The Student Performance Improvement Program: An Approach to Alternative Compensation

A Joint Project of St. Francis Independent School District #15 and Education Minnesota St. Francis
Timeline, 1995 - 2005: St. Francis & Minnesota

1995 - Minnesota begins 2% set aside for professional development

1997 - St. Francis negotiates teacher teams, leaders, 20 hours of individual professional time

2000 - Chief negotiator, union vice president attend ER&D training, write what becomes Teacher Academy policy

2001 - District starts Teacher Academy, Gov. Ventura provides $$ for five model alternative compensation programs

2002 - Tim Pawlenty elected governor

2003 - Minnesota provides no increase in education funding for two-year period, state senate (controlled by Democrats) propose an increase all tied to performance-based pay
Timeline, 1995 - 2005: St. Francis & Minnesota

2004 - St. Francis union executive council endorses a plan to pursue performance-based pay as “most likely means to significantly increase teacher pay,” 54% of teacher leaders endorse the concept

2005 - (March) 70% of St. Francis teachers endorse plan for negotiations

2005 - (July) State legislature approves Q Comp, Governor signs law

2005 - (September) 85% of St. Francis teachers vote “yes” for performance-base pay plan

2005 - (October) St. Francis Plan accepted by State, goes into effect
Minnesota’s Quality Compensation (Q Comp) Law

• Passes legislature in July 2005, goes into effect August, 2005
• Voluntary program - districts, schools, and chart schools must apply
• Provides $260 per pupil for designated purposes (about 7% increase in money available for teacher salaries)
• Five components -
  • Career ladder for teachers
  • Job-embedded staff development
  • Teacher evaluation system
  • Performance pay (standardized test bonus)
  • Reformed steps and lanes
Four-Member Performance Review Team
Assigned to each professional covered by the teacher contract

Membership
1. Teacher
2. Peer Leader
3. Specialist (peer)
   (Assigned by program coordinator)
4. Administrator

Fall Meeting
- Reviews Annual Goal & Plan
- Sets observation schedule
- Sets Up Planning for "Evidence of Student Growth"

Spring Meeting
- Determines Plan Completion
- Provides Annual Rating
- Approves Teacher's Plan for the following year
Annual Review Process for Individual Teachers

PRT Reviews Work / Reports Results (PRT Meets) (Spring)

Performance Review Team (PRT) Assigned Spring/Summer

Formal Observations / Evidence of Student Growth (November - May)

Annual Program Developed (PRT Meets) (Summer/Fall)

Professional Growth (Summer/school year)
# Salary Schedule (2009-11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Level</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BA - Mentor</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>MA - Mentor</th>
<th>Accumulated Annual Reviews Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>$39,120</td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,750</td>
<td></td>
<td>Entry Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>$45,641</td>
<td></td>
<td>$47,814</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (all proficient or above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td>$52,160</td>
<td>$53,247</td>
<td>$55,420</td>
<td>$56,507</td>
<td>6 (all proficient or above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$59,767</td>
<td>$60,854</td>
<td>10 (7 established)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$64,114</td>
<td>$65,201</td>
<td>13 (10 established)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$71,542</td>
<td>$72,629</td>
<td>16 (13 established)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,854</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 (4 established)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$65,201</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 (4 established)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$72,629</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 (4 established)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extended Responsibility Stipends Range - $4,162 to $10,404
Career Teacher Incentive - $1,700 to $2,420
Teacher Career Paths

Emerging Professional Teacher
6 annual reviews at proficient level (minimum)

Professional Teacher

Mentor Teacher
Teachers eligible after 7 annual reviews

Approved Master’s Degree Program
Completed

Career Classroom Performance
Teachers eligible with 10 annual reviews, 7 of which are “established”

Career Ladder in Teacher Leadership
Teachers eligible with 7 annual reviews, 4 of which are “established”
St. Francis Student Achievement, Compared to the State Average...

Increased by an average of

**+12.81** point average gain in mathematics

**+10.15** point average gain in reading

St. Francis Graduates Increasing College Access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grad Year</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>2178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Career College</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 year College/University</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Continuing Education</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Baseline (2000) - 59.6% of graduates go on to college.
Average of full implementation years (2002–2006) - 70.4% of graduates go on to college.
University of Minnesota Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement Study

U of M CAREI Study
What Attracts New Teachers to St. Francis?*

33% - Teacher Support System
32% - Improved Salary Schedule
24% - Early hiring decision
11% - Other

U of M CAREI Study
Is St. Francis attracting more applicants for teaching jobs?*

70% - Agree St. Francis is attracting more applicants
18% strongly agree
51% agree

*Survey given to administrators and teacher-leaders.
U of M CAREI Study
Is St. Francis attracting better applicants for teaching jobs?*

75% - Agree St. Francis is attracting better applicants
   18% strongly agree
   57% agree

*Survey given to administrators and teacher-leaders.
U of M CAREI Study
Support for the system*

88.9% - Highly support system
79% - Believe salary advancement should be connected to student achievement gains
82% - Believe system will result in greater achievement gains for students

*Survey given to all teachers.
U of M CAREI Study
Summary & Conclusions

• Most significant change - explicit link between professional development and positive, observable changes in work settings

• Teachers must demonstrate proficiency in attaining goals through observations by peers and administrators during the four classroom visits

• Link between professional development and professional behavior provides catalyst for permanent and positive change
U of M CAREI Study
Summary & Conclusions

Improved professional development

• Increased reflective practice
• Teacher growth objectives observed and assessed
• Increased understanding of various roles (teacher, social worker, educational assistant, administrator)
• Process is clear, not overly rigid or prescriptive
• Student performance in both reading and math improved
• Extended teacher duties increases leadership capacities of young teachers
Keillor’s Theorem

A system that is indifferent to the performance of its employees and rewards them alike regardless of effort or effectiveness is based on an assumption that what those employees do really isn’t very important or difficult.
Keillor’s Postulate

If well constructed, the most significant changes that result from implementing high-stakes evaluation of teachers are not so much what good teachers do in their classrooms but in the way school systems function – the environment in which those good teachers find themselves now thriving.
“Those of us responsible for public education must never defend or try to perpetuate a school to which we would not send our own children.”

Sandra Feldman,
President, American Federation of Teachers, 1997-2004