

# NGA Policy Academy State Planning Committee Meeting February 18, 2010

---

## Members in attendance:

- Sally Cauble, Member, State Board of Education
- Diane DeBacker, Interim Commissioner/Deputy Commissioner, KSDE
- Peg Dunlap, Director of Instructional Advocacy, KNEA
- Donna Ginther, University of Kansas
- Jarius Jones, Instructional Coach, Kansas City Kansas Public Schools
- Jim Lentz, Superintendent, Augusta USD 402
- Pam Robinson (for Linda Wilhelm), Past President of KASB and Member, Blue Valley USD 229
- Sam Rabiola, Teacher, Lawrence USD 497
- Andy Tompkins, Dean, College of Education, Pittsburg State University

## Guests:

- Alan Cunningham, Superintendent, Dodge City USD 443

Diane thanked everyone for attending today's meeting and reviewed the agenda for today's meeting. Diane reminded members there is link to this committee's work, etc. on the KSDE webpage, ([www.ksde.org](http://www.ksde.org)), under the Division of Learning Services.

## RTTT

Diane gave a summary of the state's Race To The Top (RTTT) grant application. RTTT is part of the American recovery and Reinvestment Act (AARA), which a total of \$4.35 billion for RTTT. RTTT is a competitive grant that only states could apply for. The four reform areas of RTTT are:

1. Adopting standards & assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workforce and to compete in the global economy
2. Building data system that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction
3. Recruiting, developing, rewarding and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most
4. Turning around our lowest-achieving schools.

The state application was for \$166 million and of that 50% will go back to participating districts who indicated they would be willing to work in the four reform areas. The other 50% stays

within the agency to assist in administering these projects and to also be used as discretionary grants.

Applications were due January 19, 2010 and are currently being reviewed, using a rubric of 500 points. States receiving the highest points will be invited to D.C. to defend their application. We should know by April if we're invited to DC to be interviewed. If we do not get accepted in Phase I we can apply in Phase II.

Of the 293 school districts in Kansas, 283 (97%) signed the MOU to be a part of RTTT, with signatures from the superintendent, local board president, and local KNEA representative. This was a great testament to the working relationships between administration, local school boards, staff and teacher associations. Six (6) districts said no for various reasons. Most are small districts and they felt overwhelmed. RTTT funding is based upon a school district's Title I allocation. Once we receive notification that we've received the grant we'll have 90 days to go back to districts. Only eight (8) MOU's were returned without the signature of their local teacher association. Diane thanks KNEA for their assistance in working with local associations. Some had concerns about the compensation piece. As a state we have not had conversations; however, there has been discussion in committees. The current state funding situation complicates that piece.

Funding for RTTT will end in 2014; however, President Obama wants to make RTTT a permanent part of his budget. We believe that what we saw in RTTT and the four reform areas is what we'll see in the reauthorization of ESEA.

As part of Kansas' application, 31 projects were written into the grant. All of the projects have been discussed by the State Board either from the Teaching in Kansas Commission (TKC) or the Kansas Educational Leadership Commission (KELC) or are projects that are on-going on or have been discussed. As a state, we have not had the money or the reason to put these in place. As an agency, this will become our strategic plan, whether or not we receive RTTT funding. This is the way to go in Kansas, at least from the Learning Services Division. We're talking about how to roll this out and how to put it into a 3-5 year plan in order to make these things happen. At next week's Kansas Exemplary Educators Network (KEEN) conference KSDE staff will have a breakout session to talk about the projects.

A part of this committee's work is to decide what type of programs we are going to suggest districts look at. We will not go with one program; but will give two to three different programs that are good models. It is not this committee's job to recommend an evaluation component(s).

Diane reminded members that the outcomes of participation in the NGA Academy are to:

- 1) Continue the study of teacher compensation models that enhance teacher effectiveness;
- 2) Develop a plan for implementation of new teacher compensation models in Kansas;
- 3) Begin discussions with stakeholders regarding the proposed models;

- 4) Utilize the new models as the foundation to raise beginning and average teacher compensation to be more competitive with other states and with comparable professions;
- 5) Lobby for state funding of the new models; and 6) implement the new teacher compensation models.

Diane shared that as part of the RTTT Reform Area 1, Kansas was one of 48 states who signed on to be a part of common core standards, which are different from national standards. CCSSO, NGA, Achieve, have been involved in the development of English Language Arts and Mathematic standards. Released drafts of the standards have been shared with the Governor's and chief state school officers and they have been reviewed and feedback has been provided. The State Board will have to decide whether or not they want to adopt them, which they will probably receive in April or May and then be asked to adopt in May or June. In Kansas we would still have benchmarks and indicators, but because they are aligned it will not be a huge change and in a lot of cases it will be better. For years, we've felt that we had too many standards in math; for us it allows us to scale those down – fewer but better. If the State Board does not adopt the common core standards, we will go through our normal process. A state can add 15% more to the standards. As a staff (KSDE), we're comfortable with them.

If you have common standards, then the next thing would be common standards. Kansas has chosen to be a part of 3 assessment consortia which have been formed.

### **Supplemental Report to the Teaching in Kansas Commission**

Alan Cunningham reviewed information from the TKC Salary and Benefits Subcommittee, which was included in the Supplemental Report. This was the only place in TKC that they talked about the variation of how to compensate teachers. The goals of the commission and subcommittee talked about raising the status of teachers and teaching as a profession and changing the roles of teachers in leadership. The subcommittee made the following recommendations:

- Raise beginning and average teacher salaries across Kansas to the national average.
- Compact salary schedules for "Initial" and "Professional" educators
- Add dimensions to the Salary Schedule reflecting "Accomplished Educator" criteria -- a salary scaffold structure, which blends professional, accomplished, teacher leadership, etc.
- Use best practice in developing compensation systems

Teacher salaries need to be restructured, not that they do not value longevity. We have teacher leaders – those serving in leadership capacity with their peers, students, community. Do we compensate someone for having a license or compensate someone for their role? In summation, we have to have a new compensation structure which requires new money.

Jarius and Sam were on a committee that looked at the amount of time that a teacher spends with students, etc.

KNEA is looking at alternative compensation; one thing they're looking at is a tiered system of licensure. Those who take the time to achieve that professional license, they likelihood that they will stay for a career is huge. Need to change mindset of teachers.

## ProComp

Brad Jupp, Senior Program Advisor in the Office of Secretary of Education Arne Duncan, joined the meeting, via conference call. He shared his experience with Denver's Professional Compensation System for Teachers, ProComp. ProComp is a nationally recognized, path-clearing effort to reform the way teachers are paid, so their annual and career earnings are based, in part, on the academic performance of the students they teach.

The system grew out of a four-year pilot program that tested various elements of compensation reform in select Denver schools. The program was approved in 2004 and in 2005, Denver citizens voted to approve a \$25 million tax increase to implement the full plan. The premise of the program is to "link its single largest annual expenditure, teacher salary, more directly to its highest policy priority, improving student learning."

ProComp: Four Major Changes:

1. From a system of entitlements, to a system of earned increased based on accomplishments
2. From a system that rewarded for years of service and hours of graduate credits, to a system that rewards successful practice in four basic categories
  - a. Knowledge and skills
  - b. Professional evaluation
  - c. Market incentives
  - d. Student growth
3. Point incentives toward student success
4. Move more annual earnings power to the beginning of the teaching career

Ultimate results were to improve student results and their goal is to stay to the policy premise (as noted above). It is not the perfect system – there have been flaws. There isn't much disagreement between the parties. There is a lot of evidence that teachers are moving into system on their own choice. It is a thriving system that is heading in the right direction.

The teacher incentive fund was about \$25,000,000 -- \$4 million, plus a year for 5 years. It is a perpetual tax increase; if a sunset, it would diminish the fate of teachers in their compensation system. A local cost of living was built into it.

### Q&A:

Q: What do you know now that you wish you would have known? A: First, changing the pay system really wouldn't be as controversial after the system as before. Second, practical details really do matter. They had to work hard on connecting dots between measuring student progress to connecting to individual teachers. In practice the details were more difficult. Have

to have a strong partnership to work out those details. Third, having high expectations of professionals really mattered. Do it jointly and set rigorous expectations to be met over time. When you try to micromanage from the policy level, there is a tendency to miss details. Having expectations of adults, matters the most.

Q: Are there any consequence if the school building or grade level is not meeting some overall expectation? A: There are separate consequences and compensation. Compensation is one form of consequence and having a wide range of consequences, both for success and failure.

Q: Were your teacher evaluation system in place for setting goals? A: Yes. They retooled it in 1999 and gave it a lot of knowledge and skills and deployed new objective-setting process, prior to ProComp. Money does make a Difference. By 2005 when ProComp was adopted and paid for by taxpayers it become a much more rigorous process – a series of linking expectations and having compensation at stake.

Q: On professional development, did you have to change professional development much in order to make that work – going from graduate credit to professional development? A: It was a category of big learning. PD learning experience was rigorous but not consistent. We had to create some consistency. Second, there was a lot of pressure for professional development experience to be rigorous and do not believe we have accomplished that. The relationship between the size of the incentive and rigor of professional development is in line. Value of the incentive is probably too high. His colleagues may not agree. We have to be thoughtful about the relationship about the size of the incentive, how powerful it is as a motivator and what it produces.

Q: In regard to professional development learning, is there any type of evaluation component? A: Most rigorous work is being down at UC Denver. Not a lot to show for it at this time.

Q: How many teachers in Denver public schools? A: Approximately 4500, and about 4000 are in ProComp.

Q: How much is it costing taxpayers per year? A: Individual taxpayers pay about \$6.00 a month on \$100,000 home value.

Q: How many people are being taxed? A: Approximately 350,000-400,000 taxpayers.

Q: Has there been incentives that correlate with improved student performance/growth? A: Do not know.

Diane thanked Brad for participating in today's meeting.

## Begin work on Kansas Framework

Diane said that our next step is to begin work on a framework. The work of the policy academy focused on what came from the TKC supplemental report, which reads: "...the NGA Policy Academy is committed to the following recommendations:

- 1) The NGA Policy Academy recommends that teacher salaries in Kansas be raised to the national average
- 2) That all teachers have the opportunity to attain "professional" status within 10 years of beginning their career.
- 3) That additional compensation be available to accomplished educators, including:
  - a. serving in teacher leadership roles,
  - b. providing professional development for colleagues,
  - c. working on projects beyond standard expectations for teachers,
  - d. serving in specialized teacher roles,
  - e. coordinating specialized programs or projects,
  - f. attaining National Board Certification,
  - g. demonstrating specialized skills, and
  - h. engaging in community outreach.
- 4) That additional compensation is available to teachers for achieving school/department/grade-level student achievement.
- 5) That best practice in developing teacher compensation systems is used, including:
  - a. guaranteed stable, adequate state funding;
  - b. commitment to and stability of local funding;
  - c. an infrastructure to support all aspects of a new compensation system;
  - d. acceptance for a change in the compensation system;
  - e. a phased-in plan for the transition to the new compensation system;
  - f. compensation that is sufficiently large enough to justify the time, effort and risks involved in pursuing the elements of the new compensation system;
  - g. choices about which aspects of the new compensation system teachers wish to pursue;
  - h. professional development;
  - i. a simple compensation system that is easy for all to understand; and
  - j. an avenue for appeals."

This group needs to start looking at these; is this the foundation of the program, should we have more in it and how do we move forward to a chart that looks like ProComp.

What would be some of the preconditions that we would expect to see for a district who wants to become a part of the pilot. We need to make it a positive outcome. We need to have conversations so that they have buy-in. We need to have some model compensation system on the table. Do we give local school boards the questions/answers that are needed to make it successful? Which comes first, the money or a plan? Evaluation piece is huge. Is that something we need to think about, possibly bringing in someone. Teacher evaluation piece is a piece of the teacher compensation model.

For the purposes of our Policy Academy, by October or sooner we have to have a framework that we turn in to NGA, regardless of whether or not it goes any further. We have a good framework with the work that Alan co-chaired. There are conversations that can occur at the local district level around what do we compensate for now, what do we value with our current compensation structure. Most value time of service, college credit, inservice/professional development, certain additional tasks, and additional knowledge/skills. Encourage districts to have those conversations and building the relationships when funding becomes available. There is work that can be done now, to guide those discussions at the local level. A framework would meet our obligation to NGA, getting that information out and having conversations and helping districts to have the conversations at the local level. The purpose of the conversations would be for local school boards and teacher organizations to have consistency to have those things that matter for student learning.

Diane said Kansas is a high-achieving state. We are already good. Our policy premise is that we have to know why we're having those discussions. We're doing the same thing that we've always done in the state, do we as a state board need to push this more? If so, why? Sally thinks that Main Street America would be more willing to pay more money for education if teachers are compensated appropriately. They are upset with tenure, even if we move tenure to five years we would have done something.

It was mentioned that student achievement should be mentioned in a negotiated agreement. Student achievement has gone up and if we truly want to increase teacher salaries, the public needs to see that something else is going on. They are happy with what's currently happening. If we want to get more money for teacher salary; need to start arguing to get the money.

For the public, we need to attract the best and brightest.

When 60% of the variation in average student achievement is accounted for outside the school, the thing that we have to think about is alignment to increase the likelihood for more kids. How we move behavior in compensation system and giving opportunities for district incentives to align to make sure teachers are more highly qualified. Think about what it does; look at the premise of what they learned from ProComp. Incenting someone to make it a part of a broader reform effort. What we know on change is that you have to have models of success. We need to begin to collect those models. If you incent, how do you get long-term commitment? Incent is to come up with some models, it is not to continue on and on. It is difficult for districts to see a difference in changing in the future.

### Next Steps:

1. Look at good models that are out there:
  - a. Sherwood Model, Oregon
  - b. TAP model
  - c. University of Pennsylvania (Wertzberger) -- Andy will get us information

2. Develop a protocol to use that if Kansas gets RTTT money to select schools who could pilot something around alternative compensation structures. KSDE staff will put that together.
3. Take what we currently have and put it in some type of format – looking at who’s been involved.

Sally suggested possibly taking a large district and a small district and obtain funding for them to look at innovation. There are piles of money out there – State Chamber of Commerce, Gates Foundation, Kaufman Foundation, et al. There is a need for commitment from Main Street America; if they’re going to talk the talk, they need to walk the walk.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> Policy Academy meeting of the six (6) states will be held May 13-14, 2010. As further information is received, it will be shared with members.

Diane said members will continue to receive information to read; something that is reasonable/consumable.

Thank you for your hard thinking. We have made progress and know more about how we want to proceed/move forward.

### **Next Meeting**

June 10 at the Board Room at the Kansas State Department of Education, 120 SE 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Topeka, Kansas.