We have to do some kind of manual quality control to be sure that everything is accurate.”
- “The current system is too complicated. I would like to simplify it.”
- “Integration is the key. It is an overwhelming amount of work to get this thing up and running.”
- “Given the right number of resources, you can do anything ... [ProComp] may be too complicated in some areas [of the program].”

Teachers report that ProComp-related activities enhance collegiality.

Member Comments:

- “[ProComp] is helping us to come together as a faculty and work as a team. We work more as a community. We are responsible to each other.”
- “The goal is that we are working as a school designing our PDUs and having [professional] book clubs. The PDUs are dynamic.”
- “We are working interdepartmentally.”
- “In my school [ProComp] has become the connective tissue that ties together teachers at different grade levels. It affects all of our pay.”
- “The things that we are doing to get our PDUs help us to come together as a community. I think that is the benefit.”

Teachers describe ProComp as complex and time-consuming.

Member Comments:

- “My experience has been that there was a lot of work involved in the PDUs, and it does take time from students.”

- “I do not think most teachers understand the nuances of ProComp. No one really understands how to complete the PDU and who to turn it in to.”
- “I would say fewer than 20 percent [of the district’s teachers] understand ProComp, because teachers are more involved in teaching their students than in [determining] their salaries.”
- “There are a lot of teachers who are in ProComp, and others who are not, who have asked me questions about it. A lot of the teachers do not understand the system.”
- “If you’re in ProComp, you still have to do all the other staff development. It is many more hours. Many hours are spent on this.”
- “Principals say it takes too much time administratively.”

Teachers regard some of the bonuses as too small to be meaningful.

Member Comments:

- “The money for hard-to-staff schools averages \$85 a month, and I don’t think that’s enough.”
- “As far as the \$684 [for completing Professional Development Units], am I excited about the money? No.”
- “It is not enough money to be significant. You are doing PDUs more for yourself.”

Support for ProComp among teachers is mixed.

Member Comments:

- “As veteran teachers, [opting-in to ProComp] was a no-brainer. We got to a point where we were maxed out [on the single salary schedule], and this gave us a little bit of a pay increase.”
- “As a first-year teacher, I am looking toward another district. I would rather do that than jump through hoops to get a raise. It takes my focus away from the kids.”
- “If I am going to stay in the profession, I want to take advantage of everything I am offered ... I am glad to be in ProComp ... I will make more with ProComp than with the traditional salary [schedule].”
- “I am looking at other districts because of the pay system.”

NEA STAFF REFLECTIONS

The Denver Classroom Teachers Association did a good job of representing all members in its negotiations. The association ensured that experienced teachers could choose when, during a seven-year period, it was most financially advantageous for them to opt-in and made allowances for those who decided to remain on the single salary schedule for the rest of their careers.

ProComp attempts to use the pay system to solve a wide variety of the problems faced by Denver Public Schools: Staffing shortages for particular positions and schools, recruitment and retention

overall, accountability, and professional development. As a result, the program is too complex to be widely understood by teachers and is extremely difficult to administer.

The administrative complexities and costs associated with administering the system make Denver ProComp expensive and impractical to replicate.

The payouts for incentive components may be too insignificant to be meaningful. For example, the bonus for teaching in a hard-to-staff school—or teaching a hard-to-staff subject—amounts to fewer than \$6 per day.

Although both internal and independent program evaluations are conducted regularly as part of the collective bargaining agreement, Denver Public School (DPS) administration did not offer any data on the program's effects.

The teachers who shared their views were not chosen scientifically, but most of the experienced teachers who opted-in to the system seemed happier with ProComp than newer teachers, for whom there was no choice.*

*In 2008, ProComp underwent significant changes after a prolonged negotiation between the Denver Classroom Teachers Association and the Denver Public Schools. The details of the tentative agreement appear in Appendix C, page 37.

Eagle County Education Association

Eagle County, Colorado

Program Summary and Key Findings

NEA staff met with 15 members and leaders from the Eagle County Education Association.

Colorado's Eagle County School District serves diverse communities, from ski resort areas such as Vail and Beaver Creek, to small rural towns like Minturn, Red Cliff, and Gypsum. The Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) in Eagle County began as a pilot program involving three schools. Contrary to the guidelines recommended by TAP's founders, the Eagle County School District refused to conduct a formal vote of the district's teachers to determine their support, yet expanded the program to all of the district's schools.

Teacher Advancement Program Components

Multiple Career Paths

- **Career teachers** have classroom responsibilities 100 percent of the day.
- **Mentor teachers** have classroom responsibilities 70 percent of the day; for extra responsibilities and 10 additional days worked, they are paid \$5,000 more annually; Mentor teachers are required to have three years of teaching experience.
- **Master teachers** have classroom responsibilities 30 percent of the day; for extra responsibilities and 20 additional days worked, they are paid \$11,500 more annually; Master teachers are required to have at least seven years of teaching experience.

Ongoing Applied Professional Growth

- Cluster group meetings are held regularly and focus on improving student achievement through instructional development.
- Both Mentor and Master teachers provide leadership.
- Three evaluations, held annually, are scored on a scale of 1–5: The first evaluation is performed by a Mentor teacher (and doesn't count toward pay for performance), the second is performed by a Master teacher, and a third evaluation—which counts more than the Master teacher's—is performed by the principal.
- School-wide achievement, as measured by annual Colorado Student Assessment Program (CSAP) scores.
- Individual achievement, as measured by student growth on the Northwest Education Assessment (NWEA).

Performance-Based Compensation (up to \$2,600 a year)

- Fifty percent of additional compensation is earned through the acquisition of additional skills and knowledge, as demonstrated by the teacher's earned evaluation score, with a maximum possible award of \$1,300.
- Twenty-five percent of additional compensation is earned through individual student achievement, as demonstrated by value-added growth performance on the Northwest Evaluation Assessment (NWEA), with a maximum possible award of \$650.
- Twenty-five percent of additional compensation is earned through school-wide achievement, as demonstrated by CSAP value-added growth performance, with a maximum possible award of \$650.

Additional Stipends

- Teaching in a high-poverty school adds a one-time signing bonus of \$2,000.
- Holding an advanced degree in a district priority area pays a one-time bonus of \$2,500.
- National Board Certification adds \$2,500 to salary annually for the life of the certificate.

KEY FINDINGS

Teachers view the evaluation system as unfair and lacking transparency.

Member Comments:

- “There is a lack of transparency. [Evaluators] do not want to give the top score [of five], or the lowest score [of one]. Therefore, scores tend to be judgmental.”
- “It is impossible to have inter-rater reliability. I was trained as a Mentor, and I still see the differences [among evaluators].”
- “Our pay is based on the CSAP and NWEA tests. It is also based on evaluations. People ask their Mentor, “How do I bring up my score?” The Mentor says that the teacher cannot get a higher score than the Mentor. We have been marked down because we do not talk about special education standards, but there *aren't* any state special education standards.”
- “We were told that we would never get “fives.” If we told our students that they would never get A's, we would be fired.”

Teachers view the performance-based compensation formula as complex and lacking clarity.

Member Comments:

- “Most people do not understand the test score evaluation on CSAP. No one understands the value-added method of determining student growth on CSAP.”
- “The formula is so confusing that no one really knows how they get paid.”

- “I would be more enthusiastic if the base pay were more in line with the cost of living. We do not know how they calculate pay. We ask, and [administration] says they will get back to us.”
- “We would not know if they made a mistake in our pay [because nobody understands it]. We basically trust them to figure out pay.”
- “Last year we had six teachers who were overpaid by \$1,000 and had to pay it back. Because teachers do not understand the payout, they do not know if they are being paid correctly.”

The TAP program, as implemented in Eagle County, does not work well at the secondary level.

Member Comments:

- “The program was designed for the elementary grades; we tried to adapt [TAP] for middle school and high school. It just does not work because it is so specialized. Middle school and high school are departmentalized.”
- “I want to address class size. The Science Department contributes a Master and Mentor teacher. When they are participating [in these positions], no one replaces them. Our class size goes up.”
- “A big problem is for the core subject teachers ... Noncore subjects were told that they could not get the [individual bonus] money. It put a distinction between core and noncore teachers.”
- “There is one Master and two Mentors from the English Department; therefore, the class size in the department increases [because fewer teachers are actually teaching].”

The program—not jointly developed, bargained, or voted on by the district’s educators—has minimal support.

Member Comments:

- “No one should do pay for performance as it is being done here ... If anyone wants to see how to do everything wrong, come to Eagle County.”
- “For me [at the elementary level], parts of it are very beneficial. We have a 90-minute reading cluster every week and a 60-minute math cluster. It helps me as a first-year teacher. The support is different at my level.”
- “I would make the [evaluation] rubric so that it reflects the job.”
- “The HR Department controls [salaries]. The unknowns can be challenging. The system has its pot of money. Teachers are evaluated on the bell curve.”
- “I think we have lost respect for the district office and the superintendent.”
- “A new hire comes in with no record and gets \$3,000 more than a veteran teacher with the same credentials.”
- “I would like to throw TAP out.”

Teachers view leadership opportunities as inequitable.

Member Comments:

- “I was not qualified to be a Mentor teacher. I was a teacher for two years with no master’s degree. I was talked into being a Mentor teacher, although I was not qualified for it.”
- “I applied to be a Mentor teacher the first year [of the program]. I felt, with my special education background, I would be a good Mentor. I was told flat out that if I [became a Mentor] they would not be able to fill my position. Special education teachers are at a disadvantage [for selection as a Mentor teacher] because it is hard to spread their students over other classes.”

NEA STAFF REFLECTIONS

Eagle County is a very expensive place to live, and yet salaries are low; the district will need to raise all salaries considerably to attract and retain quality teachers.

Implementing TAP throughout the entire district was a misguided decision. Major changes will need to be made, particularly at the high school level, where TAP may never work.

The experience of Eagle County teachers with the TAP model strongly contradicts what promoters of the program tout: its ability to revitalize and reform schools.

The district’s failure to involve the Eagle County Education Association in the creation and implementation of this program was—and continues to be—a mistake. Because Eagle County ignored this basic TAP principle, their program may not be representative of other TAP districts.

POSTSCRIPT

In March 2008, the administration in Eagle County announced plans to significantly overhaul the district’s compensation system. (See Appendix D, page 39.)

Hamilton County Education Association

Chattanooga, Tennessee

Program Summary and Key Findings

NEA staff met with association leaders, staff, and 11 members from the Hamilton County Education Association (HCEA) in Chattanooga, Tennessee. Staff also met with several members and the principal at Hardy Elementary School.

In 2001, \$7.5 million in private grants was invested in nine low-performing elementary schools in Chattanooga. This reform effort, funded primarily by the Benwood Foundation, is known as the Benwood Initiative. Eight additional schools were added to the program in late 2007.

The Benwood Initiative Program Components

Participating teachers are eligible for:

- Retention bonuses: Existing teachers with three years of high performance on the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) receive a salary bonus of \$5,000 annually for three years.
- Recruitment bonuses: Teachers new to the Benwood schools with three years of high performance on the TVAAS receive a salary bonus of \$5,000 annually for three years.
- Salary bonuses: Principals whose schools achieve high performance on the TVAAS receive an annual salary bonus of \$10,000.
- Team bonuses: If a school achieves an average TVAAS score of 115+, each teaching professional receives a salary bonus of \$1,000. If the school achieves an average TVAAS score of 120 or higher, each teaching professional receives a salary bonus of \$2,000.
- Low-interest loans of up to \$10,000 to purchase a home in nine central downtown neighborhoods.
- Fellowships: The opportunity to pursue a master's degree in urban education at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga at no cost.

Job-imbedded professional development—led by a Master teacher during the school day—is also an element of the program.

KEY FINDINGS

Collaboration contributes significantly to the program's strength.

Member Comments:

- “Benwood supplied extra planning time and funds so that we could have teamwork.”
- “We are departmentalized in grades 4, 5, and 6. It has made us more dependent and reliant on other teachers.”
- “At my school we are all friends ... we have a huge camaraderie. I think the relationships keep us [at the school].”

Teachers believe the program’s professional development component leads to improvements in teaching practice.

Member Comments:

- “At Hardy, we have had intense professional development that has been very helpful. [The district has] given us opportunities to have quality professional development.”
- “The money is like icing on the cake. The master’s is much more important—the Osborne Fellowship. That has affected me more.”
- “The professional development and all of the extra training we received has empowered us.”

Teachers view the performance-based compensation formula as complex and lacking transparency.

Member Comments:

- “We do not truly know how the [TVASS] scores are used.”
- “We need to know how [the bonus] is calculated, and we need to know ahead of time.”
- “In our school, there was a little animosity as to how people were chosen to receive bonuses. [The animosity] is not between members; it is between members and the system.”

Specialists and preK teachers are not eligible for individual rewards, which creates some resentment.

Member Comments:

- “We had a teacher who was teaching developmentally challenged students. The program does not consider her a classroom teacher; therefore, she was not eligible for the bonus.”
- “I do not feel it is justifiably fair ... for me to get the bonus [because not everybody is eligible to get one.] I want to see my pay increased as salary.”

The level of program support among teachers is mixed.

Member Comments:

- “Do you understand the pressure to take children up four grade levels?”
- “[The bonus] is a validation of the fact that you do so much.”
- “I would rather see the money go to additional resources. I would rather see incentives in the classroom with extra people and supplies.”
- “At our school we are a family. We are encouraged to be teams.”

- “We didn’t find out until [the district] released the scores . . . that we had to close a bigger gap to get the bonus [because the target had changed].”
- “There are summer workshops for which teachers are paid a stipend. There are lots of opportunities.”
- “I [thought I would] teach at Clifton Hills Elementary School only until I got tenure, but now I cannot see myself anywhere else. The people at Benwood and the Public Education Fund invited [Benwood teachers] to dinners. We felt appreciated.”
- “The value-added [goals] changed from when [the program] first started.”

NEA STAFF REFLECTIONS

A major strength of the program is its emphasis on professional development, including: a fellowship to pursue a master’s degree in urban education, paid summer workshops, and the embedded professional development that is targeted to the needs of the students.

The Benwood Initiative created incentives to bring high-performing teachers to Chattanooga’s low-performing schools. However, many teachers who came as a result of these incentives are staying because of the strong relationships they developed with their colleagues and their commitment to provide all students with quality educational opportunities.

Teachers in these schools emphasized the importance of their principals, in particular, the instructional leadership and guidance they provided on a daily basis to support the work of the staff.

Teachers valued the many opportunities they had to collaborate with—and learn from—their colleagues.

It’s questionable whether the alternative pay system itself contributed significantly to the Benwood school improvements.

Helena Education Association

Helena, Montana

Program Summary and Key Findings

NEA staff met with 10 members and leaders from the Helena Education Association.

In 2002, more than half of Helena's teachers were nearing retirement, and starting teacher salaries were among the lowest in Montana. In a joint effort to attract and retain quality teachers, the Helena Education Association agreed to work closely with the district to develop the Professional Compensation Alternative Plan (PCAP). The plan, which allows members to remain on the traditional salary or move to PCAP, increased the 2004 starting salaries from \$23,000 to \$30,000, and top salaries from \$55,241 to \$65,000.

Thirty-six teachers took early retirement, enabling the district to allocate \$1 million to start up the new system. The district commissioned a study on Helena's school funding, and the result was both a short-term and long-term cost analysis for the program, projecting ahead 20 years. The study predicts that the new system will reach equilibrium as soon as the current retirement wave passes.

The purpose of the Professional Compensation Alternative Plan (PCAP) is to foster "high levels of student growth, achievement and academic excellence ... encourage and reward professional growth, knowledge and responsibility ... that result in observable and/or measurable improvements in education."

PCAP Program Components

Skills and Knowledge: A Three-Pronged Approach

To advance to the next salary step each teacher must:

- Write, submit, and complete a Career Development Plan (CDP) that includes an education component.
- Receive a positive evaluation as defined in the negotiated agreement.
- Perform professional service as defined in the plan. Service may include committee involvement, peer support, curriculum development, community outreach, and/or leadership roles, including association service.

Additional Compensation

- A \$2,000 annual stipend is awarded to educators who complete their master's degree while on the plan.
- A \$2,000 annual stipend is awarded—for the life of the certificate—to educators who achieve National Board Certification.

KEY FINDINGS

This system, designed by teachers and collectively bargained, boasts high member support.

Member Comments:

- “Stability in the district has made a difference. Without the contentiousness [around bargaining], the association and the district can work on other issues in the district to improve student achievement.”
- “We are the best paid teachers in the state of Montana.”
- “[The work group that developed the plan] had meetings all the time. They communicated all the time. They allowed for a lot of teacher feedback.”

Strategic efforts to communicate with the public solidified community support for the program.

Member Comments:

- “We talked a lot about how the plan is presented to the community. Communication focused on students and what is done for them.”
- “Our community members support teachers and do not believe that they are overpaid. We have huge support.”
- “PCAP creates a degree of respect among educators, administrators, and school board members. When all are on the same page with expectations that leads to mutual respect for everybody. It is going above and beyond. People who are doing this ... are now rewarded. People are getting new experience.”

Teachers view the new system as enhancing collegiality.

Member Comments:

- “I am now working with a colleague on new ways to teach chemistry. It has motivated and energized me. Working with a colleague gave me more insights, new ways to look at things.”
- “I put together a Career Development Plan with my teaching partner. It helped to keep me focused. This year I am doing a cross-grade level plan. [PCAP] has allowed us to work across grade levels.”
- “I am working with high school and middle school. That has been fun. About 50 percent of teachers work on collaborative plans.”

Members view PCAP as having a positive impact on the professional culture in the district.

Member Comments:

- “The networking with Career Development Plans has allowed for more collegiality. New teachers say that there are many requirements. However, those requirements are noticed, and you are being paid for them. The Career Development Plan was developed for educators by educators. It always goes back to what is best for kids.”
- “The Career Development Plan requires a higher level of education to move. It makes you a better educator. You get credit for doing more outside the classroom.”

NEA STAFF REFLECTIONS

Helena’s compensation system boasts financial stability and a very high degree of support from members and the community, factors which give the program staying power.

The district’s culture shifted from oppositional bargaining to collaborative bargaining: both the district and the association were intent on improving student achievement through enhanced professional learning, and by financially rewarding teachers for the acquisition of skills and knowledge, they created a win-win situation.

The professional service element is a unique aspect of Helena’s Career Development Plan. Creditable activities include curriculum work, community outreach, and coaching, as well as association work. As a result, members are now competing to serve as building representatives.

The shared sense of urgency between the district and the association drove the change process. Together, they were anxiously trying to figure out how they could attract and retain high-quality teachers.

Helena’s compensation model encourages and nurtures collaboration among teachers, not only within the same subject area, but also across grade levels. What became apparent was the energy and passion of teachers that resulted from having a voice in the creation and implementation of their individual Career Development Plans.

Manitowoc Education Association

Manitowoc, Wisconsin

Program Summary and Key Findings

NEA staff met with the local UniServ director and 18 association members, including leaders, to discuss Manitowoc's compensation system. Staff also met with the former superintendent who was instrumental in working with the association to develop Manitowoc's compensation system, though his comments are not reflected in this report.

Prior to 1999, the Manitowoc Public School District (MPSD) had no National Board Certified teachers and only 23 percent of its teachers had earned master's degrees. As a result, the district had expressed concerns about the level of professional development accessible to teachers and decided that the bargaining table was the best place to link professional development and professional compensation. (Carlson, 2006)

In 1999, after months of collaborative work between the local association and the school district, the 400-member Manitowoc Education Association voted nearly unanimously to accept a contract that encouraged and rewarded the acquisition of skills and knowledge.

Manitowoc Program Components

The collective bargaining agreement:

- Restructured the salary schedule from 12 steps and two lanes—one for teachers with a bachelor's degree, and a second for those with a master's degree—to 11 steps and eight levels.
- Requires that teachers, in order to move on the new salary schedule, work toward a goal: an advanced degree, National Board Certification, or a Professional Development Certificate.
- Created the Manitowoc Public School District Academy, which offers courses created and taught by educators.
- Introduced the Professional Development Certificate (PDC), a research-based, portfolio-driven program that is specifically tailored to each individual teacher's professional assignment. (Note: The PDC, like advanced degrees or National Board Certification, is optional.)
- Increased the pay of teachers who earn a doctorate degree (13%), National Board Certification (13%) and/or a master's degree (9%).

The impact has been significant:

- The number of teachers with master's degrees increased from 91 to 155.
- The district, previously without any National Board Certified teachers, now has 19.
- Teacher turnover declined from 20 percent in 1997–98 to 11 percent in 2004–05.

KEY FINDINGS

Teachers view the system as strengthening the impact of professional development.

Member Comments:

- “It cannot help but affect your practice. It had you question why you are doing what you are doing. Once you participated in the new system and felt successful, you could continue to grow. Everyone has a reflective part. The [Professional Development Certificate] requires reflection.”
- “I took a number of Academy classes, and it gave me a window into what was happening in the classroom. It also gave me a nice window into what was going on in other classrooms. I got more out of some Academy classes, more than university classes.”
- “So many in my own department have achieved [National Board Certification], I thought I should move up to that level. It was not only desirable, it was achievable.”

The system boasts high member support.

Member Comments:

- “There are lots of opportunities; we move across the lanes faster and can increase our salaries faster.”
- “It changed the climate of the school; more and more people talk about professional learning. Because I got my Professional Development Certificate, I had to have a professional plan; I became more of a participant. I began to do presentations. I attended conferences.”
- “The compensation leads to more professional development. I knew I had to do something else. I could afford to begin and finish National Board Certification [NBC]. I could not afford to pay for a master’s degree. Now that I have my NBC [and the higher salary that comes with it], I can afford to get a master’s degree.”

The program’s stability is undermined by a lack of commitment to long-term funding.

Member Comments:

- “Funding is an enormous problem. As [my colleague] said, we will price this out of existence. We do not cost forward. We do actual costing. Finally, someone has done something that works, but it will have to be phased back without the funding mechanism. It is a profound problem and one you do not hear about.”
- “The year that I started NBC, I didn’t pass. I was asked by the HR director to pursue it. I cannot see that happening today. I can’t see administration recruiting people for NBC now. I think the number of people getting all these credentials is scaring them. I think they worry about the cost if everyone pursues National Board Certification.”

Some teachers view differentiated pay as eroding union solidarity.

Member Comments:

- “When revenue caps limit the money and the money goes to a select few who have done something to earn it, there is a jealousy factor. [Some teachers] claim it does not benefit the members as a whole.”
- “I am fearful it will split our union if we become a group of ‘haves’ and ‘have-nots.’”
- “...Where are the coaches and union leaders coming from? I am seeing fewer younger teachers involved in social things. We are becoming the corporation of education. We used to be part of the neighborhood; we are not so much anymore.”

The new program lacked a public relations strategy—the community didn’t understand it and, therefore, wasn’t supportive.

Member Comments:

- “We need the kind of attention that Denver has gotten. We should have done more PR on the plan.”
- “On my wish list would be that the public recognizes what we do and supports it.”
- “Nothing in the budget equation is going down. Other costs are going up. [Without community support,] I think sustainability is a concern.”
- “The [school] board needs spokespersons taking pride in the achievements of the teachers. The board and the administration are not doing this.”

From Jim Carlson, the local UniServ director and architect of the system:

Ultimately, the cost of this new compensation system will consume all available resources, leaving nothing for the normal growth in the base schedule ... Without new and additional resources, this very successful teacher compensation initiative will be significantly modified or entirely evaporated, ending the story.

Carlson, Jim. *“Alternative Compensation in Manitowoc, Wisconsin, Six Years Later,”* January, 2006.

NEA STAFF REFLECTIONS

The Manitowoc Education Association pioneered its innovative compensation system in 1999, and it has served as a model for other skill- and knowledge-based programs. But without a public relations strategy and program branding (it has no name like PCAP, ProComp, etc.), the program has been undervalued. The energy and professional climate it brought to the district were impressive.

The enthusiasm and the motivation, shown by several veteran teachers, were palpable—they were energized by their professional learning, their self-reflection, and their ability to analyze and change their practice.

Association leaders, who helped to develop this model, led by example: several past local presidents have achieved National Board Certification; other leaders have earned master's degrees and Professional Development Certificates, and as a result, they have been champions for the compensation program.

The importance of securing long-term funding for this initiative cannot be overemphasized.

Portland Education Association

Portland, Maine

Program Summary and Key Findings

NEA staff met with 21 members of the Portland Education Association (PEA), as well as local leaders and staff. In addition, NEA staff met with the Portland superintendent and director of human resources, but their comments are not reflected here.

In 2006, the Portland Education Association (PEA), preparing to bargain, conducted a member survey that revealed several priorities. First, members wanted their salaries to be more competitive with professions that require a similar level of education. Second, members were dissatisfied with the district's professional development offerings and a lack of control over their own professional learning. Finally, early career educators, wanting greater opportunities for salary advancement, saw streamlining the compensation system as their top priority. Armed with this survey data, PEA began working with the district to develop a new compensation model.

The result, the Professional Learning Based Salary System (PLBSS), is grounded in the shared beliefs that the best predictor of student learning is teacher learning and teachers must receive professional pay. Goals of the professional pay system included: improving instructional practice through professional learning; compensating teachers for the acquisition of new skills and knowledge; reducing the number of years to reach maximum salary; improving career earnings; and rewarding teachers who take on leadership roles.

The collective bargaining agreement stipulated that teachers would transition to the new schedule, which had fewer steps and one additional lane, for the 2007-2008 school year. First, teachers were placed on the traditional salary schedule and then moved to the appropriate lane and step (at the identical or next higher salary) on the Professional Learning Based Schedule. No teacher lost salary in moving to the new compensation system.

In 2008, Portland's budget constraints, coupled with the district's inaccurate forecasting of salaries under the new system, prompted the district to access a contract provision (Portland's Living Contract Provision – Appendix E, page 43) allowing either party to propose a modification of the contract and for the parties to reach a tentative agreement, if possible. The association agreed to modify the pace at which teachers could move across the salary schedule, helping the district to more accurately predict salary costs and ensuring the program's sustainability. In exchange, PEA was able to extend the contract for two years, and PEA members ratified the new agreement with 94% voting to support the changes.

Portland Program Components

Advancement on the Professional Learning Based Salary Schedule

To advance on the schedule, teachers must accumulate 225 approved salary contact hours (SCH) defined as follows:

- **1 university/college credit hour = 15 SCH**

Eligible credits are those that would meet approval standards for course reimbursement.

- **1 continuing education unit (CEU) = 10 SCH**

Eligible CEUs are those that would meet the approval standards for course reimbursement

- **1 non-university related contact hour = 1 SCH**

Examples of eligible learning projects include: classroom action research, conference/course presentations, new curriculum development and implementation, parent/community involvement programs, professional learning collaborations, and committee work that is not otherwise compensated.

NOTE: Teachers are eligible for a lane change three years after their last lane change (or date of hire), and lane changes may be made only on September 1 of each year.

More specific information regarding the accrual of salary contact hours, as well as movement and placement on the salary schedule, is available in Appendix F, page 44.

KEY FINDINGS

Teachers have embraced quality professional development opportunities targeted at improving their students' learning.

Member Comments:

- “This is an opportunity to advance your professionalism and get compensated for it at the same time. Now I can get compensated salary-wise for what I would do anyway.”
- “One of the young teachers said, ‘Instead of working two jobs, I can put energy into becoming a better teacher.’”
- “I have always had people say to me, ‘You have to go into administration to make more money.’ The teacher leader role was a huge benefit for me.”

Members view the system as strengthening the professional culture.

Member Comments:

- “The staff that I work with became a community of teachers, getting together and taking courses. [One] school, in particular, has groups of teachers working and taking courses together.”
- “I had never heard anyone say before this, ‘I am going to take a course. Would you like to join me?’ This was a movement, and I totally firmly believe it was a result of the contract. I hadn’t seen it in 27 years. People are sharing what they learn.”
- “Collaboration across grade levels has been incredible.”
- “People are much more reflective about their practice. [The system] has moved us to a culture of continuous growth.”

- “Increased professional development has promoted problem solving among peers. Instead of saying a student just can’t learn, teachers are seeking opportunities to build their own toolboxes to solve problems. Teachers are seeking to join groups with people who might have the answers.”
- “I am really excited about learning and my students can see that.”

The system has fostered collaborative relationships between teachers and administration.

Member Comments:

- “Administration is pleased to see us taking advantage of learning new skills and improving our craft, and not just getting paid more because we have another year in the profession.”
- “The Central Office is on board. It is such a change. They say, ‘Go out there and get [professional development]. We will reward you for it.’ It feels totally different. I have a new respect for the administration for supporting this.”
- “We all gained respect for each other. [The administration was] willing to talk and to listen and that increased the respect on both sides.”
- “[The district] trusted us to handle our own advancement and careers.”

The new system has increased association capacity and enhanced PEA’s positive image in the community.

Member Comments:

- “[The pay system] has brought in more members. It has helped [PEA leadership] have conversations with teachers and encourage them to join PEA based on professional development.”
- “When I’ve talked to friends and family in the business world, they are very impressed [with Portland’s compensation system].”
- “The superintendent and city council members have taken every available opportunity to say that the teachers renegotiated their contract [when the initial version proved too costly]. We have gotten a lot of press for participating in the solution.”
- “[PEA leadership] went around to groups of parents and got lots of positive feedback and support.”
- “This contract has increased respect for PEA within our community of teachers, and in other communities where we have shared [the details of] our contract. The reaction has been a ‘pat on the back’ for PEA.”
- “For technical teachers like me, [a master plumber], we can get the teaching skills we need to stand in front of the classroom. It is perfect for vocational teachers who may not have learned about pedagogy.”

Although the system boosts high support, some teachers expressed frustration concerning what they viewed as inequities.

Member Comments:

- “I still find that some experienced teachers resent the teachers with less experience making the same kind of money that they had to wait many years to get to.”
- “I was one of the lucky ones who did my [professional learning] early [before mid-term adjustments to the contract] and benefited. I did this with the suspicion, based on past experience, that short term promises made by the school board “du jour” are seldom good for the long-term employee.”
- “I am very unhappy that my lane change equated to an \$1800 raise, while my colleague who had 5 fewer years teaching than I, got a \$7000 raise. We started \$5000 apart based on the fact that I had much more experience than she, and now we are at the same step on the scale and make the exact same annual salary.”

Administratively, the system has been challenging.

Member Comments:

- “The district has some problems executing the administrative portion in a timely manner. There is only one person at the district level who can approve proposals [for salary contact hours].”
- “I would like more of the proposals to fit in a category and not have [the process of determining a proposal’s value] be so subjective. It would help if we had proposals written and published so that people could use them as models to work from.”
- “People understand the concept [of salary contact hours] but not necessarily the logistics. The system is still somewhat confusing: salary contact hours versus other hours; the deadlines and when the forms are due.”
- “If a teacher is doing action research or curriculum work, how do you measure that [in salary contact hours]? Is it the same as a course? Now, it is clearly worth 45 hours [because the district and the association went through the process of defining it.]”

Teachers believe the new pay system allows them to focus on improving their practice.

Member Comments:

- “Now, my time is spent more wisely. It is wonderful to take rigorous classes. Though they are a lot of work, they have improved my teaching.”
- “I have been able to go to workshops and bring curriculum back to my school, and this is what changes my practice.”
- “About 13% of [Portland’s] students are special education students, 25% are English Language Learners, and 40% are low income. I have noticed [the system] has been a good vehicle for improving the delivery of instruction. [The professional learning opportunities] have improved everyone’s ability to deal with all students and promote a better integrated system for the students.”

Since the professional pay system was implemented, teachers feel more respected and valued.

Member Comments:

- “We have the opportunity to present courses, share information and get credit. It is recognition of teachers’ expertise and a respect for what teachers have to offer.”
- “I think when you have rewards in place and respect for the work you are doing, that makes [the district] a better place for learning.”
- “We make enough money to survive. We feel more like first-class citizens.”
- “This is an opportunity for teachers to get paid for [the extras]. We can now have those extra duties validated as a legitimate part of what we do.”

NEA STAFF REFLECTIONS

The Portland Education Association (PEA) and the district worked collaboratively to design a system that focused on teachers’ professional growth. When the system was collectively bargained, PEA made a concerted effort to ensure that all members were well represented and would benefit from participation in the professional salary system. Consequently, the system boasts high member support.

The trusting, collaborative relationship between district and association leaders was crucial to the success of this program. In 2008, both parties were willing to return to the bargaining table to make mid-term adjustments to the salary system which improved its sustainability, mitigated the district’s fiscal vulnerability, and enhanced the association’s image in the community.

Portland’s compensation model promotes collaboration and professionalism among teachers. The passion and enthusiasm, resulting from teachers having a voice in their own professional growth, was immediately observable. They demanded professional development opportunities that were relevant to their needs and those of their students. Increasingly, the conversation in the teachers’ rooms focused on professional learning opportunities, as teachers shared with colleagues the specific ways in which their professional learning had improved their practice. From this, came a shared sense of intellectual purpose and a collective responsibility for student learning that was apparent during all discussions with members and leaders.

Initially, PEA received pushback from members concerning the move from a traditional single salary schedule to a new compensation model. Association leadership, however, was committed to improving compensation and professional learning for all teachers. They firmly believed the result would be improved student learning, and that core belief underpinned the design and implementation of this program.

PEA’s Professional Learning-Based Salary System has received national attention as a viable alternative to traditional single salary schedules because it is in harmony with the resolutions of the Maine Education Association and National Education Association.

Education Minnesota

Alternative Teacher Professional Pay Systems

NEA staff attended Education Minnesota's 2007 Alternative Teacher Professional Pay System (ATPPS) Conference. Participants included 50 Education Minnesota members, local leaders and association staff. Since Minnesota's alternative pay system is decentralized and bargained by each participating local affiliate, the programs differ from district to district. Consequently, the comments below come from members working in different districts with diverse programs.

Minnesota's state-level alternative compensation program, Alternative Teacher Professional Pay Systems (ATPPS), was initiated by Governor Tim Pawlenty and enacted by the Legislature in July, 2005. The program—which the Legislature calls Quality Compensation for Teachers, or Q Comp—was modeled after the Milken Family Foundation's Teacher Advancement Program (TAP).

Districts apply to be part of ATPPS by submitting a proposal and an implementation plan to the Minnesota Department of Education. Each plan must include five standard program components (see below). A teacher vote is not required before districts apply for the program, but each application must be signed by the president of the local teachers' association. As of December 2007, there were 39 Minnesota school districts and 21 charter schools participating in the program.

ATPPS Program Components

- Career ladders for teachers
- Job-embedded professional development
- Instructional observations and standards-based assessments
- Measures to determine student growth
- Alternative teacher compensation

KEY FINDINGS

Anticipating the introduction of a statewide initiative, Education Minnesota engaged members to outline the principles of an acceptable alternative compensation program.

Education Minnesota Staff Comments:

- “It became clear to us that something was going to come forward about alternative pay. We established a standing committee to look at it and decide whether it was something we wanted or were opposed to.”
- “Teachers’ pay was not what it is supposed to be. It took forever to get to the high end. It was a form of deferred compensation. We decided we wanted to shape this and take part rather than have it happen *to us*.”

- “The union has had a generational opportunity to do something different.”
- “Many states have adopted our principles. We are seen as a leader.”
- “In 2003, three years after the principles [developed by Education Minnesota outlining the necessary components of alternative compensation] were adopted, we worked to craft something to be ready for the governor, in case he put something forward. In 2005, in the closing minutes of the session, something was put in place. It passed in early July and was going to be put into place in August.”
- “We do support this, but we only support it if it’s done in the right way.”

Each plan’s success has been highly dependent on the degree to which members were involved in developing it.

Member Comments:

- “We did a big survey this year to find out what people like and do not like about ATPPS, and that has helped us write our new plan. We have drafted our plan for the next two years.”
- “A hallmark of the program that was indispensable was real cooperation between district administration, teachers, and the local union.”
- “This was our first year of Q Comp in our district. Our plan began by our superintendent coming to us with this new plan with money. She thought it would fit well with our school improvement plan. Without a committee really looking at it, we agreed. She went and got the paperwork for it. When she was looking for a team, no one came forward because everyone knew it would take a lot of time because it involved the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE). Our plan is not reader-friendly.”
- “Another plus was the individual goals that we set. We came with goals that we wanted to work on; that was how we gained the majority of our dollars. We could choose whatever we wanted to improve our teaching. The staff became very excited.”
- “If you are going to get involved [with ATPPS], you need a team. We really don’t have a team, and it is kind of hit or miss. We are trying to figure out our issues and how we are going to attack them.”
- "I was on the oversight committee. We worked hard to make the plan the best it could be.

Teachers view the system as strengthening the impact of professional development.

Member Comments:

- “Teachers are directing professional development, and it is meaningful.”
- “It has increased the professional status of teachers in the district. Professional development can be a key for building a relationship between the union and the administration.”
- “[In our district] the courses are created by teachers. Participation is voluntary. It’s empowering for teachers.”
- “This has changed the conversation in school districts. The union has made professional development front and center.”

The level of program support is hard to gauge because the ATPPS plans differ greatly from district to district.

Education Minnesota’s Recommendations for Participation in ATPPS

- Ensure that the plan has member support.
- Make the plan simple.
- Focus on improving teaching and learning.
- Develop the plan through a transparent and inclusive process.
- Make use of Education Minnesota’s available resources.
- Put a communication plan in place.
- Educate members on the details of the program.

NEA STAFF REFLECTIONS

Education Minnesota’s decision to be proactive rather than reactive enabled them to shape ATPPS and provided safeguards for local associations interested in developing programs in their districts.

The attractive aspect of ATPPS is its emphasis on professional development and teachers’ ability to direct their learning, making it more meaningful. The most successful district plans involved the union from the beginning; consequently, the union played a central role in developing the plans’ foundation. Professional development becomes union work, and the perception of the union changes.

Professional development can act as the lever for forging a collaborative relationship between the union and the district.

The program is decentralized, which is both a strength and a weakness. Locals are free to create programs that work for them and are beneficial. Conversely, it is difficult to assess and coordinate the wide variety of programs that have resulted from such a decentralized system.

Overall Observations

The site visits conducted by NEA staff suggest key elements that are essential to successful, sustainable programs:

Quality professional development is a powerful motivator: Experienced teachers who engaged in new kinds of learning, such as action research and classroom-focused professional development, found they were inspired in unexpected ways. Also, they were often paid for these professional development experiences, indicating the importance that districts place on this kind of professional learning.

District and association leaders must be visionaries and champions of lifelong learning: In order to successfully develop forward-thinking, skill- and knowledge-based programs like those in Manitowoc and Helena, districts need superintendents and association leaders who strongly support lifelong learning. It should be noted that neither of the superintendents in these districts believed in tying compensation to test scores, but rather believed that standardized testing should be used to identify achievement gaps and inform practice.

School-level leadership matters: In these schools, teachers emphasized the importance of the role that principals play in providing ongoing instructional leadership and guidance to support the work of the staff.

Collaboration should be a fundamental aspect of a program: A by-product of the intense collaboration in Helena and Chattanooga is each district's ability to better recruit and retain the next generation of teachers, who seem to thrive on collaboration.

Programs like the Benwood Initiative show promise in closing achievement gaps: Although the district did not make major staffing changes (two-thirds of the existing teachers in those schools remained), student achievement improved because of the embedded, focused professional development. As an article in *Education Week* noted (see Appendix G, page 46), the large strides in student achievement are attributable primarily to "the rising effectiveness of teachers who had been at the schools when their students' performance was dismal."

Rigorous professional development can significantly raise the level of professionalism in a district: In Manitowoc and Helena, districts with compensation systems based on improving skills and knowledge, teachers experienced a deeper level of engagement, felt that the school's culture was strengthened, and expressed a high level of shared responsibility for improving the quality of teaching.

Compensation systems should be transparent and understandable: Some teachers expressed frustration that complex systems are hard to understand, making it difficult to estimate the impact on a teacher's compensation. In addition, complex systems are difficult and costly to administer.

Educators want the ability to choose whether or not they participate in a new compensation system: When a plan allows educators to opt-in to a new compensation system or retain their previous salary schedule, all teachers are more likely to support the program, as the Denver interviews illustrated.

Long-term funding is essential: A critical component of alternative compensation systems is guaranteed long-term financial stability. In districts with stable funding, like Helena and Denver, teachers have more confidence in the system than they do in Manitowoc, where funding is always in jeopardy.

Association involvement is essential: Programs such as Eagle County, developed without the input of the Association or voted on by members, will not succeed in the long-term.

Teacher attitudes were less negative than may have been expected: While teachers are clearly suffering in bad programs (like Eagle County's), there is less evidence that other programs have significantly impacted teacher attitudes or beliefs about the association, the district, or the profession.

Recommendations and Policy Implications

NEA should continue to develop its strategies around the positive elements of innovative models, particularly programs that improve the skills and knowledge of teachers, like those in Helena and Manitowoc. In addition to creating a positive lexicon, the Association needs to ensure that staff and leaders have a shared understanding of what we can support. For example, the Professional Standards and Practice (PSP) Committee’s recent report embraced pay for experiences (emphasis on the “s”), a concept supported by members who participated in the site visit conversations. The idea of “pay for professional growth” could change our strategy from opposing bad ideas to supporting good ideas.

NEA should continue to closely track these and other burgeoning programs so that we can share with our affiliates and the public what works, what doesn’t, and why. These systems are complex and need to be examined for their ability to positively impact both teaching quality and compensation.

NEA needs to determine how we want to frame our argument against pay for test scores because our adversaries continue to gain an advantage by strategically defining the language. For example, proponents of performance incentives are reframing their argument: instead of using punitive terms like “accountability,” they are using terms like “teacher recognition” or “pay for contribution”—labels which are challenging for the Association to oppose from a public relations standpoint. At the same time, NEA must continue to study, analyze and/or critique the validity, limitations and reliability of methods like *value-added assessment* to determine teacher effectiveness.

NEA should consider conducting or supporting research studies with scientifically selected focus groups (or surveys) in districts with alternative compensation programs in order to collect evidence concerning what our members think, and how these systems impact them. Also needed is quality research measuring the short- and long-term impact of these systems on student achievement, teacher pay, administrative costs, and recruitment and retention.

NEA should create strategies in the context of today’s political reality. Despite sparse evidence to support “merit pay” and “pay for performance,” many educators, researchers, and policymakers continue to support experimenting with performance incentives. The Association needs to carefully craft a message that recognizes this strong support, while continuing to promote salary structures that are consistent with sound compensation theory and NEA policy. The Association should define alternative compensation in a way that allows us to emphasize the elements that may hold promise: Advocating for skill- and knowledge-based programs that pay for things like embedded, relevant professional development and teacher career ladders.

Appendix A: At-a-Glance Overview of Sites Visited ^{*}

Location & Program	Manitowoc, Wisconsin	Chattanooga, Tennessee: The Benwood Initiative ^{**}	Minnesota: ATPPS
Program Scope	Manitowoc Public School District	Eight Hamilton County elementary schools that were among the lowest performing schools in the state	All Minnesota school districts are eligible - participation is voluntary
Components of Salary Determination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Restructured salary schedule includes 8 levels ◆ Level movements for all educators (except new teachers) require the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful completion of 12 graduate credits • Successful completion of Manitowoc Public School District Academy credits • Any combination of the above • 3 level movements are granted upon completion of a Professional Development Certificate • Educators earning a master's degree minimally move to level 5 ◆ National Board Certification: Adds 10% to salary each year certification is held ◆ Doctorate degree: Additional 13% of salary each year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Retention bonus: Existing teachers with records of high performance (3-year Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System, or TVAAS, scores averaging 115+ or a recommendation by the K-3 committee) receive a bonus of \$5,000 for three years. ◆ Recruitment bonus: New teachers with records of high performance (3-year TVAAS average of 115+ or a recommendation by the K-3 committee) receive \$5,000 after 3 years. ◆ Team Bonus: If any high priority schools achieve an average minimum TVAAS of 115+, each teaching professional receives \$1,000. If the schools achieve a score of 120+, each teaching professional receives a bonus of \$2,000. ◆ Housing Incentive: Benwood Initiative teachers who buy homes in nine central downtown neighborhoods can receive a low-interest loan of up to \$10,000. If they live in the home for 5 years, the loan will be forgiven. ◆ Opportunities for fellowships for a free master's degree in urban education. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Statewide program; plans bargained at the local level ◆ Broad guidelines include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Career ladder/career advancement • Job-embedded professional development • Teacher evaluation • Alternative Teacher Compensation
Measures of Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Evaluation ◆ New skills and knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Bonus payments are determined by TVAAS scores or by a recommendation of the K-3 committee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Instructional observations and standards-based assessments ◆ Measures to determine student growth <p>NOTE: 60% of incentives must be based on teacher evaluations and measurement of student achievement; 40% can be based on other factors, such as cost of living.</p>
Funding	No long-term funding commitment; without additional resources, this initiative is likely to be significantly modified or phased back.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ \$7.5 million in grants from the Benwood Foundation and the Public Education Foundation in 2001 ◆ The Benwood Foundation provided another \$7.2 million grant to continue and expand the 2007 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Funded by Legislature. State has allocated \$86 million annually for the program which is funded by state aid and local tax levies.

^{*} Portland, a recent addition to this report, has not yet been incorporated.

^{**} Chattanooga schools have received three sizable grants to raise student achievement. The Benwood Foundation award went to elementary schools, while a Carnegie Foundation grant was made to high schools, and The NEA Foundation provided a \$1.5 million grant over five years to address middle school student achievement.

Location	Helena, Montana PCAP	Denver, Colorado ProComp	Eagle County, Colorado TAP
Program Scope	Helena Public School District	Denver Public Schools	Eagle County School District
Components of Salary Determination	<p>To move to the next step on the 25-step career ladder educators must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write, submit, and implement a Career Development Plan • Perform professional service as defined in the plan • Receive a positive evaluation as defined in the negotiated agreement <p>Additional remuneration includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$2,000 annual stipend to educators who complete their master's degree while on the plan • \$2,000 annual stipend to educators who obtain National Board Certification (valid for the length of the certification) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Knowledge & Skills <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completing Professional Development Units adds 2 percent of salary index • Graduate degree or national certification adds 9% of index • \$1000 lifetime tuition reimbursement ◆ Successful Evaluation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adds 1 percent of index each year (probationary employees) • Adds 3% of index once every 3 years (non-probationary employees) ◆ Market Incentives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching in a hard-to-staff position adds 3% of index • Teaching in a hard-to-serve school adds 3% of index ◆ Student Growth <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1% of index added to salary if both student growth objectives are met • 1% of index as a bonus for meeting 1 student growth objective Colorado Student Assessment Program (CSAP) – increases or decreases salary 3% for exceeding or falling below expectations • Distinguished schools – 2% of index is added 	<p>The single salary schedule was replaced by the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Multiple Career Paths <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Career teacher • Mentor teacher (adds a \$5,000 stipend) • Master teacher (adds a \$11,500 stipend) ◆ Teacher evaluations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four evaluations each year, with a maximum payment of \$1,300 ◆ Performance Pay <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value-added methodology • Maximum payment is \$2,600
Measures of Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Write, submit, and complete a Career Development Plan ◆ Complete professional service ◆ Positive evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Evaluations customized to particular jobs. ◆ Measures to determine student growth: statewide standardized test, meeting 2 student objectives, and/or serving in a Distinguished School. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ 4 evaluations, 2 by the principal, 1 by a Master and 1 by a Mentor teacher ◆ Annual Performance Awards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50% skills, knowledge and responsibilities • 50% based on student achievement
Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Board of Trustees funds the PCAP through state and local levies ◆ Board of Trustees hired Augenblick, Palaich, and Associates to do a cost analysis (20-year projection) to determine the affordability and sustainability of the plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ The program is funded by a \$25 million annual mill levy; funds are administered by an independent board. ◆ DPS received a Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) Grant from the U.S. Department of Education. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Eagle County received a Teacher Incentive Fund Grant from the U.S. Department of Education. ◆ Salaries are funded through state and local levies.