"In the Confucian tradition it is said that the mark of a golden era is that children are the most important members of the society and teaching is the most revered profession.”

Peter M. Senge

PREAMBLE

Oregon’s beloved Poet Laureate, the late William Stafford, wrote a poem entitled, “The Way It Is.” Stafford’s poem could well have been the “theme poem” for the Chalkboard Quality Workgroup:

“There’s a thread you follow,
   It goes among things that change.
   But it doesn’t change.
   People wonder about what you are pursuing.
   You have to explain about the thread.
   But it is hard for others to see.
   While you hold it you can’t get lost.
   Tragedies happen; people get hurt or die; and you suffer and get old.
   Nothing you do can stop time’s unfolding.
   You don’t ever let go of the thread.”

The Chalkboard Quality Workgroup’s thread was the belief that ALL Oregon children deserve a rigorous education that engages their hearts and minds in imaginative and powerful ways. Schools should provide opportunities where young people can wrestle with deep questions, learn to develop inquisitive minds, and develop the courage to act on their beliefs. Deborah Meier, author and former school principal, observed that schools that unleash the learning potential for students create “feisty” learners ready to tackle ever more learning through innovation and creativity.

Teachers and administrators, who are well prepared and dedicated, relish the opportunity and challenge of education – the most important work in Oregon. Over the past decade, high profile research efforts have showcased how the quality of teachers and principals dramatically affects student achievement. The report “What Matters Most: Teaching for America’s Future” asserts, “What teachers and principals know and can do is the most important influence on what students learn.” The American Council on Education synthesizes a slew of research to arrive at a similar conclusion in its report “To Touch the Future.” The report states, “The success of the student depends most of all on the quality of the teacher. We know from empirical data what our intuition has always told us: Teachers make a difference. We now know that teachers make the difference.”
The evidence is compelling. The quality of the teacher-principal is the most important factor to improve student achievement. In other words, both poor and excellent teaching and school leadership leave a legacy. Outstanding educators create learning environments that engage all students. Every classroom deserves an understanding and caring teacher who helps students enjoy success. In a culture of learning, a student’s imagination can be sparked, skills honed, and dreams evoked. The Chalkboard Quality Workgroup thought deeply about creating recommendations that ensure Oregon Schools are staffed by high quality teachers and administrators.

**CONTEXT AND INTRODUCTION**

In June 2005, the Chalkboard Project announced 15 top policy recommendations resulting from an extensive statewide civic engagement process and its proprietary education research. These recommendations fit within three goals including 1) educator and administrator quality, 2) funding and accountability and 3) parental and community involvement. The members of the Quality Workgroup were recruited to suggest recommendations that address the issues on educator quality that emerged from the civic engagement process (listed below). This report offers consensus recommendations of the Educator/Administrator Quality Workgroup.

**Goal #1A:** Generate recommendations on the creation of new standards to license teachers.

**Goal #1B:** Create an alternative way for qualified people to become licensed as principals, superintendents, and teachers in high-need areas such as science and math.

**Goal #1C:** Recommend specific procedures to reinstitute Oregon’s beginning teacher and mentor program, with a special emphasis in areas with high turnover and teacher shortages.

**Goal #1D:** Recommend procedures to make sure that high-quality professional development opportunities for teachers, principals and superintendents align with the needs of their schools, as well as with the requirement for continuing licensure and career-long professional development.

**Goal #1E:** Refine and focus administrator licensing standards. Make licensure dependent on a candidate’s ability to demonstrate in greater depth that he/she possesses the skills to successfully implement plans to improve instruction throughout his/her school.

**Goal #1F:** Determine how effective current methods are for evaluating, improving, and removing teachers and principals. Strengthen those methods and promote their use.
**Goal #1G:** Propose an alternative model for compensating teachers and principals based on rewarding performance that improves student learning. Apply what has been learned during the past decade regarding alternative models for labor-management relations in education, including school-based management and budgeting. Use this information to also make recommendations on which responsibilities for decision-making should be made at the state, district, and school levels.

### CASE STATEMENT

The Oregon public is concerned about the quality of education in its schools. Data from statewide testing indicates that not all children are meeting expected academic proficiencies, and there is a gap in achievement levels between groups of children, particularly those living in poverty and/or from diverse cultures. The quality of education is directly connected to the quality of the educators teaching and leading Oregon’s 198 school districts and 1290 school buildings.

The difficulty in providing high quality education for every child is multi-faceted. Staffing schools for Oregon is a complex system of recruiting, preparing, licensing, and hiring educators. Oregon currently has teacher shortages in math, physical science, special education, and foreign languages, as well as in rural and remote areas. Well-prepared administrators can also be difficult to recruit to high schools, district level positions and in rural/remote regions. In addition, both teachers and administrators are significantly less diverse than the children they serve.

Once an educator is recruited, prepared, licensed and hired, development of professional skills and leadership capabilities must be ongoing. Education changes rapidly, the experiences of children change and educators must have opportunities to reflect, learn, and implement practices that serve children well. Efficient and appropriate assessment and evaluation of educators should be implemented only after every educator has access to high quality, appropriate professional development. In addition, we know that nearly half of all new teachers leave the classroom within five years. Attrition is costly for both the public and for children who lose the opportunity to learn from experienced teachers. Effective support for educators throughout their careers will increase the stability of a high quality workforce.

Investment in teacher and administrator quality is critical to improving Oregon’s schools. Implementation of recommendations in this report will provide an opportunity for all children to learn and meet academic expectations.
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### PROCESS

As the Educator/Administrator Quality Workgroup (EAQW) wrestled with this complex task, it became clear that while there is much that is positive about education in Oregon, there are many issues that must be addressed to ensure high quality learning opportunities for all K-12 students. The recommendations that emerged from the EAQW fall into four broad categories: professional development, educator accountability (evaluation), licensure, and compensation in priority order. For each of these areas, the report that follows will address context, current practice, recommendations, research and information to support the recommendations, and accountability. The conclusion of the report speculates what may change in Oregon’s schools if the recommendations are implemented as described. The EAQW believes that there are overarching guiding principles that must be recognized for implementation of the recommendations to be effective.
These principles are:

- Effective leadership skills must be intentionally developed at all levels: teacher, administrator, school board, and community.
- Education is a system, and all of the components of education are interrelated; so, addressing any one component in isolation may not produce maximum effect.
- Implementation must be planned thoroughly in advance, and all players must be prepared to complete their tasks.
- Educators need time to think, plan, and adapt recommendations to their locations. Innovations work best from the ground up.
- We work from an abundance model rather than a deficit model. We assume an abundance of knowledge, skill, and commitment in the field. Deficits of time, energy, and money pose challenges.

**GOAL AREA 1: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

Professional development is the most critical component of the EAQW recommendations. Evaluation, licensure, and compensation all depend on a strong and effective professional development system. To be effective, professional development must be given considerable thought and research as to what opportunities will support the largest impact on student learning. Attention to national research, ongoing local contextualized research, student needs to be academically successful, training for professional development providers and other practices will ensure that opportunities offered to educators are worth the considerable investment that must be made.

An educator’s practice develops over time and is improved through ongoing evaluation and support. Professional development begins with preservice preparation, continues through early career induction (entrance period into the profession, usually considered to be the first 3-5 years of practice) and peer mentoring. It is critical to provide both mentoring for early career educators and ongoing professional development for experienced educators. Effective early career mentoring increases the chances that an educator will continue in the profession. As the educator gains experience, learning must be ongoing to ensure improvement in practice and development of important leadership skills.

We know that professional growth is best accomplished in a supportive school community. Michael Fullan and Andy Hargreaves, in *What’s Worth Fighting for in Your School*, state that “schools characterized by a strong sense of professional community are workplaces that create, sustain, and motivate good teachers throughout their careers.” Likewise, Lisa S. Goldstein in *Teaching, Learning, and Loving: Reclaiming Passion in Educational Practice* says:

“The benefits of membership in a learning community – being valued, supported, challenged, and encouraged and doing the same for others; having a safe place to ask questions and to take the risk of answering questions; knowing others well and
being known and respected by them in turn – are as delightful to adults as to children and are likely to create classroom atmospheres conducive to learning and growth regardless of the age of the learners involved.”

Chalkboard Goals Addressed

**Goal #1C:** Recommend specific procedures to reinstitute Oregon’s beginning teacher and mentor program, with a special emphasis in areas with high turnover and teacher shortages.

**Goal #1D:** Recommend procedures to make sure that high-quality professional development opportunities for teachers, principals and superintendents align with the needs of their schools, as well as with the requirement for continuing licensure and career-long professional development.

Current Practice

Licensed Oregon educators are required to complete professional development activities for license renewal. Each educator sets personal goals for enhanced practice. Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC) requires that professional development activities be focused in at least one of six domains of professional competency: subject matter, assessment, teaching methods and curriculum, diversity, state and national education priorities, and technology. School districts may design district level professional development programs and require educators to participate. Typically district programs are focused on the specific learning needs of their students. Larger districts often employ teachers on special assignment to design curriculum and provide technical support for classroom teachers.

To renew an existing license, teachers are currently required by TSPC to complete 25 Professional Development Units (PDUs) for each year of K-12 classroom service. PDUs are roughly equivalent to clock hours and can be acquired through college coursework, conference attendance, curriculum development, hosting a student teacher and other district activities that will lead to improved practice and enable the teacher to meet professional development goals.

There is no state funded program for early career induction or mentoring. Some districts provide mentoring on a limited basis for the first year of teaching. Very few districts provide support for early career administrators.

The EAQW makes these recommendations for Professional Development:

1. **Beginning Teacher and Administrator Support:** Reinstitute the policy in place for beginning teacher support, which operated successfully in the 1980’s. The beginning teacher support program should be updated and reinstated, and educators in their first three years of practice should be supported with
professionally prepared mentors. New administrators should also be assigned mentors who have had successful experiences in similar positions.

2. **Learning Network System:** Institute a learning network system that enables educators to create collegial, rigorous, and supportive learning communities that provide for ongoing professional growth of teachers and administrators. The learning network services could be housed on college/university campuses, in school districts, in Education Service Districts (ESDs), or other accessible locations. This system will integrate induction and mentoring support for early career educators, as well as provide learning and leadership opportunities for practicing educators. The learning communities could be a source of expertise and data for school improvement and university research efforts. The learning network system should include locations that serve all geographic areas of the state. These centers could be staffed by outstanding teacher/coaches on leave from their school districts; college and university faculty; retired educators who have demonstrated outstanding qualities that enhance learning; and other professional development providers.

3. **Funding:** Invest in professional development by providing funding for:

   - Educators to become mentors and for schools to work with candidates preparing to become teachers and administrators.
   - Districts and colleges/universities to offer paid internships to promote recruitment of candidates into high need content areas or schools/districts and rural/remote locations. Savings from reduced intern pay could be used to fund school-based mentors assigned to coach both candidates and practicing educators on site.
   - Teachers to achieve advanced licensure or National Board Certification. This advancement in practice should lead to a differentiated role for teachers that might be designated “Professional Development Specialist” or learning coach.

**Supporting Statement**

Ongoing professional development is critical for educators. The most effective professional development begins with entry into an initial preparation program and continues throughout one’s career in the profession. Such a system recognizes that although the needs of a novice educator differ dramatically from those of an experienced educator, all educators' professional development should be anchored to the learning progress of students. The most effective type of professional development offers support for teachers and administrators within the context of their own schools, involves sustained interactions over time, and focuses on the unique needs of the educator.

**New Teacher Induction:** The National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (NCTAF) urges strong support for early career teachers. In its 2005 report, "Induction
into Learning Communities” the Commission discusses these key findings related to induction:

- Induction should be a stage in continuum of teacher development.
- Induction should support entry into a learning community.
- Mentoring is a useful component of induction, but only one element of a comprehensive induction system.
- An external network supported by online technologies can add value.
- Induction is a good investment.

NCTAF recommends that leaders of states, districts, schools and higher education systems support comprehensive induction systems that are based on four central goals:

- Building and deepening teacher knowledge.
- Integrating new practitioners into a teaching community and school culture that support the continuous professional growth of all teachers.
- Supporting the constant development of the teaching community in the school.
- Encouraging a professional dialogue that articulates the goals, values, and best practices of community.

The EAQW recommends looking to the University of Washington’s Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession in the State of Washington for a model induction program. Additional information is available at [http://www.cstp-wa.org/](http://www.cstp-wa.org/).

**Learning Network:** Effective early career mentoring cannot occur in isolation. The school climate new teachers enter must support growth for all educators. In order to support effective professional development Oregon must create places where educators can go to renew their enthusiasm for learning and revive their commitment to the “moral imperative” of education. The purpose of the learning network is to provide focused opportunities for learning and leadership development for teams of teachers, administrators, counselors, board representatives, students, and other members of the learning community.

The learning network will provide intensive professional development around critical issues that are common to all schools such as collection and use of assessment data and the implementation of research-based best practices that promote learning for all children. We expect that teams of educators will spend focused time together throughout the year and be provided space and resources to develop action plans for school improvement. Staff from the learning network will offer on-site technical assistance for implementation of improvement plans on an ongoing basis. The work of the learning network will build on existing educator knowledge, skills, and commitments and will encourage teams to attend to both individual educator needs and to systemic changes that will improve the learning environment.

To support teachers and administrators in Oregon, we recommend a system of learning network locations that serve all the geographic areas of the state. These centers could be staffed by outstanding teacher/coaches on leave from their school districts; college
and university faculty; retired educators who have demonstrated outstanding classroom performance, peer mentoring skills, administrative expertise and other qualities that enhance learning; and other professional development providers. It is recommended that start-up costs be funded by the legislature with plans for sustainability over time. The learning network offices could be located on college or university campuses, in ESD facilities, in school districts, or other easily accessible venues.

Teams of educators including teachers, administrators, and other educators from school districts should have opportunities to attend extended sessions (one to three weeks) during the summer where they have mentors, resources, and time to work together on school improvement plans. These sessions should be residential to provide maximum opportunity for collaboration. Following these intensive workshops, learning network staff would collaborate throughout the academic year to support the implementation of improvement plans. Support could include research summaries and analyses, direction for action research projects, evaluation of existing structures and policies, professional development targeted toward specific district needs such as secondary school content literacy, assistance in analyzing assessment data, or other needs identified in district plans.

Training should also be provided in the use of “critical friends” strategies for improvement of practice. The Critical Friends Group process acknowledges the complexity of teaching and provides structures for teachers to improve their teaching by giving and receiving feedback. Working together to improve the day-to-day learning of all students is crucial to the success of Critical Friends Groups.

Closing the learning gap for K-12 students is imperative for all Oregon schools. Learning networks for the enhancement of learning and teaching will provide support for achieving this goal in a timely and effective manner that improves the quality of learning for all Oregon students.

**Teacher/Learning Coach Role:** In order to meet the staffing needs of such a system, we envision cadres of professional coaches who would serve in these roles and are prepared by districts and educator preparation programs at colleges and universities or through the learning network. The position of coach would be a teaching position, not administrative, and would give experienced teachers a new career opportunity that maximizes their expertise to improve teaching and learning within a school context. The assignment would involve an extended contract; thus, offering additional compensation. An educator would only serve as a coach for a limited number of years (3-5) before returning to the classroom. The learning coach could be based in a school building, a district, or a regional learning network center.

Job responsibilities would vary based on the size, nature, and needs of the school faculty but could include coaching student teachers placed in the building, new teachers, as well as experienced teachers who may be in a new assignment or experiencing difficulty. The role would be proactive – offering assistance before a teacher needs to be put on a plan of assistance. Expanded responsibilities for this role
could include serving as a liaison with colleges or universities and planning/coordinating professional development opportunities for faculty that align with a school or district’s improvement plan.

The position would require a rigorous application process. Validation of success with students and peers would be part of the process. Educators in this role would need excellent communication skills, the ability to transfer research and best practices into classroom application, keen abilities to observe and give constructive feedback, an understanding of adult learning styles, and the ability to respectfully interact with those whose teaching styles may be different from their own. They would need to demonstrate success with helping all students achieve and be able to communicate that with others in a collegial manner.

Oregon must resolve the following critical issues: the attrition rate of new teachers, burnout among experienced teachers, and the disconnect between professional development and improved performance in the classroom. Funding for such an endeavor would be needed to develop and implement a leadership network to prepare an initial cadre of coaches statewide. To sustain the model, legislators will be called upon to address the state’s current unfunded mandate to provide mentoring. Districts could reapportion Title II funds and resources currently dedicated to professional development. Where available, partnerships involving colleges and universities can include the use of paid internships and tuition vouchers to help provide sustainable funding sources; in turn, providing improved mentoring of student teachers and strengthened relationships between teacher preparation programs and school districts.

**Incentives for Preservice Preparation:** An important aspect of growth for a practicing educator is mentoring a preservice or early career educator. Incentives for schools and individuals to work with preservice candidates or interns should be provided. Essential to the preparation of an effective teacher is a carefully constructed series of supervised field experiences in schools. This intersection of teacher preparation and classroom practice is where skilled and successful teachers work with the TSPC-approved college/university programs to provide experiences that assist candidates in integrating theory with practice, developing a critical base of confidence for a wide range of teacher tasks, and reflecting on successes and failures with a focus on continued improvement.

Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 584-017-0180 requires candidates seeking initial licensure through an Oregon teacher preparation program to complete fifteen weeks of student teaching, at least nine weeks of which are full time. Most teacher preparation programs in Oregon far exceed this timeframe, recognizing the value of early field experiences prior to student teaching that allow candidates to immediately enact what they are learning while they are learning it. This approach requires close collaboration between the instructor in the teacher preparation program and the teachers whose classrooms the candidates enter. Most effective are models where groups of candidates can actually have their instructor on site to help them process what they may observe in a classroom and provide immediate feedback on their initial teaching attempts.
As responsibilities and expectations increase for teachers, the willingness of skilled teachers to assume the role of cooperating or mentor teacher has been tested. Deans and directors of teacher preparation programs in Oregon have reported an increased shortage of schools and cooperating teachers willing to open their classrooms to preservice candidates, particularly in the Portland area where multiple institutions compete for limited placements. Teachers and administrators are increasingly reluctant to sacrifice valuable instructional time to a novice when there are high stakes consequences. The incentives for teachers which can range from $75 to $350 depending on the length/level of placement and the college/university are increasingly inadequate to compensate for the additional time and responsibilities expected of a quality cooperating teacher.

**Professional Development Schools:** The highest quality supervised experiences occur in school cultures that are focused on teacher learning as well as P-12 student learning. At schools that are partnered with teacher preparation programs, student teachers are not a rare occurrence in only one or two classrooms but rather a common occurrence that becomes more efficient and effective over time. At these sites, courses from the college/university are sometimes taught in a spare classroom allowing candidates to have immediate guided practice and feedback, as well as enhanced understanding of the course content. Teachers employed at these sites often report that they become more effective teachers themselves as they become more comfortable with articulating their practice to novice teachers and “making their thinking visible.” Rich in dialogue about teaching and learning and closely connected to the preparation program, these sites, also called professional development schools, clinical schools or partnership schools, emulate the role of a teaching hospital.

Ideally, we recommend developing close ties between K-12 schools and preparation programs. A professional development school partnership that emerges between college/university and school is based on parity and results in benefits for all involved. Candidates benefit from being in a community of teachers, not just in one teacher’s classroom. In addition to the typical supervision time provided by the university, a faculty member may also be onsite to work with staff on school determined needs and initiatives. This helps keep college and university faculty current and connected to the day-to-day realities of the classroom, increases involvement of colleges and universities in closing the achievement gap, and involves school personnel more directly in efforts to improve the teacher preparation program. These all offer solutions to commonly heard criticisms of teacher preparation programs. Lastly, professional development schools can become a natural context for custom designed professional development activities as teachers and university personnel help each other acquire, practice, and refine strong teaching and coaching skills.

**Paid Internships:** The typical final student teaching experience can cost a candidate upwards of $1800 in tuition and fees, not to mention transportation costs, supplies, and lost income from part time employment. TSPC currently permits paid internships (Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 342.120 and OAR 584-017-0057) allowing candidates to receive academic credit for student teaching while receiving financial compensation.
from a district willing to employ them. (Paid interns usually receive 50-75% of a
teacher’s salary and assume the responsibility for the classroom; thus, releasing a
teacher to temporarily assume other responsibilities.) Salary savings from simultaneous
and multiple paid internship placements in a school site can help fund an experienced
teacher onsite to serve as a mentor to candidates and new and experienced teachers in
the building. At the same time, this arrangement can provide a financial incentive to
recruit candidates to content shortage areas like math, physical science, or special
education as well as recruit them to high need or rural schools/districts. The extended
time offered in a paid internship usually more closely approximates the actual school
year and has been shown to have positive lasting effects on teacher performance and
retention.

Incentives for Advanced Licensure/Certification: In other professions, standards
have not only guided professional accreditation, but have also provided the backbone
for advanced certification systems that designate professional recognition of high levels
of competence. In fields such as accounting, medicine, and law, professionals opt to
add these additional designations understanding that they usually require rigorous
advanced levels of skills often determined through performance assessments.

“Those who have met these standards are then allowed to do certain kinds of work
that other practitioners cannot. The certification standards inform the other sets of
standards governing accreditation, licensing, and relicensing: they are used to
ensure that professional schools incorporate new knowledge into their courses and
to guide professional development and evaluation throughout the career. Thus these
advanced standards may be viewed as an engine that pulls along the knowledge
base of the profession.” (Darling-Hammond and others, 2005, p. 470-1).

Oregon currently requires a second stage licensure (Continuing License) for all school
administrators, counselors and psychologists. The second stage license for classroom
teachers, the Continuing Teaching License (CTL), is no longer mandatory. The
opportunity to design a new Advanced Teaching License exists by incorporating the
best elements of the former CTL with National Board Certification. The licensure we
envision would provide additional assurances to Oregonians that teachers who have
earned the Advanced Teacher Licensure have met high standards that demonstrate
what an accomplished teacher should know and be able to do as the research linking
National Board certification to student performance grows stronger every day.

In Oregon we envision that teachers would not begin work on advanced licensure until
they had completed at least three years of successful teaching and earned a master’s
degree in education, a related field, or appropriate content area. There would be no
window of expiration to begin work on a CTL and the designation, once earned, would
last for the duration of one’s careers in education.

Prospective candidates for the CTL would apply to participate in a year long
professional learning community hosted by a learning network designed to provide
opportunities for candidates to observe master teachers, collaborate with colleagues,
and receive extensive support on key elements of successful teaching. Topics would include:

- Collection and use of assessment data on individual students and student groups
- Differentiated instruction to meet the learning needs of all students
- Classroom or building level research and application of research-based instructional methods
- Leadership skills
- Clinical supervision
- Facilitation and consensus building

After six months, candidates would then be eligible to apply for National Board Certification which currently costs about the same as the voluntary Continuing Teacher Licensure programs offered in Oregon. Former National Board certified teachers would earn additional compensation to provide extensive support as candidates prepared their portfolios and took the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS – "National Board" for short) assessments. Oregon’s Ford Family Foundation provides funds for Oregon’s rural educators to seek National Board Certification. Currently, close to 150 Oregon teachers have earned National Board certification.

Teachers awarded National Board certification would be eligible to:

- Earn additional compensation based on state legislative rule
- Be hired as instructors in the learning network
- Be hired as adjunct instructors in teacher preparation programs
- Coordinate professional development school structures and activities
- Serve as a Professional Coach
- Begin school administrator preparation

Currently thirty states provide some level of financial incentive to help defray the cost of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards application fee and thirty states provide some level of financial incentive to candidates who achieve National Board certification ranging from a one-time bonus of $3,000 to a $7,500 annual adjustment. In addition, a number of states provide financial incentives to National Board Certified Teachers willing to mentor other teachers.

**Accountability**

Student learning improves when appropriate, high quality professional development focuses on the needs of educators and students. Data currently collected and analyzed at the building level should be monitored to inform the focus of professional development in a building. A rigorous and effective evaluation process for each educator will provide evidence for accountability in the area of professional development.
The purpose of the evaluation of teachers and administrators is to improve professional practice. Research clearly demonstrates that high levels of professional expertise positively impact student performance. Essential evaluation principles include:

- Evaluation is not only an individual matter but a systems matter, and effective evaluation requires the full attention of the system in terms of time and resources.
- Evaluation must be part of a continuous learning model that leads to improved individual and team practice and the renewal of professional commitment to teaching and learning.
- Evaluation must include clear expectations and multiple sources of evidence.
- Evaluation must be respectful, ethical, and tied to best professional practice.
- Evaluation must enhance student learning.

Jim Collins, who wrote *Good to Great in the Social Sectors*, says:

“In the social sectors, where getting the wrong people off the bus can be more difficult than in a business, early assessment mechanisms turn out to be more important than hiring mechanisms. There is no perfect interviewing technique, no ideal hiring method; even the best executives make hiring mistakes. You can only know for certain about a person by working with that person.”

A *Survey of Teacher Evaluation Models* can be found in Appendix A. This report was provided for the EAQW by Chalkboard, and it includes research, background on Oregon evaluation practices, and models from other states.

**Chalkboard Goal Addressed**

**Goal #1F:** Determine how effective current methods are for evaluating, improving, and removing teachers and principals. Strengthen those methods and promote their use.

**Current Practice**

Evaluations of educators are the responsibility of each individual school district as articulated in the educators’ contracts and in accordance with Oregon Administrative Rules. Every school administrator in Oregon conducts annual evaluations for the teaching staff. However, the evaluation process is often sporadic, under-resourced, and therefore somewhat ineffective for promoting educator growth and improving student learning. The Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) addressing evaluation is included in Appendix B.

**The EAQW makes these recommendations for Educator Evaluation:**

4. **Evaluation Procedures Training:** Chalkboard should convene a process to review performance evaluation procedures for teachers and administrators. This
action should be undertaken in partnership with key stakeholders, including but not limited to school districts, Oregon School Boards Association, Confederation of Oregon School Administrators, Oregon Education Association, Oregon Department of Education, public stakeholders, students and colleges/universities. The outcome would be driven by an agreed upon set of guiding principles and characteristics, including:

- Comprehensive orientation and training for both evaluators and those being evaluated through the learning networks. The program should include training for boards, school leaders, faculty, and staff.
- Model evaluation tools and rubrics.
- A pilot program prior to full implementation.

5. Hiring Procedures: Evaluation begins with the hiring process. The EAQW recommends that the process be integrated across the state to recruit the most qualified candidates to positions, schools, and districts and include these components:

- Establish and train a panel of stakeholders in each district to inform and advise the candidate review process.
- Establish reasonable timelines for hiring to avoid last minute decisions.
- Streamline a statewide application process to better match candidates and job openings.
- Prepare back up plans to provide for temporarily filling positions to allow sufficient time to find the candidate who is the best fit for the position.

Supporting Statement

Effective evaluation of educators is a critical component in a system that promotes student learning. After much discussion, the EAQW agreed to a number of important points that undergird the evaluation process. The following guiding principles and characteristics of quality evaluation were compiled by the EAQW:

1. The program should address all personnel in the educational system, from board members to paraprofessionals.
2. The system should measure and reward teachers who demonstrate the ability to:
   - foster learning for all children, particularly in areas specified as school goals
   - teach using up-to-date and accurate knowledge in subject matter and core content
   - adapt and change their practices as necessary to implement improvement efforts
   - work as a member of a team to support student success
   - accept constructive feedback
   - use assessment data to enhance student learning
- use appropriate technology to support the instructional process in every classroom

3. The evaluation process for principals should determine the ability of principals to:
   - design, implement, and facilitate comprehensive programs of school improvement
   - achieve measurable goals for all students
   - inspire and support teachers as they help students achieve measurable academic progress
   - analyze, interpret, communicate and act on student achievement data
   - evaluate teachers and paraprofessionals and identify and implement plans to improve or remove poor performing teachers
   - work effectively with diverse populations
   - implement innovative and effective budgeting processes that are aligned with student achievement
   - be strong and effective leaders for their school, their district, and their community

4. The evaluation process for superintendents and central office administrators should:
   - hold administrators clearly accountable for the educational performance of students
   - determine how well the administrators have maximized the quality and performance of school-level educational administrators and teachers
   - gauge community satisfaction with the school district
   - provide evidence of engaging diverse communities’ support concerning student achievement and closing the achievement gap
   - show evidence of innovative leadership, including areas of shared leadership and team building

5. Boards of Education should be evaluated against external, consistent criteria relative to the standards a well-functioning board should meet including:
   - board dynamics
   - board focus on key tasks and decision areas central to school improvement
   - board ability to oversee professional staff and gauge their performance effectively

6. Making the right hiring decision for the position is the first and a very critical step in the Performance Evaluation Program.

7. Induction, mentoring, and professional development are critical subsequent components of the Performance Evaluation Program.

8. In order to provide high quality, valid feedback to teachers and administrators, multiple sources of evidence should be utilized.

9. All stakeholders need to be involved in the development of an evaluation system.
10. The evaluation program should serve to focus time, energy, resources and efforts on the level of excellence present in the classroom, school, and district.

11. The program should allow for a positive, mutual “outplacement” of educators and administrators when it becomes apparent that there is a mismatch between the educator and the school culture.

12. The Performance Evaluation Program should establish clear expectations and provide for ongoing feedback and coaching. Evaluation becomes an ongoing essential element of organizational improvement and is connected closely to multiple other measures of organizational health and functioning.

Retooling Performance Evaluation: In a study completed by Kelley and Maslow from the University of Wisconsin – Madison (2005), it was noted that “evaluation can provide an important source of data to inform school leaders about systemic learning needs. This information can be used to develop and focus professional learning opportunities for all teachers. It can also provide structures to foster collaboration between teachers that can promote the development of powerful professional learning communities” (p. 22). Charlotte Danielson and Thomas McGreal (2000) state, “The principles of adult learning show that when people use self-assessment and self-directed inquiry in professional development, they are more likely to sustain their learning, in more disciplined ways, than when outsiders impose professional development requirements” (p. 25). Combining these two perspectives suggests that an effective model of educator evaluation should include both personal growth and systemic growth goals.

Danielson (1996) and Danielson and McGreal (2000) are both excellent resources for developing evaluation systems that embed professional development components.

Accountability

Evaluation is about accountability. An effective evaluation process holds school boards, administrators, teachers, and other staff accountable for student learning. Every educator is expected to pursue student learning as the primary goal. Incompetence at any level should be documented and plans for improvement should be implemented immediately.

GOAL AREA 3: LICENSURE

Licensing only high quality educators is critical to improving learning opportunities for all children. High level licensure standards drive the improvement of preparation programs and candidate evaluation. Currently, Oregon’s standards are more closely tied to preparation programs than to candidate licensure. It will be important to communicate with the public regarding existing standards for teachers and administrators, all of which are aligned with current national standards. Licensing only high quality educators is critical to improving learning opportunities for all children. Speaking specifically about teachers, Dr. Lee Shulman, President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, writes:
“The teacher must remain the key… Debates over educational policy are moot if the primary agents of instruction are incapable of performing their functions well. No computer will replace them, no voucher system will bypass them.”

**Chalkboard Goals Addressed**

**Goal #1A:** Generate recommendations on the creation of new standards to license teachers.

**Goal #1B:** Create an alternative way for qualified people to become licensed as principals, superintendents, and teachers in high-need areas such as science and math.

**Goal #1E:** Refine and focus administrator licensing standards. Make licensure dependent on a candidate’s ability to demonstrate in greater depth that they possess the skills to successfully lead plans to improve instruction throughout their schools.

**Current Practice**

Oregonians deserve assurances that only teachers who are effective in the classroom are licensed to work in Oregon’s schools. The state has moved in this direction by establishing Initial and Continuing Teaching Licenses based on standards adopted in 1997 which were later revised and implemented in 1999. Design and approval for all Oregon teacher preparation programs are based on expected beginning teacher competencies rather than on lists of prescribed courses. The competencies, along with sample indicators, are organized around five major teaching functions:

- Candidates plan instruction that supports student progress in learning and is developmentally appropriate.
- Candidates establish a classroom climate conducive to learning.
- Candidates engage students in planned learning activities.
- Candidates evaluate, act upon and report student progress in learning.
- Candidates exhibit professional behaviors, ethics and values.

Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC) systematically determines the compliance of preparation programs with these standards by an initial program approval process; annual reports submitted by the institution and affiliated consortiums; regular (every seven years) site visits and recommendations by trained program review teams; periodic staff audits of selected elements of the program; and performance of candidates for licensure.

For licensure, all candidates are also required to pass a state adopted Basic Skills test and a Commission-approved content area test for their respective discipline or teaching area. Licensure and program design are focused on preparing candidates at specific developmental levels that are called “authorization levels.” There are four grade-level
related authorizations for Oregon licensure: Early Childhood, Elementary, Middle Level and High School.

Additionally, the state of Oregon was the first in the nation to use Teacher Work Sample Methodology as a source of evidence for recommending and granting an Initial Teaching License, further linking the licensure of teachers to their ability to help students learn. Current Oregon Administrative Rules require all teacher preparation programs to assess two Teacher Work Samples from each candidate. The Teacher Work Sample is a performance assessment task in which candidates pre-assess, use the results for planning instruction in a unit tied to state standards, teach the unit, post-assess, analyze progress made by students, and make recommendations for next steps in the learning process for each individual learner.

Standards and competencies for teachers are continuously evaluated to be sure they align with national standards for high quality teaching practices, national content standards, and K-12 content standards and benchmarks for Oregon students. Currently the TSPC is in the process of generating specific standards in all content areas, such as math and language arts, where teachers can receive license endorsements. This activity engages the state professional organizations, such as the Oregon Council of Teachers of Mathematics, the Oregon Science Teachers Association and the Oregon Reading Council, in the review and development process. Content standards are implemented as they are completed and adopted by the Commission.

New standards for administrators were adopted in 2005 and will be implemented in January 2007. These expectations for administrators are based on standards from several national professional organizations, the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISSLC) and National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA).

The EAQW makes these recommendations for licensure:

6. Performance Assessment System: Invest in the research, design, and development of a system of reliable, valid, and defensible performance assessments that could be utilized by colleges, universities, Teacher Standards and Practices Commission, educators prepared out-of-state, and those seeking an alternative route to teaching or administration. Implementation of such a system would ensure the quality of initial preparation programs and competence of teacher and administrator candidates as they begin practice.

7. Alternative Licensure Systems for Teachers: Create standards-based alternative routes to teacher licensure in order to increase the pool of qualified candidates in shortage areas (such as math, physical science, special education, and in rural and remote locations) and to diversify the workforce. Alternative route processes must ensure, through the use of a rigorous performance assessment, that only highly qualified candidates are licensed.

8. Alternative Licensure Systems for Administrators: Create a streamlined, standards-based alternative route to administrator licensure. Alternative route processes must ensure, through the use of a rigorous performance assessment, that only highly qualified candidates are licensed. Providers for the streamlined
process could be the result of university, school district, and professional organization collaborations.

9. **Review and Update Licensing Standards:** Allocate resources to Teacher Standards and Practices Commission to hire a consultant to convene and facilitate subject matter experts around content/authorization levels to ensure consistent alignment of educator preparation standards with Oregon’s K-12 student standards. Review and update all licensing standards to align with the best quality national standards for teachers and administrators.

**Supporting Statement**

Licensure should be tied to performance standards for educators. In their December 2005 report, “When Learning Counts: Rethinking Licenses for School Leaders,” Adams and Copland developed a matrix that illustrates the steps in developing professional expertise over time as it relates to stages in licensure. Initial licensure assures the public that educators possess the competencies required for entrance to the profession, but it is through continuing practice that professional expertise is developed.

**Reliable, Valid, and Defensible Performance Assessments:** Adams and Copland suggest that tests of knowledge and skills, as well as performance assessments, should be open to all candidates regardless of professional background. “The test provides a direct assessment of the knowledge and skills that matter to school improvement. It reduces the need to make assumptions about the ‘right’ background” (p. 46).

**Alternative Routes to Licensure:** The Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission recognizes the need to provide alternatives so that highly qualified individuals from non-traditional backgrounds may obtain licenses as teachers and administrators. Alternative routes to licensure are most common in states that are experiencing severe teacher shortages due to population growth or turnover or where there is a need to increase the diversity of the workforce. To date, Oregon’s shortages are limited to areas found in most states, for example mathematics, physical science, foreign languages and special education.

Any educator licensed through an alternative route that did not include the completion of a traditional educator preparation program, should meet the same standards as a teacher or administrator licensed through the current system. Alternative route requirements that are less stringent in their expectations regarding performance standards can erode the quality of all educators entering Oregon’s schools. If Oregon were to experience a sudden population explosion or an unanticipated swell of retirements, the standards-based design has the potential to create an alternative route for candidates to prove their competency in an accelerated way. The alternative route would only be viable if defensible, valid and reliable systems of performance assessments are designed, tested, and calibrated and a system of objective assessment is established in a manner that is fiscally sustainable.

**Accountability**
There are several levels of accountability involved in licensure. Preparation programs are evaluated by Teacher Standards and Practices Commission. There are standards in place to require remediation or closure of those programs that produce incompetent candidates. Programs are required to report annually on progress of candidates toward licensure. Individual licensure candidates are held for passage of basic skills and content tests along with effective and appropriate performance assessments.

**GOAL AREA 4A: BUILDING/DISTRICT LEVEL COMPENSATION MODEL**

The professional judgment of the EAQW, after reviewing relevant research, is that compensation systems for individual educators are less effective in promoting student achievement than are incentives designed for buildings or districts. We believe that improving student achievement is a team effort. All staff members contribute to the success of a school. Creating a climate of student success is the responsibility of every person in the building, and when success occurs, every member of the team should be rewarded. Success of students should be measured by an individual student growth model methodology over time. Unlike No Child Left Behind or other measures of a single point in time, the criteria should be consistent improvement over at least a three year period for each individual student. Under current federal requirements achievement is measured for discrete groups of children and comparisons are made between groups that are unrelated to each other. Best practice assessment models include multiple points of assessment over time. Accordingly, a team approach coupling compensation to achievement is more likely to be fair and reflect the realities of multiple teacher contact with students.

**Chalkboard Goal Addressed**

**Goal #1G:** Propose an alternative model for compensating teachers and principals based on rewarding performance that improves student learning. Apply what has been learned during the past decade regarding alternative models for labor-management relations in education, including school-based management and budgeting.

**Current Practice**

Teacher contracts are currently negotiated by individual school districts and their unions. Pay scales are set by negotiation, and educators generally advance on the scale based upon positive performance reviews and years of successful experience in schools.

**The EAQW makes this recommendation for compensation:**

**10. Building and District Level Awards:** Create building and district level compensation awards to allow for successful achievement of student growth targets. This would enable the staff to decide how to invest additional funds.
We believe that this should be funded by the legislature. However, this is also an excellent way for Oregon corporations and foundations to demonstrate a commitment to rewarding excellence. Corporate bonuses are frequently based upon corporate profitability, not individual employee performance.

Supporting Statement

**Building Level Compensation Model:** Several states, including Alaska, Texas, Oklahoma, and Kentucky, have implemented state-funded building or district level compensation rewards. Typically these models distribute cash awards for educators for improving student performance. For teachers in reward schools, the cash bonus is an acknowledgement for work well done, but not the primary incentive that drives their practice.

Examples of opportunities to use building level compensation awards include:

- Financial rewards distributed equally to all staff members
- Additional equipment for the school
- Donations to families in the community
- Professional development funds
- Decreased class size or investment in curriculum enhancements
- Instructional materials and library resources
- Building enhancements including technology

Compensation awards should be based on multiple measures. For example, these measures might include:

- Student achievement data disaggregated by ethnicity, limited English proficiency, poverty, disability, and general school performance measured over time
- Attendance data
- Graduation rates (high school only)
- Some additional elementary indicators to be identified, for example, initial 3rd grade performance
- Some additional middle school measures to be identified, for example, initial GPA in the 9th grade year in the same district

---

**GOAL AREA 4B: INDIVIDUAL COMPENSATION MODEL**

The EAQW would like to be clear that there was not group consensus around the recommendation regarding individual compensation models. The group clearly supported the building/district level compensation model, but had a variety of opinions on the efficacy of individual compensation models. If Chalkboard chooses to recommend a compensation system for individual educators, the system should be designed with multiple components on which evaluation and/or compensation depends. Accordingly, it is recommended that Chalkboard fund a pilot model in Oregon in order to test an innovative compensation system. The compensation structure should be locally
determined. Additional information provided by Chalkboard around teacher compensation systems is located in Appendix C. The EAQW found the report to be useful for providing models from other states that are implementing such systems.

Minnesota is one state that has enacted sweeping teacher compensation reform. The Minnesota alternative pay system is called Quality Compensation, or “Q-Comp.” Q-Comp is based on a performance pay program called the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP). TAP was developed with funding from the Milken Foundation and is supported by the Broad Foundation and the federal government.

Q-Comp requirements include the establishment of multiple career paths, objective educator evaluation systems, and professional development that aligns with performance. The EAQW has recommended that all three of these requirements be included in any proposed individual compensation system. It seems that Q-Comp might be a system that would be compatible with our beliefs about educator evaluation and compensation.

TAP (Teacher Advancement Program Foundation, 2006) supports teachers in improving instruction and student achievement through the implementation of four key elements:

- Multiple career paths give teachers opportunities to take on more responsibility and be compensated for doing so.
- Ongoing applied professional development provides teachers with school-based opportunities during the school day. Teachers meet weekly in small groups to analyze student data and improve instruction.
- Instructionally focused accountability ties teacher evaluations to teaching skills and student achievement. Teachers have clear criteria for evaluation, and they are evaluated four to six times a year by multiple evaluators who are trained and certified. Evaluation rubrics are based on the work of Rowley (1999) as outlined in the “High Performance Mentoring: Facilitator’s Guide.”
- Performance-based compensation provides incentives to teachers who demonstrate their skills through classroom evaluations and increases in student growth over time.

The EAQW recommends that any compensation system based on educator evaluation should attend to multiple components as outlined below.

**Purpose of multiple components:**

- Allows for recognition of educators’ different strengths and interests
- Minimizes potential for inequitable or unfair negative impact of any one component
- Recognizes that the teaching/learning enterprise is complex
- Can be used to address multiple district challenges such as hard-to-staff positions and gaps in achievement levels
Principles underlying use of multiple components:
- All stakeholders should be involved in a collaborative process to design and implement the system.
- The system should be well-prepared for implementation before “jumping in.” It should include a pilot program with a phase-in of incentive options, beginning with implementation of at least 2 options at each site. Building administrators need to be fully prepared for successful implementation.
- Existing educators can choose to opt in or not.
- A parallel system for administrators should be included.
- The system must include support for “underperforming” educators who do not meet criteria for additional compensation.

Suggested measurement components in a multiple component system:
- Student achievement data collected over time
- Engagement in professional development opportunities
  - Must be used by the teacher in his/her classroom to improve the learning experience for students
  - Educator should provide evidence that the professional development has been effective in promoting student learning
  - Closely connected to teaching role (an administrative program might be appropriate in some cases)
- Professional evaluation
  - National Board for Professional Teaching Standards or similar national evaluation could be included
  - Classroom observations by trained evaluators (likely administrators in this case)
  - School-wide engagement in leadership activities
  - Advocacy for children is displayed
  - Attainment of advanced licensure
- Teaching in high priority, difficult to fill positions
  - Math or physical science
  - Special education/Services for all exceptional students (ELL, TAG, etc.)
  - Rural, remote or high risk schools

Additional career ladder components are available for teachers:
- Assuming mentoring/coaching roles
- Additional responsibilities
  - Curriculum development
  - Community programs
  - Other

Accountability

Accountability is fundamental to the operation of compensation systems. Building level awards are based on student performance over time. Individual compensation assumes
effective evaluation of educators through evidence collected by trained evaluators. Incompetent educators are remediated and become productive members or they are removed from the system.

**CONCLUSION – LOOKING AHEAD**

What could our schools and classrooms look like if all these recommendations were funded and implemented? The EAQW believes there are several major changes that will occur in the education system, keeping in mind that few of the recommendations can be successfully implemented in isolation. The workgroup believes that:

- Student learning, including test scores, will improve for ALL students, and the achievement gap between groups of children will close.
- The rate of students completing high school and continuing on to post-secondary education will increase.
- High quality teachers and administrators will be supported and retained in Oregon schools.
- The educational enterprise will become more collaborative, and hence, more successful with the integration of the community, the school board, administrators, teachers, staff and children.
- Incompetent and unmotivated teachers and administrators will exit the system or find positions that better fit their skill sets.
- Schools will be magnets for learners, teachers and community members to engage in life.
- Oregon will no longer appear near the bottom of national rankings in any assessment of educational quality.

**COMMENTS FROM THE FACILITATORS**

In designing the process for the EAQW we had two key goals. We wanted to create a culture of optimal learning—one in which it would be safe for people to take risks, to discuss contentious issues, to listen, and to speak honestly. We also wanted to co-create the same high performance culture that we were asking people to create/improve upon in Oregon’s schools.

**The Process**

While we looked into various formulas and techniques, we thought that the complexity of the task required us to create a process in which each meeting would build upon and respect the learning and progress made in the prior meetings. So rather than using a particular approach (e.g. “Getting to Yes”) we were guided by the following key principles. Our process was:

- Emergent, flexible, and goal oriented. Each meeting was designed to maximize the learning that had occurred at the prior meeting. Although we had an overall
plan, we were flexible in following it, depending on what the group came up with.
- Informed by multiple theories and methods, including Appreciative Inquiry, World Café, Dialogue theory, and Open Space methodology.
- Intentional about including a combination of individual reflection time, small group (both mixed and similar stakeholder groups), and large group dialogue time.
- Informed by a combination of best practice research and the experience/wisdom in the room.
- Rooted in the purpose of the group’s task, and the principles that the group created to this end.

Reflections on the Process

The principles described above helped us to manage three tensions which were present for the life of the group. These tensions included:

- Holding a systemic view of the problems and solutions and working on specific topics with specific recommendations.
- Time for creativity and divergent thinking and time for focus and convergent thinking.
- Focusing on the dilemmas of the current state of education in Oregon and opportunities for future action.

Each of these presented their own challenges and opportunities.

Systemic view and specific topics

From the beginning many wanted to approach the work in a holistic way. The belief was that each of the categories that Chalkboard presented were connected to each other and had to be seen in that way. We believe that the final product represented that systemic way of thinking and is more powerful because of it. The challenge this presented was that we did not have a linear process and we did need an outcome of specific recommendations. Participants were not always sure where we were in that process.

Creativity and focus

The participants were articulate and broadly informed about education, therefore their thinking was often divergent and associative. That eventually led to good ideas, but it was not always a straight path getting there. The movement between pairs, small groups, and large group conversations helped manage this tension.

The current state and future action
This was a passionate and committed group of educators and community members. For many, who had been doing this work for a long time, there was sadness and even grief about the state of education in Oregon. We thought it was important for people to be able to express that and yet not lose heart nor lose focus on what is possible. After expressions of sadness or even defensiveness participants were always able to come back to the questions of how to make it better.

We believe that the Chalkboard initiative has given hope to this group of educators and that education in the State of Oregon will greatly improve because of it. Thank you for the opportunity to be part of it.
Resources
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**Background**

The traditional model of teacher evaluation consists of multiple observations by the principal and a subsequent conference involving one-way communication from the principal to the teacher [1]. Research, however, indicates that this process does not accurately measure teacher performance. There are many alternatives to this traditional teacher evaluation model. In fact, eight methods of evaluation have been identified, and these include: student ratings of instructors, peer judgments, self evaluations, observations, evidence of student achievement, alumni evaluations, formal exams, and assessor judgments [2].

Teacher and administrator evaluations are generally either formative or summative in nature, or may be a combination of both. Summative evaluations provide information for personnel management decisions, while formative evaluations are used to support faculty development and improvement [3]. This analysis describes Oregon’s model and then discusses models for teacher evaluation, from the hiring process through termination. A brief description is also provided on the assessment of administrators.

Oregon’s teacher evaluation system has many of the components of successful evaluation programs. According to Oregon statute 342.850, evaluations must satisfy the following requirements [4]:

1. Be based on multiple observations and other evidence
2. Incorporate teacher and administrator design input
3. Establish job descriptions, and performance standards that include items from the job description
4. Produce evaluations based on written criteria
5. Include pre- and post-evaluation interviews
6. Discuss evaluation results with each teacher
7. Develop written programs of assistance for improvement to remedy any deficiencies
8. Utilize voluntary peer assistance whenever practical and reasonable
9. Use evaluators who hold teaching licenses
Oregon has also established a detailed due process procedure for dismissing teachers. In Oregon Senate Bill 1180 (Chapter 342 in the Oregon Revised Statutes), Oregon established two different dismissal procedures for probationary and contract teachers. Contract teachers are teachers who have served a three-year teaching probation (or a lesser time agreed to by both the teacher and district) and had their contract renewed for the following school year. Probationary teachers are teachers who have not finished serving their probationary teaching period and serve one-year renewable contracts. Probationary teachers may be removed for legal cause as long as they receive written notice of the reasons for contract non-renewal by April 1st of the prior school year [4]. They have a right to a hearing in front of the district board and further appeal to their county circuit court under certain procedural conditions [4]. Contract teachers receive three-year contracts, although these teachers can be placed on a program to improve performance if they do not have their contract renewed during its first year [4]. Contract teachers may not have their contract renewed or may be dismissed for legal cause, but are entitled to an appeal to the Fair Dismissal Appeals Board or arbitration (if the district agrees to participate in arbitration) [4]. The Board is an independent statewide organization that facilitates fair hearings and includes witnesses if relevant. The Board can overturn or uphold the district board’s decision to dismiss, not renew a contract, or renew the contract on a contingent basis [4]. These procedures aim to prevent unjustified dismissals and may be particularly applicable if evaluations are unreliable, invalid, unclear, or biased.

Contract teachers in Oregon can only be dismissed or not retained for one of the following reasons [4]:

1. Inefficiency
2. Immorality
3. Insubordination
4. Neglect of duty
5. Conviction of a felony
6. Inadequate performance
7. Failure to show normal improvement and comply with reasonable requirements for professional training and growth
8. Cause that constitutes grounds for revoking the teaching license
In assessing adequate professional performance, regular and special evaluation reports are considered in addition to written standards adopted by the district board [4].

**Hiring**
A 2003 study of four states (California, Florida, Massachusetts, and Michigan) indicated that a majority of teachers were hired through a moderately or highly decentralized process [5]. This means that most teachers were hired directly by a particular school instead of a district. The vast majority of teachers interviewed with a school principal; few interviewed with teachers or department chairs [5]. The hiring process also relied heavily on paper credentials and interviews, and less on observations of applicant skills [5].

**Seattle**
The Seattle School District is one school district that has adopted an alternative hiring system. Each school has a leadership team, comprised of six teachers and the principal. The team interviews each candidate and hires without regard to seniority, but gives the principal veto authority [6]. Prior to the instatement of this hiring system, applicants to Seattle schools could be directly hired by the principal based solely on seniority [6]. It appears that at least some Seattle teachers report that their school is better as a result of the new hiring practice [6].

There has been only a small amount of research on the best methods for evaluating teacher applicants and examining absolute standards for judging applicants. One author advises those hiring teachers to look for applicants with strong work ethics, people skills, and communications skills [7]. Suggestions for a successful hiring system include: identification of the characteristics that are most needed in the classroom, screening for these at every stage of the process, validation of the selection process, elimination of unnecessary paperwork, and the provision of prompt, accurate information to candidates during the process [8].

**Connecticut**
Connecticut’s Education Enhancement Act of 1986 increased the standards for teacher preparation and increased teacher salaries to levels competitive with other professions [9]. Specifically, Connecticut required teachers to have a major in the content area taught, more pedagogical training, greater preparation in reading and special-needs pupil education, and required teachers to pass basic skills and content tests in order to be hired [10]. Although the state eliminated emergency licensing, it introduced an alternate route to certification in order to widen the applicant pool [9, 10]. These entry standards have been successful in eliminating teacher shortages and have contributed to improved student achievement [10]. A National
Education Goals Panel report found that in Connecticut districts with improved achievement, educators cited the high quality of teachers as a critical reason for the improvements [11].

**Induction Programs**

A new teacher induction program is the next essential evaluation step after teachers are hired. According to one literature review, about one-sixth of the national teaching workforce leaves the profession annually [12]. Although some of these are retirees, up to 30% of beginning teachers leave by the end of their third teaching year [13]. Teacher induction programs aim to retain talented new teachers by using support networks, evaluation, and opportunities for professional development. As of 1999, 38 states had some sort of teacher induction program targeted at beginning teachers, although these programs vary from state to state [14]. One study found that “funding teacher induction programs at a level of up to $5,000 per teacher (in 1990 dollars) is more cost-effective than paying for programs to replace teachers who have left” [15]. Connecticut and California are widely cited as having some of the best teacher induction programs.

**Connecticut**

According to the Southeast Center for Teaching Quality, Connecticut has made the most progress of any state in connecting assessment and support components through a comprehensive induction program [13]. Connecticut’s Beginning Educator Support and Training (BEST) Program has evolved since it was first instituted as a one-year program in 1986 [9, 15]. Content-focused seminars are offered throughout the induction process to instruct teachers on teaching techniques and to give teachers a forum for sharing ideas [15]. In the first year of the three-year program, each teacher is paired with a mentor or team of mentors. The trained mentors meet regularly with the new teachers to help them develop fundamental teaching competencies such as classroom management, instruction, and assessment of student understanding [16]. Teachers in their second year of teaching submit a discipline-specific portfolio that includes lesson logs, video tapes, student work, and teacher self-assessments [13, 15]. These portfolios are evaluated by two trained assessors; those teachers who pass earn the second level of certification [15]. Successful second-year teachers then receive further assistance in implementing their personal teaching goals and continuing professional development. Teachers who do not meet expected standards receive additional feedback and support to help them succeed during the third year.

Connecticut Teachers must complete the induction program within three years to move beyond an initial teaching certificate [15]. Eighty-five to ninety-two percent of new teachers meet
requiremens during their second year; the state predicts a 98% success rate when third-year candidates are reexamined [13]. Although the purpose of the induction program is to develop new teachers, the process is considered rigorous enough to convince weaker candidates to leave teaching before the submission of the portfolio [13]. The cost of Connecticut’s induction program is $1,300 per new teacher [13]. The agency regularly evaluates the entire teacher induction program for content validity, and the relationship between participation, teaching practices, student achievement, and the impact of scorer training on teaching practice [13]. In a 2001 case study of the BEST program, most beginning teachers reported that the induction program was supportive and offered useful feedback for improving their teaching [17].

California

“In 1992, California legislation established the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) Program to provide new teachers with supervised experiences in schools and to address teacher attrition rates” [15]. While the Connecticut BEST program is mandatory for all districts and all teachers, organizational participation in California’s BTSA program is voluntary. California’s evaluation program also differs from BEST in that BTSA evaluation results are used for teacher development only, and are not used in employment decisions. BTSA can be administered by either a district or another educational service provider (such as consortia of districts or universities). Organizations may vary in their implementation of BTSA, but they are guided by state standards for beginner-level knowledge and skills [15].

During their first two years of teaching, new teachers in participating schools are mentored and coached on teaching, attend summer orientation and training workshops, observe veteran teachers, and receive assessment of their professional growth [15]. New teachers are observed twice in the classroom and participate in pre- and post-evaluation conferences [15]. This gives new teachers the chance to set goals, and develop action plans with support from more experienced teachers [16]. Beginning teachers also complete the California Formative Assessment and Support System, a self-assessment tool for teachers.

During the 2001-02 school year, BTSA funded 145 programs serving 22,253 teachers at a total cost of $84.6 million [18]. Research in 2001 found that schools participating in BTSA had attrition rates of 9% compared to a 37% rate at schools without BTSA or other induction program [14]. According to the BTSA website, school retention rates did not vary significantly among BTSA programs serving schools with different degrees of urbanicity, program maturity, or
program size [19]. In an independent evaluation of the program, many BTSA teachers reported the BTSA program was the best professional development they had ever received [20].

**Broad Evaluation for Novice AND Tenured Teachers**

**The Federal Government**

The United States government has utilized performance management across departments since the passage of the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993. For this reason, the federal government has conducted substantial research on performance appraisals. Many of their conclusions can also be applied to teacher evaluation. An interagency government workgroup on performance management reported summary findings in 2000. It recommends that supervisors communicate employee expectations clearly and establish links between those expectations and organizational purposes [21]. “Sharing performance expectations leads to greater understanding and ownership of the work” [21]. The interagency workgroup recommends that most agencies monitor performance and provide feedback regularly [21]. This allows employees to incorporate feedback into their job performance. Written documentation of performance should make meaningful distinctions between good and bad performance [22]. The Government Accountability Office also emphasizes the importance of employee involvement in goal setting and action plans [22].

The government offers the following suggestions for conducting performance appraisals:

Multiple sources of evidence are helpful in comprehensive evaluations and can include peer review and review by service recipients [21]. Goals for employees should be realistic, clear, consistent, and high enough to motivate improvement [21]. Research has shown that setting expectations that are too easy leads to low performance [23]. In order for the goals to be realistic and attainable, organizations must provide adequate resources and training for employees. Excellent performance should be rewarded with financial rewards or recognition [21]. Employees not meeting basic performance expectations should have access to remedial counseling and support [21]. These recommendations provide useful lessons for the design and implementation of teacher evaluation systems.

**The Private Sector**

Employee appraisals in the private sector often gain attention when they fail and are subsequently challenged in court. However, it is much more difficult to objectively identify organizations with best practice employee evaluation processes. As a result, there is very little information on the
best private sector employee appraisals. Instead, human resource consultants author the majority of the literature on best practice performance appraisals.

Management consultants offer plenty of suggestions for designing performance appraisal systems for organizations that, like schools, have a strong need for formal employee evaluations. For example, private sector consultants maintain that employees are more likely to feel satisfied with their appraisal if they have the chance to discuss their performance with the evaluator [24]. When negative feedback is provided, it should be constructive in nature and should be specific enough to give employees guidance on improvement [25]. It is important to include employees in setting goals for their performance because this helps to motivate employees [26]. The credibility and objectivity of the evaluator is also essential in appraisals [27]. Other best practices include linking performance appraisal to organizational and job-specific objectives, investing in employee training and education, holding regular reviews, and using flexible appraisal forms [28].

According to some management experts, numerically-based performance appraisals tend to result in clustered rankings because supervisors have trouble making meaningful distinctions in performance [29]. In order to conduct fair evaluations, assessors should be trained in evaluation methods, and a multiple rater system should be considered to reduce potential bias [28].

Employee appraisals in the private sector are usually tied to employment decisions. There is a debate in the literature about whether doing so is in the best interest of the organization. While money is a motivating factor for employees, many appraisal systems fail to adequately measure performance. As result, employees often perceive the evaluation systems as biased and unfair. It does appear, however, to be helpful for employee appraisal systems to offer recognition to employees who perform above organizational standards.

**School Districts: Washoe County, Cincinnati, and Vaughn Next Century Learning Center**

In 1998, a task force of teacher association members, principals’ association members, district office staff, and school board members from Washoe County, Nevada met to address problems with Washoe’s traditional teacher evaluation system. The main concerns about the evaluation system were that it did not empower teachers or provide teacher input opportunities [30]. Furthermore, feedback did not encourage improvement, and evaluations were viewed as inconsistent and vague [30]. After surveying Washoe teachers, the County agreed that the new teacher evaluation system should focus more on teacher growth, specify clear performance
expectations, and be easier to use [30]. The task force studied Tennessee’s system, but found it too cumbersome. Instead, the task force decided to adapt Charlotte Danielson’s *Framework for Teaching* for their needs.

After a year of planning and two years of field-testing, the new teacher evaluation system was implemented. Assessment was based on the four domains described by Danielson. Teachers were judged on multiple sources of evidence including: self-assessments, lesson plans, classroom observations, pre- and post-evaluation conferences, alternative analyses of instruction, teaching work samples, instructional artifacts, reflection forms, three-week unit plans, activity logs, and knowledge of students and resources [30]. The results of these assessments have no direct bearing on salary, but do serve as the basis for employment decisions such as tenure [31]. Evaluations vary somewhat according to the teacher’s track: Probationary teachers, Tenured professionals, and Focused Assistance (for teachers who need assistance to meet performance expectations) [30]. Washoe principals receive limited training in how to conduct evaluations [30].

Cincinnati and Vaughn are two other educational providers that have implemented innovative teacher evaluation programs in recent years. Both Cincinnati and Vaughn adapted Danielson’s *Framework for Teaching* for use in their own systems. Although the results of these adaptations were not identical, they were similar to each other and to the Washoe County system. According to independent system evaluators, Cincinnati and Vaughn used several key design components that were not present in Washoe County. (The Cincinnati system did not actually go into effect as planned, but the pilot was evaluated and provides useful lessons for examining others systems). One main difference between was that Cincinnati and Vaughn used evaluation results as the basis of pay-for-performance systems [31]. In contrast to Washoe, both of the other education providers invested considerable money in assessor training [32]. Cincinnati even required assessors to score a common, videotaped instructional episode at a certain agreement level with an expert assessor [32]. In both locations, teachers were evaluated by more than one assessor, on multiple occasions, using multiple sources of evidence.

None of the three locations based teacher evaluation on student achievement. However, independent analysis of the teacher evaluation systems in Washoe, Vaughn, and Cincinnati found positive relationships between teacher evaluation scores and student learning gains [32]. The criterion validity of evaluations in Vaughn and Cincinnati was found to be high enough to be used as the basis for determining teacher compensation [32, 33]. The level of agreement among
multiple assessors was moderate to high in both Vaughn and Cincinnati and was not relevant in Washoe County because they used only one assessor per teacher. Teachers in Vaughn and Washoe expressed overall teacher support for the teacher evaluation system [30, 34]. On the other hand, 50% of Cincinnati teachers who exited during the evaluation pilot mentioned the teacher evaluation system as a factor in their decision to leave [35].

All three of these programs represent reasonably successful models for teacher evaluations. However, independent system evaluation found some consistent problems in all three models. Professional development systems for teachers and principals were not aligned sufficiently [32]. Recruitment and applicant screening did not always focus on hiring teachers who could meet the standards, and the induction programs did not offer training in the areas considered important to the districts or Vaughn [32]. Human resources systems were not well aligned with the new teacher evaluation systems [32]. Additionally, Washoe County and Cincinnati had difficulty linking students to particular teachers [32]. Implementation problems were a huge factor in Cincinnati, where teachers voted against the evaluation system despite successful results from the pilot. According to Allen Odden, this failure underscores the importance of working with stakeholders to gain buy-in [36]. Vaughn and Washoe County have expressed commitment to ongoing assessment and modifications of their teacher evaluation programs.

**Value-Added Methodology**

Value-added modeling (VAM) is a technique used to measure student achievement in a meaningful way. VAM is a statistical procedure that uses multiple years of student test scores to isolate the effects of schools or teachers on student achievement [37]. This allows student test scores to be compared across different teachers, schools, and districts while accounting for factors such as socio-economic status and language background. VAM has received considerable attention and praise in recent years and is widely used in many states, districts, and schools in some capacity. However, some research organizations urge caution in the application of VAM to high-stakes testing until all sources of potential error and bias can be identified [37].

In teacher evaluations, VAM is typically utilized to assess the overall validity of evaluation programs. In 2002, Tennessee mandated the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) to determine school system effects on academic progress [16]. “TVAAS provides a sophisticated longitudinal measure of the impact of individual teachers on individual students. Results are used only to make recommendations to teachers regarding professional development” [38]. Other states, districts, and schools use VAM as a component of individual teacher
evaluations. Texas, for instance, uses value-added student achievement to determine one-eighth of every teacher’s annual evaluation score [38].

**Intervention Models**

**The Toledo Plan**

The first formal teacher remediation plan nationwide was “The Toledo Plan”, which was implemented in Toledo, Ohio in 1981. The Toledo plan has both an intern and an intervention component. In the intern component, beginning teachers are each assigned to a mentor teacher. The mentor is responsible for the professional development and evaluation of the intern [39]. Mentors must have five years of outstanding teaching service, three favorable references from other teachers, and a favorable reference from their principal to pass initial mentor screening [39].

Mentor teachers meet with the interns to establish specific performance goals and discuss results [39]. Each mentor assists the intern in achieving their goals and evaluates the intern based on observations and other evidence of teacher quality [39]. After the last evaluation, the mentor makes recommendations to the Intern Board of Review on the future employment status of the intern [39]. The Board of five teachers and four administrators can accept the recommendation or reject it by a vote of six or more [39]. “More than 91% of former interns were still teaching in Toledo in 2000-2001. Of those no longer teaching, roughly half resigned and half were fired or did not have their contracts renewed” [40]. The teachers union did not object to these decisions due to their involvement and input into the process [41].

Experienced teachers who need intervention are identified by their principal and/or a teacher union building committee [39]. The intervention program is designed to assist non-probationary teachers who have been identified as performing at an unsatisfactory level [39]. Mentor teachers are then assigned to these unsatisfactory teachers and decide when intervention is no longer necessary. “Between 1981 and 1998, 51 teachers were designated for assistance. Of those teachers, 15 regained their normal teaching status and remained as teachers, 11 retired, 12 resigned, and 7 were fired” [40]. The Toledo Plan has been the recipient of several awards, including the Innovations in American Government Award, sponsored by Harvard’s John F. Kennedy School of Government [41]. Other districts with similar plans include Rochester, New York, and Seattle, Washington.
Models for Principals

Many of the models used to conduct evaluations for teachers and for employees in the private sector and federal government can also be successfully applied to the evaluation of principals. For example, one author lists the following nine steps necessary to develop effective evaluation practices for principals [42]:

1. Identify purposes of the evaluation
2. Develop clear performance expectations
3. Involve principals in evaluation design
4. Encourage goal setting and self reflection
5. Observe principals frequently
6. Collect feedback on the principal from peers
7. Collect documentation on performance
8. Discuss the evaluation results
9. Reward outstanding performance

These steps are remarkably similar to the steps recommended for the appraisal of teachers and other employees.

North Carolina

While there is a profusion of case studies on teacher evaluation, examples of best practice administrator evaluations are not readily available. North Carolina was identified by at least one educational organization as having a principal evaluation program that was considered a model for best practice [43]. Principals in North Carolina are evaluated based on their vision, student performance, ability to ensure a safe learning environment, ability to foster a school culture of continuous improvement, and track record in organizational management [44]. The overall objective of the principal evaluation in North Carolina is to assess performance and promote professional growth [43].

Conclusions

To improve its teacher evaluation systems, Oregon should consider mandating additional statewide teacher and administrator evaluation policies that:

1. Involve teachers in hiring decisions
2. Mentor and support beginning teachers

3. Include a remediation/mentoring program for teachers who under-perform

4. Ensure that evaluations consider multiple sources of evidence

5. Ensure that evaluation procedures are clear, specific, constructive, valid, and reliable. Evaluations should provide guidance that helps employees improve.

6. Provide thorough training for assessors and require that multiple evaluators assess each employee in order to ensure consistency

7. Offer professional development to improve upon areas of deficiency

Districts currently have the authority to implement these additional evaluation components, but are not legally required to include these features. Implementation of these best practices, however, may improve both teaching quality and student achievement.
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ORS 342.850 Teacher evaluation

Evaluation of probationary teachers

- Annual evaluation of probationary teachers with multiple observations is required.
- Evaluations shall be based upon at least two observations and other relevant information developed by the district.
- The purpose of the evaluation is to aid the teacher in making continuing professional growth and to determine the teacher’s performance of the teaching responsibilities.

Evaluation of contract teachers

- The district school board shall develop an evaluation process in consultation with school administrators and with teachers.
- If the district’s teachers are represented by a local bargaining organization, the board shall consult with teachers belonging to and appointed by the local bargaining organization.
- The district school board shall implement the evaluation process that includes:
  - The establishment of job descriptions and performance standards which include but are not limited to items included in the job description.
  - A pre-evaluation interview which includes but is not limited to the establishment of performance goals for the teacher, based on the job description and performance standards;
  - An evaluation based on written criteria which include the performance goals.
  - A post-evaluation interview in which the results of the evaluation are discussed with the teacher:
    i. And a written program of assistance for improvement is established, if one is needed to remedy any deficiency specified in ORS 342.865 (1)(a), (d), (g) or (h);
    ii. And the utilization of peer assistance whenever practicable and reasonable to aid teachers to better meet the needs of students.
    iii. Peer assistance shall be voluntary and subject to the terms of any applicable collective bargaining agreement.
- Nothing in this subsection is intended to prohibit a district from consulting with any other individuals.
- Except in those districts having an average daily membership, as defined in ORS 327.006, of fewer than 200 students, the person or persons making the evaluations must hold teaching licenses. The evaluation shall be signed by the school official who supervises the teacher and by the teacher.
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**Background**

For many years, districts and states have been experimenting with pay-for-performance teacher compensation. Teacher pay-for-performance systems aim to increase the quality of teaching and consequently improve student learning and achievement. In order to improve the quality of teaching, most pay-for-performance programs attempt to improve teacher recruitment and retention of teachers. The theory behind pay-for-performance compensation is similar to the compensation philosophy used in the private sector—employees who perform well should receive additional compensation and more responsibility. Those who do not perform well should not be rewarded for poor performance.

**Types of Pay-for-performance Compensation**

Pay-for-performance systems vary considerably because teacher performance can be measured in a number of different ways. One method of assessing performance is called Knowledge- and Skills-Based Pay (KSBP). Under KSBP programs, teachers receive pay increases for demonstrating essential knowledge and skills. States and districts determine which knowledge and skills teachers should possess at various stages in their careers [1]. KSBP can be used to reward the attainment of formal degrees, licenses, certifications, educational credits, and/or by passing content or pedagogical exams. Awards can also be given for informal expertise as reflected in administrator evaluations of classroom performance. Districts may provide compensation for successful completion of informal district professional development courses. KSBP can be awarded as a one-time bonus, a limited-duration annual bonus, or a permanent raise [2].

A second type of pay-for-performance is Achievement-based pay, which evaluates teachers, in part, on student outcomes. These outcomes may include student performance on standardized tests, attendance rates, dropout rates, and many other measures [2]. In order to fairly implement achievement-based pay, districts and states increasingly measure student outcomes using achievement gains, rather than one-time achievement levels. This approach compares the achievement of students over time and thus does not put teachers with challenging students at a comparative disadvantage in attaining bonuses. Compensation is usually provided as a one-time bonus when students meet district or school-level goals.

The achievement-based pay system rewards teachers for student achievement based on either an individual, small group, or school-wide basis (or distinct combinations of these). Some districts and states reward individual teachers for the achievement of students they teach, while some districts reward all the teachers in a particular school where students meet expectations. Individual teacher performance compensation directly links pay to the quality of teaching, and many teachers may use this as a motivating
factor. However, it may be difficult to fairly evaluate teachers’ performance or directly attribute student improvements to a particular teacher [3]. Another criticism of individual teacher performance awards is that they may create competition among teachers, especially when awards are limited in number. The top teachers within a school may receive compensation, but the awards do not necessarily provide any incentive for the majority of teachers [4].

Policies that reward entire schools are called School-Based Performance Awards (SBPA). SBPA aim to encourage collaboration among teachers. All the teachers within the school benefit financially if students achieve more. However, this school-wide system does not reward outstanding individual teaching. It may also reward poor individual teaching that takes place within an otherwise successful school. As a result, SBPA may not be an incentive for individuals to improve teaching quality. Several models also offer bonuses for groups of teachers that create outstanding learning plans and work to achieve them, although small-group plans are less common.

There are two other types of pay-for-performance that are usually used in combination with KSBP and achievement-based pay. The first of these, responsibility pay, rewards teachers with bonuses for taking on additional school responsibilities, such as coaching, chairing a department, or mentoring other teachers [2]. The second type, issue-specific pay, gives incentive pay for serving in hard-to-staff schools, filling a hard-to-fill position, or possessing hard-to-find attributes [2]. In some schools, issue-specific pay also refers to compensation for attaining attendance or other goals.

There are also variations among these four types of pay-for-performance. Some pay-for-performance programs utilize career-ladder structures that establish levels of career attainment for teachers. Each career level is commonly associated with a higher level of pay. In a system of achievement-based compensation for instance, teachers may progress from novice, to career, to master teacher, if their students continually perform above expectations. Under a KSBP system, advancement up a career-ladder may be determined by the acquisition of new knowledge and skills through education or training. Responsibility-pay systems may even use career-ladders to formally recognize the levels of responsibility that teachers take on. The alternative to the career-ladder system is a variable bonus pay system that allows teachers to earn bonuses and raises through demonstration of a performance, skill, or responsibility. A number of states and districts use several different pay-for-performance practices in combination.
Motivation

Motivation can fall into one of two distinct categories— intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic teacher motivations include opportunities to expand professional expertise, learn new skills, collaborate with other teachers, and influence decisions on curriculum, instruction, and management practices [4-6]. Perhaps, most important for teachers, is the intrinsic desire to improve student learning. “Teachers enter the profession because they value the intrinsic rewards that result from reaching students and helping them to learn” [7]. Extrinsic motivation for teachers includes monetary incentives, promotion opportunities, and professional recognition [5]. Pay-for-performance systems rely on the theory that money motivates teacher quality. The literature indicates that monetary compensation is one motivation to improve teaching quality, but certainly not the only one. The following research on motivation assumes that money can motivate better teaching, although other factors may be equally or more important influences.

The Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE) has written extensively on the subject of teacher compensation and teacher motivation. CPRE asserts that teacher motivation is based on three factors: the value of the potential reward; the belief that the award will be received if goals are met; and the belief that the goal is attainable [8].

Research in the private sector has found that in order to affect worker motivation, annual bonuses need to be at least 5% to 8% of salary or about $2,000 for a typical teacher [9, 10]. This research is supported by studies showing that some teacher bonuses are too low to motivate additional teaching effort and may even be viewed as insults if they are too low [9, 10]. In Charlotte-Mecklenburg, teachers complained that an annual bonus of $400-$600 after taxes was too small to be viewed as a reward for all the time it took to earn it [11]. The higher the rate of pay-for-performance, compared to base pay, the more likely teachers will be to change their behavior to earn it [3]. Based on previous studies, it is likely that financial compensation will motivate teacher behavior if the award is large enough.

One author suggests that money is not a motivator at all until teachers are convinced they will actually see the award [4]. Pay-for-performance programs are not always funded sufficiently or the number of available awards may be arbitrarily limited. As a result, it is possible that high-quality teaching is not always rewarded. In addition, unreliable and invalid teacher evaluation procedures may result in unfair reward systems [8]. In order for pay-for-performance programs to succeed, they should be funded adequately with no quotas for the number of eligible teachers, and should use valid, reliable evaluation methods that are clearly explained to teachers.
Finally, “if teachers do not believe that their effort is likely to meet with success, they will be less likely to make the effort” [8]. The goals and expectations of a new compensation system should be realistic and clearly defined so that teachers believe the goals are attainable. Furthermore, schools and districts offering pay-for-performance compensation programs should provide professional development opportunities and technical assistance for teachers to gain the knowledge and skills to meet expectations [8].

**Pay-for-Performance Systems**

The following districts, states, and regions are just several examples of pay-for-performance systems. This analysis outlines their purposes, implementation processes, structures, and any available results. According to *Education Week*, 11 states encouraged pay-for-performance programs in 2005 [20]. Districts and even schools have also implemented pay-for-performance programs independent of the states. A few of the pay-for-performance programs are discussed below.

**Denver ProComp**

In June 2003 Denver completed a four-year pilot of a teacher pay-for-performance system called ProComp at twelve elementary schools, one middle school, and two high schools [12]. The purpose of ProComp is to align teacher compensation with student learning, district goals, and district priorities [12].

The four-year time frame allowed Denver to work through problems that occurred and secure the support of teachers and administrators in the process. For example, the district experimented with Knowledge- and Skill-Based Pay (KSBP) in some schools and achievement-based pay in others (although these approaches were later combined) [3]. Denver Public Schools (DPS) worked with the Denver Classroom Teachers Association (DCTA) to design, implement, and modify the ProComp system during the pilot. DPS and DCTA created informal and formal partnerships in the district, including higher education institutions, to help design the structure of ProComp [13]. The input from multiple stakeholders allowed the district to address concerns before district-wide implementation.

The piloted ProComp system combines KSBP with individual and school-wide achievement-based pay, and issue-specific compensation. It utilizes variable bonus pay instead of the career ladder approach. ProComp provides bonuses for the following KSBP activities [12]: professional development units, graduate degrees in the teaching subject, National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification (NBPTS), and $1,000 in annual tuition reimbursement. Teachers receive annual salary increases only if they receive satisfactory evaluations. They are assessed and compensated according to whether they meet their own annual objectives (which must be approved by the principal). Teachers are also rewarded individually based on the achievement gains of their students on the ITBS and CSAP. If their school as a
whole makes the desired achievement gains, teachers also receive compensation. Finally, teaching positions and schools that are hard-to-staff offer financial incentives for teachers willing to fill them. No limits are placed on annual or career teacher earnings.

An independent organization was brought in to evaluate the pilot and compare outcomes between the pilot schools and control schools. Linear modeling was used to adjust for between-school differences in school and student characteristics [13]. At all three levels of school, higher teacher evaluation scores were positively related to higher mean student achievement scores on the ITBS and CSAP [13]. The study did not measure longitudinal achievement increases or decreases. Higher achievement scores were also positively associated with the length of time teachers participated in the pilot [13]. Teachers felt that cooperation between teachers generally remained the same or improved during the pilot [13]. However, teachers did feel that there should be more consistency between how principals review and analyze objectives and they also indicated a need for more professional development opportunities [13].

Denver Teachers approved the ProComp plan in March, 2004. On November 1st, 2005, 58% of Denver voters approved the ProComp $25 million levy, and ProComp will be implemented in all Denver public schools in the 2006-07 school year [14]. Current teachers can opt into the ProComp system or remain on the traditional single-salary schedule, but ProComp will be mandatory for new teachers.

**Vaughn Next Century Learning Center**

Vaughn is a charter school in Los Angeles County enrolling about 1,200 student, most of whom are limited-English Proficient (LEP) and eligible for free or reduced price lunches [9]. In the 1998-99 school year, Vaughn began to pilot a pay-for-performance system in response to external accountability pressures as well as the desire to recruit and retain highly skilled teachers, and address perceived pay inequities [15]. Vaughn provided teacher professional development, mentoring and coaching resources, and funded the program by reallocating savings from management efficiencies and additional state funding [15].

The Vaughn pay-for-performance plan was instigated by Vaughn’s well-respected and charismatic principal. The plan was designed by a small group of teachers and administrators and then discussed extensively through informational meetings and leadership committee meetings [15]. The original plan was to slowly expand the pilot program from newly hired teachers to more senior staff. However, senior staff members asked to be included during the second year after observing the results from the first-year pilot. As a result, the school established a school-wide compensation system for all teachers and allowed experienced teachers to participate in the individual pay-for-performance system [16]. Vaughn assessed school-wide performance through California’s Academic Proficiency Index (API), which establishes a
5% annual academic growth target [16]. Vaughn’s pay-for-performance system uses a career ladder approach to award individual achievement-based pay and KSBP. The individual achievement-based pay component is also linked to the API.

In order to be rewarded KSBP, teachers must be rated by a peer review committee on 11 different rubrics (such as lesson planning, classroom management, and mathematics knowledge). The ratings on each rubric collectively determine each teacher’s tier on the career ladder (1, 2, or 3) [16]. The ratings were based loosely on Charlotte Danielson’s *Framework for Teaching*, which defines four broad proficiency levels of unsatisfactory, basic, proficient, and distinguished [17]. Teachers can demonstrate knowledge in some areas by formal certificates. For example, to reach Tier 2, teachers must have a full California teacher license and a score of 3.0 on each Tier 1 area. Teachers can receive a bonus for particular credentials without progressing to Tier 2 even if they fail to meet other expectations [9].

If the school meets attendance, discipline, parent partnership, and collaboration goals, issue-specific pay is available to all teachers. Responsibility compensation is awarded for taking on additional responsibilities.

During the first four years of the Vaughn pay-for-performance compensation plan, student test scores improved [16]. Teacher evaluation scores at Vaughn were found to be positively related to gains in student achievement. Furthermore, 84% of Vaughn teachers reported being motivated by the systems of bonuses [9]. One potential problem lies in the area of teacher evaluations. Although 74% of teachers believed the measurement system for knowledge and skills was fair during the second year, only 46% believed the evaluations were fairly run [16].

**Douglas County, Colorado**

Douglas County is another Colorado district with a prominent pay-for-performance program. Douglas County teachers vote annually to continue the program, which has been in place since the 1994-95 school year [3]. Douglas County implemented the plan to reassure the public about the accountability of school funds, align compensation with the strategic direction of the district, and improve the quality of teaching in the process [3, 15]. The district also hoped that other effects of the pay-for-performance program would include improved teacher recruitment and retention, more motivated teachers, and more opportunities for teachers to acquire new skills.

The county superintendent worked with the Douglas County Federation of Teachers and members of the Douglas County Board of Education to construct a new compensation plan over the course of nine
months [3]. To inform the plan, the district utilized compensation research and experience from the private sector [18].

The Douglas County pay-for-performance plan includes KSBP, responsibility pay, group (both school-wide and smaller groups), and individual achievement-based compensation. Teachers receive a base salary based on education and undergo annual evaluation by principals or other administrators. Teachers who are judged as satisfactory receive pay according to their years of proficient experience, while unsatisfactory teachers must undergo remediation [19]. There is also a voluntary outstanding teacher bonus award of $1,250, based on a portfolio submitted by a teacher to the district for approval. This portfolio must address district academic goals or National Board Certification and be approved by the district [4]. A teacher may receive “Master Teacher” compensation if their students improve academically and the teachers attain either National Board certification, or the outstanding teacher award for two consecutive years. The district also hands out bonuses to small groups of teachers who plan for and achieve goals aligned with district objectives [3].

The KSBP component of the Douglas County system offers bonuses for formal coursework in the teaching area and successful completion of district-sponsored skill blocks. Douglas County provides financial incentives for teachers who take on additional school or district level responsibilities [4]. The total cost of the new compensation elements was $700,000 or 1.5% of the total 1995-96 teacher payroll, and these funds were raised from the local tax base [4, 15].

Student achievement has improved since the plan was implemented, although other initiatives may have also contributed to achievement gains [4]. Teacher recruitment has also increased since the institution of the program [4]. Several outside evaluators found that most schools had an enhanced focus on the school-wide agenda, enhanced teachers’ skills, and improved school cultures [18]. The district has received significant national attention for the plan, including a profile on the American Federation of Teachers website [18].

**Iowa**

Iowa passed the first statewide pay-for-performance legislation in the United States in 2001 and allocated $40 million from the 2001 tobacco settlement for implementation [12]. The legislation aimed to improve teacher quality and student learning by recruiting and rewarding quality teachers [3, 21].

The impetus for the pay-for-performance system originated among high-level state government and business leaders, in combination with several districts and teacher union members [21]. Groups of key stakeholders reached partial consensus after debating the business community’s proposal and the
Governor’s proposal on pay-for-performance. However, they were unable to agree on several key components and the compromise did not completely please any group [21]. Although the initiative passed, some have described the watered down version as the “lowest common denominator” [21]. The pay-for-performance system was scheduled to be implemented statewide by 2003 [22]. Participating districts were instructed to formulate district compensation policies that aligned within the broad statewide guidelines.

The broad Iowa pay-for-performance system combines KSBP with a school- and district-wide achievement-based component. Iowa utilizes a career-ladder structure with four levels: Beginning, Career I, Career II and Advanced [3]. Progression from one level to the next is determined by the acquisition of skills and knowledge. Teachers can demonstrate this acquisition by completing formal education, licenses, certifications, informal district courses, submitting portfolios, and undergoing evaluation at least once every five years [22]. Evaluations are conducted by district administrators or a regional team [22]. Beginning teachers take part in induction and mentoring programs, and ongoing professional training is a priority for all teachers [22]. For the achievement-based component, teachers receive a bonus if their school or district shows student test score gains [22].

As of 2005, Iowa had only been able to implement the Beginning and Career I levels of the plan [23]. Critics of the Iowa plan contend that the plan would be extremely cumbersome and would take $300 million instead of the allocated $40 million to fully implement [22, 24]. In addition to the expense of the program, Iowa has faced declining revenues since the legislation was passed [24], which have exacerbated implementation problems. Other problems include the lack of direction for districts implementing the plan and a general lack of support from teacher unions [21].

**Arizona**

In November 2000 Arizona passed Proposition 301, an initiative directing a significant portion of revenue to teacher pay-for-performance. The purposes of the initiative were to recruit and retain teachers and increase accountability.

Prior to the passage of Proposition 301, 40% of Arizona teachers were already participating in pay-for-performance systems, including some schools in Milken’s Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) and others in the 1984 Career Ladder program [25]. Evaluation of both of these programs indicate that they resulted in positive student achievement outcomes [25, 26].

Proposition 301 did not originally contain a pay-for-performance component. This component was added as the result of discussions in the state legislature and in the business community [25]. Voters approved
the initiative after a large grassroots campaign by the education community, the business community, the Governor’s office, and the Superintendent [25].

Proposition 301 provides about $445 million to schools annually and is funded by a 0.6 cent sales tax increase [25]. Forty-percent of the total is designated for pay-for-performance programs. Iowa stakeholders, however, disagreed on the appropriate structure of the statewide pay-for-performance system. The resulting initiative directs districts to design pay-for-performance systems that meet their own needs, rather than specifying strict standards statewide [12, 25].

In a survey by the Arizona Education Association in 2002, 98% of districts awarded achievement-based pay at the school, district, or grade level and only 11% of districts awarded it solely at the teacher level, although several awarded compensation for meeting group and individual goals [27]. Ninety-two percent of districts used student achievement as the performance indicator, in contrast to 23% of districts evaluating teachers based on satisfactory teacher evaluations [27]. Among districts using achievement-based compensation systems, a wide variety of tests, goals, and benchmarks were used [27].

Due to the inconsistent nature of district pay-for-performance plans in Arizona, it is not possible to assess the impact of pay-for-performance on student academic achievement [27]. It does appear that the proposition has increased teacher salaries statewide [27].

**North Carolina**

In 1996, North Carolina piloted a state accountability plan for rewarding teacher performance [28]. The pay-for-performance program was part of a broader state educational accountability program [28]. The North Carolina statewide accountability plan was piloted in the 1995-96 school year in 10 volunteering districts and implemented across the state before the 1996-97 school year [24]. During the pilot year, the Department of Public Instruction provided technical and financial assistance to participating districts [28]. In return, feedback from the pilot districts helped the state adjust the model. Although it was implemented as a state program, the North Carolina accountability system relies on schools and school districts to design and implement local plans that meet the requirements with guidance from the state [28].

North Carolina’s pay-for-performance program measures student performance using a value-added approach on end-of-course (EOC) and end-of-grade (EOG) tests [19]. Certified staff in schools that make expected growth targets receive one-time bonuses of $375-$750, or $500-$1,500 if schools make exemplary growth targets [29]. Exemplary growth is defined as growth that is 10% or higher than the North Carolina average. In addition to the statewide achievement-based compensation, North Carolina offers responsibility bonus pay for teachers who mentor other teachers. The state also finances
professional development and a 12% percent salary increase for teachers who attain National Board Certification [29].

In 1998, the State Board of Education announced that twice as many K-8 schools reached exemplary growth targets in the second year of the program, compared to the first [28]. Initial results suggested that the accountability program might be an effective way to improve student achievement [28]. North Carolina ranked in the top ten states nationwide in efforts to improve teacher quality in 2005 [20]. Additionally, North Carolina had a greater number of National Board Certified teachers than any other state and employed 21% of all the National Board Certified Teachers in the nation [29].

**Other examples: TAP**
The Milken Family Foundation has developed a Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) that has been gaining interest in a number of regions. TAP combines KSBP, achievement-based pay, responsibility pay, and issue-specific compensation [30]. It also emphasizes professional development, teacher evaluation, and offers incentives based on each teacher’s unique abilities. Several districts and states have visited TAP schools or consulted with the Foundation before developing their own system. Initial results of TAP schools indicate student achievement gains and teacher support [30].

**International Examples**
Australia and Israel provide two international examples of pay-for-performance systems. Australia instituted a KSBP career ladder in 1990 to compensate teachers for additional knowledge and skills while keeping teachers in the classroom [31]. Teachers apply for the first level on the ladder by submitting a short form documenting their capacity to meet the criteria based on knowledge and skills [32]. Ninety-three percent of applicants successfully meet the criteria and subsequently receive a raise [32]. When this program was evaluated, most teachers did not perceive a link between the career ladder and genuine development as a teacher, but rather viewed the process as an easy way to earn a salary boost [31]. Due to financial concerns, quotas were instituted for the number of teachers who could attain career levels 2 and 3, and this undermined the purpose of the system [31].

Israel’s pay-for-performance compensation program rewards individual teachers with bonuses for improvements in their students’ performance on exams in English, Hebrew, and math [33]. Each teacher is rewarded based on the rank of their students compared to the performance of other students in the same subject [33]. An independent study of this program examined students’ average passing rates and average scores on the high school matriculation exam to measure the effects of the compensation system [33]. The results of this study suggest that the individual achievement-based pay system had significant effects on students and had minor spillover effects on students in other subjects [33]. On the basis of a survey of
these teachers, the researcher found evidence linking the student achievement gains to changes in participating teachers’ teaching methods, pedagogical techniques, and additional effort during the pay-for-performance program [33].

Conclusions
In general, pay-for-performance programs appear to positively influence student achievement and increase teacher recruitment and retainment. The most successful programs achieve local support and compensate teachers using several different approaches. Programs at the state level appear to experience more obstacles in implementation. It may be more difficult to achieve essential teacher and administrator support at the state level. States may also struggle to define clear, specific requirements that give districts both structure and flexibility. However, since no true experimental designs have ever been used to evaluate the effects of pay-for-performance, it is unclear whether similar effects could have been obtained simply by increasing teacher pay or using funds for other purposes, such as targeted class reduction or specialist teachers. Another mitigating factor in judging the success of pay-for-performance systems is that they are rarely paired with robust programs to identify and improve or remove poor performing teachers. It is not clear how much relative improvement might be gained from a paired set of policies, which would also allow resources to be concentrated on those clearly exceeding expectations.

The pay-for-performance literature consistently recommends a number of essential success factors for implementing a pay-for-performance system. The following recommendations were repeated throughout the literature:

8. The creation of a pay-for-performance system should involve discussions and input from key stakeholders. Key stakeholders should at least include teachers, teachers’ unions, school- and district-level administrators.

9. All stakeholders should come to agreement on the most valuable educational results.

10. A pilot should be conducted to allow for feedback and modification. Ongoing evaluation should be performed to monitor results.

11. The objectives should be aligned carefully with methods of earning compensation.

12. The methods of evaluating performance, knowledge, and skills must be valid, reliable, and understandable to teachers and evaluators.

13. Adequate funding must be available to ensure awards can be paid if objectives are met. Bonuses need to be large enough to motivate the additional time or effort.
14. There should be no limit on the number of schools or teachers who can receive the award if they meet the goals.

15. Ongoing investments should be made in professional development. Opportunities for collaboration and mentoring programs are other resources for teachers that should be considered.

16. Because of differences in school demographics, compensation based on student achievement should measure gains, rather than actual achievement level.

17. Teachers, schools, and districts that under-perform should receive feedback and opportunities for remediation.
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Teacher Compensation in Denver

ProComp

Today’s Agenda

• What is the DPS/DCTA Professional Compensation System for teachers?
  ✓ The Background
  ✓ The Pay System
  ✓ The Infrastructure

• This Year’s Goals and Milestones
  ✓ Goals and Milestones

Council of Great City Schools National Meeting
ProComp -- Background

• 1982 to 1999 -- Protracted disagreement about changing teacher compensation
• 1999 -- Landmark agreement to pilot “pay for performance”
  ✓ Introduced objective setting process
  ✓ Showed that objective setting could make a difference
  ✓ Proved the value of collaborative activity between DPS and DCTA
  ✓ Taught us that we needed a more comprehensive pay system than “pay for performance”

ProComp -- Background

• 2001 -- Convened Joint Task Force on Teacher Compensation
  ✓ Body independent from the Pay for Performance Pilot, charged to create a recommendation for a new teacher compensation system based, in part, on academic growth
• 2004 -- Joint Task Force recommendation ratified by the Board of Education and members of DCTA

Council of Great City Schools National Meeting
ProComp Aligns Teacher Compensation with the District’s Goals

- Replaces a capped system of entitlements with an uncapped system of earned increases
- Allows teachers to build a professional compensation package based on a wider range of choices
- Requires a $25 million property tax increase to be fully funded

The ProComp “Menu” Is Composed of Ten Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Facts</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>District Entry Salary ($3,301)</th>
<th>Professional Evaluation</th>
<th>Market Incentives</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary Index</td>
<td>Safety Index</td>
<td>$666</td>
<td>$2,807</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase both</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ProComp Redefines a Teacher’s Career Earnings Pattern

Council of Great City Schools National Meeting

ProComp Reprioritizes How We Invest Our Salary Increases

Council of Great City Schools National Meeting

Survey of Pay-for-Performance Teacher Compensation Systems
ProComp Has Three “Bread & Butter Elements”

The Three Bread and Butter Elements Work Together to Reinforce Student Learning and Quality Teaching
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The Infrastructure: Leadership

DPS Board of Education
Teacher Compensation Trust Board of Directors
DCTA Board of Directors

DPS Superintendent, Michael Fasani
DCTA President, Kim Haddad

Transition Team
Five Administrative Representatives – Andre Peddy, Co-Chair, Richard Allen, Rosanne Fulton, John Leslie, John Youngquist
Five Teacher Representatives – Connie White, Co-Chair, Margaret Bobb, Jeff Buck, Sainie Patterson, Harry Raman
Coordinator: Brad Jupp

Council of Great City Schools National Meeting

The Infrastructure: Getting the Work Done

Operations Team
Ed Freeman and Rosanne Fulton, Co-Chairs

Work Groups
Student Growth Objectives
Sustainability/Environmental Stewardship
Professional Development
Capacity and Resources Management
Professional Evaluation
Workforce

“ProComp 3.5 Committee”
Bob Anderson, Co-Chair, Sainie Patterson, Co-Chair

Council of Great City Schools National Meeting
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2005-2006 ProComp Goals

- Integrate the three “bread and butter elements” of ProComp, Professional Development Units, Professional Evaluation and Student Growth Objectives
- Provide high quality and rewarding professional development about ProComp and related instructional initiatives to principals, student services professionals and managers, DPS administrative staff, and DCTA leaders and staff
- Prepare human resources, payroll, DoTS and other key operations staff to support implementation of ProComp related systems in addition to their other duties supporting students and schools
- Build the capacity to support a sustainable system in the future
- Conduct successful opt in periods in November 2005 and January 2006
- Collect baseline data for the internal evaluation of ProComp

2005-2006 ProComp Milestones

- Fall 2005 -- Continue pilot testing of professional
- November 2005 -- ProComp Mill Levy election
- November 7, 2005 -- First opt in window Opens
- January 2006 -- Second opt in window opens
- January 2006 -- Limited implementation of ProComp for people who entered during the first opt-in window
- Fall 2006 -- Full implementation of ProComp for people who entered during the first two opt-in windows
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Thank You

DPS/DCTA ProComp Project
http://DenverProComp.org
procomp@dpsk12.org