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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Reason for the Study

The political, economic, and demographic fibers of American society have significantly changed since World War II. However, society's quest for free, quality public education has remained a constant throughout this current period of cultural reformation. This cycle of democratic society has again thrust education to the forefront. As a political agenda item and a national priority, this renewed focus has given the educational community the attention and permission needed to induce dramatic and progressive change and to aggressively pursue credible school improvement research (Tecker, 1985). Society's implication is not that the state of education in America is necessarily substandard, rather, the education community is being asked to be responsive to the technological, cultural, societal, and global interdependent changes needed. Thus, current educational improvement serves to illustrate the continual, evolutionary process of education and is a means to an end toward global and domestic societal improvement.

Perhaps the most common and motivating theme in the school reform movement of the 1980s and 1990s is accountability. Accountability has been generally defined as schools and school personnel being held responsible for meeting the expectations and demands of students, parents, business and industry, special interest groups, government,
higher education, and other constituencies they serve. The lack of public confidence caused the national reform reports to examine school accountability with responses encouraging community-imposed reforms (Brandt, 1990). Chubb and Moe (1990) believe that schools have always been held accountable through legislated rules, policies, reporting requirements, and regulations governing personnel and expenditures of money, but the focus of accountability has shifted to each school's ability to guarantee that students learn a more rigorous curriculum. And in this reformist atmosphere, accountability is the catalyst of academic excellence substantiated by a public's demand for concrete evidence of results.

With the help of the state's Supreme Court, Kentucky's Education Reform Act of 1990 has helped to redefine accountability. Accountability is the process of teaching and assessing the state mandated outcomes, and the degree of school effectiveness attained. School effectiveness is the proportion of students meeting the outcomes; school "quality" will be measured by test results and publicly scrutinized (Foster, 1991). Tecker (1985, p.5) defines school accountability, politically, as

An increasingly well-educated and sophisticated public continues to voice its expectations. . . . The public knows intellectually--and personally--the positive results of educational success and the negative consequences of educational failure. It is no wonder that significant public support results in the public demanding its money's worth.
Glickman (1990) offers a new working definition of accountability and asserts that a new accountability can be a healthy compromise between the two extremes that have beset education over the past two decades. He explains historically, the pendulum swung from the excessive left, the mid '60s and early '70s exemplified by "open", project- and student-centered education, to the extreme right, categorized by legislated learning, testing, and "academic excellence." Education currently finds itself in the midst of two contradictory movements: the legislative reform and the empowering reform. He suggests that combining the successes of each period into two fixed frames will create a new balanced movement of the 1990s. By establishing two pillars, equal access to knowledge and public demonstration of results, educators can respond to a new accountability characterized by shared governance, choice, responsibility, and student performance.

Every level of the education profession has been included in the public's scrutiny of the programs and processes by which children ultimately are educated. Proactive and responsible school districts continue to respond to accountability issues and community expectations by implementing educational systems that are well grounded in current school effectiveness research often resulting in school improvement measures and innovative change. It is concluded that incentive pay programs can be both an internal
(community and school district imposed) and an external (legislated) form of school accountability (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; Brandt, 1990; Cetron & Gayle, 1991). Additionally, the evaluation system implemented to support the incentive pay plan will hold teachers and administrators accountable for the students' education.

Aggressive research projects focusing on successful schools have identified a myriad of variables that affect student growth, school climate, and staff improvement. Some predominant characteristics that have surfaced throughout many of the school effectiveness efforts and which are interdependent on the success and improvement of the school unit have included:

- an orderly and safe environment;
- clearly articulated mission for the school and district;
- strong instructional leadership within the management structure of the school system;
- high expectations for students and staff;
- collegiality demonstrated by (1) talking about teaching, (2) observing each other, (3) working on curriculum, and (4) teaching each other;
- sound classroom instructional practices;
- accurate, disaggregated analysis of assessment results of students' work;
- school autonomy from external bureaucratic influence;
- supportive, school-wide climate for students to learn
and staff to professionally grow;
-emphasis on basic skills; and
-increased time on task (Edmonds, 1979; Lightfoot, 1983; Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1984; Abrams, 1985; Lezotte & Bancroft, 1985; Stedman, 1987; Barth, 1990; Chubb & Moe, 1990).

These common school improvement correlates provide a justification for inducing changes needed within governing board policies, teaching and assessing methodologies, and perhaps most importantly, management and administrative procedures. Considering these recurring factors, education in the 1990s is ripe for the marriage of renewed management strategies and solidly researched educational methodologies.

Many school districts are redefining their infrastructure by implementing better organizational and management practices that have long been successful in the private sector. School system restructuring advocates agree that incentive pay is an area worth serious consideration (Frase, Hetzel, & Grant, 1982; Cavanaugh & Yoder, 1984). As demonstrated by the private sectors of business and industry, incentive plan systems represent a viable and proven management strategy (Rumery, 1985; Wood & Green, 1985). Incentive pay plans used in tandem with other organizational/management strategies such as Management by Objectives (M.B.O.), Quality Circles, Site/Building, Project or Management Teams, Site-based Management, and Cross-functional Training are management tools
found in today's successful companies and applicable to school systems (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Wood & Green, 1985; Herman, 1989).

The management of the education system is continually being compared to business and industry management. By using business and industry management as a model, President Reagan initiated support for incentive pay for teachers at the national level of government. President Reagan's National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983) report, *A Nation At Risk*, supports the implementation of merit pay systems. In a commencement address to the graduates of Seton Hall University (1983, p.2), the President said

> Teachers should be paid and promoted on the basis of their merit and competence... Hard-earned tax dollars should encourage the best. They have no business rewarding incompetence and mediocrity.

The merit pay issue is not strictly a conservative agenda item. Congressman Carl Perkins, a Democrat from Kentucky and chairman of the House Education Committee, established a House Task Force on Merit Pay for Teachers. The purpose was to establish a model teacher incentive plan (Perkins, 1984).

There are three compelling reasons for the education community to implement incentive plans. First is the immediate and long-term need for an increased teacher work force (English, 1984; Darling-Hammond, 1986). Second, the implementation of effective schools research coupled with school accountability requires improvements in the quality and professionalization of teaching; incentive plans relate
teacher performance to evaluation standards (Cresap, McCormick, & Paget, 1984). Finally, incentive plans provide the necessary management structure and processes needed to improve the administration of the district and the implementation of other school improvement efforts; incentive plans can provide the vehicle by which a sound evaluation system and a supportive staff development program can be implemented (Robinson, 1983).

Statement of the Problem

The use of incentive pay/pay for performance is a controversial trend that is quickly making its way onto America's current educational agenda. It is the focus of many public interest groups, teacher unions, school districts, state legislatures, private institutions, and government agencies, all of which perceive merit pay in some way affecting the quality of education and thus teacher and school accountability (Hawley, 1985; Tecker, 1985; Glickman, 1990). Effective schools researchers have identified many factors that significantly promote improved schooling for all children (Brookover & Lezotte, 1977; Edmonds, 1979; Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1984; Stedman, 1987; Barth, 1990). Educational reformers are aggressively implementing restructured policies and processes that they hope will influence the quality of the education system. Merit pay can be a major consideration that supplements the
political factors driving the policy changes of education; but perhaps as important, it can serve as a catalyst for a renaissance for the teaching profession (Anderson & Mark, 1985; Flannelly & Palaich, 1985; Inman, 1985; Turner et al., 1986).

Because of the nature of this study, the statement of the problem and, thus, questions posed are not intended to generate the hypotheses to be tested statistically. It is the intent of this study to (1) provide the rationale and justification for the development of a performance-based pay plan model, (2) develop the model, and (3) using synthetic data, hypothetically analyze the cost of the model in terms of teacher compensation.

The following questions more succinctly define the problem:

a. Does the influence of the current political climate, professionalization of teaching, and/or the apparent teacher shortage warrant the implementation of performance-based pay plans?

b. What variables should be included in a comprehensive pay for performance plan?

c. Can a comprehensive merit pay plan model be developed that represents current effective schools research, motivation theory, and sound pedagogy?

d. How should the factors selected for inclusion in a merit pay plan model be weighted?
e. How should the pay for performance plan algorithms be
developed to provide for a balanced, yet properly
distributed, comprehensive model?
f. What legal, motivational, and/or procedural considerations
should be included in a merit pay plan model?
g. What is the possible cost of compensation the district may
incur using different percents of salary and varying the
number of teachers qualifying?

Purpose of Study

The primary purpose of this study is to develop a
comprehensive merit pay plan that (1) incorporates current
effective schools pedagogy, (2) integrates a total systems
approach to personnel evaluation, (3) provides for teachers'
due process and program validity, (4) presents well-balanced,
equitable, and multi-dimensional weighted algorithms, and (5)
provides a model that discriminates between levels of teacher
competency and performance. Specifically, a pay for
performance paradigm and supporting implementation procedures
will be developed based on a hypothetical school district's
teacher evaluation philosophy, procedures, and policies.

The second purpose of this study is to examine the cost
of this merit pay plan solely in the context of differentiated
compensation, or the dollar amount realized for merit pay per
individual teacher results. Using a total systems approach to
personnel evaluation (Manatt & Stow, 1986) as the model's
infrastructure, a cost analysis matrix will be developed to demonstrate the financial impact and feasibility of implementing the merit pay plan. The matrix will represent the differentiated levels of teacher experience, district staffing, and varying possibilities of results of the teachers' composite score as a function of the model's algorithms.

Ultimately, this study will provide a model from which school districts can develop a merit pay plan. Districts will determine how to implement a teacher evaluation system, reward quality teaching, provide staff development opportunities, and establish the rate of compensation. This study is designed to promote the use of merit pay plans and initiate the further study of the individual factors included in this model as to their validity, influence, and contribution toward effecting teacher motivation and performance, and student achievement. The implementation of such a model and the demonstration of the feasibility of the plan could assist local school districts in the development of a plan and help predict the financial impact.

Assumptions

This study was based on the following parameters:

a. The Teacher Performance Evaluation system used is based on the School Improvement Model research of the last ten years, and the model school district has implemented the
Teacher Performance Evaluation system consistent with School Improvement Model projects protocol.

b. The model school district would have a valid and reliable K-12 Criterion-Referenced Test battery for all disciplines in use.

c. The model school district would implement the use of a Student Feedback Questionnaire.

d. Issues commonly negotiated by teachers' unions such as class size, compensation ranges, and student test gains criteria will be assumed to be pre-established by the individual school districts, and represented levels for this study are only hypothetical in nature.

Delimitations

a. The value of this study lies in the concept of the development of the model and that variations to the factors and weights are dependent on the individual Teacher Performance Evaluation system and the needs of the school district.

b. The focus of the model is on the individual teacher, within the context of the SIM performance appraisal system; thus, no school-based incentive factors such as school climate indicators or school-wide student achievement results will be included.

c. This study will not attempt to statistically validate (1) the influence or contribution of the individual variables
included in the merit pay plan model, or (2) the appropriateness of the weights associated with each variable within the individual algorithm or within the whole plan, or (3) weights assigned to the classification of students within the class size variable.

d. No attempt will be made to assess the validity of this plan regarding its influence on student achievement, teacher performance, improved classroom instruction, teacher motivation, teacher morale, teacher acceptance, nor teacher satisfaction.

e. All demographic data, student and teacher performance results, and compensation ranges will be hypothetical and synthetically derived.

f. The feasibility of the merit pay plan model will be determined within the context of the financial cost associated with the total amount of merit pay hypothetically distributed to the district's teachers.

Outline of Subsequent Chapters

Because of the developmental nature of this study, the format of the following chapters and the methodology warrant clarification. The second chapter reviews the literature related to teacher supply and demand, incentive plans as motivators, and the professionalization of teaching. The third chapter will present the performance pay plan including the supportive implementation procedures, description of
evaluation instruments, and the algorithms with explanations and example computations. The fourth chapter will present the feasibility study in the form of cost analysis matrices. The fifth chapter will summarize the study with conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The difference between $70,000 and $75,000 is a difference only in the ego of the player. I had made that clear from the beginning. If they didn't want to make me feel happy, fine. But they were showing me exactly what they thought of me. I was an employee and they were my employers. I could call them "mister" when we passed in the hallway . . . (Koufax, 1966, p.91).

As somewhat dramatically demonstrated by baseball Hall of Famer Sandy Koufax in 1966, compensation in terms of one's performance can be the root of dissatisfaction and controversy between employee and employer. Whether a professional athlete, scientist, physician, teacher, or plumber, the value that is assigned an occupation in a democratic society can differ from the merit of that job and, likewise, the compensation earned by performing the tasks of that job at the varying degrees of competence (Lincoln & Guba, 1980). This review of literature will focus exclusively on the teaching profession and examine the many factors associated with the development of incentive pay plans and more specifically performance based pay plans.

Historic Overview

Historically, merit pay was the norm early in the twentieth century (Kohut & Wright, 1984). As the Depression precipitated financial crises for school districts and as teachers and administrators struggled to maintain existing
levels of school support, merit pay quickly disappeared from school systems' budget proposals. Johnson (1984) cites NEA surveys that indicated 48 percent of the 309 districts surveyed used merit pay to determine salaries in 1918-1919, 33 percent of 941 school districts in 1923 based salary on merit, and by 1928 only 18 percent determined salaries on merit. Any return to merit pay plans again after the depression were quickly abandoned with the onset of World War II. Districts were faced with trying to maintain a teaching force which was depleted by the war effort; men were called to service in the armed forces and women pursued higher paying factory jobs.

The merit pay issue again surfaced in the post-World War II era. Because of the large shift of teachers out of the education field during the war, school districts now found themselves attempting to shore up and stabilize their faculties. Additionally, the post-war years brought our nation's first baby boom producing a record number of children entering the school system. Merit pay was seen as a possible incentive to attract the numbers of teachers needed to staff the classrooms (Kohut & Wright, 1984).

However, in the early 1940s and during the immediate post-war era, the teachers' organizations had worked diligently to establish and institutionalize the single salary schedule. Labor unions were re-establishing themselves nationally within the industrial workplace and, likewise, teacher unions were being fortified with the increased number
of teaching positions. The use of the single salary schedule was further justified to end the obvious disparities between elementary and secondary school teachers' salaries, and more important, inequity by gender and race (Urban, 1985). This plan compensated all teachers based on similar experience and training; consequently, the resurgence of merit pay fizzled out (Educational Research Service, 1983; Murnane & Cohen, 1986). Between 1939 and 1953, the number of school districts in cities with populations of more than 30,000 that used merit pay fell from 20 percent to 4 percent (Porwoll, 1979).

The last significant attempt to implement merit pay into the educational system was in the early 1960s and was fueled by Sputnik (Natriello & Dornbusch, 1984). The space race influenced 10 percent of school districts to use some form of merit pay in the 1960s (Johnson, 1984). Porwoll (1979) found that by 1972 the number of school districts using merit pay had fallen to 5.5 percent and a 1978 survey of 11,500 school systems netted only 115 merit pay plans.

As recently as 1983, only 7 percent of Catholic high schools reported that they used some form of merit pay (National Catholic Education Association, 1985). The Educational Research Service (ERS) (1983) found that 6.4 percent of 3,000 schools surveyed had attempted some form of merit pay plan but had terminated them. But the ERS research further found that nearly 90 percent of the 3,000 schools in their survey had not yet had any experience, good or bad, with
any type of incentive pay plan. In fiscal years 1983 and 1984, the U.S. Education Department funded 71 teacher incentive plans in 37 states at a cost of $2.6 million; in 1984 it awarded over one million dollars to 51 school districts for developing and implementing pay-incentive plans (Bridgeman, 1984). Bobbitt (1989) found almost two out of five (38 percent) of all public schools offered one or more teacher incentive programs. According to Cornett in the Career Ladder Clearinghouse (1990), the U.S. Department of Education's School and Staffing Survey of 1988 found that as many as 572,000 or 26 percent of the total 2.2 million public school teachers were participating in some incentive pay program. Boyer and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1990) found 31 percent of those surveyed participating in some form of an incentive pay program with 4 percent in a merit pay program.

Incentive Pay

Twenty-five years after Sputnik and responding to demands outside of the educational community, school districts were again attempting to implement incentive pay plans. This latest attempt has found the educational community armed with significant research supporting effective teaching methodologies, more articulated evaluation systems, and wide-

Proponents argue that incentive plans motivate teachers to work harder and better (Frase, Hetzel, & Grant, 1982). Wilson (1980) asserts that merit pay "encourages the optimum performance of all individuals within an institution." He further explains there is little incentive for teachers to perform beyond "maintaining" the classroom and to continue to reward mediocrity is to undermine the teaching profession. Likewise, Burrill (1985) states

Merit pay, rather, is a method of recognizing and rewarding excellence. It is a method for communicating that mediocrity will not be tolerated. This is equally as important as raising base salaries.

Lovrich et al. (1980) states "there is inadequate motivation because we have too few rewards for excellence and too few penalties for unsatisfactory work." Cetron and Gayle (1991) include merit pay as their fourth of nine recommendations cited as necessary for the improvement of our education system. Major reports advocate for tying teacher performance to increased merit-based compensation (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983; Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; National Governors' Association, 1986; California Department of Education, 1990).

Incentive pay programs can counter the plateauing effect that influences all jobs, particularly teaching, in that
incentive plans offer opportunities to expand teachers' perspectives of what they do and how they do it (Brandt, 1990). Merit can be seen as a fundamental form of justice that exemplifies the economic structure of a democracy. The ethics are simple; the harder one works, the better one works, the more compensation one should receive beyond their colleagues who have failed to reach the same level (Jackson, 1985).

Brandt (1990) using industry as a model, believes that merit pay communicates the corporate values and receives emphasis through explicit criteria, job descriptions, and employee evaluation forms. Merit pay effects change in industry, and he believes it could aid educators to stimulate instructional improvement. A well-conceived merit pay system can improve the quality and quantity of production as well as morale (Thomsen, 1978; Printz & Waldman, 1985).

However political it may be to include performance-based pay to teachers' salaries, it is necessary to provide merit to substantiate a teacher's self-worth. Lack of merit pay sends a message to teachers that

... my employers lack the political courage to reward any exceptionally good work that I do. Obviously, they don't value the quality that is the source of my self-esteem, my effectiveness in helping young people to learn (Sizer, 1985, p.186).

Conversely, opponents state that incentive pay plans and merit pay specifically are detrimental to the teaching profession. Dennis (1982) believes merit pay is
"fundamentally dishonest" because the measurement of merit is not valid. Likewise, Friedman (1984, p.32) views teaching as a calling rather than a means to "material prosperity" and merit pay as insulting to the profession, and that "merit pay is never offered to people engaged in highly respected occupations; they are expected to possess drive and initiative independent of salary considerations." Lipsky and Bacharach (1982, p.7) conclude

... changing to merit pay is risky, costly, and may create more problems than are solved. While no compensation strategy is a panacea, the single salary schedule is a better plan than merit pay.

Herdon (1983) offers six reasons why merit pay won't work: (1) merit pay systems can institutionalize the acceptability of mediocrity and inferiority; (2) merit pay systems can be driven more by political than professional considerations; (3) merit pay systems can complicate the remediation of performance problems among teachers; (4) merit pay plans might stifle extra effort; (5) merit pay plans require arbitrary comparison and contrast of functions; and (6) merit pay plans can induce unpleasant competition within faculties.

Other concerns of opponents include:
- favoritism and inequity;
- professionalism will become passe;
- the process will demoralize staff and be divisive;
- merit pay can stifle extra effort;
-lack of validity for performance measurements; and
-reliability of supervisor's appraisal (Lawler, 1971; Dennis, 1982; Burnside, 1985).

Hawley (1985) believes that performance pay cannot by itself induce significant changes in educational productivity. Sergiovanni (1985) maintains that incentive systems will lead to destructive competition between teachers and force teachers away from increasing internal discipline and self-responsibility. Murnane & Cohen (1986) conclude that "seniority-based employment contracts may be more effective in promoting public education than performance-based contracts."

Additionally, Murnane (1985) uses an economist's model to explain that it is difficult to identify the incentives that merit pay really provides or to predict how teachers and administrators will respond to the incentives. Teacher unions are concerned that merit cannot be measured objectively and subjective performance evaluation would be at the discretion of individual principals (Chubb & Moe, 1990).

Throughout this discussion, how change is facilitated within a formal institution is the driving issue. For a program to succeed, the teachers as individuals and collectively as the district must be ready for change. Sarason (1971) believes this type of major change is highly unlikely because educators seldom examine the underlying regularities of school as an institution. Such a regularity is never comparing teachers in any way; it is seen as
subversive. If educational institutions are to change and improve, he feels that this type of regularity must change.

Public and teacher response

Seventy-five percent of the public responding to the 1984 Gallup poll support basing teacher salaries on merit. In a survey conducted for Newsweek, Eitelberg (1983, p. 61) found 80 percent of the public surveyed favored basing teachers' salaries on merit and 60 percent disagreed with the National Education Association's point that "it is difficult to evaluate teacher performance objectively."

In the most current survey on the profile of teaching, Feistritzer (1990) found 75 percent of teachers surveyed agreed that pay for teachers should be based on job performance in addition to seniority and level of education. As reported in The Condition of Teaching, A State-by-State Analysis by Boyer (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990, pp. 79-80), teachers were asked, "If you had the authority to do what is really necessary to make public schools better, how would the following be distributed on your priority list: longer school days; somewhat longer school year; career ladder program for teachers; mentor-teacher program; requiring professional exams or teachers; day care for children of teachers; merit pay program; and alternative certification routes." Seventy-six percent of respondents prioritized the three incentive pay issues in the top four.
The American School Board Journal (Rist, 1983) reported 62.7 percent of a national sample of teachers agreed that teachers should be paid according to how well they perform in the classroom. Additionally, 61.5 percent and 62.1 percent of the affirmative respondents were affiliated with the A.F.T. and N.E.A. respectively, with 76.4 percent of non-union teachers represented.

In 1989, the president of the National Education Association, Mary Hatwood Futrell, endorsed the Fairfax County merit program (Cetron & Gayle, 1991). The American Federation of Teachers President Albert Shanker also has softened his position on incentive programs to the point of offering a model of "incentive schools" for consideration (Shanker, 1990).

**Incentive Pay Plans**

The current school reform movement, initiated in the early 1980s, has forced public schools to be more accountable to their community and student population. Toward this end, 37 state legislatures and numerous local school boards have mandated some form of incentive compensation for teachers (Cornett, 1988). The variety of extra compensation plans range from career ladders to merit pay and mentor teacher programs to job enlargement proposals (Educational Research Services, 1983; Kapel et al., 1985).
For this study, "incentive pay" is used as an umbrella term including all the practices that serve to compensate teachers beyond the base salary schedule for teaching. Citing Brandt's (1990) definitions, the interchangeable terms "merit pay" and "pay for performance" will refer to plans that compensate teachers, above the base salary, based on the quality of performance however judged. Likewise, Hawley (1985, p.19) refers to merit pay as "any form of financial reward that is tied to higher levels of teacher or student performance." Career ladders are plans that feature performance exclusively in additional non-teaching areas and are usually extra responsibilities required for promotion to further steps on the ladder. Career ladders usually differentiate the teaching staff into levels or titles. Job enlargement refers to plans that require working longer hours or additional days, or assuming extra duties such as mentor teacher.

Numerous reasons prohibited previous incentive plans from truly increasing the quality of the educational program (Cramer, 1983b). The majority of plans have been harnessed with non-educational parameters that 1) stifle domestic input and ownership and 2) do not adequately address current elements of effective schools research. Few plans have research-based pedagogical criteria that can be evaluated either as a causal effect of school improvement efforts or the influence of teachers' motivation and attitudes toward the
incentive plan. The most prevalent compensation model, currently used for approximately 99 percent of public school teachers, is solidly grounded in a single salary schedule that solely pays teachers for years of experience and professional or academic units completed (Calhoun & Protheroe, 1983; Murnane & Cohen, 1986). These plans offer little true incentive for the observably better teaching and increased student learning.

Rhodes (1973) found 12 basic flaws in merit pay plans that did not succeed:

- insufficient discrimination among teachers;
- artificial cutoffs on the number of teachers to receive merit pay;
- poor evaluators;
- mistaken concepts by board members and administrators;
- lack of clearly understood goals;
- lack of clear definition of the job;
- lack of priorities in the teachers' job;
- lack of effective evaluation instruments;
- inability to measure teacher and student results;
- inability to translate evaluation into improved instruction;
- inadequate financial incentives; and
- too limited concept of merit, more elements in the plan.

Current incentive plans tend only to use one factor to evaluate teachers' effectiveness and, thus, lack in the
program breadth needed for significant school and district improvement. Brandt (1990, p.34) concludes that merit pay plans should include elements from different models. "The combination of elements from different models provides an eclectic and politically more easily sustained program than most single models." With few exceptions, these programs with single factors have not directly improved the schools' performance nor have they been sustained over a period of time with long-term, documented results positively affecting student achievement, school climate, or improved professionalism (Frase et al., 1982). Current incentive plans are modeled after existing systems that produce a diluted and differentiated meritorious compensation plan. Murnane and Cohen (1986) found that the most successful incentive programs in schools were those that distributed awards evenly; this defeats the basic premise of performance-based pay plans—that of differentiated rewards objectively based on an individual's performance.

The educational climate is ripe for the implementation of a comprehensive pay for performance plan that integrates sound pedagogy, current effective schools correlates, proven institutional management processes, and that is balanced with an accurate evaluation system and union supported administrative procedures. The following discussion will address the factors considered that warrant the use of performance-based pay plans: to increase the teacher work
force, to improve the professional image of teaching, to justifiably compensate effective teaching, to motivate teachers, and to facilitate the improvement of classroom teaching methodologies and student learning through an effective evaluation system (Sykes, 1983; Educational Research Service, 1983; Burden, 1985).

Teacher Shortage and Recruitment

Current teacher employment and recruitment research provides strong justification for the many reasons the current education system needs to provide incentive plans. The National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983) found three problems that exemplify the teacher shortage: (1) teaching fails to attract the most able young people; (2) a disproportionate share of the highly able teachers leave teaching to pursue careers elsewhere; and (3) most schools fail to motivate and support teachers to consistently give their best effort. Darling-Hammond (1984, p.iii) states . . . dramatic changes in our nation's teaching force will soon lead to serious shortages of qualified teachers. . . . The currently highly educated and experienced teaching force is dwindling as older teachers retire in increasing numbers and many younger teachers leave for other occupations.

Teacher demand

There is a significant dearth of potential teacher candidates to fill increasingly greater numbers of teaching positions (Anderson & Mark, 1985). Fewer than 5 percent of
full-time college freshmen chose teaching as a career in 1982 as compared with 19 percent in 1970 (Feistritzer, 1986). At least one-third of the nation's teachers are 45 years old or older, and coupled with the current "baby boomlet", it is expected that the demand for new public and private school teachers will exceed 2 million teachers during the next decade, or 200,000 teachers a year. Estimates range as high as 2.5 million, which means that as many teachers are likely to be hired within the next ten years as are currently teaching today (Bradley, 1990).

Through the turn of the 21st century, the need for teachers will expand by approximately one-half of the current staffing in today's schools (Cresap, McCormick, & Paget, 1984). Presently, some school districts are unable to fill vacancies in impacted disciplines with qualified teachers (Cresap, McCormick, & Paget, 1984; Engel & Nall, 1984; National Governors' Association, 1986; Cetron & Gayle, 1991). The survey of school and university placement officials reported that 14 of 45 teaching fields suffered from "some shortage" of teachers, and "considerable shortage" in the areas of bilingual education, special education, physics, mathematics, computer science, Spanish, chemistry, and counseling (Bradley, 1990). Research indicates that attrition rates vary with subject specialization and by the age of the teachers when they enter the profession (Murnane, Singer, & Willett, 1988). The California Education Summit Final Report...
(1990) recommended that school systems expand teacher recruitment to target minority individuals, encourage mid-career entrance into teaching, and provide incentives to keep outstanding teachers in the profession. It is estimated that by 1995, at least 40 percent of the present 200,000 mathematics and science teachers (who are older on average than teachers in other subject areas due to heavy recruitment during the Sputnik era) will be retired (Cresap, McCormick, & Paget, 1984). The National Governors' Association (1986) estimated that by 1991, the demand for new teachers will be met with only a 68 percent supply. The Carnegie Forum (1986) estimated that between 1986 and 1992, the need for new teachers will exceed 1.3 million.

Current teacher employment studies indicate more veteran teachers leaving the profession than new teachers entering or re-entering it (Cresap, McCormick, & Paget, 1984; National Center for Education Statistics, 1990). A 1986 Metropolitan Life Survey (Harris & Associates, 1986) found 27 percent of teachers polled stated they would leave the field of education within the next five years. The RAND report (Darling-Hammond, 1984) showed a drastic change in the number of teachers who indicated they "would not teach again." The report showed an increase of 10 percent from 1970-71 to approximately 38 percent in 1980-81. In the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's *The Condition of Teaching* (1990), Boyer found that only 63 percent of 21,389 teachers surveyed
planned to teach until they retire. Fifteen percent of the 3,201 teachers surveyed in the Profile of Teachers in the U.S.-1990 (Feistritzer, 1990) stated they would be retired or employed in another occupation outside of education within the next five years. Additionally, 10 percent of the respondents indicated they would be employed in another occupation in education. Thus, 25 percent of teachers surveyed may not be teaching by 1995 (Feistritzer, 1990).

Teachers' qualifications

The public school systems are losing many of the finest beginning teachers within their first five years of teaching (Cramer, 1983a). And according to Darling-Hammond (1984) of the Rand Corporation, the most academically talented teachers leave at twice the rate of the less-qualified teachers. Although the national teacher turnover rate is consistently around 6 percent annually, turnover rates for the initial four years of teaching are estimated at 50 to 60 percent (Vance & Schlechty, 1982). Another study by Schlechty and Vance (1981), indicated that those students with the strongest academic backgrounds leave teaching for other pursuits in greater numbers than those with weaker backgrounds. Feistritzer (1990) found that only 72 percent of teachers hired since 1985 plan on teaching five years from 1990. The recruitment, retention, and promotion of academically able and talented individuals are fundamental goals of the
education reform movement. By limiting pay, incentives, and rewards for teacher growth, the present system discourages young people who respect their own talent from pursuing a teaching career (Hart & Murphy, 1986). Underlying the development of recent incentive plans is research that indicates college students and teachers with the best academic qualifications are no longer attracted to teaching or interested in making a career of it if they have entered the field (Koerner, 1963; Schlechty & Vance, 1981; Weaver, 1984; Murnane et al., 1988).

Dunwell (1986, p.1) finds

... the American public and American education appear to have arrived at some kind of agreement that the two most critical problems now facing teaching are: (1) the lack of teachers with quality educational backgrounds, and (2) the lack of career incentives sufficient to retain the most talented teachers.

Rosenholtz and Smylie (1984, p.158) present four points that illustrate the current decline in teacher candidates' academic qualifications:

(1) there is a relationship between teachers verbal ability and student achievement, (2) there has been a decline in the average salary of both beginning and experienced teachers as compared to other professions, (3) this decline in relative salaries has paralleled a decline in the verbal ability of teacher candidates and a dramatic decrease in the overall numbers of college students aspiring to teach and (4) persons who do not choose to teach often cite low salaries and low occupational status as their reasons.

Both teachers planning to leave teaching and those who actually do leave the profession are more academically able,
on the average, than teachers who want to stay in the profession (Rosenholtz & Smylie, 1984). Anderson and Mark (1985) delineate a cycle that hampers teacher recruitment; low pay drives talented teachers out of the profession and makes it difficult to attract high-quality people to teaching as a career and, thus, this leads to reduced performance in the school system. Subsequently, poor performance erodes public confidence which leads to reduced financial support and further reductions in teacher salary levels. The Rand report (Darling-Hammond, 1984) revealed that teachers with an academic major in their field of teaching were more dissatisfied than those who may lack a major in their field of teaching (in short, those teachers less qualified); the best qualified teachers are the most dissatisfied with the profession.

**Teachers' salaries**

Rousseau in *Emile* stated,

There are callings so noble that one cannot follow them for money without proving oneself unworthy of following them. Such is that of the man of war; such is that of the teacher (p. 47).

Rousseau's idealism certainly is admirable, and perhaps altruism or public service are bases for career choice. Yet, in such an important, performance-dependent profession as teaching is today, it is naive to believe that altruism should be a supplemental form of compensation.
Low pay is frequently cited by many college students who do not choose teaching as a career, and more than 25 percent of teachers indicated low salary as the single reason for leaving teaching (Duttweiler, 1986; Page & Page, 1982). Salaries for entry level teachers are not competitive with other employment opportunity markets (Perkins, 1984; Feistritzer, 1986). As a comparison, in 1987 the average starting salary for an accountant was $21,200; a computer specialist earned $26,170; an engineer began at $28,500; as compared to a teacher at $17,500 (Cetron & Gayle, 1991). Cetron and Gayle also found that in 40 of 50 states, a starting garbage collector still earns more than a starting teacher.

The public is overwhelmingly supportive of teacher salary increases and, likewise, feel increased salaries would improve the quality of education. Fifty percent of respondents think teaching salaries are too low, as compared to 33 percent in 1985. And 79 percent of those surveyed think higher teacher salaries would improve school quality (Gallup, 1990).

The Carnegie Forum in A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century (1986, p.35), recognized that "higher teacher pay is an absolute prerequisite to attracting, and keeping, the people we want in teaching." The crisis in recruiting teacher candidates and its relationship to salary is not new. Andrews (1987, p.53) quotes a report to the Committee on Education and Labor, by President John F. Kennedy (1963)
Improved research and teacher training are not enough if good teachers do not choose to teach. Yet present salary schedules in some cases are too low at the start to compete against other positions available to college graduates. In almost all cases, they are too low at the top to retain our ablest young teachers. Without sufficient incentive to make teaching a lifetime career, teachers with valuable training and experience, but heavy family responsibilities, too often become frustrated and drop out of the profession.

Only 51 percent of surveyed teachers said they were satisfied with their household income as compared to 69 percent of the general public in 1988 (National Center for Education Information, 1990). Schrag (1983, p.258) contends that rewarding excellence in teaching provides an incentive for good teachers to continue and for good prospects to enter the profession. She states, "any occupation in which merit is totally divorced from rewards will fail to attract or retain its fair share of creative, dedicated individuals."

There is a tendency for most salary increases to occur in the first third of the teacher's career, within ten to fifteen years, and thus by the time a teacher has reached the highest salary level and is perhaps at the peak of professional competence, there are limited possibilities for salary advancement (Schlechty & Vance, 1981). Thus, many experienced teachers are opting for second careers or retiring early, creating the inevitable teacher shortage (Carnegie Forum, 1986). Also, many teachers report taking second jobs in order to compensate for low salaries. Nationally, 11.1 percent of teachers indicate they were working at two jobs during the
school year; the average income is approximately $3,189 (Boyer, 1983). The Education Commission of the States (1983) found that 16.8 percent of all teachers and 22.4 percent of high school teachers reported working at outside jobs during the previous school year. Boyer (1983), in his 1982 survey of Texas high schools, found 29 percent of the teachers held additional jobs during the school year. Bobbitt (1989) of the National Center for Education Statistics found that 9.7 percent of teachers surveyed held down second jobs during the entire calendar year. Finally, Cetron and Gayle (1991, p.225) have predicted a trend for teachers' salaries.

Teachers' salaries will continue to be debated in the 1990s while research regarding the relationship of financial incentives to retention of qualified teachers continue. Teacher salaries will need to increase by as much as $10,000 per teacher if the profession is to be able to attract talented individuals with skills commensurate to other like professions.

In summary, John Goodlad in *A Place Called School* (1984, p.116) claims:

Talk of securing and maintaining a stable corps of understanding teachers is empty rhetoric unless serious efforts are made to study and remedy the conditions likely to drive out those already recruited.

A well-developed and manageable incentive plan can attract, motivate, and retain good teachers (Cresap, McCormick, & Paget, 1984). Cramer (1983a) sees merit as a measure for the public to attract and keep the good teachers in their schools.
Professionalization of Teaching

Until teaching becomes a more attractive profession, the problems of attracting and retaining talented teachers will undermine the success of other reforms intended to upgrade educational programs and curricula (Darling-Hammond, 1984). Educators need to embrace changes that will positively affect the perception of teaching as a profession.


Teaching as a profession is characterized by influence, efficacy, cooperation, collegiality, and the ability to work effectively without extensive supervision or direction (Chubb & Moe, 1990). Cetron and Gayle (1991, p.54) state "they claim
the right to police their own members as doctors and lawyers
do, yet reject the accountability that a true professionalism
carries with it." And "teachers demand to be treated and
trusted as professionals. . . yet they respond with old-
fashioned unionism. . . ." Yet Cetron and Gayle
optimistically predict that education will be respected as a
valuable and prestigious profession by the twenty-first
century.

At issue with many teachers are the status and salaries
associated with teaching as a profession. Sizer (1985)
contends that our culture signals respect for a profession in
three ways, two of which directly support teachers' concerns
for status and salary. He states that one aspect of
professionalism is the autonomy society gives professionals;
this is the trust to solve problems alone. Certainly teachers
experience this autonomy as evidenced by the privacy each has
within the confines of the classroom. Secondly, Sizer (1985,
p.186) believes that society signals respect with money. "We
pay people what we think they deserve." Thus, money is a
cultural expression of our priorities.

Teacher salaries and benefits need to be competitive with
other similar professions (Amundson, 1987). Education must
compete equitably with the medical, legal, scientific, and
business professions; to do this requires compensation
according to what the individual produces and their value to
the educational community (Shaten, 1983). The Rand report
(Darling-Hammond, 1984, p.16) reported that faculty salaries had decreased "15 percent in real dollars over the past decade" at a time when teaching salaries were already considerably below other occupations for which college degrees are necessary. College freshmen are not entering the education field because of poor salary and lack of public respect for the profession (Perkins, 1984; Amundson, 1987). The National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983, p.17) recommended in *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* that "Salaries for the teaching profession should be increased and should be professionally competitive, market-sensitive, and performance-based."

The inclusion of teachers under the protective umbrella of unionism has caused a shift in the eyes of the public from professional status to that of blue-collar-worker (Andrews, 1987). The standardization of faculty salaries under unionism has resulted in neither enhanced nor respectable salaries, and it has potentially diminished public confidence in the education systems. The single salary schedule plan tends to reward all the system's teachers minimally rather than rewarding less teachers with more relevant compensation as with other true professions (Shaten, 1983; Urban, 1985). Pritchard and Smarr (1983, p.38), tying the professionalization of teaching to a performance-based system, found that "73 percent of those polled agreed with the statement, 'Salaries for the teaching profession should be increased and
should be professional by competitive, market-sensitive, and performance-based." As reported in the Southern Regional Education Board Career Ladder Clearinghouse (Cornett, 1988, p.1), more than 80 percent of Americans favored "increased pay for teachers who prove themselves particularly capable." A dichotomizing factor between professional and non-professional occupations is that of compensation based on individual production. Shaten (1983, p.61) believes that as long as the teaching profession maintains a lock-step salary schedule based on longevity and credits, teachers will continue to equally share the tax dollar with other salary regimented civil service groups such as the police, fire and sanitation departments. And we will never receive the professional status, prestige, influence and compensation we desire.

In the comprehensive national survey of 21,389 teachers, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1990) found the teaching profession in need of image improvement; within the teaching ranks nearly 40 percent of teachers reported that if they had to do it over again, they would not become public school teachers. Additionally, within the context of professionalism, 44 percent agree that this is a poor time for any young person to enter the profession. "Improved" community respect for teachers, as perceived by teachers, showed a 10 percent drop from 24 percent in 1987 to 14 percent in 1990, with 30 percent of teachers feeling community respect had declined. Finally, Boyer's research showed that 91 percent of all teachers polled, ranked higher
salaries within the top four of proposed changes needed to improve teaching as a profession, with 55 percent of teachers indicating higher salaries as the most important change.

Over the past 20 years, teaching as a favored profession of parents for their children has dropped from 75 percent in 1969 to 45 percent in 1983 with a minor increase to 51 percent in 1990 (Gallup, 1990; Gallup, 1985). Harris (1986) found that teaching ranked a neutral sixth among 15 occupations believed to have prestige.

Andrews (1987, p.13) accurately summarizes the influential power of merit pay to the teaching profession.

The challenge of merit pay, while not in itself offering a panacea for education, may prove to be the catalyst to upgrade a struggling profession--teaching--to that of a status that recognizes it as the backbone of future American Democracy!

Evaluation System

The implementation of an incentive pay plan can be "a means to an end" by providing the philosophical foundation and operational processes for a total systems approach to personnel evaluation. The National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983, p.13) recommended, "Salary, promotion, tenure and retention decisions should be tied to an effective evaluation system. . . ." In an operational sense, a comprehensive incentive plan must be strongly integrated with the evaluation process (Flannelly & Palaich, 1985; Amundson, 1987). Andrews (1987, p.viii) stated, "excellence cannot be assumed without an effective evaluation system for the
faculty." Berman and Mulcahey (1985) found that personnel decisions must be based on performance and that public criticism is not on teachers' due process rights, rather on the minimal evaluation skills of evaluators and the lack of comprehensive evaluation procedures.

Teaching is highly complex work and should be recognized as such by performance appraisal systems (Darling-Hammond, 1984). Andrews and Marzano (1984) contend that teacher recognition must evolve out of a strong and objective evaluation system. The evaluation system and the procedures by which it is implemented is the key to a successful merit pay plan. Just as in industry, merit pay plans can effect changes and help school leaders stimulate instructional improvement (Brandt, 1990).

The administration of both the evaluation system and thus the incentive pay plan requires clearly defined criteria by which employees will be evaluated, an evaluation cycle that allows for teacher improvement, and a supportive staff development program to provide continued training and skills improvement (Manatt, Palmer, & Hidlebaugh, 1976; Cavanaugh & Yoder; 1984, Stufflebeam, 1988). Duke and Stiggins (1986, p.27) state:

Performance criteria define the dimensions of teacher performance to be evaluated. . . .attributes of sound performance criteria and standards vary as a function of purpose. . . .teachers have met minimum acceptable levels of performance for personnel management (accountability) reasons. . . .in terms of--uniformity for all teachers, legal defensibility as central to sound teaching.
To this end, researchers from the Research Institute for Studies in Education (RISE) at Iowa State University initiated a research project in which a consortium of five school organizations in the Midwest sought to develop a model for school improvement based upon the hypothesized relationships between administrator performance, teacher performance, student performance, and staff development opportunities. Thus, the School Improvement Model (SIM) project was originated. SIM successfully developed and tested an articulated approach to teacher performance appraisal (Manatt, 1987; Manatt, 1988). The study included staff development opportunities to improve both teaching methodologies and performance appraisal.

SIM's intent was to influence student achievement vis-à-vis school improvement by introducing a comprehensive, total-systems approach to teacher and administrator appraisal based on current effective schools and teaching methodology research. For SIM's purposes, school improvement was equated to "student outcomes" or, using McGreal's (1983) terminology, "product." Research findings were based upon "student outcomes" results of fourth and eighth grade student achievement on norm- and criterion-referenced mathematics and reading tests. The study concluded that an articulated teacher and administrator evaluation system can significantly influence student achievement (Manatt & Stow, 1986; Manatt & Holzman, 1990).
The SIM model emphasizes the "process" of the plan development as well as the functional performance appraisal system. Depending on the model used, typical performance evaluation is limited to the product of the evaluation, the instrumentation, and the resulting employment decisions. However, teacher performance evaluation (Manatt, 1986) articulates two major criteria: (1) the criteria for teacher performance (articulated productive teaching techniques), and (2) the operational procedures to monitor and report performance. SIM provides a model for the facilitation and development of the performance expectations, or criteria, and includes the evaluation cycle, due process considerations, and staff development opportunities to ensure consistent supervisors' appraisal and teacher support. Manatt and Petrone (1989) have elaborated upon the expected teacher behaviors and have developed a Teacher Performance Indicator Bridge. The Teacher Performance Indicator Bridge instrument expands the criterion and descriptors used to portray effective teaching and further describes expected, observable teacher and student behaviors, called indicators, normally exhibited when a teacher is "meeting" or "exceeding" the stated criterion.

Motivation

The strength of money and its role as a motivator for job performance has long been argued. Although many of the major
motivation theorists did not initially nor specifically address the potential influence of money as a motivator, their theories have explained the motivating role of money and the improvement of the quality of job performance. Today, monetary incentives are recognized as influencing employees (Cresap, McCormick, & Paget, 1984).

Maslow's (1954) theory of the hierarchy of human needs states that man's needs are delineated in an ascending priority and that lower-level needs must be satisfied prior to moving on toward satisfying higher-level needs. Money, viewed as an obvious job-related outcome, can be used to fulfill other needs such as food, shelter, security, social interactions, and esteem. Therefore, it can be argued that money is a vehicle that allows man to meet the initial human needs and thus can be considered a motivator. Money, however, is not considered a human need as it stands by itself (Lawler, 1971).

Herzberg's (1959) research provided the two-factor theory, satisfiers or motivators versus dissatisfiers or maintenance factors. His theory states that satisfiers contribute to job satisfaction and are associated with gratifying or motivating experiences. Satisfiers include recognition, achievement, and advancement. Dissatisfiers contribute to the job dissatisfaction. These include supervision, company policies, and working conditions. Herzberg found pay to be equally present in both contexts; pay
could be a dissatisfier when it was unfairly low, or as a satisfier when it was viewed as a form of recognition. Ironically, Herzberg classified pay as a dissatisfier, although many studies have provided mixed support for that theory (Lawler, 1971). However, Herzberg's two-factor theory clearly suggests that money can be instrumental in satisfying one's esteem and recognition needs. And insufficient pay is a primary source of dissatisfaction among teachers (Lortie, 1975).

Lawler (1971) in an impressive analysis of 49 studies on the importance of pay to employees found that the average rank of pay was third and that 27 percent of the studies found pay ranked first in importance among job factors. Similar studies of the importance teachers assign to pay as a motivator rank pay third or fourth (Rosenholtz & Smylie, 1984). Porter and Lawler (1975) reported that pay satisfaction will be related to performance only when pay is based upon the performance, and pay serves to motivate employees when the pay is closely tied to performance. Lawler found when pay is tied to performance the resulting effects indicate: pay is important; pay motivates; pay satisfaction is high; and absenteeism and turnover is centered on poor performance.

In relation to public education, Andrews and Marzano (1984, p.106) found the importance of recognition:

Average performance faculty people can control, weaken and destroy highly motivated faculty if the "group process" operates in an institutional climate that is void of a recognition process. However, an
institution that fosters the motivation of outstanding faculty efforts through formal recognition, merit, and public awareness of such efforts makes it difficult for the "average performance" persons to force regression back towards the mean. Recognition can thus be used to keep outstanding faculty out in a position of leadership. It can also provide the motivation for more faculty to try to move away from an average performance.

Vroom (1964) and Atkinson (1958) found that a number of factors within organizations could serve to motivate workers. Their findings suggested that pay, recognition, methods for monitoring performance, and providing feedback were potential motivators. Additionally, Vroom (1964) views money as acquiring an importance as a function of its perceived instrumentality for obtaining other desired outcomes. Hawley (1985) found that three generalizations could be made from these findings for merit pay plans: (1) merit pay can be a significant resource for school systems to motivate workers, (2) performance based pay plans can increase the processes through which employees are monitored and feedback given, and (3) depending on the implementation procedures, the nature of teacher autonomy and supervision could increase teachers' sense of efficacy. Monetary recognition is a tangible and visible form of reward for effective performance and is inherently motivating (Tecker, 1985). Incentive plans, in both business and industry are dependent on rational motivation theory (Lawler, 1971; Wilson, 1980). Business and industry contends that merit increases have the most leverage
in shaping employee behavior (Cresap, McCormick, & Paget, 1984). Studies conclude that extrinsic rewards such as money do affect teachers' attitude and performance (Frase, Hetzel, & Grant, 1982; Mitchell, Ortiz, & Mitchell, 1984).

Brandt (1990) views incentive plans as an intervention for the early burnout phenomenon experienced by many teachers. The problem is commonly known as plateauing. Structural plateauing occurs when promotion to a higher level is less likely or not available; content plateauing takes place when there is a loss of the sense of learning or job stimulation in one's present position. In both cases, Brandt concludes that incentive pay plans can offer significant opportunities to stimulate and advance teachers away from career stagnation.

Brandt also found in an extensive national survey of incentive plans that money was the number one reason for their participation in an incentive pay program. He states:

Obviously the extra money for individuals has to be substantial to have an effect. . . . $200 is not worth complicating an already complicated work life. . . . Even $2,000 to $3,000 obviously serves as a sufficient incentive for many. . . (p. 66)

At the onset of this current wave of incentive pay plans, a 1983 study of 47 districts indicated that an average of $1,064 was awarded (Educational Research Service, 1983). Citing current performance based pay plans, the approximate range of compensations awarded is from $1,000 to $4,000. The American Association of School Administrators recommend incentive awards to range between 5 percent and 20 percent.
(Tecker, 1985). The South Carolina Teacher Incentive Plan awarded between $2,000 and $3,000 annually. The Danville, Georgia plan compensates teachers between $2,500 to $4,000 (Cornett, 1988). In Round Valley, California the average merit compensation is $2,800 (Inman, 1985). And the Amphitheatre, Arizona plan provided for increases between $1,000 and $2,000 (Amsler et al., 1988). Brandt (1990) found that $2,000 to $3,000 provided significant incentive for Tennessee teachers.
CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The methodology of this study differs from that of a hypothesis-based research study. Its intent is to develop a comprehensive performance pay plan model that could serve as a turn-key plan for school districts to implement. The paradigm presented will be a merit pay plan developed to compensate teachers meeting an expected level of competence as articulated by the evaluation instruments and processes. This study will use a hypothetical school district, hereafter called Westonlee School District.

Plan Development

The development of a district’s incentive pay plan requires clear articulation of the goals and objectives of the plan. It must hold up to the rigors of the teachers’ union examination, be efficiently, consistently, and objectively administered, and provide teachers with a clear and simple appeals process (Tecker, 1985). Additionally, merit pay plans should:

- have effective evaluation procedures;
- have workable administrative procedures;
- have the commitment of the school board and the school administrative staff;
- involve the staff in developing the program;
- promote teacher satisfaction;
- have adequate financing;
- be available to all who qualify;
- have a plausible definition of superior performance;
- have valid and verifiable measures of results;
- apply assessment measures objectively and consistently;

and

- promote increased learning of pupils (Robinson, 1983).

Sibson (1974) finds similar characteristics required for merit pay programs in industry; they are applicable to education as well:

- the program should be structured to attract and retain the numbers and kinds of employees required by the business;
- the program should help maintain the company in a reasonably competitive position in its product market;
- the nature of the program and the associated administrative time costs must be reasonable and be in proportion to the other priorities and time demands on the company's financial resources;
- the plan must gain and maintain employee acceptance;
- the plan must play a positive role in motivating employees;
- the program must gain acceptance from the firm's "public" entities; and
- the plan must provide opportunities for employees at all
levels to achieve their reasonable aspirations in a framework of equity and impartiality.

Ultimately, incentive plans should provide a structured process for school districts to promote, grant tenure, and make rationale retention decisions while rewarding superior teachers (Education Commission of the States, 1983). When considering teacher evaluation and merit recognition, qualities a solid plan must possess are: teacher confidence with the system and strong commitment of the administration (Savage, 1983).

The background presented on performance-based pay justifies the examination of current evaluation models from which to develop an incentive pay plan. As previously mentioned, a merit pay plan must be linked to a solid teacher evaluation system that reflects the nature and intent of the plan. Thomas L. McGreal (1983), in a book he wrote entitled Successful Teacher Evaluation, proposes a taxonomy of teacher evaluation models. McGreal's taxonomy clearly identifies five models of teacher evaluation from which philosophies of evaluation and the procedural implementation of the systems can be classified. McGreal offers the five models: (1) Common Law; (2) Goal-setting; (3) Product; (4) Clinical Supervision; and (5) Artistic.

The pay for performance model presented in this study reflects the integrated use of three of McGreal's models. Petrone (1990) found two of these models to be used quite
extensively in schools nationally: goal-setting and clinical supervision. The third model, product, was found to be a limited style of evaluation; however, with the new emphasis on Mastery Learning and Outcome-based Education, the frequency of this model's use will likely increase (Lezotte, 1988; Spady, 1988; Guskey, 1990).

A succinct description of the relevant models of the taxonomy follows.

(1) Goal-setting: This model is characterized by the emphasis on an individualized approach to teacher evaluation leading to goals necessary for self-improvement. McGreal (1983, p.26) explains its' basic tenet as being "the focus should be on showing continual growth and improvement and continually doing things better." Goal-setting processes have been incorporated into many teacher evaluation systems in the form of performance improvement commitments, job improvement targets, and a host of other synonyms (Bolton, 1973; Redfern, 1980; Manatt, 1988). Goal-setting via job targets influence maximizing teacher commitment and help ensure a quality, productive evaluation system (Darling-Hammond, 1986). This model should be collaborative in nature and dependent upon teacher and supervisor conferring together to determine the goals (Hyman, 1975).

(2) Product: This model equates the teacher's performance to results of student achievement measured by criterion-referenced tests. It is far less dependent on
method, style, or process; rather, it emphasizes the productivity-ability for teachers to produce student learning. Millman (1981, p.146) advocates: "Using student achievement as a measure of teacher competence rests on the assumption that an important function of teaching is to enhance student learning." Product models are based on "student outcomes"; they are "input-output", product-oriented models (Hanushek, 1989). Feldvebel (1980, p.417) states, "since we cannot prove that any one method, style, or process of teaching is superior, all that we can do is go by results."

(3) Clinical supervision: This type of evaluation is based on a collegial and collaborative process of observing teacher performance. It requires two-way communication; there must exist an equality of responsibility on both the teacher's and supervisor's part (Sergiovanni, 1982). Cogan (1973, p.54) interprets clinical supervision as "the analysis of data and the relationships between teacher and supervisor form the basis of the program, procedures, and strategies designed to improve the students' learning by improving the teacher's classroom behavior." McGreal (1983, p.29) asserts:

Clinical Supervision assumes that most teachers—when supplied with adequate information and allowed to act on it—can analyze, interpret, and decide in a self-directed and constructive manner.

Although each clinical supervision system labels the steps differently, there is general agreement that this supervision process contains five common stages: (1) pre-
observation conference; (2) observation of teaching episode; (3) analysis of lesson data and strategy for post-observation conference; (4) post-observation conference; and (5) post-conference analysis (Goldhammer, 1969; Cogan, 1973; Acheson & Gall, 1980).

Because of the dynamic influence each of these models presents to the teaching/learning experience and assuming that each of these models does not necessarily have to exist in an "evaluative vacuum" by itself, it would be advantageous to develop a teacher evaluation system and, thus, a complementary merit pay plan, that could integrate as many of these models as appropriate. Gleaning the conceptual integrity from those relevant models and tying them to the current effective schools research will provide a solid foundation for a new teacher appraisal model from which to develop a viable performance-based pay plan.

During the formal process of developing a merit pay plan, consideration must be given to the planning process. As recommended by Cresap, McCormick, and Paget (1984) and presented in Figure 1, the planning process consists of six major steps: (1) establish a planning process; (2) determine objectives and criteria; (3) develop a plan; (4) determine cost; (5) develop implementation plan; and (6) approve and implement plan. This study will focus on step three, develop a plan, and step four, determine salary cost.
PLANNING PROCESS FLOWCHART

- Establish a Planning Process
  - Provide leadership
  - Plan participation
  - Develop decision-making process
- Determine Objectives and Criteria
  - Assess current situation
  - Determine criteria
- Develop a Plan
  - Select prototypes
  - Develop features
  - Assess obstacles
  - Reassess earlier decisions
- Determine Cost
  - Estimate costs and benefits
  - Reassess earlier decisions
- Develop Implementation Plan
  - Plan for phase-in
  - Management plan
  - Communications plan
  - Monitoring and assessment
  - Reassess earlier decisions
- Implement Plan

Figure 1. Steps followed for planning a Pay for Performance Plan

Pay for Performance Plan

As a point of departure for the construction of the merit pay plan model, the study will use an established and currently implemented Teacher Performance Evaluation (TPE) cycle from a School Improvement Model (SIM) projects school district, as discussed previously. This TPE system will provide the philosophical and operational foundation of the plan. It will incorporate the facilitating procedures and timelines representative of a typical SIM Teacher Evaluation Cycle and Procedures (Appendix A). The TPE system will also include the selected teacher performance criteria and evaluation standards represented in the aforementioned Teacher
Performance Indicator Bridge (Appendix B). Additionally, the plan will reflect the established district's Philosophy of Education (Appendix C), Philosophy of Instruction (Appendix D), and Philosophy of Evaluation (Appendix E).

Using the TPE system coupled with current effective school's research, sound pedagogy, and accepted motivation theory, variables will be determined that represent assessable and influential factors for evaluating teacher performance and student learning. The model presented will combine three elements from McGreal's (1983) Taxonomy of Teacher Evaluation Models: (1) Product models, (2) Clinical Supervision models, and (3) Goal-setting models. The "product" element aligns with the use of student mastery levels via criterion-referenced tests that will measure student outcomes. The Goal-setting factor emphasizes the use of job targets or professional growth plans collaboratively developed by the teacher and supervisor, and facilitates increased focus on specific areas of growth. The Clinical Supervision model's contribution is the systematic and collaborative process of observing teacher performance with targeted feedback and specific instruction for continued skill attainment. Thus, the elements from the Goal-setting and Clinical Supervision models will be integral factors for the procedural and teacher support components of the paradigm.

Algorithms will be developed that reflect the weight and scales for computation of each variable as a part of the
overall teacher evaluation rating. For each variable scored, specific elements will be mathematically defined and procedures will be delineated that will affect the teacher's rating. Additional parameters will also be determined such as teacher staff development activities and student mastery levels. Examples of teachers' and students' mastery scores will be presented to graphically display potential results.

Westonlee School District Pay for Performance Plan

The Westonlee School District Pay for Performance Plan was developed for the purpose of compensating professional educators for providing exemplary instruction to Westonlee School District students. The Pay for Performance Plan provides incentive for the teacher to grow professionally while sharing the common district goal: all children can learn and achieve their potential. To this end, the Pay for Performance Plan outlines a structured, multi-dimensional program that specifically addresses the interrelationships of three weighted strands: student achievement, student feedback, and the supervisor's rating.

Following School Improvement Model Project protocol, a Stakeholders' Committee was convened to develop the evaluation policies and procedures leading to the final development of the Pay for Performance Plan. As with all Stakeholders' Committees, 51 percent of the participants are current classroom teachers. This ensures teachers an active role in
the development of the complete evaluation system and it taps
the expertise garnered by these professionals. Careful
consideration was given to blending the district's philosophy
of evaluation, the processes and evaluation cycles, and
outcomes of the School Improvement Model Project and current
effective schools research into the Pay for Performance Plan.
The primary goal during the plan's development was to adhere
to the district's Stakeholders' Committee guidelines while
ensuring the appropriate weight and balance among the three
measured factors. It is understood that the Pay for
Performance Plan will stand by itself as a district
compensation program. Contracted salary schedules and
compensation ranges are separate and subject to the current
negotiation practices of the meet-and-confer agreement
process.

Paradigm overview

The paradigm relies on two main components: (1) the
Continuing Professional Growth Schedule, and (2) the
algorithms that ultimately provide a score derived from the
measurement of three specific teacher-influenced factors.

The first element, the algorithms, combine the
measurements of three separate factors: Supervisor's Rating,
Student Achievement, and Student Feedback. They provide one
overall computed score that represents the teacher's
performance; this score is the Teacher's Composite Score. The
initial comparable weight distribution for the three factors is: Supervisor's Rating weighted 3, Student Achievement assigned a weight of 2, and Student Feedback is given a weight of 1. As presented in Figure 2, the Supervisor's Rating is worth 50 points, the Student Achievement factor is worth 33 points, and the Student Feedback Report is valued at 17 points. The points earned for the three factors will be added together to produce the Teacher's Composite Score for which differentiated compensation will be awarded.

Figure 2. The three factors and values producing the Teacher's Composite Score

The second, the Continuing Professional Growth Schedule, is the keystone to the plan in that it requires both the district and each individual teacher to commit to an organized plan of professional growth. Based on the teacher's years of
experience, each teacher must fulfill specific requirements associated with classroom observations, evaluation, formal higher education training, and professional growth activities.

As presented in Figure 3, the plan begins with the teacher and administrator collaboratively developing the activities required for the Professional Activities Report portion of the Continuing Professional Growth Schedule. A Teacher Composite Score is derived from the results from the three areas of measurement: (1) Supervisor's Rating: a score based on summative evaluation report with input from peer coach, and must meet employee rules; (2) Student Achievement: a score representing the Student Mastery Level Percent based on the student's results from the district's criterion-referenced tests, and a score for the teacher's adjusted, average class size; and (3) Student Feedback Report: a score based on the district mean score results of the Student Feedback Report. Teacher's Composite Score ranges and the corresponding Compensation ranges will be predetermined. If an individual's Teacher's Composite Score is below the agreed upon district Teacher Composite Score range, the teacher will not receive merit pay and the administrator will review and provide specific input to the teacher through targets for improvement as part of the Continuing Professional Growth Schedule. If an individual's Teacher's Composite Score is above the district Teacher's Composite Score range, the teacher will receive merit compensation.
Figure 3. Steps followed for participation in the Pay for Performance Plan
Supervisor's Rating Factor

The Supervisor's Rating factor of the Pay for Performance Plan is comprised of one score worth a maximum of 50 points of the total Teacher's Compensation Score. The Supervisor's Rating factor is the total score from the teacher's summative evaluation report and follows the established district Teacher Performance Evaluation Cycle and Procedures (Appendix A).

Teachers will be evaluated against the standards delineated by the teacher performance areas, criteria, and descriptors, using the Behavioral Anchored Rating Scale (BARS) mode, as established by the Stakeholders' Committee. These performance standards are outlined on the teacher evaluation instruments, and the Behavioral Anchored Responses are further described by the Teacher Performance Indicator Bridge (Appendix B).

The Teacher Performance Indicator Bridge is an "effective teaching", research-based blueprint that ties teacher's performance and administrator's ratings to specific and observable, effective teaching behaviors. The Teacher Performance Indicator Bridge clearly describes the specific teacher behaviors that are representative of each teaching skill and hooks them to the levels of performance that "meets criterion" or "exceeds criterion." The Teacher Performance Indicator Bridge also delineates the expected student behaviors that will be observed when the teacher is demonstrating the "meets" or "exceeds" standards. Those areas
in which a teacher demonstrates skill levels meeting or exceeding the district standards will receive predetermined point values weighted for the specific criteria.

Peer Coaching

As a demonstrated element of professionalism, collegial feedback is integral to the continued growth of the professional teacher (Chrisco, 1989). Peer Coaching helps re-establish professional communication and dialogue. It allows teachers additional opportunities to rehearse the lesson through pre-conferencing. And Peer Coaching brings a professional, reflective aspect to teaching; peer coaches facilitate prompting questions that stimulate analytical thought about the teacher behaviors observed (Raney & Robbins, 1989; Chase & Wolfe, 1989). Additionally, it is important to collect data from many different sources to ensure a more accurate and objective assessment of the teacher performance (Manatt, 1986; Duke & Stiggins, 1986; Stufflebeam, 1988). To support this effort, a formal Peer Coaching program will be implemented to broaden the data collection effort. Peer coaches will observe teachers following the Clinical Supervision model of conferring twice each year. Prior to the appropriate administrator completing the Summative Evaluation Report, the peer coach may confer and share with the evaluating administrator his/her findings of the teacher's performance only upon request of the observed teacher. All
findings will have previously been discussed with the teacher as a part of the Peer Coaching process. Although the peer coaches' input is not quantitatively nor directly included in the Supervisor's Rating, it is a formal source of data for the administrator to consider when rating each of the performance criteria. During an appeal of a Teacher Composite Score or more specifically the Supervisor's Rating, the teacher may request the data collected by the peer coach to be submitted.

Criterion ranking and performance level weight

The Stakeholders' Committee will determine the performance criteria in the Westonlee School District Teacher Performance Evaluation instrument. The following are the criteria established by the Stakeholders' Committee:

I.A Demonstrates effective planning skills including time, materials, and resources.
I.B Implements the lesson plan.
I.C Motivates students.
I.D Communicates effectively with students.
I.E Provides students with specific evaluative feedback.
I.F Displays a thorough knowledge of curriculum and subject matter.
I.G Selects learning content congruent with the prescribed curriculum.
I.H Demonstrates accountability for success of students.
I.I Makes efficient use of time to ensure maximum learning.
I.J Sets high expectations for student achievement.
II.A Displays evidence of classroom organization.
II.B Adheres to high standards for student behavior.
II.C Organizes students for effective instruction.
III.A Demonstrates effective inter-personal relationships with others.
III.B Demonstrates awareness of the individual needs of students.
III.C Promotes positive self-concept.
III.D Demonstrates sensitivity in relating to students.
III.E Promotes self-discipline and responsibility.
IV.A Demonstrates employee responsibilities.
IV.B Demonstrates willingness to keep curriculum and instructional practices current.
IV.C Supports school regulations and policies.

Each Stakeholder will rank the criteria and a mean score for each criterion will be derived. A final ranking of the criteria will be established based on descending mean scores. The criteria are then clustered into three groups indicating the 80 percent, 70 percent, and 60 percent levels of distribution, respectively. These percents of levels of distribution are chosen based on the belief that they represent a quantitative measure of the philosophical importance the Stakeholders place on the criteria as it pertains to fulfilling teaching/teacher responsibilities.

Each criteria cluster is assigned a weight for each of the two evaluation rating categories of "meets" and "exceeds." Table 1 delineates the point distribution for each criterion that will be used when evaluating a teacher. The criteria are clustered in descending order, 80 percent, 70 percent, and 60 percent, respectively. This ranked clustering denotes the weight assigned to each criterion within the cluster and for each of the two performance levels.

The proportional rating weights between the "meets" and "exceeds" categories are based on an upper two-thirds, or 66.66 percent ratio representing a skewed point proportion, rather than a straight 50 percent or one-to-two proportion
(e.g., Criterion III.C promotes positive self-concept: "meets" = 2.133, "exceeds" = 3.2; 2.133 is 66.66 percent of 3.2). This proportion is used to illustrate the difference between the "meets" and "exceeds" categories but that the implied competence of the "exceeds" category is not twice that of the "meets" category. The 66.66 ratio distributes the influencing power of any one criterion less dramatically within each cluster. As illustrated in Table 1, adding the maximum points earned for all 18 criteria for the "meets" and "exceeds" standards, respectively, the point range for the Supervisor's Rating is 33.32 to 50, rather than a 25 to 50 range.

As with all SIM evaluation instruments, there will be performance levels delineating "needs improvement" and "does not meet criterion." The "needs improvement" performance level will not receive a score; such a score will have a neutral effect. However, the "does not meet criterion" performance level will receive a negative weight equal to the "meets criterion" value. As an example, a teacher receiving a "does not meet criterion" rating on Criterion 8, "Motivates students", would receive a -2.133. A teacher receiving more than the maximum three (3) "does not meet criterion" ratings, will not be eligible for Pay for Performance compensation.
Table 1. Point distribution for each criterion to be used when evaluating a teacher for the Supervisor's Rating factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>CRITERION</th>
<th>MEETS</th>
<th>EXCEEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 80 Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I.J Sets high expectations for student achievement.</td>
<td>2.133</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>III.C Promotes positive self-concept.</td>
<td>2.133</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I.I Makes efficient use of time to ensure maximum learning.</td>
<td>2.133</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I.F Displays a thorough knowledge of curriculum and subject matter.</td>
<td>2.133</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>III.B Demonstrates awareness of the individual needs of students.</td>
<td>2.133</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I.D Communicates effectively with students.</td>
<td>2.133</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I.G Selects learning content congruent with the prescribed curriculum.</td>
<td>2.133</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I.C Motivates students.</td>
<td>2.133</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>II.B Adheres to high standards for student behavior.</td>
<td>2.133</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>III.D Demonstrates sensitivity in relating to students.</td>
<td>2.133</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 70 Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I.E Provides students with specific evaluative feedback.</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I.H Demonstrates accountability for success of students.</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>III.E Promotes self-discipline and responsibility.</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I.A Demonstrates effective planning skills including time, materials, and resources.</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I.B Implements the lesson plan.</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 60 Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>II.A Displays evidence of classroom organization.</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>III.A Demonstrates effective interpersonal relationships with others.</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>II.C Organizes students for effective instruction.</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MAXIMUM TOTALS PER EVALUATION CATEGORY 33.32 50.00
Employee rules

For this plan, 18 of the 21 criteria are being used. The remaining three criteria are considered minimum employee rules and thus are not included in the computation of the Supervisor's Rating. Employee rules are those absolute requirements that are necessary for each employee to meet irrespective of his/her teaching performance. Employee rules reflect the organization's need to first have good employees who comply to the organization's mission, rules, regulations, and procedures. Not included on Table 1 are items IV.A, "Demonstrates employee responsibilities", IV.B, "Demonstrates willingness to keep curriculum and instructional practices current", and IV.C, "Supports school regulations and policies." Teachers must receive "meet" or "exceed" ratings on these employee rules to be eligible for Pay for Performance compensation.

Supervisor's Rating example computation

To demonstrate the computation of the Supervisor's Rating, Table 2 represents a teacher's results for each criterion. As determined in Table 1, the values assigned for "meets" and "exceeds" have been awarded, and to illustrate the "does not meet criterion" Criteria Number IIIB received a value of -2.133. By adding the values, the teacher would receive 38.13 points out of 50 possible for the Supervisor's Rating factor.
Table 2. Computation example for establishing a teacher's Supervisor's Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>CRITERION</th>
<th>CRITERION VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I.J</td>
<td>Sets high expectations for student achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>III.C</td>
<td>Promotes positive self-concept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I.I</td>
<td>Makes efficient use of time to ensure maximum learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I.F</td>
<td>Displays a thorough knowledge of curriculum and subject matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>III.B</td>
<td>Demonstrates awareness of the individual needs of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I.D</td>
<td>Communicates effectively with students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I.G</td>
<td>Selects learning content congruent with the prescribed curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I.C</td>
<td>Motivates students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>II.B</td>
<td>Adheres to high standards for student behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>III.D</td>
<td>Demonstrates sensitivity in relating to students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I.E</td>
<td>Provides students with specific evaluative feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I.H</td>
<td>Demonstrates accountability for success of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>III.E</td>
<td>Promotes self-discipline and responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I.A</td>
<td>Demonstrates effective planning skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I.B</td>
<td>Implements the lesson plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>II.A</td>
<td>Displays evidence of classroom organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>III.A</td>
<td>Demonstrates effective interpersonal relationships with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>II.C</td>
<td>Organizes students for effective instruction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TEACHER'S SUPERVISOR'S RATING 38.13
Student Achievement Factor

The Student Achievement factor of the Westonlee School District Pay for Performance Plan is comprised of two numeric indicators: Student Mastery Level Percent and Adjusted Average Class Size. The Student Achievement factor constitutes one-third, or 33 points, of the total Teacher's Composite Score. The weighing of the Student Mastery Level is 100 percent of the total Student Achievement factor. The Adjusted Average Class Size, if applicable, is added to the total Student Achievement factor. Thus, it is possible for a teacher to receive more than 33 points if his/her adjusted class size exceeds the district maximum and he/she receives the maximum Student Mastery Level points (e.g., 33 points + 1.5 points for three students above the district class size maximum, yields 34.5 points).

Student Mastery Level

Westonlee School District has developed a comprehensive battery of criterion-referenced tests that is directly aligned with the district's articulated curriculum. Each subject at each grade level (1-12) has a Criterion Referenced Test that will serve as the Student Achievement-Student Mastery Level testing instrument. Each test's item bank has been developed by the content and grade level specialists of Westonlee School District currently instructing in the tested areas. Test items have been validated and curriculum alignment verified
through exhaustive pilot testing and statistical analysis. Test reliability will be established as each test is administered throughout the test development cycle. After the initial pilot administration and through continued analysis, each successive year's test data will be added to the baseline data for the purpose of updating district norms and determining expected percent of mastery for each instrument/course.

A criterion-referenced pre-test and mastery test will be administered to all students for each class or discipline as per the district testing schedule. Student Mastery Level data will be ascertained for every student within every class that he/she is officially enrolled. Pre-test data will be used exclusively by the teacher for the purpose of establishing a baseline of student performance and diagnosis of student abilities for targeting more specific instruction, methodologies, and in-class grouping.

Student Mastery Level is the required percent of course objectives met by each student as demonstrated by the mastery test. Grade level, course content, grouping, type of course, and the established district norms will be considered in establishing the district's Student Mastery Level for each criterion-referenced test. By meeting the predetermined Student Mastery Level, students will have demonstrated their learning of core course objectives at the performance level determined by the district. Student Mastery Level for
identified Special Education students with Individual Education Plans (I.E.P.s), will be rated on the expected percent level of mastery of the mastery test as predicated on the specific learning goals determined at the time of establishing the I.E.P.

**Student Mastery Level Percent**

Student Mastery Level Percent is the percent of all the teacher's non-exempt students meeting the predetermined Student Mastery Level of the mastery test scores. (Exemption status is discussed in the Adjusted Average Class Size section.) A simple "GO-NO GO" system of analysis will be used for determining the number of students to be used in the computation establishing the "Number of Students Meeting Student Mastery Level" (Figure 4). Students meeting the district's Student Mastery Level will "go" and be added into the computation of the Student Achievement Factor, while students not meeting the criteria will "no go" and not be counted.

A Student Mastery Level Percent is calculated by taking the total number of a teacher's non-exempt students in all classes taught and dividing by the teacher's total number of students meeting the district's Student Mastery Level for all classes taught. There is an elementary and a secondary example in Figure 4. In the elementary teacher's example, 73 students out of a possible 96 students met the Student Mastery
Level Percent of 76. In the secondary teacher's example, 84 out of 108 students met the Student Mastery Level, thus resulting in a Student Mastery Level Percent of 78.

Formula:

\[
\frac{\text{TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS MEETING}}{\text{TOTAL NUMBER OF NON-MASTERY LEVEL}} / \frac{\text{TOTAL NUMBER OF NON-EXEMPT STUDENTS}}
\]

Example Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
<th># of Students Meeting Mastery Level</th>
<th>Non-exempt Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculation Example:

\[
\frac{73}{96} = .76 = 76\% \text{ Student Mastery Level Percent}
\]

Example Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
<th># of Students Meeting Mastery Level</th>
<th>Non-exempt Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
<td><strong>108</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculation Example:

\[
\frac{84}{108} = .78 = 78\% \text{ Student Mastery Level Percent}
\]

Figure 4. Student Mastery Level Percent formula and example computation
Student Achievement point value computation

The district will determine the level of expected student mastery. For the purpose of this study, assume the district has set an expected Student Mastery Level Percent of 80 percent. Curricularly this percent represents the mastery of 80 percent of the course objectives; operationally it represents the required passing score on the criterion-referenced mastery test. The calculation of the point distribution for the Student Achievement Factor will be made against a predetermined Student Mastery Level Percent range of 20 (100 percent the high, 80 percent the low). Likewise, a predetermined range of points of 23 (33 the high, 10 the low) will be equally distributed against the Student Mastery Level range of 20; thus, 100 percent will be assigned 33 points and 80 percent will be assigned 10 points.

Student Achievement point value formula

In Figure 5, the simple calculation of dividing the point range of 23 by the Student Mastery Level Percent Range of 20 will produce the point value constant of 1.15 (A). It is awarded to every composite percentage point above the predetermined baseline percent of 80 percent.
Formula:

POINTS RANGE / STUDENT MASTERY LEVEL PERCENT RANGE = A

Calculation Example:

\[ \frac{23}{20} = 1.15 \]

Figure 5. Formula for determining the point value assigned for each percentage point above the pre-determined Mastery Level of 80 percent

**Student Achievement Factor formula**

As illustrated in Figure 6, a teacher with a Student Mastery Level Percent of 85 would be awarded 15.75 points out of a possible 33 points for the Student Achievement factor.

This is derived by multiplying the established constant of 1.15 by the difference of the teacher's Student Mastery Level Percent and the baseline percent, and adding the product to the baseline points.

**Formula:**

\[ \text{INDIVIDUAL TEACHER'S} \]
\[ (A)(\text{STUDENT MASTERY LEVEL PERCENT-BASELINE PERCENT}) + \text{BASELINE POINTS} \]

**Example Data:**

Individual Teacher's Student Mastery Level Percent = 85

Calculation Example:

\[ [(1.15)(85-80)] + 10 = [(1.15)(5)] + 10 = 5.75 + 10 = 15.75 \]

Figure 6. Formula and computations determining the points earned for an example Student Mastery Level Percent of 85 percent
Table 3 provides an example summary of random point values demonstrating the computation of the Student Mastery Level Percents.

Table 3. An example of a summary table of point values for random Student Mastery Level Percents of 80, 84, 92, 97, and 100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT MASTERY LEVEL PERCENT</th>
<th>POINT VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>29.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>23.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>14.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted Average Class Size

The Adjusted Average Class Size factor will be calculated as a part of the Student Achievement factor. However, a resultant numeric value will be used only if the Adjusted Average Class Size exceeds the district determined class size maximum established by district policy and practices. Additional attention will be given classes that ordinarily have more or less students such as band, choir, physical education, industrial arts, and home economics. The predetermined maximum class size for this study's examples will be 28 students. Since the Student Mastery Level factor is worth the maximum value of the Student Achievement factor of 33 points, an Adjusted Average Class Size value will be added to the Student Mastery Level factor when applicable.
The Adjusted Average Class Size will be determined for each teacher. The Adjusted Average Class Size is an average across an individual teacher's class enrollments; adjustments are made by assigning a predetermined value to each student dependent upon the student's academic placement. Table 4 delineates the weight assigned for each student category. The variable weights represent an estimated quantitative value associated with the additional classroom and extracurricular time required to meet the specific behavioral and academic needs of the identified students (e.g., preparing specialized materials, re-teaching and/or individualizing instruction, conferring with parents, etc.).

Table 4. Weight indicator assigned for each category of student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>WEIGHT INDICATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Education</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted and Talented</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Learning Disabled</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentally Retarded</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriously Emotionally Disturbed</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech/Language Impaired</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually Impaired</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impaired</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedically Impaired</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Health Impaired</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adjusted Average Class Size computation

The Adjusted Average Class Size will be calculated for each teacher. It is computed by first assigning each student a weighted indicator appropriate for his/her educational status as per an Individual Education Plan, district program, or regular education placement. Care must be taken to insure student confidentiality. A student can only be assigned one weighted indicator per class/subject matter; the category with the largest weight will be assigned. For example, if a student is both Hearing Impaired (2.0) and Seriously Emotionally Disturbed (3.5), the student would receive the weight of 3.5. Also, if a student in a self-contained classroom is Specific Learning Disabled for math, his/her weight will be adjusted for that math class only; he/she will be assigned other weighted indicators as appropriate for his/her other subject matters with the same teacher.

The teacher's Adjusted Average Class Size (Figure 7) will be computed by adding all the students' weights for all of a teacher's classes (adjusted class size) and dividing by the number of classes/subject matters the teacher instructs. If the Adjusted Average Class Size exceeds the district's ceiling of 28, a factor of .05 will be multiplied to the difference between the teacher's Adjusted Average Class Size and the district ceiling of 28. This product will then be added to the teacher's Student Achievement Score.
In Figure 7, the teacher with these two classes has an Adjusted Average Class Size of 5.5. Since 5.5 is below the district average of 28, the teacher would not receive any extra points to be added to his/her Student Achievement score.

**Formula:**

\[
\frac{\text{SUM OF STUDENTS' WEIGHTS}}{\# \text{ OF TEACHER'S FOR ALL CLASSES}} / \# \text{ OF TEACHER'S CLASSES}
\]

**Example Data (abbreviated example for two classes):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>WEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH 11</td>
<td>John B. regular education</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary T. visually impaired</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sue S. regular education</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tom F. specific learning disabled</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH 9</td>
<td>Fred S. Chapter 1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alice B. regular education</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jane H. Chapter 1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joe P. regular education</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted Class Size: 11.0

Calculation Example:

\[
11.0 / 2 = 5.5
\]

**Figure 7.** Formula and computation of the Adjusted Average Class Size

In Figure 8, the Teacher's Adjusted Average Class Size is 34, six students over the district maximum. Thus, the teacher would receive an additional 3 points added to his/her Student Achievement Score for an adjusted total Student Achievement Score of 30.
**Formula:**

Teacher's 
(Adjusted Average - District Maximum) (.05) = B 
Class Size Average Class Size

**Example Data:**

Teacher's Adjusted Average Class Size = 34 
District Maximum Average Class Size = 28

Calculation Example:

\[(34 - 28) \times 0.05 = 6 \times 0.05 = 3\]

Figure 8. Example of Adjusted Average Class Size over the 
district predetermined maximum level

**Exemptions to the Student Achievement Score Calculations**

Predictably during the school year, students move between 
different academic and/or behavioral classifications. 
Likewise, a student may be placed in an inappropriate class: 
a student may be placed in a class by his/her parents or 
guardians against school district recommendations, or a 
student may become eligible for Special Education placement.

**Student Placement**

To guard against any inappropriate placement affecting a 
teacher's Student Achievement Score, a Student Placement 
Review Team will be established for each school site. The 
Student Placement Review Team will consist of a school site 
administrator, school district psychologist, special education 
teacher, regular education teacher, and the student's 
counselor.
Since the teacher will be monitoring all students' progress, if a behavioral or academic problem arises, it is the responsibility of the teacher to initiate appropriate intervention strategies for the student. At such time as classroom strategies prove to be ineffective, the teacher may request a Student Placement Review Team meeting. The Student Placement Review Team will ensure proper and immediate review of a student placement upon the request from a teacher. The Student Placement Review Team will conduct a meeting in which the initiating teacher will present the documentation substantiating the concerns of the inappropriate placement and the intervention strategies attempted. In cases where a student is experiencing difficulties in more than one class, all the effected teachers will present appropriate data concerning the student's progress.

As a result of the Student Placement Review Team meeting, if a student is referred to a Special Education placement, the student will be assigned the corresponding weighted indicator, thus adjusting the class size formula. Likewise, the student's Individualized Education Plan will supersede the original district's Student Mastery Level Criteria.

If the student is not placed in another weighted category, the Student Placement Review Team will recommend additional strategies to be implemented to help the student learn the course objectives. If the student continues to experience difficulties, the teacher must request a second
Student Placement Review Team meeting; if the Student Placement Review Team finds the teacher has exhausted his/her efforts in providing appropriate interventions, it will designate the student as "exempt." The exempt status eliminates the use of the student's test scores, thus excluding the student from the computation of the teacher's Student Mastery Level Score.

**Student attendance**

Assuming students are placed in the appropriate academic and/or skill level classes, the attendance rate of students is directly related to the potential level of content mastery. The district will predetermine a student attendance rate that will indicate at what point students will be excluded from the teachers' Student Mastery Level Scores. For this study, a student attendance rate of 90 percent will be used. A student in attendance for each class for a minimum of 162 days (90 percent of the average 180 day school year is 162; this number of days would be halved for semester classes), as verified by official school attendance records, will be designated as non-exempt. The non-exempt status will result in the inclusion of the student's test scores in the computation of the teacher's/s' Student Mastery Level Score. An exemption will apply to all home study placements and pre-arranged educational leaves.
Transferred students

Any student transferring into a class or school 20 school days after the beginning of the class will be designated as exempt. Students leaving a class before the mastery test has been administered will be designated as exempt. The transfer student exemption status will result in the exclusion of the student's test score from the calculation of the teacher's/s' Student Mastery Level Score.

Other considerations

The Westonlee School District Stakeholders' Committee outlined a number of parameters to be included in the development of the weighing of the Student Achievement factor. The constraints included heterogeneous versus homogeneous grouping, age level, elective versus required course, and type of student enrolled in the course.

The educational effects from these perceived constraints will be dissipated as a function of the testing process and the student weighing. Each criterion referenced test is designed to reflect the age level, reading level, and comprehension level of that student population. Likewise, the type of course, elective versus required, will not alter the performance on a course specific test. Additionally, if these factors would in any way consistently affect test performance, it would be so indicated on the initial administrations of the
test, from which the district norms and Student Mastery Level Criteria will be established.

The type of students and the heterogeneous or homogeneous groupings are accounted for in the weighing of the Adjusted Average Class Size factor. Additional weight is added to identified students requiring greater teacher effort and instruction attention.

Constraints Report

Extenuating circumstances may arise when considering Student Achievement. To protect against any unforeseen situation impacting a teacher's Student Achievement results, a Constraints Report will be available. A teacher who does not qualify for Pay for Performance compensation due to a low Student Achievement Score may submit a Constraints Report. The Constraints Report will provide the teacher with a vehicle to describe and explain the reasons for the Student Achievement results and rationale for consideration for adjusting the Teacher's Student Achievement Score.

The Constraints Report will be initiated by the teacher and submitted to the site administrator by April 15. The site administrator will review and render a decision within five working days upon receipt of the report. If the teacher is not satisfied with the findings of the site administrator, the teacher may appeal to the Pay for Performance Review Team. The teacher has ten working days from the receipt of the
administrator's decision to file the Constraints Report's appeal to the Pay for Performance Review Team.

Student Feedback Report Factor

The Student Feedback Report factor of the Westonlee School District Pay for Performance Plan will consist entirely of the Westonlee School District Student Feedback to Teachers Questionnaire (Appendix F). The instrument was developed for its use in providing teachers with current and specific feedback from their students on teaching practices, classroom discipline and teacher/student interaction.

Four separate questionnaires are used: lower elementary (K-2), upper elementary (3-6), middle school (6-8), and the senior high school (9-12). The instruments focus on areas of teaching that specifically represent the nature and style of instruction and student learning suitable for each level. Each instrument has been written to reflect the appropriate reading, vocabulary, and comprehension level. Response modes are, likewise, appropriate for the target level. Questionnaire items were selected from an item bank which have been researched for reliability and discrimination power (Judkins, 1986).

For the purpose of rating consistency, only the items appearing across all four of the instruments will be used. These nine items are selected as district-wide items which cover the topics of motivation, fairness, teacher preparation,
presenting, caring, and summarizing. Since tabulation of the results for the Pay for Performance Plan will use only these identified items, individual teacher or department items will not be included in the Pay for Performance Plan analysis since they have not been researched for reliability or discriminating power.

The questionnaire response mode assigns a one (1) for the highest response and a five (5) for the lowest response. The response mode will need to be reversed, five (5) highest response and one (1) lowest response, for this study's calculation and formula purposes.

Administration of the Student Feedback to Teacher Questionnaire will follow district policies. Questionnaire responses from the primary grades will be transferred to computer scan sheets while the upper elementary, middle, and high school will respond directly onto scan sheets. The questionnaires will be machine scored and tabulated by a non-certificated and confidential employee. Resultant mean scores will be forwarded for further tabulation and inclusion within the overall Teacher's Composite Pay for Performance Score formula. All questionnaires will be returned to the individual teacher for further personal analysis.

**Student Feedback Report Factor computation**

The Student Feedback Report constitutes one-sixth, or 17 points, of the total Teacher's Composite Score. The
calculation of the point distribution (Figure 9) will be made against a district-wide mean score determined annually. The predetermined range of points of 10 (17 the high, 7 the low) will be distributed equally along the upper half of the score's continuum starting with the baseline of 7 being assigned to the district mean score and ending with 17 assigned to a score of 45 (100 percent of a possible score of 45 points). As illustrated in Figure 9, by dividing the range by the difference between the top possible score of 45 and the district mean score, the resultant is a point value constant of .67. It is awarded to every score point above the calculated district mean.

**Formula:**

\[
\text{RANGE} \div (45 - \text{DISTRICT MEAN}) = C
\]

**Example Data:**

District Mean = 30

**Calculation Example:**

\[
(17 - 7) \div (45 - 30) = 10 \div 15 = .67
\]

Figure 9. Formula and computation for determining the point value to be assigned for each percentage point scored above the district mean.

As presented in Figure 10, by multiplying the derived constant of .67 by the difference between the teacher's individual score and the district mean and adding this product to the baseline point value, an individual scoring 35 would be awarded 10.35 points out of a possible 17 points for the Student Feedback Report factor.
**Formula:**

\[(C)(\text{INDIVIDUAL SCORE-DISTRICT MEAN}) + \text{BASELINE POINT VALUE}\]

**Example Data:**

- District Mean = 30
- Individual Score = 35
- Baseline Point Value = 7

**Calculation Example:**

\[
[(.67)(35 - 30)] + 7 = [(0.67)(5)] + 7 = 3.35 + 7 = 10.35
\]

**Figure 10.** Formula and example computation for determining the point value earned for the Student Feedback Report factor

Additional scores and point values are presented in summary Table 5. The table illustrates the point values associated with the high and low scores.

**Continuing Professional Growth Schedule**

The keystone of the Westonlee School District Pay for Performance Plan is the Continuing Professional Growth Schedule (Table 6). The Continuing Professional Growth Schedule is the conceptual matrix representing teacher professional growth attained as they gain experience and progress through the schedule. The Continuing Professional Growth Schedule serves two purposes: (1) as an outline of eligibility criteria associated with the differentiated compensation ranges, and (2) as a model representing the professional activities teachers engage in during a career as a teacher. Westonlee School District regards teachers as the
integral asset in providing quality education to the students the district serves. The Continuing Professional Growth Schedule reflects the Stakeholders' Committee and Board of Education's belief that teaching, as with all true professions, requires continual professional development, and thus, should be compensated accordingly.

The Continuing Professional Growth Schedule outlines a number of criteria that teachers must fulfill to earn pay for performance compensation. The areas include: Years of Experience; Formal Observations per year; Unannounced Observations per year; Semester Graduate Hours or Advanced Degree; Professional Activities Report; and Teacher's Composite Score Range. A teacher must meet or exceed each criterion for Pay for Performance eligibility.
Table 6. An example of the Continuing Professional Growth Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>1-3 years</th>
<th>4-6 years</th>
<th>7-9 years</th>
<th>10+ years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal Observations per Year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unannounced Observations per Year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester Graduate Hours or Advanced Degree</td>
<td>2 per year; Total of 6 by 3rd year</td>
<td>2 per year; Total of 12 by 6th year</td>
<td>2 per year; Total of 18 by 9th year</td>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Activities Report</td>
<td>1st year: 1; 2nd year: 2; 3rd year: 3</td>
<td>3 per year</td>
<td>3 per year for 2 of 3 years; peer coaching and 1 activity the remaining year</td>
<td>3 per year, or 2 and peer coaching or mentor teacher project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's Composite Score Range</td>
<td>70-100</td>
<td>75-100</td>
<td>80-100</td>
<td>85-100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Years of Experience"

Each compensation range is associated with a range of "Years of Experience." The ranges of "Years of Experience" are: one to three years, four to six years, seven to nine years, and ten or more years. The district will place all new teachers without teaching experience in the first year range. The district will award credit for new teachers with previous teaching experience after the successful completion of a probationary year. A teacher successfully completes a probationary year by meeting or exceeding all the Continuing Professional Growth Schedule criteria for the one to three "Years of Experience" range. At that time, the teacher will receive the compensation appropriate for that range and his/her Teacher's Composite Score. The teacher can then
proceed to the "Years of Experience" range appropriate for the teacher's total years of teaching experience.

**Formal observations/Teacher Performance Evaluation**

All participants will be formally observed twice every year. The Continued Professional Growth Schedule observations can simultaneously fulfill the required observations for those teachers on the Teacher Performance Evaluation Cycle and where temporary or probationary teachers are required to be observed more frequently, as per the teacher contract and state mandates.

Compliance to the Westonlee School District Teacher Performance Evaluation process will be maintained for the Continued Professional Growth Schedule. All observations will be conducted by trained district-certified administrators. A mutually determined schedule for pre-observation conference, observation, and post-observation conference will constitute a completed observation cycle. Data gathered from the observations will: (1) be used to reinforce the teacher for instructional strengths, (2) provide guidance and instructional modeling for areas in need of strengthening, and (3) be used as an information base for evaluation.

**Unannounced observations**

Unannounced classroom observations will also be used as a source for evaluative data collecting. The Continued
Professional Growth Schedule requires two unannounced observations per year. Unannounced observations can be considered unannounced walk-through observations focused on any aspect of the teaching experience, classroom management, or other teacher related responsibilities. Formal post-conferencing is not required, but some form of professional feedback is encouraged.

**Graduate hours/advanced degrees**

True professions encourage the continued pursuit of academic training, professional growth, and new trends; teaching is no exception. The Continued Professional Growth Schedule outlines a differentiated scale for the graduate hour requirements associated with the "Years of Experience" ranges. Guidelines for approval of courses will follow the current district policy. All approved courses will be directly related to instructional methodology, curriculum development, management systems, the teacher's specific area of instruction, and/or a part of a formal graduate education degree program. Every course will require pre-approval for admittance toward the Continued Professional Growth Schedule requirement. The site administrator will be responsible for approving course selections.
Professional Activities Report

The Professional Activities Report is the focus of the Continued Professional Growth Schedule and is intended to extend the professional growth of the educator. A teacher will participate in a specified number of approved activities depending upon his/her "Years of Experience" range. All activities will be pre-approved by the site administrator. In the case of an activity that may require involvement or support from another source outside of the school site, the appropriate district office administrator will confer with the teacher and administrator prior to approval (e.g., a teacher developing district curriculum units will work directly with the responsible district office level administrator).

Activities will directly relate to curriculum development, instructional methodologies, management systems, student programs or activities, staff development activities, or at-risk student programs. Other specific areas of teacher interest or school district need may warrant other activities; proposals will address the educational benefit, purpose, cost, specific goals and objectives to be met, procedures for implementation, and evaluation standards.

Teachers in the 7-9 "Years of Experience" range will participate as Peer Coaches during at least one of the three years. The district implementation of a Peer Coaching program will provide additional instructional leadership and a
supportive staff development program by utilizing experienced and successful teachers as peer coaches.

A list of example activities follows:

1. Successfully complete an inservice course conducted by the Westonlee School District or other educational agency.

2. Plan, coordinate, or conduct an approved pilot study or project.

3. Attend a district approved instructional conference and presentation inservice to appropriate district staff.

4. Prepare and publish an article of academic nature in a professional educator's journal.

5. Successfully complete re-certification procedures by National Teacher Examination in a field not currently certified.

6. Serve as a non-remunerated sponsor of a student club, organization, forensic, or athletic activity.

7. Regularly assist in planning/conducting approved school or district-wide student activities or programs.

8. Prepare and demonstrate/present an exemplary unit of study for district teachers' use (i.e., 4th grade science unit).

9. Create and demonstrate/present an exemplary management system for district teachers' use (i.e., computer assisted grading).

10. Create and/or gather and catalog with district librarian, supplementary curricular materials.

11. Develop school/district handbook, manual, or brochure.

12. Develop and implement a major unit of instruction that employees articulated academic goals and objectives and innovative teacher behaviors which represent a higher level of teaching skills extending the participating teacher's instructional expertise.

13. Demonstrate an exemplary cooperative effort by sharing materials/methods with other designated teachers in an organized and documented Cooperative Teacher Group.
14. Serve as a member of a district-wide study, curriculum, or planning committee.

15. Serve as a member of a special problems or curriculum development workshop.

16. Serve in a leadership capacity in planning and/or conducting one or more inservice programs.

17. Serve as a member of a school self-study committee or as a chairman of one of its subcommittees.

18. Serve in a leadership capacity in a district, state, or national professional teacher organization directly related to the teacher's assignment.


20. Serve as a cooperating teacher for university placed student teachers.

21. Serve as a department, curriculum, or grade level chairperson.

NOTE: The activities and services are not limited to the aforementioned. Other professional involvement or instructional activities shall be considered on the basis of their direct value to the students, staff, schools, the school district, and/or the education profession.

Teacher's Composite Score

To qualify for Pay for Performance compensation, participants will need to meet or exceed a predetermined score for the Teacher's Composite Score. Each "Years of Experience" range will require a different score increasing as the "Years of Experience" increase, justified by the expectation of increased teacher expertise in the many facets of the professional teacher (not limited to the teaching episode exclusively).
As presented in Figure 11, the Teacher's Composite Score is the sum of the three weighted factors: Supervisor's Rating, Student Achievement, and Student Feedback Report. As computed, the Teacher's Composite Score is 70.03.

**Formula:**

\[
\text{Teacher's Composite Score} = \text{Supervisor's Rating Score} + \text{Student Achievement Score} + \text{Student Feedback Score}
\]

**Example Data:**

- Supervisor's Rating Score = 38.13
- Student Achievement Score = 21.55
- Student Feedback Score = 10.35

**Calculation Example:**

\[
38.13 + 21.55 + 10.35 = 70.03
\]

Figure 11. Formula and example computation of the Teacher's Composite Score

**Other Procedural Considerations**

The Pay for Performance Plan provides teachers with due process. In addition to built-in due process, addressed in the Teacher Performance Evaluation Procedures, the Pay for Performance Plan establishes procedures to guarantee the review of the outcomes derived from the factor data.

**Pay for Performance Review Team**

A Pay for Performance Review Team will be established to review and take action on teacher concerns and appeals. The Pay for Performance Review Team will be a district advisory
committee with the superintendent having final decision-making responsibility. The Review Team will consist of five (5) teachers and three (3) administrators. Three teachers and the administrators will represent each level; a teacher and administrator per elementary, junior high, and senior high school levels. The two remaining teachers will be at-large representatives. It is recommended that one of the at-large teachers currently teach at the same level as the teacher making the appeal, but he/she should not teach at the same school. Thus, a pool of teachers will be established for the at-large positions and the teachers will rotate through this assignment.

Appointments to the Pay for Performance Review Team will be made by the Board of Education based upon recommendations from the superintendent for administrators, and the teachers' union for the teacher representatives. Term of appointment, and committee logistics will be consistent with district policies and past practices, and determined by the Stakeholders' Committee.

Appeals process

An appeals process is guaranteed within the Pay for Performance Plan. Its sole purpose is to provide a teacher with internal due process; a means to insure consistent application and administration of the Pay for Performance Plan. To this end, the Pay for Performance Plan's appeals
process is a systematic and timely review of the teacher's concerns. A teacher does not relinquish any of his/her legal rights or responsibilities when pursuing a review of his/her concerns.

Two areas of appeal specifically outlined in the Pay for Performance Plan are the teacher's supervisor's evaluation and the approval of the teacher's Continuing Professional Growth Schedule. However, the appeals process is not limited to these areas; any concerns regarding procedure, implementation, and/or rating may be appealed.

A teacher completing the Pay for Performance process who wishes to appeal the summative evaluation, Professional Activities Report, or final Teacher's Composite Score, may, within five (5) working days of the receipt of his/her evaluation, request a review of the evaluation with the principal. The review conference will be scheduled within five (5) working days from the receipt of the request. If the teacher is not satisfied with the review results, the teacher may, within five (5) working days of the review conference, submit a written appeal to the superintendent requesting a Pay for Performance Review Team hearing. The appeal is forwarded to the Pay for Performance Review Team. Within twenty (20) working days, the Pay for Performance Review Team will review the appeal, a decision will be rendered and forwarded to the superintendent for the final decision.
The teacher can request either an informal review of the appeal in which just the documentation is reviewed, or he/she may request a formal hearing in which he/she presents the appeal and documentation. The presentation will be limited to the teacher only; witnesses, cross-examination, and/or legal representation is not permitted. The decision of the superintendent is final.

A teacher who is dissatisfied with the decision pursuant to this appeals process may submit a brief, concise written statement rebutting or objecting to said decision; the statement shall become a part of the teacher's permanent employment file.

Participation

Beginning in the 1990-1991 school year, all teachers will participate in the Westonlee School District Pay for Performance Program. It is expected that the range of compensations and the opportunities for professional growth will provide incentives for experienced teachers to assume leadership roles.

Application process

The application process will consist of the Pay for Performance application form submitted by the end of the last week of September of the current school year. The Pay for Performance application will closely follow the format
represented by the Continuing Professional Growth Schedule. The Professional Activities Report will be included in the application; teachers will indicate the objectives, timelines, rationale, evaluation processes, and other pertinent information for their proposed professional activities.

A designated site administrator and the teacher will review the application during the first two weeks of October. If a teacher's professional activity requires approval prior to the review deadline (e.g., conference registration), it is the teacher's responsibility to schedule and meet with the administrator within the activity's timeline, to ascertain appropriate activity approval for that particular activity; the Continuing Professional Growth Schedule can be reviewed later within the October timeline. Final approval and/or modification will be the responsibility of the administrator.

If agreement cannot be reached, the teacher may appeal the decision to the Pay for Performance Review Team within five working days upon receipt of the application denial. All effort will be made to collaboratively reach consensus on proposed Professional Activities Reports. It is understood that in some cases, student needs, breadth of educational value, district needs, and district ability to provide resources will dictate restricted implementation of proposed activities. Prudent administrative practices and district policies will provide guidelines for balanced and equitable Professional Activities approval.
Movement across Continuing Professional Growth Schedule

A teacher with the appropriate "Years of Experience" who successfully completes the required criteria outlined in the Continuing Professional Growth Schedule and who meets the minimum district percent for the Teacher's Composite Score may progress to the next "Years of Experience" level. The application process is the same for all participants.

A teacher not maintaining or improving upon his/her performance will return to the previous "Years of Experience" level and not be eligible for compensation. An administrative review will take place to determine appropriate professional growth activities for successful completion of the newly assigned level.

Leave of absence/sabbatical

A teacher taking a district approved leave of absence will maintain his/her status upon return to a classroom assignment. A teacher taking a sabbatical leave will maintain his/her Pay for Performance Plan status upon returning to a classroom assignment unless he/she can meet the next level's criteria. During the teacher's sabbatical year, he/she will earn the salary commensurate with district policy and his/her previous year's Pay for Performance status.
CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS

Now that the model has been developed, the feasibility of the plan will be determined by projecting the financial impact of the plan in terms of teacher compensation. A cost analysis matrix will be developed to demonstrate the differentiated levels of merit expenditures. Since the financial commitment will vary with each school district, one hypothetical salary schedule will be offered for comparison; multiple examples will be generated to illustrate the combinations of differing levels of experience, staffing, evaluation results, and compensation ranges. Eligibility for compensation is based on two factors: 1) successfully completing the Continuing Professional Growth Schedule as per the appropriate "Years of Experience", and 2) attaining a Teacher's Composite Score at or above the predetermined Teacher's Composite Score Range as per appropriate "Years of Experience."

Chapter IV will first present the Teacher Composite Score matrices. These matrices will provide the potential number of teachers qualifying for compensation by using samples of Teacher's Composite Scores and by considering various Teacher's Composite Score Ranges. Secondly, the Westonlee School District Salary Schedule and a cost analysis by Compensation Ranges will be provided to illustrate the potential financial impact for the hypothetical school district. Finally, formulas and examples will demonstrate how the individual teacher's compensation will be calculated.
Teacher's Composite Score Matrices

The Teacher's Composite Score matrices are represented on Tables 8, 9, 10, and 11. The Teacher's Composite Score matrices were developed to (1) illustrate the hypothetical combinations of the minimum, average, and maximum scores using each of the Teacher's Composite Score factors (Supervisor's Rating, Student Achievement, and Student Feedback), and (2) help approximate how many teachers may qualify for merit pay based on their Teacher's Composite Score.

Tables 8, 9, 10, and 11 demonstrate the possible Teacher's Composite Scores based on the minimum, average, and maximum scores for Supervisor's Rating—33.32, 41.66, and 50; Student Achievement—10, 21.50, and 33; and Student Feedback—7, 12, and 17, respectively. The results of the various combinations of scores, derived by adding together one representative score from each factor, are compared against the Teacher's Composite Score Range. The inclusion of the "average" score per factor helps estimate how "average" scores fare against the Teacher's Composite Score Ranges. The Teacher's Composite Score Ranges vary for each of the tables and represent ranges of compensation reflecting existing plans. In practice, the appropriate range would be predetermined as part of the Continuing Professional Growth Schedule and be represented by the "Years of Experience" categories. As an example, Table 8 demonstrates the Teacher's Composite Score Ranges: 70-100 for one to three "Years of
Experience", 75-100 for four to six "Years of Experience", 80-100 for seven to nine "Years of Experience", and 85-100 for ten or more "Years of Experience." Thus, one can determine the range of Teacher's Composite Scores that would qualify for merit pay.

As represented in Tables 8, 9, 10, and 11, those scores above the Teacher's Composite Score Range minimum and qualifying for compensation are noted with a "Y" as compared to those scores not within the score range and not qualifying as designated with an "N." As exemplified on Table 8, a teacher in the one to three "Years of Experience" category (70-100 Teacher Composite Score Range) and receiving a 33.32 (minimum) on the Supervisor's Rating, a 21.50 (average) for Student Achievement, and a 17 (maximum) for Student Feedback, would earn a Teacher's Composite Score of 71.82 and qualify for merit compensation.

Tables 8 through 11 also provide the number and percent of scores qualifying per each Teacher's Composite Score Range, and the total number and percent of the qualifying scores for all ranges. In Table 8, 67 percent or 18 scores would qualify in the 70-100 score range; 52 percent or 14 scores for 75-100; 37 percent or 10 scores for 80-100; and 22 percent or 6 scores for the 85-100 Teacher's Composite Score Range. Overall, 44 percent or 48 scores would qualify from all ranges represented in Table 8. Likewise, the aforementioned results are also provided with comparisons to Tables 9, 10, and 11 on the
summary Table 7. The value of these tables is the estimate of the number and percent of scores qualifying. It is understood that the inclusion of the "average" score is not necessary to provide the range of combination of scores; however, the "average" scores help further establish a benchmark for review.

Table 7. Summary table of Tables 8, 9, 10, and 11 of the Teacher's Composite Score matrices presenting a comparison of the total number and percent of qualifying teachers by the Years of Experience/Teacher's Composite Score Ranges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-3 Years</th>
<th>4-6 Years</th>
<th>7-9 Years</th>
<th>10+ Years</th>
<th>Total # per Range</th>
<th>Total % per Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 8</td>
<td>70-100</td>
<td>75-100</td>
<td>80-100</td>
<td>85-100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 9</td>
<td>60-100</td>
<td>70-100</td>
<td>80-100</td>
<td>90-100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 10</td>
<td>60-100</td>
<td>70-100</td>
<td>75-100</td>
<td>80-100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 11</td>
<td>50-100</td>
<td>60-100</td>
<td>70-100</td>
<td>80-100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple combinations of Teacher's Composite Score Ranges are presented to illustrate how the total number and percent of qualifying scores differ. As the Teacher's Composite Score Ranges become more liberal with lower minimum scores, a greater number of scores qualify.
Table 8. Matrix of minimum, average, and maximum Teacher's Composite Scores for qualifying Teacher's Composite Scores by Ranges of 70, 75, 80, and 85
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor's Rating</th>
<th>Student Achievement</th>
<th>Student Feedback</th>
<th>Teacher Composite Score</th>
<th>Qualifying Teacher's Composite Score Range by Years of Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Avg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.32</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55.32</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>78.32</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>86.66</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>91.66</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher's Composite Scores Qualifying for Compensation by Teacher's Composite Score Ranges

| # per Range | 18 | 14 | 10 | 6 |
| % per Range | 67 | 52 | 37 | 22 |
| Total for Ranges | # | 48 | % | 44 |
Table 9. Matrix of minimum, average, and maximum Teacher's Composite Scores for qualifying Teacher's Composite Scores by Ranges of 60, 70, 80, and 90
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor's Rating</th>
<th>Student Achievement</th>
<th>Student Feedback</th>
<th>Teacher Composite Score</th>
<th>Qualifying Teacher's Composite Score Range by Years of Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Avg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.32</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>61.82</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>73.32</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55.32</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.82</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>78.32</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60.32</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>71.82</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>83.32</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.66</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70.16</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>81.66</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63.66</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75.16</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>86.66</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68.66</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>80.16</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>91.66</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>67.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78.50</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>83.50</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>95.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>88.50</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teacher's Composite Scores Qualifying for Compensation by Teacher's Composite Score Ranges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># per Range</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% per Range</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for Ranges</td>
<td># 56</td>
<td>% 52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10. Matrix of minimum, average, and maximum Teacher's Composite Scores for qualifying Teacher's Composite Scores by Ranges of 60, 70, 75, and 80
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor's Rating</th>
<th>Student Achievement</th>
<th>Student Feedback</th>
<th>Teacher Composite Score</th>
<th>Qualifying Teacher's Composite Score Range by Years of Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher's Composite Scores Qualifying for Compensation by Teacher's Composite Score Ranges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># per Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% per Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for Ranges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11. Matrix of minimum, average, and maximum Teacher's Composite Scores for qualifying Teacher's Composite Scores by Ranges of 50, 60, 70, and 80
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor's Rating</th>
<th>Student Achievement</th>
<th>Student Feedback</th>
<th>Teacher Composite Score</th>
<th>Qualifying Teacher's Composite Score Ranges by Years of Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Avg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher's Composite Scores Qualifying for Compensation by Teacher's Composite Score Ranges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th># per Range</th>
<th>% per Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-100</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-100</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total for Ranges # 80 % 74
Westonlee School District Salary Schedule

For the purpose of this study, a sample salary schedule from a school district on the Central Coast of California will be used. The financial and staffing scenario realistically illustrates the norm for a suburban/rural school district in the state.

The Westonlee School District Salary Schedule, Table 12, includes a frequency distribution for each year of employment and the level of semester credits awarded. Additionally, the frequency for each "Years of Experience" range is presented; and the total of all full-time employees (FTE) is designated. Of the total 432 teachers, there are 50 FTEs with one to three years of experience; 81 FTEs with four to six years of experience; 64 FTEs with seven to nine years of experience; and 237 FTEs with more than ten years of experience.

These frequencies accurately represent the trends in teacher staffing over the last 20 years. Teaching staff frequencies are greatest in the years four to six and with ten or more years. This pattern parallels the hiring trends experienced by schools four to six years ago with increased state funding and the restructuring of schools to accommodate a longer school day (from six hours to six and one-half hours per day). There are significantly increased staffing numbers at the high end of the schedule in years 13 through 28. Likewise, the large number of teachers in the 13 to 28 years preceded the numerous tax initiatives of the late 1970s (e.g.,
California's Proposition 13) and represents the current "graying" of America's teaching corps. The average years of experience for Westonlee School District teachers is 11.8 years as compared to the national average of 14.5 years of experience (Feistritzer, 1990).

Westonlee School District has a total operating budget of $39,749,495. Teacher salaries comprise 40 percent of the budget, or $15,934,707, excluding benefits. This is somewhat consistent with most of the nation's school districts in that roughly half of the average public school district's budget is allocated for teachers' salaries (Chubb & Moe, 1990).

Westonlee School District's average teacher salary for 1989-1990 was $35,040 as compared to the national average of $31,278 and California's average of $35,285. Likewise, this can be compared to national regions: Far West, $35,310; Middle Atlantic states, $34,689; New England, $34,698; Great Lakes region, $33,425; Plains states, $27,874; Rocky Mountain states, $27,542; Southeast, $26,883; and Southwest, $26,335 (Cetron & Gayle, 1991). Sixty-six percent of Westonlee School District's teachers earn $35,000 or more as compared to the national average of 22 percent of teachers earning more than $35,000. The 1987 national average base salary was $26,230; Westonlee School District's 1987 base salary of $22,354 was $3,875 less, and the 1990 base salary of $25,994 is below by $236. No teachers in this district earn more than $50,000, as compared to 2 percent nationally (Feistritzer, 1990).
Table 12. Westonlee School District Salary Schedule for 1990-91, and Full-Time Employee (FTE) frequency distribution by level and years of experience.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>BA+15 FTE</th>
<th>BA+30 FTE</th>
<th>BA+45 FTE</th>
<th>BA+60 FTE</th>
<th>FTE Subtotals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25,994</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>25,994</td>
<td>25,994</td>
<td>25,817</td>
<td>28,369</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>26,774</td>
<td>27,597</td>
<td>29,149</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25,994</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25,994</td>
<td>26,593</td>
<td>28,144</td>
<td>29,695</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>27,373</td>
<td>28,924</td>
<td>30,475</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25,994</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26,371</td>
<td>27,923</td>
<td>29,475</td>
<td>31,022</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>28,703</td>
<td>30,255</td>
<td>31,802</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26,149</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>27,700</td>
<td>29,251</td>
<td>30,802</td>
<td>32,352</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>30,031</td>
<td>31,582</td>
<td>33,132</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>27,473</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29,033</td>
<td>30,584</td>
<td>32,131</td>
<td>33,688</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>31,364</td>
<td>32,911</td>
<td>34,468</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>28,807</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,358</td>
<td>31,912</td>
<td>33,461</td>
<td>35,012</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>32,692</td>
<td>34,241</td>
<td>35,792</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30,138</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31,690</td>
<td>33,241</td>
<td>34,791</td>
<td>36,345</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>34,021</td>
<td>35,571</td>
<td>37,125</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>33,018</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34,568</td>
<td>36,121</td>
<td>37,671</td>
<td>39,001</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>35,348</td>
<td>36,904</td>
<td>38,451</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>34,348</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35,898</td>
<td>37,449</td>
<td>39,001</td>
<td>39,781</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>36,678</td>
<td>38,229</td>
<td>39,781</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>37,229</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38,779</td>
<td>38,229</td>
<td>40,331</td>
<td>40,331</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>38,009</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39,559</td>
<td>39,559</td>
<td>41,111</td>
<td>41,111</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>38,557</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40,309</td>
<td>40,309</td>
<td>41,659</td>
<td>41,659</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>39,337</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40,889</td>
<td>40,889</td>
<td>42,439</td>
<td>42,439</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>41,439</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>42,988</td>
<td>42,988</td>
<td>42,988</td>
<td>42,988</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>42,219</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>43,768</td>
<td>43,768</td>
<td>43,768</td>
<td>43,768</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>44,318</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>45,853</td>
<td>45,853</td>
<td>45,853</td>
<td>45,853</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>45,098</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>46,643</td>
<td>46,643</td>
<td>46,643</td>
<td>46,643</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18L</td>
<td>45,618</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>47,173</td>
<td>47,173</td>
<td>47,173</td>
<td>47,173</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18ML</td>
<td>46,398</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>47,953</td>
<td>47,953</td>
<td>47,953</td>
<td>47,953</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23L</td>
<td>46,318</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47,828</td>
<td>47,828</td>
<td>47,828</td>
<td>47,828</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23ML</td>
<td>47,098</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48,658</td>
<td>48,658</td>
<td>48,658</td>
<td>48,658</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28L</td>
<td>47,018</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48,538</td>
<td>48,538</td>
<td>48,538</td>
<td>48,538</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28ML</td>
<td>47,798</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>49,363</td>
<td>49,363</td>
<td>49,363</td>
<td>49,363</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL DISTRICT FTES 432
Although the salary schedule and frequency distribution illustrate a hypothetical school district, the figures presented can be easily extrapolated to represent staffing and budget allocations for any size school district.

Compensation Range Calculation

The following Tables 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17 provide an example for illustrating the cost computation of the pay for performance plan based on (1) the percent of teachers qualifying for merit pay and (2) four predetermined salary range percents. Table 13 represent 20 percent of teachers qualifying; Table 14, 40 percent; Table 15, 60 percent; Table 16, 80 percent; and Table 17, 100 percent. The percents for the salary range minimum and maximums, respectively, are: 1 percent and 3 percent; 3 percent and 5 percent; 5 percent and 7 percent; and 7 percent and 10 percent. These tables serve two purposes: (1) to illustrate the compensation ranges for each of the four salary range percents and for each of the "Years of Experience" range; and (2) to determine the total district cost.

As demonstrated in Table 13, to determine the Compensation Range (lines 11 and 12) the average salary (line 4) within the "Years of Experience" range is computed, then multiplied by the minimum and maximum salary range percents (lines 8 and 9, respectively). The Salary Range Minimum and Maximum for one to three "Years of Experience" are $25,994 and
$31,802, respectively (these values were originally ascertained from Table 12, the Westonlee School District Salary Schedule, and represent the minimum salary—one year and Bachelors Degree, and maximum—three years, Bachelors Degree, 60 additional semester units, and Master's Degree). The average of those salaries is $28,898. Multiplying this average by the minimum and maximum salary range percents of 1 and 3 percent produces the Compensation Range Minimum of $289 and the Compensation Range Maximum of $867.

To determine the Total Compensation Minimum and Maximum per "Years of Experience", the Compensation Range Minimum and Maximum are multiplied by the number of teachers qualifying for compensation. Thus, the resultant minimum and maximum compensation for the one to three "Years of Experience" with 20 percent of 50 teachers qualifying (or 10 teachers) are $2,890 and $8,670, respectively.

Finally, to determine the overall possible compensation the district may need to award, the totals of each "Years of Experience" category are added together. Thus, for 20 percent of teachers qualifying for performance pay at the one to three percent salary range, the total possible compensation the district will have to encumber is between the minimum of $32,375 and the maximum of $97,096.

Following the same procedures, Tables 14 through 17 illustrate the aforementioned percents of teachers qualifying and calculated against 1 and 3 percent, 3 and 5 percent,
Table 13. Compensation range calculations for 20 percent of the district's teachers qualifying for merit pay
## Years of Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-3</th>
<th>4-6</th>
<th>7-9</th>
<th>10 or more</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salary Range Minimum</strong></td>
<td>25,994</td>
<td>26,149</td>
<td>30,138</td>
<td>37,229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salary Range Maximum</strong></td>
<td>31,802</td>
<td>35,792</td>
<td>39,781</td>
<td>47,798</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Salary</strong></td>
<td>28,898</td>
<td>30,971</td>
<td>34,960</td>
<td>42,514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of District Teachers</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Teachers Qualifying</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1% and 3% Salary Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1%</th>
<th>1%</th>
<th>1%</th>
<th>1%</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Salary Minimum</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Salary Maximum</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compensation Range Minimum</strong></td>
<td>289</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compensation Range Maximum</strong></td>
<td>867</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Compensation Minimum</strong></td>
<td>2,890</td>
<td>4,960</td>
<td>4,550</td>
<td>19,975</td>
<td>32,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Compensation Maximum</strong></td>
<td>8,670</td>
<td>14,864</td>
<td>13,637</td>
<td>59,925</td>
<td>97,096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3% and 5% Salary Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Salary Minimum</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Salary Maximum</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compensation Range Minimum</strong></td>
<td>867</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compensation Range Maximum</strong></td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>1,549</td>
<td>1,748</td>
<td>2,126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Compensation Minimum</strong></td>
<td>8,670</td>
<td>14,864</td>
<td>13,637</td>
<td>59,925</td>
<td>97,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Compensation Maximum</strong></td>
<td>14,450</td>
<td>24,784</td>
<td>22,724</td>
<td>99,922</td>
<td>161,880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5% and 7% Salary Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Salary Minimum</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Salary Maximum</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compensation Range Minimum</strong></td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>1,549</td>
<td>1,748</td>
<td>2,126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compensation Range Maximum</strong></td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td>2,168</td>
<td>2,447</td>
<td>2,976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Compensation Minimum</strong></td>
<td>14,450</td>
<td>24,784</td>
<td>22,724</td>
<td>99,922</td>
<td>161,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Compensation Maximum</strong></td>
<td>20,230</td>
<td>34,688</td>
<td>31,811</td>
<td>139,872</td>
<td>226,601</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7% and 10% Salary Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>7%</th>
<th>7%</th>
<th>7%</th>
<th>7%</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Salary Minimum</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Salary Maximum</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compensation Range Minimum</strong></td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td>2,168</td>
<td>2,447</td>
<td>2,976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compensation Range Maximum</strong></td>
<td>2,890</td>
<td>3,097</td>
<td>3,496</td>
<td>4,251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Compensation Minimum</strong></td>
<td>20,230</td>
<td>34,688</td>
<td>31,811</td>
<td>139,872</td>
<td>226,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Compensation Maximum</strong></td>
<td>28,900</td>
<td>49,552</td>
<td>45,448</td>
<td>199,797</td>
<td>323,697</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14. Compensation range calculations for 40 percent of the district's teachers qualifying for merit pay
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>1-3</th>
<th>4-6</th>
<th>7-9</th>
<th>10 or more</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary Range Minimum</td>
<td>25,994</td>
<td>26,149</td>
<td>30,138</td>
<td>37,229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Range Maximum</td>
<td>31,802</td>
<td>35,792</td>
<td>39,781</td>
<td>47,798</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Salary</td>
<td>28,898</td>
<td>30,971</td>
<td>34,960</td>
<td>42,514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of District Teachers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Teachers Qualifying</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Teachers Qualifying</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1% and 3% Salary Range

| % of Salary Minimum | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| % of Salary Maximum | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Compensation Range Minimum | 289 | 310 | 350 | 425 |
| Compensation Range Maximum | 867 | 929 | 1,049 | 1,275 |
| Total Compensation Minimum | 5,780 | 9,920 | 9,100 | 40,375 |
| Total Compensation Maximum | 17,340 | 29,728 | 27,274 | 121,125 |

3% and 5% Salary Range

| % of Salary Minimum | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| % of Salary Maximum | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Compensation Range Minimum | 867 | 929 | 1,049 | 1,275 |
| Compensation Range Maximum | 1,645 | 1,549 | 1,748 | 2,126 |
| Total Compensation Minimum | 17,340 | 29,728 | 27,274 | 121,125 |
| Total Compensation Maximum | 28,900 | 49,568 | 45,448 | 201,970 |

5% and 7% Salary Range

| % of Salary Minimum | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| % of Salary Maximum | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Compensation Range Minimum | 1,645 | 1,549 | 1,748 | 2,126 |
| Compensation Range Maximum | 2,023 | 2,168 | 2,447 | 2,976 |
| Total Compensation Minimum | 28,900 | 49,568 | 45,448 | 201,970 |
| Total Compensation Maximum | 40,460 | 69,376 | 63,622 | 282,720 |

7% and 10% Salary Range

| % of Salary Minimum | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| % of Salary Maximum | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Compensation Range Minimum | 2,023 | 2,168 | 2,447 | 2,976 |
| Compensation Range Maximum | 2,890 | 3,097 | 3,496 | 4,251 |
| Total Compensation Minimum | 40,460 | 69,376 | 63,622 | 282,720 |
| Total Compensation Maximum | 57,800 | 99,104 | 90,896 | 403,845 |
Table 15. Compensation range calculations for 60 percent of the district's teachers qualifying for merit pay
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>1-3</th>
<th>4-6</th>
<th>7-9</th>
<th>10 or more</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary Range Minimum</td>
<td>25,994</td>
<td>26,149</td>
<td>30,138</td>
<td>37,229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Range Maximum</td>
<td>31,802</td>
<td>35,792</td>
<td>39,781</td>
<td>47,798</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Salary</td>
<td>28,898</td>
<td>30,971</td>
<td>34,960</td>
<td>42,514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of District Teachers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Teachers Qualifying</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Teachers Qualifying</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% and 3% Salary Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Salary Minimum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Salary Maximum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation Range Minimum</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation Range Maximum</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Compensation Minimum</td>
<td>8,670</td>
<td>15,190</td>
<td>13,300</td>
<td>60,350</td>
<td>97,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Compensation Maximum</td>
<td>26,010</td>
<td>45,521</td>
<td>39,862</td>
<td>181,050</td>
<td>292,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% and 5% Salary Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Salary Minimum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Salary Maximum</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation Range Minimum</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation Range Maximum</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>1,549</td>
<td>1,748</td>
<td>2,126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Compensation Minimum</td>
<td>26,010</td>
<td>45,521</td>
<td>39,862</td>
<td>181,050</td>
<td>292,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Compensation Maximum</td>
<td>43,350</td>
<td>75,901</td>
<td>66,424</td>
<td>301,892</td>
<td>487,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% and 7% Salary Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Salary Minimum</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Salary Maximum</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation Range Minimum</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>1,549</td>
<td>1,748</td>
<td>2,126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation Range Maximum</td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td>2,168</td>
<td>2,447</td>
<td>2,976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Compensation Minimum</td>
<td>43,350</td>
<td>75,901</td>
<td>66,424</td>
<td>301,892</td>
<td>487,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Compensation Maximum</td>
<td>60,690</td>
<td>106,232</td>
<td>92,986</td>
<td>422,592</td>
<td>682,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7% and 10% Salary Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Salary Minimum</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Salary Maximum</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation Range Minimum</td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td>2,168</td>
<td>2,447</td>
<td>2,976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation Range Maximum</td>
<td>2,890</td>
<td>3,097</td>
<td>3,496</td>
<td>4,251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Compensation Minimum</td>
<td>60,690</td>
<td>106,232</td>
<td>92,986</td>
<td>422,592</td>
<td>682,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Compensation Maximum</td>
<td>86,700</td>
<td>151,753</td>
<td>132,848</td>
<td>603,642</td>
<td>974,943</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16. Compensation range calculations for 80 percent of the district's teachers qualifying for merit pay
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>1-3</th>
<th>4-6</th>
<th>7-9</th>
<th>10 or more</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary Range Minimum</td>
<td>25,996</td>
<td>26,149</td>
<td>30,138</td>
<td>37,229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Range Maximum</td>
<td>31,802</td>
<td>35,792</td>
<td>39,781</td>
<td>47,798</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Salary</td>
<td>28,898</td>
<td>30,971</td>
<td>34,960</td>
<td>42,514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of District Teachers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Teachers Qualifying</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Teachers Qualifying</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1% and 3% Salary Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Salary Minimum</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Salary Maximum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation Range Minimum</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation Range Maximum</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>1,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Compensation Minimum</td>
<td>11,560</td>
<td>20,150</td>
<td>17,850</td>
<td>80,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Compensation Maximum</td>
<td>34,680</td>
<td>60,385</td>
<td>53,499</td>
<td>242,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3% and 5% Salary Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Salary Minimum</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Salary Maximum</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation Range Minimum</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>1,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation Range Maximum</td>
<td>1,645</td>
<td>1,549</td>
<td>1,748</td>
<td>2,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Compensation Minimum</td>
<td>34,680</td>
<td>60,385</td>
<td>53,499</td>
<td>242,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Compensation Maximum</td>
<td>57,800</td>
<td>100,685</td>
<td>89,148</td>
<td>403,940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5% and 7% Salary Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Salary Minimum</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Salary Maximum</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation Range Minimum</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>1,549</td>
<td>1,748</td>
<td>2,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation Range Maximum</td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td>2,168</td>
<td>2,447</td>
<td>2,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Compensation Minimum</td>
<td>57,800</td>
<td>100,685</td>
<td>89,148</td>
<td>403,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Compensation Maximum</td>
<td>80,920</td>
<td>140,920</td>
<td>124,797</td>
<td>565,440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7% and 10% Salary Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Salary Minimum</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Salary Maximum</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation Range Minimum</td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td>2,168</td>
<td>2,447</td>
<td>2,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation Range Maximum</td>
<td>2,890</td>
<td>3,097</td>
<td>3,496</td>
<td>4,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Compensation Minimum</td>
<td>80,920</td>
<td>140,920</td>
<td>124,797</td>
<td>565,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Compensation Maximum</td>
<td>115,600</td>
<td>201,305</td>
<td>178,296</td>
<td>807,690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17. Compensation range calculations for 100 percent of the district's teachers qualifying for merit pay
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>1-3</th>
<th>4-6</th>
<th>7-9</th>
<th>10 or more</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary Range Minimum</td>
<td>25,994</td>
<td>26,149</td>
<td>30,138</td>
<td>37,229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Range Maximum</td>
<td>31,802</td>
<td>35,792</td>
<td>39,781</td>
<td>47,798</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Salary</td>
<td>28,898</td>
<td>30,971</td>
<td>34,960</td>
<td>42,514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of District Teachers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Teachers Qualifying</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Teachers Qualifying</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1% and 3% Salary Range

| % of Salary Minimum | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| % of Salary Maximum | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Compensation Range Minimum | 289 | 310 | 350 | 425 |
| Compensation Range Maximum | 867 | 929 | 1,049 | 1,275 |
| Total Compensation Minimum | 14,650 | 25,110 | 22,400 | 100,725 | 162,685 |
| Total Compensation Maximum | 43,350 | 75,249 | 67,136 | 302,175 | 487,910 |

### 3% and 5% Salary Range

| % of Salary Minimum | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| % of Salary Maximum | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Compensation Range Minimum | 867 | 929 | 1,049 | 1,275 |
| Compensation Range Maximum | 1,445 | 1,549 | 1,748 | 2,126 |
| Total Compensation Minimum | 43,350 | 75,249 | 67,136 | 302,175 | 487,910 |
| Total Compensation Maximum | 72,250 | 125,469 | 111,872 | 503,862 | 813,453 |

### 5% and 7% Salary Range

| % of Salary Minimum | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| % of Salary Maximum | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Compensation Range Minimum | 1,445 | 1,549 | 1,748 | 2,126 |
| Compensation Range Maximum | 2,023 | 2,168 | 2,447 | 2,976 |
| Total Compensation Minimum | 72,250 | 125,469 | 111,872 | 503,862 | 813,453 |
| Total Compensation Maximum | 101,150 | 175,608 | 156,608 | 705,312 | 1,138,678 |

### 7% and 10% Salary Range

| % of Salary Minimum | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| % of Salary Maximum | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Compensation Range Minimum | 2,023 | 2,168 | 2,447 | 2,976 |
| Compensation Range Maximum | 2,890 | 3,097 | 3,496 | 4,251 |
| Total Compensation Minimum | 101,150 | 175,608 | 156,608 | 705,312 | 1,138,678 |
| Total Compensation Maximum | 144,500 | 250,857 | 223,744 | 1,007,487 | 1,626,588 |
5 and 7 percent, and 7 and 10 percent of the average salary. These percents serve only to illustrate a computed dollar amount. However, the district must structure the compensation to be (1) a lucrative increase in salary; (2) perceived by teachers as worthwhile to pursue; and (3) sustainable as an on-going budget expenditure. A lucrative salary increase in the context of performance compensation is dependent upon its motivational strength. As cited previously in this study, current incentive pay plans compensate teachers from $1,000 to $4,000.

Summary Table 18 concisely illustrates the ranges of compensation costs (derived from Tables 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17) the district could incur considering two variables: (1) the percent of teachers within the district qualifying for performance pay compensation, and (2) the percent of the average salary per "Years of Experience." Additionally, the summary table provides the percent of the total district budget of $39,749,495 that each level of compensation represents. As an example, if 40 percent of the district's teachers qualify, or 173 teachers, using the 3 and 5 percent salary range, the total minimum the district would award is $195,467 or .48 percent of the total budget, and the total maximum would be $325,886 or .80 percent of the total budget. Thus, a merit pay plan using these results would cost the district between one-half and one percent of their total operating budget. If all the teachers qualified and using the
maximum 10 percent compensation range, the maximum percent of the total operating budget that could be incurred is 4.09 percent.

Table 18. Summary table of the Compensation Ranges and the percent of the total district budget ($39,749,495) each represents, using differing percents of qualifying teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Teachers Qualifying</th>
<th>20 percent</th>
<th>40 percent</th>
<th>60 percent</th>
<th>80 percent</th>
<th>100 percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Teachers Qualifying</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 percent- Minimum</td>
<td>32,375</td>
<td>65,175</td>
<td>97,510</td>
<td>130,310</td>
<td>162,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total budget</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 percent- Maximum</td>
<td>97,096</td>
<td>195,467</td>
<td>292,443</td>
<td>390,814</td>
<td>487,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total budget</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 percent- Minimum</td>
<td>97,096</td>
<td>195,467</td>
<td>292,443</td>
<td>390,814</td>
<td>487,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total budget</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 percent- Minimum</td>
<td>161,880</td>
<td>325,886</td>
<td>487,567</td>
<td>651,573</td>
<td>813,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total budget</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 percent- Minimum</td>
<td>161,880</td>
<td>325,886</td>
<td>487,567</td>
<td>651,573</td>
<td>813,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total budget</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 percent- Maximum</td>
<td>226,601</td>
<td>456,178</td>
<td>682,500</td>
<td>912,077</td>
<td>1,138,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total budget</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 percent- Minimum</td>
<td>226,601</td>
<td>456,178</td>
<td>682,500</td>
<td>912,077</td>
<td>1,138,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total budget</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 percent- Maximum</td>
<td>323,697</td>
<td>651,645</td>
<td>974,943</td>
<td>1,302,891</td>
<td>1,626,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total budget</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculating Individual Teacher's Compensation

It is necessary to determine the exact amount of compensation for each qualifying teacher. The Compensation Ranges are differentiated for each "Years of Experience" range, and within each Compensation Range. Since the range
for Teachers' Composite Scores is reduced across the Continued Professional Growth Schedule (Table 6), and the Compensation Ranges increase per the salary schedule, the net result provides for substantially greater compensation per score.

Figure 14 contains the formula for the Compensation Constant. The Compensation Constant is the dollar amount which will be awarded for each point of the Teacher's Composite Score above the minimum score of that range and added to the Compensation Range minimum. The Compensation Constant is computed by determining the difference between Compensation Range Maximum and Minimum dollar value and dividing by the range of the Teachers' Composite Scores for the particular "Years of Experience" range. Thus, in Figure 14, the difference, $699, of the Compensation Range Maximum and Minimum ($1,748 - $1,049) divided by the Range of

Formula:

\[
\frac{\text{Compensation Range Max} - \text{Min}}{\text{Range of Teacher's Composite Score Max} - \text{Min}}
\]

Example Data:

Compensation Range = $1,049 to $1,748
Teacher's Composite Score Range = 80 to 100

Calculation Example:

\[
\frac{($1,748 - $1,049)}{(100 - 80)} = \frac{699}{20} = 34.95
\]

Figure 14. Formula and example computation of the Compensation Constant assigned for each point of the Teacher's Composite Score above the minimum
Teacher's Composite Score Maximum and Minimum of 20 (100 – 80), each percentage point above 80 percent of the Teacher's Composite Score is worth $34.95.

With the computed Compensation Constant for each point, the compensation for a specific Teacher's Composite Score can be computed. As illustrated in Figure 15, the teacher's individual compensation is calculated by multiplying the Compensation Constant of $34.95 by the difference between the Teacher's Composite Score and the lowest score of the Teacher's Composite Score Range (7), and adding the product of $244.65 to the lowest compensation value of $1,049. Thus, a teacher scoring 87 on the Teacher's Composite Score would receive $1,293.65 of Pay for Performance compensation.

**Formula:**

\[ (D)(\text{Teacher's Composite} - \text{Lowest Score of}) + \text{Lowest Teacher Composite Compensation Range Value} \]

**Example Data:**

Teacher's Composite Score = 87

Calculation Example:

\[ [($34.95)(87 - 80)] + $1,049 = [($34.95)(7)] + $1,049 = $244.65 + $1,049 = $1,293.65 \]

Figure 15. Formula and example computation for determining the compensation to be awarded per Teacher's Composite Score
Program Funding

Using the aforementioned results and comparison demographics, a school district could extrapolate the cost of a performance-based pay plan. As a point of departure, the summary results illustrate the cost for this model independent of the funding source. The actual funding source of the plan may vary; numerous state legislatures have mandated and are funding such programs (Cornett, 1990). The state-supported South Carolina Teacher Incentive Plan has provided over $21.5 million for its program; under the individual component, teachers are awarded between $2,000 and $3,000 annually (Cornett, 1988). In Utah $41 million was available for local school districts to reward performance-based evaluation systems; considering the varied programs Utah offers, the individual merit awards average $1,688 or roughly 7 percent of the base average salary. The Arizona pilot program is state funded at a $14.5 million level for up to 15 districts; as an example, in 1988-89 the Amphitheater School District awarded extra compensation to 40 percent of its teachers at a cost of $1.6 million (Amsler et al., 1988). Other states committed major funding for incentive programs during the 1988-89 school year: Texas, $104 million; Tennessee, $99 million; California, $63 million; North Carolina, $46 million; Iowa, $42 million; New York, $25 million; Florida and Missouri, $10 to $13 million (Cornett, 1988, 1989).
Frase and Poston (1990) found that massive external (state) funding was not necessary for success. Some characteristics that negatively affect incentive plans that are externally funded include (1) many programs limit the number of teachers who can qualify, thus losing teacher support; and (2) districts find themselves restricted by the bureaucracy. They recommend that state legislatures considering incentive pay programs should (1) shift the locus of control to the district; (2) limit requirements to annual progress reports or formal descriptions of the plan and its implementation; (3) support and assist with implementation but do not administer the program; and (4) invest in the risk of funding local districts.
CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary—Overview of the Study

This study reviewed the current incentive pay literature and determined a need, potential format, variables, and procedures for the development and implementation of a comprehensive pay for performance plan for teachers. This study provided a model, based on the total systems approach to teacher evaluation, from which school districts could develop a plan. Finally, this study examined the cost feasibility of the model in terms of teacher compensation.

The review of literature served to substantiate the theoretical, social, and professional basis for the development of a teacher performance-based compensation plan. The literature provided three overwhelming reasons for the use of teacher performance-based pay plans: (1) to increase recruitment and holding power of the teacher work force; (2) to improve the professionalization of teaching; and (3) to provide a sound evaluation system and supporting procedures. These reasons were supported by current effective schools research, the public's request for school accountability, and the emphasis on school restructuring.

The development of the model reflected current effective schools research, sound pedagogy, rational motivation theory, a total systems approach to teacher evaluation, and longstanding business management practices. The study provided the model which included the overall paradigm and the
individual component algorithms. Additionally, the model illustrated the practical implementation of the plan; the examples demonstrated the mathematical computations of the algorithms. The model also included the rationale for each variable in the form of the Teacher Performance Evaluation System and the supporting procedures for implementation.

The study applied the performance-based plan using a hypothetical school district's staffing demographics and salary schedule. This demonstration provided an example of the cost feasibility to implement the model plan in terms of the dollar amount incurred by the district for teacher performance compensation. The information was presented in a matrix format to demonstrate varying degrees of qualifying teachers and percent of salary. Additionally, the study provided various examples of possible Teacher Composite Scores that would qualify for compensation.

Conclusions of the Study

The major result of this study is the turn-key prototype of the pay for performance plan and its cost feasibility. Second, the synthesis of the literature substantiates the need for and implementation of such a model. Third, understanding the theoretical and hypothetical nature of this study, and considering the limitations binding a non-statistical study, this research attempted to answer the following questions posed.
First research question

Does the influence of the current political climate, professionalization of teaching, and/or the apparent teacher shortage warrant the implementation of performance-based pay plans?

The overwhelming evidence suggests that incentive pay programs are one the agendas at all levels of school governance from the President to the state legislatures through the local boards of education. Surveys indicate the profession of teaching is in desperate need of improving its status within our society; the public continues to hold educators accountable for results. Likewise, the quality and amount of teachers required to meet staffing demands will need to improve and increase; incentive pay plans and the resulting financial awards are viewed as strategies that may well attract and retain highly qualified teacher candidates.

Second research question

What variables should be included in a comprehensive pay for performance plan?

Since this model used the individual teacher as the unit of evaluation and reward, it is concluded that the supervisor's rating, student achievement, and student feedback are variables required in the model. All variables can be accurately measured using the model's requirements of well-trained evaluators, a sound evaluation cycle, processes and
instruments, criterion-referenced tests, and the Student Feedback to Teachers Questionnaire. The model is constructed with differing weights for each variable which reflects the varying influence of each variable on the overall model.

Third research question

Can a comprehensive merit pay plan model be developed that represents current effective schools research, motivation theory, and sound pedagogy?

The paradigm is the result of the application of effective schools research, motivation theory, and sound pedagogy to the incentive pay issue. As each of the variables was examined for inclusion in the model, elements within effective schools research, motivation theory, and instructional methodologies were found to substantiate their use in the paradigm. Additionally, the SIM Teacher Performance Evaluation system is the by-product of current effective schools research and accepted pedagogy. The criteria and standards which the model utilizes directly reflect sound teaching and learning methods. Incentive pay in industry has been proven to be a strong motivator and an accepted business strategy for improving the quality of performance.
Fourth research question

How should the factors selected for inclusion in a merit pay plan model be weighted?

Because this study only provides for the development of the model and not its statistical analysis, the weight of each variable within the paradigm has been established hypothetically. However, the weight of each variable represents (1) the intended influence of that variable to the overall results of the model's algorithms and (2) the importance of each variable based on the teaching/learning experience reflecting the district's Philosophy of Evaluation. The weight of each variable in terms of points of the total score a teacher can earn is: Supervisor's Rating, 50 points; Student Achievement, 33 points; and Student Feedback, 17 points. The algorithms are structured so the points of the Supervisor's Rating (50) is equal to the total of both Student Achievement (33) and Student Feedback (17) points combined; thus, the Supervisor's Rating is as influential to the overall results as the other two variables combined. Likewise, Student Achievement (33) is twice as powerful as the Student Feedback (17) variable based on the ratio of possible points assigned to each (the numerical values were rounded off for ease of application).
Fifth research question

How should the pay for performance plan algorithms be developed to provide for a balanced, yet properly distributed, comprehensive model?

Combined with the differing weights of each variable, the individual variable algorithms should be constructed to discriminate between teacher performances and compensation. The three variables should be independently assessed then combined to produce the teacher's overall score. Likewise, the distribution of the performance compensation should be differentiated reflecting the teacher's performance.

The Supervisor's Rating algorithm should be based solely on the numerical values assigned to the eighteen criteria, and their definitive descriptors, and teacher and student indicators as established on the district's Teacher Performance Indicator Bridge. The eighteen criteria should also be assigned values as represented by "meets", "exceeds", and "does not meet criterion" standards. And the criteria should be ranked in order of importance to the teaching/learning experience by the district's Stakeholders' Committee. To reflect the differing importance of each criterion, the ranking should be further clustered into three groups and assigned differing weights per cluster; in this study they represented the top 80 percent, 70 percent, and 60 percent rank order. Thus, the Supervisor's Rating should provide differing weights and three performance standards to
accurately assess the teacher's performance during the observation.

The Student Achievement variable should be based on the percent of an individual teacher's students successfully meeting the Student Mastery Level on the criterion-referenced mastery test. The Student Achievement algorithm should not differentiate levels of student achievement, rather it should be constructed to eliminate student scores that, for one of the articulated reasons, would not reliably represent the teacher's instructional abilities. Additionally, class size should be considered as an add-on value to the Student Achievement variable. The class size algorithm should differentiate between the levels/types of students in each class; students should be confidentially weighted according to their academic abilities. However slight the class size value may influence the Student Achievement Score, it serves to acknowledge the teachers' beliefs that class size can affect the classroom setting.

The Student Feedback variable should be compared against the mean score of all the teachers in the district. The teacher's Student Feedback Score is weighted equally; each point scored by a teacher receives the same value which is a computed constant number based on each year's district mean score.

Finally, the Compensation Ranges should also be differentiated. The use of differentiated compensation
considers the teacher's years of experience and differing score ranges. As the teacher's years of experience increase, the plan should become more conservative in the scores qualifying for compensation. Likewise, as the years of experience increase and the score ranges decrease, the amount of compensation should increase per teacher's score. Thus it should be more difficult to qualify, but more rewarding.

The process by which the algorithms were developed for this model provides a more accurate and discriminating basis against which to evaluate teacher performance. The use of three separate yet weighted assessments of teacher performance provides a system that applies varying importance between the variables. The Teacher's Composite Scores matrix (Table 8), using combinations of minimum, average, and maximum scores on the three variables, hypothetically illustrates that 44 percent of the teacher's scores would qualify.

Sixth research question

What legal, motivational, and/or procedural considerations should be included in a merit pay plan model?

The merit pay plan should include in the system's processes a number of assurances for teachers as well as the school district. Initially, the plan should be collaboratively developed by a Stakeholders' Committee consisting of teachers, administrators, school board members, and the community. To ensure continual teacher input and
review, a Pay for Performance Review Team should be established. This advisory team should consist of representation from all levels of certificated personnel.

The Pay for Performance Review Team should administer the appeals process. The appeals process should reflect sound due process procedures, be timely in its application, and not be punitive in nature.

Participation in the merit pay plan should be mandatory. The application process should be a part of the formal, yearly evaluation process; it will take the form of the Professional Activities Report and professional goals established by the teacher and administrator.

Motivational rationale should be a part of the theoretical basis of the plan as it is developed. Some considerations should include: the amount of compensation awarded; professional development opportunities as part of the Continuing Professional Growth Schedule activities; and the teacher's personal reward and continued challenge of quantifying her/his students' academic success. Compensation should not supplement the salary schedule, rather, it should complement the teacher's salary. Professional Growth Activities should support improvement and stimulate growth for the teacher.

The Performance-based Pay Plan should be easy to administer and timely. The plan should not be labor intensive; instruments should be clear, concise, and easily
collated and computed. Teacher involvement in data collection should be limited to Professional Growth Activities Reports, administering the Student Mastery Test and the Student Feedback to Teacher Questionnaire. Computation and scoring should be the responsibility of the district.

Seventh research question

What is the possible cost of compensation the district may incur using different percents of salary and varying the number of teachers qualifying?

The examples presented in Chapter IV illustrate the possible levels of current funding for both programs and individuals. It is evident the salary range examples for individuals using 3 percent, 5 percent, 7 percent, and 10 percent of the average salary fall within the funding levels of established performance-based pay programs. These compensation ranges are: 3 percent, $867 to $1,275; 5 percent, $1,445 to $2,126; 7 percent, $2,023 to $2,976; and 10 percent, $2,890 to $4,251.

The maximum cost to the district if all teachers qualified for merit pay, considering each salary range percent, would be: 3 percent, $487,910; 5 percent, $813,453; 7 percent, $1,138,678; and 10 percent, $1,162,588. Based on the hypothetical budget of $39,749,495, the percent of the total budget for merit pay based on the same percent of salary considering all teachers qualified would be: 3 percent, 1.28
percent; 5 percent, 2.04 percent; 7 percent, 2.86 percent; and 10 percent, 4.09 percent.

Limitations of the Study

A number of limitations resulted from the nature and design of this study. The limitations are enumerated as follows:

1. This study was hypothetical in nature. Its intent was solely to develop the pay for performance plan model and to examine the cost feasibility of it. Thus, this study was not a "real world" application of the model; rather, it was a theoretical paper and pencil exercise to determine if such a plan is financially viable, or cost prohibitive, and what the dollar value of such a plan would be considering a hypothetical district budget.

2. This study was limited to only one school district's salary schedule and staffing demographics in its cost feasibility analysis and matrices development. Thus, this plan's cost feasibility represents only this school district's financial and staffing profiles. Although this district may well represent other similar school districts, it is likewise limited to the geographic, political, and economic region it represents. However, considering this limitation, it is possible to use the examples and model and extrapolate data based on another district's parameters.
3. This study represents the current state of budgetary practices and levels of funding. With a fluctuating economy, educational institutions could profit or suffer from the state of financing. Thus in education, as in business and industry, a pay for performance system can be directly and severely affected by the financial climate. This study provides a model reflecting an assumed stable economic base.

4. This study limited its examples of Compensation Ranges to a few benchmark percents of the average salary (1 percent, 3 percent, 5 percent, 7 percent, and 10 percent). As with the salary schedule and demographics, these percents serve only as examples, and could be adjusted to meet the financial and philosophical position of the specific district.

5. This study provides a performance-based pay plan based on one model of a Teacher Performance Evaluation system. Its criteria against which teachers are evaluated within the teaching episode are limited to those criteria selected by the district's Stakeholders' Committee. The criteria selected are found in current research demonstrating sound teaching practices; however the Stakeholders' Committee limited the process to eighteen. Additionally, the evaluation cycle and supporting procedures illustrate only one teacher evaluation system.

6. This study did not address the financial cost of implementation, administration, or support services required to maintain the plan. This study strictly analyzed the cost
of the program in terms of teacher compensation. Likewise, it did not consider the practical application concerns such as (1) the increase in time required for site administrators to coordinate and monitor the Continuing Professional Growth Schedule activities and maintain observation schedules; (2) the time and support staff required to implement, administer, and maintain a Criterion-referenced Testing program; (3) the time and support staff required to survey students for the Student Feedback Report; and (4) the cost of providing staff development opportunities required of teachers for Professional Growth Schedule activities.

7. This study did not assess the validity of this model merit pay plan on teacher morale, teacher or student motivation, resultant student achievement, teacher performance, teacher acceptability, or teacher satisfaction.

8. This study did not statistically validate (1) the influences of the individual variables within the model; (2) the appropriateness of the weights assigned to each variable within the individual algorithms; or (3) weights assigned to the classification of students within the class size variable.

Discussion of the Study

This study brings together a synthesis of the most current literature on incentive pay, effective schools practices, and motivation theory with the operational algorithms and compensation matrices. It is a "turn-key"
system for immediate implementation for school districts ready to embrace merit pay. It contributes a practical example of a multi-variable performance-based pay plan to the existing performance pay body of knowledge. And it transforms the theories and justifications for incentive pay into a viable and usable model.

The plan development process, by itself, can function as an evaluation tool for the current district policies and practices. The performance-based pay plan is a model against which the district's philosophies of education, evaluation and instruction should be rigorously examined and adjusted. The school district, community and staff must be ready for incentive pay; the readiness of the organization is paramount to the decision to implement merit pay. Improved student achievement through improved instructional quality is the ultimate purpose of this plan.

This performance based pay plan uniquely includes major characteristics from three different types of evaluation models found in McGreal's taxonomy (McGreal, 1983). The combination of these elements supports teacher strengths without necessarily diminishing the expected performance standards. This also adds to the model's integrity by combining the strengths of various approaches into one model.

There is no other merit pay plan that accesses the variety nor the breadth of data sources as this model does. This model uses three factors to assess a teacher's
performance: the Supervisor's Rating, Student Achievement and Student Feedback. Current education research supports each of these three factors as being valid, reliable, and accurate variables to assess. Furthermore, current effective schools literature indicates each of these factors, when developed and implemented properly, can significantly contribute to increased student achievement (Manatt & Stow, 1986; Duke & Stiggins, 1986; Judkins, 1987). Thus, combining these factors into one plan provides a clearer assessment of a teacher's performance and increases the probability for improved student achievement.

The implementation of this merit pay system requires the school district to commit to a number of significant practices. The Supervisor's Rating factor requires the district to accurately articulate the specific criteria against which to evaluate the performance of teachers. The number of performance criteria (18) and the Stakeholder's Committee process of developing them are demonstrated in this model; these are consistent with the literature's recommendations (Crespa, McCormick, & Paget, 1984; Manatt, 1986; Manatt, 1987). The clustering of the criteria is determined by the Stakeholders' Committee and ranked, differentiating the emphasis of the teaching behaviors. This local ranking of criteria is unique to this plan. This model also incorporates a Teacher Performance Indicator Bridge that clearly describes expected teacher and student behaviors; this
is exclusive to this plan. Additionally, the evaluation cycle and conferencing model are also representative of solid effective school's practices.

The Supervisor's Rating is the most subjective factor in the model and could be the most criticized by opponents of the model. More classroom observations with multiple observers could increase the validity of the evaluation results, but the demand on observer's time and the associated costs could be prohibitive. With sound training and supervised practice inter-rater reliability between administrator/evaluators can be held constant and meet high standards. Likewise, the clear performance criteria, evaluation instrumentation, and peer coaching opportunities ensure a consistent and fair assessment of the teacher's performance.

The Student Achievement factor requires the school district to articulate a comprehensive assessment system dependent on the district's curriculum and instructional practices. A criterion-referenced test battery, locally normed and validated against the district's curriculum standards, is essential for the integrity of this model. This assessment factor can be adapted to allow for the inclusion of alternative testing methods such as student portfolios, performance or authentic assessment, open-ended questions, and prompt-driven writing samples. Each of these methods would directly assess course outcomes and carefully utilize district developed rubrics and/or holistic scoring
methods. Using these new methods the results would still be locally normed and easily applied to the Student Achievement algorithm.

The Student Feedback factor is used to access the students' perceptions of the teacher's classroom effectiveness. Critics of student feedback would question whether students can identify "good teaching" behaviors. Studies indicate that students can accurately assess these behaviors through well written and validated feedback questionnaires. The questions are targeted at specific teacher behaviors outlined in the performance criteria and validated by research as effective teaching strategies (Manatt, 1986; Manatt & Petrone, 1989). Some concerns regarding student response modes may be warranted; current research is continuing to improve the instrumentation and its validity.

This performance-based pay plan requires the district to offer an articulated staff development program to support its teachers with their Professional Activities Report. This element provides teachers with continual opportunities for professional growth and stimulation while providing the district with a cadre of trained professionals available to provide the training. The literature contends that a supportive staff development program can promote increased student achievement through the improved instruction and classroom support services.
Other aspects of this plan that qualify it as an exemplar merit system include its protection of teachers' due process rights, class size computations, and the weighing of the individual and collective algorithms. The appeals process, the clearly defined evaluation system and the variety and validity of the Student Achievement and Student Feedback factors ensure each teacher their due process protection. The inclusion of a class size adjustment factor that considers the academic ability level of each student addresses the variability of each class; teachers and teacher unions view this adjustment as fair and equitable. The sophistication of the plan may be intimidating to some teachers and administrators. However, the complexity of the algorithms and weights respectively assigned, serve to proportionally emphasize the factors in the order of importance to the teaching job.

The model, algorithms, compensation matrices, and individual teacher awards can easily be computerized to aid in the plan administration. Also, the implementation of a Computer Managed Instruction (C.M.I.) system would aid in facilitating the criterion-referenced test battery and provide for test security and randomization of test items. The C.M.I. system could also be easily integrated within the overall computerized merit pay plan system.

This model provides four interdependent elements that can significantly improve student achievement. A clearly defined
evaluation system promotes improved instruction; improved instruction increases student learning. A solid staff development program fosters sound teaching strategies; improved teaching strategies increases the probability of greater student learning. Recognizing the value of and soliciting student feedback provides teachers with valuable and timely data. And an articulated curriculum supports an accurate and valid criterion-referenced assessment program; a sound assessment program ensures that what gets tested gets taught. The integration of these elements promotes a balanced triangulation of curriculum, instruction and assessment supported by the clearly articulated performance criteria.

The literature substantiates the need for incentive pay in education. It provides the evidence that performance-based pay is a viable movement supported by educators, legislatures and the public. Likewise, the literature references the many models and successes established in the private sector and encourages the development of plans to reflect the models delineated in business and industry. The literature argues the positive influences of incentive pay plans on teacher recruitment, teacher professionalization and teacher evaluation systems.

This model is consistent with accepted motivation theory that maintains money can be a motivator or satisfier for employees. The degree to which money serves as a motivator and the dollar amount that motivates the greatest are
continually debated. It is clearly stated in the motivation literature that it is difficult to generalize research findings to other employment situations because of the complexity and diversity of the variables studied. Thus, accepting the assumption that money and staff development opportunities do motivate, it is conceded that the absolute dollar amount of awards is unknown and needs to be determined for each specific organization. However, the example amounts presented within the model are consistent with the dollar amounts awarded in both state supported and mandated plans and independent district programs across the nation.

For the operational implementation of the plan, this study provides a series of cost matrices providing comparable cost figures and demonstrating the potential compensation ranges for teachers qualifying for merit pay. Compensation is differentiated based upon years of experience, the Teacher's Composite Score based on the three factors, and the hypothetical percent of salary. The matrices provide the individual and total cost of compensation projected to be incurred by the district. Together the matrices serve as examples against which districts can compare their level of funding to that of the study's. Additionally, it provides matrices demonstrating differing numbers of teachers qualifying for compensation. The matrices illustrate the possible compensation costs for a number of differing scenarios; the levels of compensation parallel those currently
observed in the programs cited as exemplary by today's research.

Of obvious concern for any incentive plan are the role and receptivity of the teachers' union/organization. The implementation of such a plan will meet with considerable resistance from the employee organization even with the built-in protections and majority input. It will be easier for the districts in states with mandated incentive pay legislation.

This study found very limited longitudinal research indicating the quality of existing performance-based pay plans. This new wave of incentive pay practices has not been rigorously assessed because of its recency and the diversity of plans, funding sources and formats. There does not exist conclusive or causal, long-term, statistically-based research examining the effect of performance-based pay on such variables as teacher motivation, student achievement or the myriad of other factors possibly influenced by incentive pay. This study provides the model from which the many hypotheses surrounding these issues can be further tested.

This study adds a more sophisticated and complex performance pay plan model to the existing body of knowledge. It also serves to stimulate the discussion of the intent and value of performance-based pay within the entire educational community.
Recommendations for Practice

The majority of considerations for implementation have been included in the model and accompanying procedures. These have focused on internal processes that lead to the development of the system and the policy decisions supporting it. However, there are other internal and external processes that should be acknowledged prior to practice.

1. District funding and budgeting practices must be considered to assure the plan can be funded and sustained at a level that insures its long-term integrity.

2. A thorough and explicit planning process must precede the development and implementation of an incentive plan.

3. Administrators must be trained in evaluation methods consistent with the plan.

4. Teachers must be trained in the teaching methodologies and instructional practices reflected in the criteria and standards of the plan.

5. A criterion-referenced test battery, student feedback questionnaires, and the Teacher Performance Evaluation system must be implemented prior to, or along with, the merit pay plan.

6. Prior to implementation, the cost analysis using specific district data, demographics, and/or hypothetical performance results should be simulated.
7. Upon implementation, the district should develop a comprehensive research project to further analyze student and teacher performance and attitudes.

8. State and local education agencies should pursue funding of valid performance-based pay systems that can improve student achievement and teacher performance.

9. The implementation process should include continuous evaluation and research of all aspects of the plan. As the infrastructure of the district changes and as teaching methodologies evolve, the plan should also adjust to reflect those changes.

Recommendations for Further Research

This study provides a model and procedures from which a school district can implement a merit pay system. It also serves to challenge the existing state of performance-based pay plans to further study the complex issues surrounding merit pay. Recommendations for further research include:

1. Survey teachers' acceptance of the model in the context of structure, concepts, performance factors, and amount of compensation;

2. Replicate the hypothetical compensation matrices using different school districts considering budgets and funding, geographic region, political influences, and demographics;
3. Hypothetically replicate the model to determine the administrative costs associated with implementation and maintenance of the plan;

4. Replicate the model in a "real world" application and design research studies to statistically validate:
   a. the influence or contribution of the each variable to the Teacher Composite Score;
   b. the manner of weighing each variable within the individual algorithms and for the whole plan; and
   c. the weights assigned to the classification of students within the class size variable;

5. Replicate the model in a "real world" application to statistically validate the influence of the plan on:
   a. student achievement;
   b. overall teacher performance;
   c. classroom instruction;
   d. teacher motivation;
   e. teacher morale;
   f. teacher acceptability/satisfaction;
   g. amount of compensation that affects results; and
   h. administrator moral and attitude; and

6. Replicate the model in a "real world" setting to determine (1) viability of the processes and procedures required for implementation including administrator time and (2) the amount and nature of the appeals within the due process system.
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APPENDIX A.

TEACHER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CYCLE AND PROCEDURES
WESTONLEE SCHOOL DISTRICT
TEACHER EVALUATION CYCLE

ORIENTATION CONFERENCE

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

CONFERENCE

WRITTEN REPORT

PREOBSERVATION CONFERENCE

FORMATIVE

FORMATIVE OBSERVATION

FEEDBACK CONFERENCES

SUPPORTIVE DATA AND INPUT

SUMMATIVE
Formal evaluation provides the opportunity to assess and evaluate professional performance. The primary purpose is the improvement of instruction.

Responsibility for the evaluation process lies with the person to whom a teacher is assigned. The teacher or administrator may request that other trained or qualified observers provide input into the evaluation process.

Initial contract teachers will be on full cycle for each of the first three years of employment in the district.

Continuing contract teachers will be on full cycle once every three years. The full of modified cycles may be applied if the respective program administrator or staff member requests it. At the end of Year One, the Continuing Professional Growth Schedule Plan will be monitored and accomplished.

I. The Full Cycle Evaluation Process

A. Self-evaluation (self-appraisal) will be completed. The form to be used will be the summative evaluation report. Input (feedback) from students should be used as self-analysis. Input will be gathered from those with whom the teacher works. These data are for self-improvement. The self-evaluation may serve as a source of discussion and permit the evaluator and evaluatee to exchange information.

B. Orientation Conference

1. This meeting is held to discuss the criteria and procedures in the evaluation system.
2. It can be held with individuals, small groups, or the entire faculty.

C. Preobservation Conference

1. This conference establishes the framework for the classroom observation.
2. Instructional plans will be submitted to be analyzed by the evaluator at least one working day prior to this conference so the plans can be discussed.
3. A preobservation data report will be completed and submitted at least one working day prior to this conference.

D. Observations-Formal Announced

1. The observation will be held for the period of time defined during the preobservation conference.
2. Data will be gathered which describe the teaching/learning situation.

E. Feedback Conference

1. Following the observations, the evaluator will analyze the data.
2. The conference will be held as soon as possible, preferably within five working days.

F. Supportive Data and Input

1. A minimum of three informal classroom observations will be conducted. The plans can be discussed.
2. Data from an informal classroom observation must be shared with the teacher.
3. Work samples should be used. These include, but are not limited to, summaries of professional meetings and conferences, student grade reports, memos, letters, or student work samples.

G. Summative Evaluation

1. Written Report
   a. The summative report must be completed by February 15.
   b. A copy of this report shall be given to the teacher at least one day prior to the conference.
   c. This report and all formative data shall be placed in the teacher's file in the superintendent's office.
2. Conference
   a. This conference is designed to review the teacher's relative effectiveness of his/her performance on the evaluation criteria.
   b. The teacher may file a written response preferably within five working days. This response is attached to the summative evaluation report and included in the teacher's personnel file.

3. Continuing Professional Growth Schedule Plan
   a. A minimum of one plan is written shortly after or in conjunction with the summative conference.
   b. The Continuing Professional Growth Schedule Plan will be written cooperatively by the teacher and the evaluator.
   c. An evaluation procedure will be included in each plan based on the specific criteria in the teacher performance evaluation system to include a signed written statement about the Continuing Professional Growth Schedule Plan.

II. Due Process
   A. All parties have had representation in the design, research, development, and review of the evaluation systems and instrument. Knowledge and understanding of performance expectations is provided for staff through distribution of this handbook.
   B. Every teacher is provided an opportunity for familiarization with the system, its procedures, and its use.
   C. Teachers are provided rebuttal opportunity as a part of each reporting cycle.
   D. All reports of unsatisfactory performance must be in writing and must enumerate shortcomings in a specific manner.
   E. Each teacher is provided access to the file of his/her evaluation reports located at the school site or the central office.
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TEACHER PERFORMANCE INDICATOR BRIDGE
CRITERIA

A. DEMONSTRATES EFFECTIVE PLANNING SKILLS INCLUDING USE OF TIME, MATERIALS, AND RESOURCES.

Descriptors

1. Selects appropriate long-range goals.
2. Selects and writes instructional objectives that are related to long-range goals and at the proper level of difficulty.
3. Utilizes a variety of teaching methods, procedures, and student activities relevant and appropriate to the objectives.
4. Utilizes both formative and summative evaluation procedures.
5. Plans appropriate time allotment.
6. Uses supplementary materials effectively.
7. Blends materials and resources smoothly into a lesson.

"Meets" Standard Indicators

Teacher Indicators

1. Teacher prepares lesson plans which reflect short- and long-term instructional objectives which can be related to the curriculum.
2. Teacher maintains a seating arrangement/grouping appropriate for the activity and the environment.
3. Teacher gives clear and administrative directions for classroom procedures or routines.
4. Teacher structures practice activities to reinforce the objectives being taught.
5. Teacher plans the necessary time frame for each lesson segment as displayed by smooth transitions and no loss of learning time.

Student Indicators

1. Students receive written and/or verbal information which explains the relevancy of short-term objectives to the entire course of study and/or grade level content area.
2. Students seat themselves promptly and orderly in assigned groups and/or individual desks.
3. Students anticipate guided practice during the lesson.
4. Students have appropriate materials prepared for the lesson.

"Exceeds" Standard Indicators

Teacher Indicators

1. Teacher writes instructional objectives related to long-range goals, prepared at the proper level of difficulty and related to purposeful activity.
2. Teacher prepares instructional objectives which include a variety of teaching methods and procedures congruent with learning styles.
3. Teacher plans lesson objectives through an efficient system of organization and structuring strategies.
4. Teacher individualizes lesson objectives to provide for individual and/or learning group differences.
5. Teacher completes task analysis for students and/or student groups by identifying critical learning elements, listing prerequisite skills, and relating student mastery to those skills.
6. Teacher places students into various groups according to the task requirements.
7. Teacher develops long-term, written classroom objectives that are diverse and individualized to achieve mastery.
8. Teacher consistently plans activities which allow for review and guided practice of instructional objectives.
9. Teacher provides opportunities for students to relate creative and unique experiences to complete the instructional objectives.
10. Teacher uses creative techniques to involve the students in the review portions of the lessons.

Student Indicators

1. Students efficiently and consistently respond to a set routine when materials are collected or distributed.
2. Students act as though they are familiar with routines when they move from one task/activity to another.
3. Students understand individualized or group placement, know where to locate materials, and are always prepared when it is time to begin class.
4. Students are attentive during the review and practice activity, therefore, the teacher exerts no effort to secure complete cooperation.
5. Students provide either written or verbal review statements to the entire class which serve to reiterate the objectives.
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PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION

The focus of the educational program of Westonlee School District is the student. The District has the responsibility to provide a program and an environment that challenges and enables each student to achieve his/her potential.

Students completing the educational program should exhibit the skills necessary to become a successful contributing citizen.

In order to insure full personal development of students, a balanced comprehensive program will be provided.

The educational program should be continually assessed to provide accountability toward meeting the district goals for students and direction for program improvement.

DISTRICT PROGRAM GOALS

1. Student Development of:
   -basic skills
   -learning and higher order thinking skills
   -maximum academic achievement
   -knowledge, skills, and attitudes in the humanities and fine arts
   -vocational skills
   -positive self-concept
   -individual skills and interests
   -acceptance of responsibility
   -an attitude of lifelong learning
   -physical fitness.

2. High expectations for student achievement by students, parents, and staff.

3. Pride in the school system and in each individual's accomplishments.
WESTONLEE SCHOOL DISTRICT

PHILOSOPHY OF INSTRUCTION

The most important role of the teacher in Westonlee School District is to provide instruction which helps each student reach his/her potential. Teachers shall instruct in a manner which encourages students to share responsibility for their education through active participation in the learning process.

To provide direct instruction, a district curriculum will be established. That district curriculum shall:

1. be in alignment with district philosophies of education
2. assure alignment of district goals and program objectives
3. provide for student fulfillment of graduation requirements
4. provide for the scope and sequence of each course
5. provide for continuity between grade levels and between appropriate courses
6. provide for the comprehensive needs of students.

Continuing assessment of the level of success of students in mastering the curriculum shall be conducted as a basis for change and adjustment of curriculum and instruction.

The important elements of effective classroom instruction include, but need not be limited to, the following list:

The teacher

- teaches appropriate basic skills in each content area in each instructional level
- organizes, manages, and directs the instruction
- uses a variety of teaching methods and procedures to meet various student learning styles
- continually evaluates student achievement and adapts instruction to meet the needs for individuals and groups
- teaches toward mastery and fluency of the established curriculum
- uses research-based instructional methods and techniques
- has high expectations and ideals for students and self
- demonstrates genuine concern for students and the educational program
- demonstrates accountability for teaching the established program and for the success of the student
- demonstrates professional ethical behavior
- is knowledgeable and current in subject matter
- creates an eagerness for learning on the part of students
- encourages creativity, higher-order thinking, and problem solving within the framework of the curriculum
- participates in professional growth activities.
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PHILOSOPHY OF EVALUATION

The primary purpose of performance evaluation in Westonlee School District is to improve performance, create a more positive learning climate, and promote student achievement. Evaluation data are used to assist in making personnel decisions such as:

A. promotion, performance-based pay, transfer, retention, release, and reduction of force
B. identifying and recognizing individual strengths in performance
C. identifying areas of performance needing improvement
D. establishing goals for improvement
E. planning individual and group staff development
F. planning assistance for individuals not meeting district standards of performance

Evaluation is a cooperative and ongoing process. It must be based on honesty, mutual trust, and confidence between the evaluator and the evaluatee. Both the evaluator and evaluatee shall be involved in monitoring and evaluating progress in reaching the improvement goals. Predetermined criteria, which trained evaluators can measure with reliability, are to be used to objectively measure performance. It is the responsibility of each evaluator to know the evaluation criteria, laws relating to evaluation, and the purpose and procedures of evaluation. The evaluator must also provide an opportunity for an open exchange of ideas and must demonstrate a fair and open-minded approach. He/she must initially and annually inform all staff being evaluated regarding the
criteria and procedures of evaluation used in the district, objectively collect and analyze data about performance, provide feedback to the evaluatee, form judgments about performance, and assist in performance improvement.

It is the responsibility of the evaluatee to know the evaluation criteria along with the purpose and the procedures of evaluation, to be receptive to suggestions, to improve areas of weakness, and to build on areas of strong performance.
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STUDENT FEEDBACK TO TEACHERS QUESTIONNAIRE—LOWER ELEMENTARY

0. I like the color red. ☒ ☒ ☒

1. My teacher makes our work interesting. ☒ ☒ ☒

2. My teacher is fair with all. ☒ ☒ ☒

3. Our teacher is often ready for class. ☒ ☒ ☒

4. My teacher tells us what new things we can learn in each lesson. ☒ ☒ ☒

5. My teacher gives us enough time to do our work ☒ ☒ ☒

6. My teacher knows me well. ☒ ☒ ☒

7. I can get help from my teacher. ☒ ☒ ☒

8. We go back over each lesson when we finish it. ☒ ☒ ☒

9. My teacher explains the lessons clearly. ☒ ☒ ☒

10. When I finish my work, my teacher gives me more work that I like to do. ☒ ☒ ☒

11. Our work is just right for us, not too easy nor too hard. ☒ ☒ ☒

12. My teacher makes me follow the rules. ☒ ☒ ☒
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STUDENT FEEDBACK TO TEACHERS QUESTIONNAIRE—UPPER ELEMENTARY

DIRECTIONS: The statements below are designed to find out more about your class and teacher. This is not a test. Do not put your name on this paper. Please answer all the statements.

Instructions for answering: Circle the corresponding number if the statement

1. does not describe your class or teacher at all;
2. does not describe your class or teacher well or if it describes something that does not happen very often;
3. describes your class or teacher the way it is sometimes;
4. describes your class or teacher the way it is usually but not all of the time;
5. describes your class or teacher the way it is almost all of the time.

1. My teacher makes our work interesting.  1 2 3 4 5
2. My teacher is fair with all students.  1 2 3 4 5
3. Our teacher is often ready for class.  1 2 3 4 5
4. My teacher tells us what new things we can learn in each lesson.  1 2 3 4 5
5. My teacher gives us enough time to do our work.  1 2 3 4 5
6. My teacher knows me well.  1 2 3 4 5
7. I can get help from my teacher.  1 2 3 4 5
8. We go back over each lesson when we finish it.  1 2 3 4 5
9. My teacher explains the lessons clearly.  1 2 3 4 5
10. When I finish my work, my teacher gives me more work that I like to do.  1 2 3 4 5
11. Our work is just right for us, not too easy nor too hard.  1 2 3 4 5
12. My teacher makes me follow the rules.  1 2 3 4 5
DIRECTIONS: The statements below are designed to find out more about your class and teacher. This is not a test. Do not put your name on this paper. Please answer all the statements.

Instructions for answering: Circle the corresponding number if the statement

1. does not describe your class or teacher at all;
2. does not describe your class or teacher well or if it describes something that does not happen very often;
3. describes your class or teacher the way it is sometimes;
4. describes your class or teacher the way it is usually but not all of the time;
5. describes your class or teacher the way it is almost all of the time.

1. My teacher makes class work interesting.  
   1 2 3 4 5

2. My teacher is fair with all students.  
   1 2 3 4 5

3. My teacher is well prepared for our class.  
   1 2 3 4 5

4. My teacher starts lessons with explaining what we are going to do and why we are going to do it.  
   1 2 3 4 5

5. My teacher gives enough time to do our work.  
   1 2 3 4 5

6. I can talk alone with my teacher if I need.  
   1 2 3 4 5

7. My teacher gives me extra help if I need it.  
   1 2 3 4 5

8. When we finish a lesson we discuss and summarize what we have just studied.  
   1 2 3 4 5

9. My teacher explains the lesson clearly.  
   1 2 3 4 5

10. My teacher asks us questions in class.  
    1 2 3 4 5
11. My teacher explains new ideas in a way that is easy to understand.

12. My teacher looks at our work, as we are doing it, to see if we understand the lesson.

13. My teacher returns tests and homework quickly.

14. If I finish an assignment before the class is over, my teacher gives me interesting work to do.

15. My teacher doesn't waste too much time checking attendance, writing passes and handing out assignments.

WESTONLEE SCHOOL DISTRICT
STUDENT FEEDBACK TO TEACHERS QUESTIONNAIRE--SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

DIRECTIONS: The statements below are designed to find out more about your class and teacher. This is not a test. Do not put your name on this paper. Please answer all the statements.

Instructions for answering: Circle the corresponding number if the statement

1. does not describe your class or teacher at all;
2. does not describe your class or teacher well or if it describes something that does not happen very often;
3. describes your class or teacher the way it is sometimes;
4. describes your class or teacher the way it is usually but not all of the time;
5. describes your class or teacher the way it is almost all of the time.

1. My teacher makes class work interesting.
   1 2 3 4 5

2. My teacher is fair with all students.
   1 2 3 4 5

3. My teacher is well prepared for our class.
   1 2 3 4 5

4. My teacher starts lessons with explaining what we are going to do and why we are going to do it.
   1 2 3 4 5

5. My teacher gives enough time to do our work.
   1 2 3 4 5

6. I can talk alone with my teacher if I need.
   1 2 3 4 5

7. My teacher gives me extra help if I need it.
   1 2 3 4 5

8. When we finish a lesson we discuss and summarize what we have just studied.
   1 2 3 4 5

9. My teacher explains the lesson clearly.
   1 2 3 4 5

10. My teacher asks questions to see if we understand what has been taught.
    1 2 3 4 5
11. My teacher gives homework related to the subject we are studying. 1 2 3 4 5
12. My teacher encourages us to look at problems in new ways and find new ways to solve problems. 1 2 3 4 5
13. My teacher explains new ideas in a way that is easy to understand. 1 2 3 4 5
14. My teacher explains how I could have done better work. 1 2 3 4 5
15. My teacher checks to see how well we understand what is being taught. 1 2 3 4 5
16. My teacher knows a lot about the subject being taught. 1 2 3 4 5
17. My teacher helps me to learn the subject being taught. 1 2 3 4 5
18. My teacher knows what I am capable of doing. 1 2 3 4 5
19. My teacher expects me to do the best work I can. 1 2 3 4 5
20. My teacher maintains discipline. 1 2 3 4 5