

2005 SEDL Policy Forum
Pay and Performance: Teacher Resource Policy
September 29–30, 2005
Albuquerque, New Mexico



SUMMARY

State policymakers from Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas joined guest speakers Anthony Milanowski, Judy Jeffrey, Lewis C. Solmon, and Jeffrey Buck to share their knowledge at the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, (SEDL) annual policy forum. The forum provided participants with research, policy, and programmatic knowledge on teacher compensation programs and teacher quality. An important message of the forum was that there are a variety of ways teacher compensation programs and processes can be established and implemented but that it takes a systemic effort to see results. SEDL's policy forum focused on what teacher compensation strategies enhance teacher quality and contribute to national and state goals to teach all students to meet high standards.

Teacher Compensation Research and Policy Overview

Dr. Anthony Milanowski
Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE)
University of Wisconsin–Madison

Dr. Anthony Milanowski reviewed research on teacher compensation and used examples to illustrate results from state and local education efforts implemented in the United States. His message was clear: we must see pay strategically and think of teacher compensation as a system, i.e., with pay and supports for the whole teacher system. He stressed that how a teacher compensation program is administered is a key factor in its success. Additionally, he emphasized that teacher compensation programs should be aimed at need; therefore, assessments of issues such



as teacher recruitment and retention; teacher skill levels; and alignment of school and/or district priorities, goals, strategies, and expectations of teachers are necessary.

Milanowski commented on teacher union issues that must be considered when thinking about teacher compensation reform, including the use of incentives and/or implementing knowledge and skill-based pay systems. He suggested public education agencies work with unions and teacher associations when constructing compensation policies, but recognized this is not always possible and other approaches may be necessary.

He described the use of incentives for teachers as one tactic, but called attention to the need to evaluate the implementation and impact of incentives. One question about incentives that we should ask is, “Does the incentive move people into the field versus keep them in the field?” In regard to incentives, Milanowski described a number of different types as well as ways states, districts, and schools have implemented incentives. Many are direct monetary funds such as signing bonuses, additions to base pay, and individual pay awards for performance. Incentives may also include loan forgiveness, housing assistance, and extra retirement credits. Some incentives are based on teacher knowledge and skills, some are tied to recruitment and retention efforts, particularly in high-need schools, i.e., those with geographic, subject-area, and/or demographic challenges. Incentives may be used to improve teacher skills or as a means of motivation. Research provides some guidance on the use and impact of incentives.

Milanowski explained that incentives for teaching in high-need schools often are in the form of bonuses and have been used in New York, Nevada, and a number of local jurisdictions. One such example is Charlotte-Mecklenburg’s Equity Plus Program in North Carolina. Econometric studies suggest relatively large financial incentives would be needed to influence teacher choice. However, there are no large-scale studies of targeted incentives, only anecdotal evidence from some districts that these incentives are effective. For additional research and information see *Making Schools Work: Improving Performance and Controlling Costs*, by Eric Hanushek et al. (1994), at <http://edpro.stanford.edu/Hanushek/content.asp?contentId=81> and the Charlotte-Mecklenburg program at <http://www.cms.k12.nc.us/departments/HR/recruitment.asp>.

Incentives specific to teachers in schools with shortages in academic subjects, such as math, science, and special education, are often in the form of a salary add-on. The state of North Carolina and local districts have used this incentive. Some evidence has shown that math and science teachers have higher-paying alternatives outside of education than do other teachers, which speaks to the amount needed for the incentive. For research, see *An Exploration of the Pay Levels Needed to Attract Students with Mathematics, Science and Technology Skills to a Career in K–12 Teaching*, by Anthony Milanowski (2002), at <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/papers/pdf/Pay%20Levels%20EI%203-02.pdf>.

Milanowski also described incentives for teachers seeking or having National Board Certification (NBC). Incentives in the form of pay bonuses and application fee and tuition reimbursement have been implemented in many states. Research indicates that incentives raise the rate of NBC participation; however, there is mixed evidence on whether NBC improves teachers’ skills. Milanowski raised the following question about NBC: “Are we rewarding teachers who are already good or are we rewarding teachers to improve?” He noted some research that has shown a connection between increased student performance and teachers with

NBC. However, he cautions us to ask, “Are we allocating teachers with NBC where they are needed?” For research see, “*Can Teacher Quality Be Effectively Assessed?*”, by Dan Goldhaber and Emily Anthony (2004), at <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410958> and *A Distinction That Matters: Why National Teacher Certification Makes a Difference*, by Lloyd Bond, Tracy W. Smith, Wanda K. Baker, and John A. Hatti (2000), at www.nbpts.org/pdf/valstudy.pdf.

When districts offer professional development incentives for teachers, they often give them in the form of subsidized tuition and necessary time off to participate in training. These types of incentives have been put into practice in Iowa, Delaware, and local districts. There is limited research on the effect of this incentive for teachers. See *Helping Teachers Teach Well: Transforming Professional Development*, by Thomas B. Corcoran (1995), at <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/CPRE/t61/index.html>.

Milanowski also focused on knowledge and skill-based teacher pay systems. These systems include efforts to compensate teachers for demonstrating competencies in the classroom. A number of programs that have been implemented in the past have been terminated; however, there are currently some that are experiencing positive results, such as those in Philadelphia and in Kyrene, Arizona. To effectively use a performance pay model, he recommended instituting rigorous assessments of teacher practice, measured by multiple classroom observations and lines of evidence, including explicit standards, various practice levels, and behavioral rating scales. He emphasized the importance of training for evaluators. In addition, he noted that hiring evaluators specifically for this purpose is costly but worthwhile. Research conducted by CPRE on the effects of evaluation can be found on their Web site: <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/tcomp/research/standards/district/studies.asp>. In his research, Milanowski also found that teachers ask how they can improve, wanting feedback and coaching. He suggests ensuring knowledge and skill-based pay systems incorporate immediate feedback for teachers on process and “not results only.” Further, he learned that teachers are less enthusiastic about moving up a compensation career ladder because they believe they can’t do it. He proposed we “up-skill our teaching workforce,” using higher-level teaching skills with multiple supports to enhance those skills and align professional development.

Another form of performance pay are school-based awards, often offered as a bonus to all teachers (and others) in a school when that school achieves pre-established performance goals. Milanowski described research showing that these programs often help focus staff attention on performance goals; however, they are not highly motivational, may increase teacher turnover, and can act as a deterrent for new teachers. Milanowski suggests that for a program to be successful we must first ask, “Do you have the school/district/statewide support to do this type of bonus program?” For more on this research, see the CPRE Web site: <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/tcomp/research/sbpa/studies.asp>.

Milanowski stated that merit pay, i.e., teacher pay increases based on a principal’s subjective evaluation, leads to many equity and personnel problems but still exists in some schools today. Current pay for performance models use a value-added approach, i.e., teachers’ pay is based on their individual student’s achievement over time. Research has shown both positive and negative effects of using a merit pay approach and additional research is needed. He noted the following research concerns:

- It is hard to identify the middle-ground teachers (those not the very best or very worst).

- It is difficult to control for what students go to what teachers.
- Not all teachers teach tested subjects.

In conclusion, Milanowski pointed out that some incentive programs and knowledge- and skill-based pay systems can work; however, changing a teacher's pay is not an end unto itself, nor is it a simple solution. We must use changes in compensation to support other reform strategies that impact instruction. He added that distrust of past efforts is so strong that making changes to pay structures is difficult. Further, Milanowski emphasized that administrators must also be included in compensation system reform. He suggests cost-benefit studies be conducted to financially justify the implementation or continuation of compensation programs.

To view Milanowski's slide presentation, go to
<http://www.sedl.org/rel/policydocs/forum2005/Milanowski.PPT>.



Teacher Resources in SEDL's Region

Dr. Zena H. Rudo
Dr. Celeste Alexander
SEDL Policy Research

Mr. James Ball
New Mexico Public Education Department

In this session, participants heard about teacher compensation research and practice in SEDL's region. SEDL staff presented findings from their research on state data systems and teacher resource links to student performance. James Ball, representing New Mexico's Public Education Department, presented information on the state's Three-Tiered Teacher Licensure System.

SEDL Presentation

Rudo gave a brief overview of SEDL's policy research studies on education resource allocation issues. She discussed several lessons learned from this research:

- Higher student performance is related to higher levels of resource allocation (fiscal and teacher resources) in instructional areas.

- State education data to study teacher resource allocation is generally available and accessible; however, variables of interest may not be, due to accuracy, consistency, and database alignment limitations.

As a basis for SEDL's research, Rudo provided information about previous research in the field. She discussed SEDL's current study in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas on teacher resources and student achievement, examining teacher base salary, experience, and education in different school environments. Schools are differentiated by their locale (urban, rural, or suburban), student minority and poverty enrollments, and per-pupil instructional expenditures. Additionally, the school environment is defined by family household incomes and levels of parent education. SEDL's study is particularly concerned with high-need schools, i.e., those that are either rural or urban and have higher than 50 percent non-White student enrollment, or over 50 percent of students on free and reduced-priced lunch, or in the lowest 25 percent on student achievement tests. Rudo showed tables describing the schools and teachers in the study, as well as data on the average salaries of teachers in various type schools.

Alexander presented preliminary findings from SEDL's current study. In all three study states, teacher salaries basically follow the single salary schedule. Alexander noted that teachers with low salaries are more often found in schools with high student poverty and minority enrollment. Additionally, certified teachers make a higher base salary on average than uncertified teachers.

In regard to high-need schools in the study, SEDL's preliminary findings indicate that in Arkansas and Texas, schools that have high student poverty not only have lower average teacher salaries than other schools but also lower teacher education levels. In Arkansas and Louisiana, high student minority enrollment is also related to lower teacher education levels in these schools. Across all three states, teachers in rural schools are more likely than those in urban and suburban schools to have lower average salaries. In Texas, on average, teachers in rural schools are also more likely to have lower education levels. Alexander also pointed out that when assessing schools with low student achievement in eighth grade math, teachers in high-need schools, on average, have lower education levels than teachers in schools in the study that are not high-need. Particular to Texas, these same schools also tend to have, on average, lower teacher salaries.

Alexander also discussed preliminary results for all schools in the study with eighth grade math achievement scores. She pointed out that in all three states, scores on prior math achievement tests, as well as student demographics, such as the percent of minority and low income students in a school, are important factors in predicting future math achievement scores. In Arkansas and Louisiana, teacher resources, such as salary, education, and experience do not seem to play much of a role in predicting math achievement. However, in Texas, teacher salary is significantly related to student math achievement, i.e., higher salary and traditional certification are related to higher math achievement. SEDL researchers also examined the relationship between traditional versus alternative teacher certification and student math achievement. In Arkansas and Louisiana, there was no significant relationship found; however in Texas, schools with higher numbers of traditionally certified teachers were found to have, on average, higher math achievement.

SEDL will complete this study in December 2005. To view SEDL's slide presentation, go to <http://www.sedl.org/rel/policydocs/forum2005/2005-Forum-SEDL.ppt>

New Mexico Public Education Department Presentation

Ball described the New Mexico's Three-Tiered Teacher Licensure System, in place since July 2004. The program links teachers' licensure levels and salaries to the work they accomplish in the classroom, and it encourages and supports ongoing professional development in nine teaching competency areas. Progressing through the program guarantees minimum salary levels for teachers at different licensure levels. The minimum salary levels will be phased in over a 5-year period. To date, New Mexico has spent \$61 million on Level I and II implementation and expects to spend another \$40 million on future implementation. A major component of the program is an evidence-based teacher evaluation system, with differentiated indicators by the licensure level and individual. Each teacher's annual evaluation includes four processes:

- Professional development plan
- Reflection on the professional development plan
- Summative evaluation
- Progressive documentation of teacher performance

For teachers to advance through the Three-Tiered Licensure System, they must submit a Professional Development Dossier (PDD), completed online. Each PDD includes five strands, three evaluated by independent reviewers at the state level and two completed at the district level. Within each strand, teachers document their progress toward meeting the state teaching competency areas. Currently, two submission periods have taken place and some analysis of the data has been performed on who advances from Level I to Level II by teacher preparation institution and teacher ethnicity. New Mexico recognizes additional work to be done on the program in the areas of local teacher evaluations and evaluation of leadership.

To learn more about the New Mexico Three-Tiered Licensure System, see <http://www.teachnm.org>. To view Ball's slide presentation, go to http://www.sedl.org/rel/policydocs/forum2005/NM_Ball.ppt.

Teacher Quality and Compensation Models

Jeff Buck	Judy Jeffrey	Dr. Lewis C. Solmon
Denver Public Schools	Iowa Department of Education	Teacher Advancement Program Foundation

This panel session, and small group discussions with the speakers following this session, provided participants with information on three teacher compensation models, including their strengths, limitations, and processes. Participants learned about similarities and differences across the models, how they were instituted, obstacles to implementation, and research on their effectiveness. Anthony Milanowski moderated this session, providing discussion points and questions for each of the presentations.



Denver Public Schools ProComp Model

Jeff Buck discussed Denver Public Schools' (DPS) voluntary Professional Compensation System (ProComp) for teachers. ProComp has received teacher union and National Education Association support and will go before the voters in November 2005 for a \$25 mill levy. He described

Denver Public Schools with its approximately 4,300 teachers in 142 schools. Denver has around 72,000 students, 80 percent of whom are non-White, and a large immigrant population. In the late 1990s, Denver Public Schools initiated a 4-year pilot project in 15 schools wanting to link teacher pay with student performance. The objective for this project was set on student achievement growth rather than achievement goals. As the project progressed, DPS experienced data issues that precluded them from making high-stakes pay decisions. They put together the Joint Task Force on Teacher Compensation and hired an economic modeler to further develop their approach, resulting in ProComp.

Buck emphasized three of the ten elements comprising ProComp. The first element is an objective setting process that includes a tool to inform teachers how to measure student growth. This process is a collaboration between the teacher and school administrator and is attached to a \$330 bonus. The second element is a professional evaluation system based on five standards with numerous benchmarks. The third element is professional development in which teachers are expected to study, demonstrate, and reflect on what they learn. Buck noted that the professional development is not based on how much time teachers spend in training, but rather on what they learn and how they apply the knowledge. Other elements upon which pay is based in the ProComp system include marketing incentives, student growth measures, education and certification levels, and a group incentive for distinguished schools. Teachers in the ProComp system have uncapped earning potential and can realize an ongoing longevity increase while in the program. Currently teachers have 7 years to opt into the system.

To learn more about ProComp, go to <http://denverprocomp.org/>.

Iowa's Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Program



Judy Jeffrey presented on Iowa's statewide approach to teacher compensation and teacher quality. Iowa has 365 school districts with approximately 33,000 teachers. The State Board of Education has authority over PK–16, as well as twelve Area Education Agencies (AEAs). The AEAs, similar to regional centers in other states, provide support services such as professional development, database management, and special education services. Jeffrey cited Iowa's strong cooperation between the teacher unions, administrator organizations, state department of education, and AEAs. She also noted Iowa has effective pre-service education in which performance-based assessments are used.

In 2001, Iowa's legislature established the Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Program that provides a structure for teacher mentoring and induction, professional development, evaluation, and career levels. The program is designed to increase student achievement by increasing teacher quality, i.e., improving instructional practices and attracting and retaining high-performing teachers. Jeffrey gave examples of the eight teaching standards and 42 objectives used to determine teacher effectiveness. One standard is for teachers to show the ability to use and analyze student achievement data, as well as to incorporate the results into their classroom practice. Another is that teachers must engage in professional growth. Teachers are evaluated based on evidence they bring forth regarding the standards and criteria. Persons performing the evaluations must go through a 10-day training and receive certification, good for

5 years. Districts are awarded \$1,000 when an individual completes training. Jeffrey stated that administrator preparation program professors also had to attend the state's evaluator training to be eligible as trainers and evaluators.

Jeffrey described the various career levels: Beginning Teacher (0–2 years), Career Teacher I and II, and Advanced Teacher. Beginning Teachers are provided a minimum salary, obtain an initial 2-year license, have a comprehensive evaluation, and receive state-funded mentoring (\$1,300 per teacher mentored). Jeffrey noted that Iowa's mentoring program is in its 4th year, with most beginning teachers moving from having an initial license to a standard license. However, if the beginning teacher is unable to demonstrate competence on all eight teaching standards after the 2nd year, he or she is no longer eligible to teach in Iowa. There is one exception to this policy. A district may fund a 3rd year of additional assistance to enable the beginning teacher to meet the standards. Jeffrey commented that anecdotal evidence indicates that beginning teachers who do not meet the standards generally leave before being told they are no longer eligible to teach.

Once a teacher enters the Career Teacher levels, pay increases are determined through evidence of competence. Jeffrey noted that teachers are required to develop a career plan tied to the state standards, student achievement goals, and district plans. The teacher's professional development is addressed in the plan. Iowa offers research-based professional development, supported by Iowa Content Network Team reviews of research. Jeffrey pointed out that Iowa's program is still scaling up and a comprehensive evaluation of the program is due in 2007.

To learn more about Iowa's Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Program, go to <http://www.state.ia.us/educate/ecese/tqt/tc/index.html>. To view Jeffrey's slide presentation, go to http://www.sedl.org/rel/policydocs/forum2005/IOWA_Jeffrey.ppt.

Teacher Advancement Program Foundation



Lewis C. Solmon discussed the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) and commented that its effectiveness is based on the fact that it is a systemic effort and not just a performance pay program. TAP, initially established by the Milken Foundation and now in a number of schools across the nation, was designed to increase student learning through quality teaching. Solmon described TAP as a comprehensive reform to attract, develop, motivate, and retain high-quality teachers. States working with TAP generally have an assigned director or coordinator who monitors the program's progress and collaborates with the TAP national office.

Solmon explained the four elements of TAP: 1) multiple career paths; 2) instructionally focused accountability; 3) ongoing, applied professional growth; and 4) performance-based compensation. TAP's career ladder enables teachers to move up, with added roles and responsibilities, yet stay in the classroom. Teachers are held accountable for their instructional practice and for the achievement growth of not only students in their classroom but for the entire school. Solmon explained that accountability is measured through a comprehensive evaluation system, using research-based instructional standards and rubrics. Each teacher is evaluated 4–6 times per year. The evaluations are an aspect of each teacher's ongoing professional growth. He pointed out other avenues TAP teachers have for professional development, including meeting in

daily 90-minute cluster groups, participating in pre- and post-conference testing sessions, receiving coaching, and attending off-site training. Solmon stressed the need to immediately provide teachers with feedback and professional development as needs are identified, not only to allay their fears of evaluation but to provide them with the necessary tools for self-improvement.

In regard to teacher compensation, Solmon stated that pay increases are based on the teacher's performance as measured by his or her evaluations, functions and duties, and student achievement gains. Teachers are also eligible for bonuses. For example, the TAP model includes a bonus for teachers who score well on skills assessments and/or when student scores improve. Generally, 50 percent of a bonus is for skills and knowledge and 50 percent for student achievement growth. Solmon emphasized that bonuses have to be significant, i.e., \$1,000 or more, if they are to make a difference. In addition to teacher pay, Solmon described costs associated with the TAP model being mostly incremental and may include, for example, specialists for teachers while they are in training. He suggested redistribution of funds by local sites to implement TAP and looking into federal funds, such as the Teacher Incentive Fund.

Solmon ended his presentation with information about some of the results from research on TAP:

- Teachers voluntarily move from low-poverty schools without TAP to high-poverty TAP schools.
- Sixty-eight percent of TAP schools outperformed similar schools without TAP
- There has been increased collegiality in TAP schools.

Solmon mentioned that research on TAP and other information about the program are the focus of their annual TAP conference, this year November 11–14.

For more information about TAP, go to <http://www.tapschools.org>. To view Solmon's slide presentation, go to http://www.sedl.org/rel/policydocs/forum2005/TAP_Solmon.ppt.

Following the three presentations on Teacher Quality and Compensation models, Anthony Milanowski praised all of the efforts and stressed the systemic nature of the programs. He commented on the need for additional research and asked a pointed question about each of the programs.

- About ProComp: "Are they sure that what they are paying for is going to what the districts goals and/or needs are?"
- About Iowa: "Will they be able to do targeting of pay?"
- About TAP: "Can TAP work in average school districts that are not voluntary?"



Where Do We Go From Here? Lessons To Take Back to Our States

Panelists: Anthony Milanowski, Jeff Buck, Lewis C. Solmon, and Judy Jeffrey

Participants from the five states in SEDL's region met in small state groups to discuss teacher compensation issues in their state. Their discussions were guided by three questions.

1. What are the most recent teacher compensation policies or programs your state has considered or implemented? Are data collected specific to these teacher compensation policies or programs?
2. Are there specific limitations or challenges that impede efforts toward teacher compensation in your state?
3. After learning about different teacher compensation models at this forum, what would you want to see your state do? How would this be accomplished (e.g., collaboration across agencies, legislation, funding, public support, etc.)?

After the small group discussions, all forum participants and the guest speakers gathered for a final session to discuss what lies ahead for the future of teacher compensation, particularly in relation to their state or local programs.

Guest Speaker Panel Presentation

Milanowski pointed out that he sees a growth in "combat pay" at the district level. He suggested we watch the Denver ProComp model for future district change in compensation, as well as state-level programs like New Mexico's Three-Tiered Licensure System and Iowa's Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Program. He believes we must set a concrete vision and get all the stakeholders to buy-in if programs are to work and that evaluations of programs are a necessity for the future.

Buck stressed the need for collaborative interaction between unions and districts for programs to work. Further, he believes connecting state, district, and community services, e.g., day care, are important for the growth and sustainability of systemic teacher compensation models.

Solmon noted that very few state-level pay plans exist and that it may be easier to implement district-level programs. He believes that as more radical reforms gain strength, policymakers will become more interested in public school issues, such as what is happening with vouchers.

Jeffrey commented that there must be state support and good organizational structures to do a state-level program. She believes the route to success is paying for knowledge and skills and that teachers need training for high-need schools. Jeffrey also stated that we must look at teaching protocols and their use to evaluate teachers. Specific to Iowa's program, state education policymakers learned from implementation that they must reconsider their Career II level and possibly do away with it entirely.

State Reports

Participants from each state described their recent teacher compensation policies or programs, the challenges they face regarding these and future teacher compensation efforts, and where they think their state may head in the future on this issue.

Arkansas

- \$4,000 legislative incentive for schools with less than 1,000 pupils; greater than 70 percent free and reduced-priced lunch
 - Developing the board of directors for the Arkansas Teacher Housing Development Foundation (the foundation is to provide affordable housing and housing incentives to attract high-performing teachers to high-priority school districts)
 - \$35 million in teacher insurance program
 - Raise in teacher minimum salary with a guaranteed \$450 step per year for experience
- Arkansas listed power/control, turf, monetary, and legislative challenges. The state also noted difficulties with collective bargaining groups. For the future, Arkansas described efforts to improve coordination between the state departments of education and higher education, explore options for performance pay, and lessen the disparity in salaries per district.

Louisiana

Louisiana is mired in rebuilding and finding immediate and long-term solutions to the recent natural disasters that created chaos in their education system. However, it was noted that what will likely happen in regard to teacher compensation in the future would be at the district level. The state is interested in bringing pay for teachers, across the board, up to the regional average and working toward lessening discrepancies in salary across and within districts.

New Mexico

- Continue their state-level reform, i.e., the Three-Tiered Licensure System
- Placed heavy emphasis on classroom teachers and now moving toward developing a system for education leadership, including salary and evaluation policies
- Looking into including instructional support providers into the Three-Tiered Licensure System
- Education is 45.6 percent of the state general fund budget

New Mexico discussed several challenges, such as a troubled teacher retirement fund and needing to maintain teacher momentum for the state compensation system. The state sees educating teachers about what has to be funded by law and finding funding outside of the state funding formula to meet the minimum salary as important. New Mexico mentioned that the state plans to strive for increased collaboration between the state public education and higher education offices. Additionally, it will focus on the Level III teachers in their Three-Tiered Licensure System.

Oklahoma

- \$3,000 across-the-board pay raise 4 years ago
- Increasing the minimum salary schedule over the next 5 years to meet the regional average
- 100 percent of teacher health insurance is paid by the state
- Approximately \$5,000–\$7,000 state funds for National Board Certification and Education Leadership Program
- Additional \$1,000 for middle school math professional development

Oklahoma noted monetary challenges, but has a positive outlook for increases in funding. The state listed several other priorities upon which the state department is focusing, including graduation standards and statewide testing. Oklahoma discussed using the information from this forum to consider the following: 1) improving teacher evaluation, particularly related to agency collaboration; 2) developing statewide standards and legislation for professional development; and 3) implementation of a compensation model on a small scale, at either a district or school site.

Texas

- Proposed performance-based incentives for teachers in small schools and those with greater than 75 percent free and reduced-priced lunch
- Considering a tuition exemption for teachers' children and other longevity incentives to retain teachers
- Currently has one school district with the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) and another district that has implemented teacher incentives

Texas discussed challenges with four teacher associations, limited funds, the teacher retirement system, and a divided legislature. The state noted difficulty in putting forth any statewide program, especially since the state funds a small proportion of education dollars. Therefore, it is believed that programs are more likely to be established or expanded at the local level. Texas discussed using the information from this forum to do the following: 1) build collaboration among education stakeholders, 2) expand TAP into more schools, and 3) educate state and local entities about teacher compensation models.



Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 E. 7th St., Suite 200 • Austin, TX 78701-3253
800-476-6861 • <http://www.sedl.org>