

SSoS Spotlight on Effective Teacher Quality Policy and ARRA Funds



Q Comp Program Overview

Presented by
Chas Anderson
Deputy Commissioner
Minnesota Department of Education

History of Alternative Teacher Compensation

- Minnesota Legislature enacted alternative teacher compensation pilot program in 2001
 - \$3.8 million allocated and five school districts participate
- Minnesota received federal grant under the Teacher Quality Enhancement Program in October 2003
 - Implemented the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) in two school districts
- Governor Tim Pawlenty proposed Q Comp in January 2005
 - Minnesota Legislature enacted Q Comp program in July 2005

Q Comp Program Support

- Initial supporters of Q Comp (when proposed in January 2005) included:
 - Minnesota Business Partnership and Chamber of Commerce
 - Minneapolis Federation of Teachers
 - Association of Metropolitan School Districts.
- Additional supporters (when enacted in July 2005) included:
 - Minnesota Association of School Administrators
 - Minnesota School Boards Association
 - Education Minnesota

Q Comp Program Support

- Stakeholder engagement early in process
 - Started working groups and discussions in February 2004
- Developed principles for policy changes around alternative teacher compensation
 - Principles guided the drafting of Q Comp legislation
- Included all stakeholders even if some disagreed or were neutral
 - Some of the education organizations eventually supported the legislation enacted in July 2005 after initially remaining neutral

Why Q Comp?

- Teacher recruitment
 - Teacher retention
 - Approximately 50% of Minnesota teachers leave in first five years of teaching
 - Improve teacher effectiveness
 - Key school-based factor in improving student achievement (Marzano, 2003)
 - Teacher distribution
 - Effective teachers in high needs schools
 - Systemic reform
-

Q Comp Framework and Components

- 1) **Career Ladders or Advancement Options**
 - Mentors and instructional coaches
 - 2) **Job-embedded Professional Development**
 - Time during the school day to meet in specified teams and review instructional practices and student data
 - 60 minutes per week, on average
 - 3) **Teacher Evaluation System**
 - Objective evaluation system based on Standards of Effective Practice
 - Minimum of three evaluations per year by evaluation team
 - 4) **Performance Pay**
 - School-wide and student achievement bonuses or permanent salary increases
 - 5) **Alternative Salary Schedule**
 - Elimination and replacement of “steps and lanes” salary schedule
-

Q Comp Program Requirements

- School board and local teacher union must negotiate the terms of Q Comp program
- School board and local teacher union must submit an application to the Department describing how district and local union will meet the Q Comp components described in law
- Department approves or disapproves application
- Department approval of application allows district to receive state funding for program
- Department approves applications on a rolling basis
- Voluntary participation

Q Comp Program Participation

- 43 school districts and 17 charter schools currently participate in Q Comp program
 - One-third of student population and teacher workforce in Minnesota under program
 - At least 10 additional school districts plan to participate in program for 2009-10 school year
 - School districts, individual school sites or charter schools may submit applications until October 1, 2009 for the 2009-10 school year

Q Comp Funding

- \$260/student total funding
 - \$190/student is state aid as part of the general education formula
 - \$70/student is levied by school board (optional)
- \$100 million (state and local resources) is available for program
 - \$57.6 million spent in FY 2008
 - Governor Pawlenty has proposed removing the statewide cap and allowing all districts to participate starting in FY 2011 or July 1, 2010.

State-District-Union Relationships

- Minnesota Department of Education maintains a working relationship with Education Minnesota
 - Q Comp Advisory group includes state union. The advisory group advises the Department on application process and program administration
 - Regular meetings (at least monthly when possible) occur with upper level management of Education Minnesota and Department to discuss “higher level” issue related to collective bargaining and the Q Comp program.
 - District and local teacher union will sometimes seek advice from Department during Q Comp application process to ensure the application will be accepted by the Department

State Implementation

- Department's school improvement division provides technical assistance and support for Q Comp program.
 - Department has assigned 8 professional level staff to work on program components
- Q Comp is integrated into the “school improvement process” required under NCLB and by state law.
- School districts do not add Q Comp on top of all existing programs – integration is key and required under state law.

Q Comp Results: Minneapolis Public Schools

- 2003-04, 2004-05 and 2006-07 school years
 - MCA-II and NWEA assessments to create a Quality Performance Index (QPI)
 - Results:
 - All Minneapolis Q Comp schools made larger improvements in student achievement and increased their QPI when compared to non-Q Comp schools located in Minneapolis.
 - All Q Comp schools reported higher teacher satisfaction with job.
-

Q Comp Results: Minneapolis Public Schools

Indicators/Assessments	Andersen Open	MPS District
Free & Reduced Lunch	97%	67%
ELL	53%	23%
QPI – 2004	2.0	2.8
QPI – 2005	2.6	3.0
QPI -- 2006	2.9	3.0
	Andersen Open	Andersen Open
Basic Skills Test (BST)	Percentage passed in 2004	Percentage passed in 2005
BST Reading (grade 8)	39.0%	61.5%
BST Math (grade 8)	28.8%	38.9%
Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments (MCA)	Percentage proficient in 2004	Percentage proficient in 2005
MCA Math (grade 3)	46.8%	49.5%
MCA Math (grade 5)	39.1%	50.4%
MCA Math (grade 7)	28.4%	40.8%
MCA Reading (grade 3)	32.3%	49.7%
MCA Reading (grade 5)	32.8%	49.1%
MCA Reading (grade 7)	26.9%	42.7%

Q Comp Study: Hezel Report

- **January 2009 Findings: Statewide Implementation of Q Comp**
 - Teacher and administrator perception of Q Comp's impact on schools has been quite positive
 - Minnesota's teachers seem to be more supported in their roles of improving student achievement since Q Comp's inception, when compared to non-Q Comp schools
 - Flexible nature of Q Comp has been helpful to empowering local districts and schools with resources they can use to undergo school improvement process

Q Comp Study: Hezel Report

- **January 2009 Findings: District-wide implementation of Q Comp**
 - Schools that have implemented Q Comp tend to view the program as an integration of each of the five components, not simply a performance pay program
 - Teachers are sharing and collaborating around student needs and instructional practices more than they even have since Q Comp was implemented
 - Participating schools praise Q Comp for providing a unifying focus and framework for collaborating around instruction, planning and professional development

Q Comp Study: Hezel Report

- **January 2009 Findings: District-wide implementation of Q Comp**
 - Teachers attribute greater consistency in the way that expectations for students are set and in the teaching strategies that are being used to their participation in Q Comp
 - In some Q Comp schools, there has been an overall shift from administrative decision making to teacher decision making, which administrators and teachers view favorably
 - Generally, observations in Q Comp schools are viewed as constructive, whereas in non-Q Comp schools, observations are perceived to be more evaluative

Q Comp Study: Hezel Report

- **January 2009 Findings: District-wide implementation of Q Comp**
 - Perception that instructional practices have improved under Q Comp is widespread within Q Comp schools
 - There is a significant and positive relationship between the number of years a school has been implementing Q Comp and student achievement
-

Q Comp Results: Minnesota Department of Education

- MCA-II state assessments in reading and math
- 2006-07 and 2007-08 school years
 - Q Comp schools were participating in the program during both school years
- Q Comp schools outperformed non-Q Comp schools between 3-4 percentage points in mathematics and 2-3 percentage points in reading.
 - Compared schools based on demographics

Opportunities and Challenges

Opportunities:

- Focus on teacher effectiveness
- Attract and retain effective teachers
- State policy driving systemic changes in public education

Challenges:

- Minnesota Legislature
 - Sustainability of funding
 - Resistance from local teacher unions
-

Contact Information

Chas Anderson

Deputy Commissioner

Minnesota Department of Education

1500 Highway 36 West

Roseville, MN 55113

651-582-8207

chas.anderson@state.mn.us

www.education.state.mn.us

Thank you

