
QUALITY COMPENSATION FOR TEACHERS OR "Q COMP"

Minn. Stat. 122A.413-415

Enacted by the 2005 Minnesota Legislature
and

Signed by Governor Tim Pawlenty

History of Alternative Teacher Compensation in Minnesota

Alternative teacher compensation grant program pilot began in 2002

- \$3.6 million per year allocated
- Local design
- Focused on alternative salary schedule and career ladders for teachers
- Five school districts participated in the program
- Results of grant program was used to develop Q Comp legislation

Q Comp Program

- Proposed by Governor Tim Pawlenty in January 2005
- Amended and enacted by Minnesota Legislature in July 2005
- Initial supporters of Q Comp legislation included: Minnesota Business Partnership, Minnesota Chamber of Commerce, Association of Metropolitan School Districts. Later supporters included Minnesota Association of School Administrators, Minnesota School Boards Association and Education Minnesota.

Why Q Comp?

- By 2010, the nation will face a shortage of one million teachers (out of about 2.6 million total teachers) – Minnesota will experience significant shortages in certain teacher licenses.
- Teacher recruitment AND retention will be crucial for Minnesota. Current Minnesota Teacher Retirement Association data indicates 44% of new teachers leave the profession within first five years. (MDE supply and demand report, TRA data, April 2005)
- The greatest effect on student achievement (aside from home/parents) is effective instruction from teachers (Marzano, 2003).
- Q comp is based on effective professional development and system-based changes and reforms based on teacher effectiveness and student achievement.

Q Comp Participation

- **40 school districts approved** under Q Comp program for 2005-06, 2006-07 and 2007-08 school years; **17 charter schools approved** under Q Comp program for the 2005-06, 2006-07 and 2007-08 school years (still taking applications for 2007-08 school year through September 30, 2007).
- School district and charter school participation **represents over one-third of statewide student population.**
- State is expected to reach funding cap for participation by October 1, 2008.

Q Comp Funding – FY 2007 or 2006-07 School Year

- \$75.636 million in FY 2007 for basic state aid as part of the general education funding formula. Funding is permanent to base budget as long as district, school site or charter school operating the Q Comp program.
- \$190/student aid and \$70/student board-approved equalized levy.
- Categorical aid program and part of general education -- not a grant program. Funding is permanent to the base budget.
- Districts must also use 2% staff development set aside (about \$100/student).

Q Comp Program Components

- Component #1: Career Ladders or Career Advancement Options
- Component #2: Job-embedded or Integrated Professional Development
- Component #3: Performance Pay
- Component #4: Teacher Evaluations
- Component #5: Alternative Salary Schedule

Component #1: Career Ladders or Career Advancement Options

Statutory Language in State Law:

The alternative teacher professional pay system agreement must: (1) describe how teachers can achieve career advancement and additional compensation; (2) describe how the school district, intermediate school district, school site, or charter school will provide teachers with career advancement options that allow teachers to retain primary roles in student instruction and facilitate site-focused professional development that helps other teachers improve their skills;

Additional language in state law:

....provide integrated ongoing site-based professional development activities to improve instructional skills and learning that are aligned with student needs.... led during the school day by trained teacher leaders such as master or mentor teachers;

Component #1: Example of Implementation in Schools

- Each site's Q-Comp goal supports the School Improvement Plan at the site, which in turn supports the district improvement agenda.
- Examples of responsibilities of teachers in a career ladder:

Mentor Teachers and Instructional Coaches

Planning and implementing professional development for the staff using research-based strategies based on student need.

Field-testing instructional strategies.

Managing and supporting each teacher's Individual Growth Plan (IGP).

Classroom observations (evaluations)/conferencing.

Demonstration teacher

Co-planning and team-teaching lessons.

Developing pre- and post-assessments.

Coaching (peer, cognitive and content).

Component #2: Site-based Professional Development

Statutory Language in State Law:

....provide integrated ongoing site-based professional development activities to improve instructional skills and learning that are aligned with student needs under section [122A.413](#), consistent with the staff development plan under section [122A.60](#) and led during the school day by trained teacher leaders such as master or mentor teachers;

Component #2: Example of Implementation in Schools

- Weekly job-embedded staff development is delivered via cluster meetings led by career ladder teachers (approximately 60 minutes per week during the teachers' contract day).
- Cluster configurations are based on grade levels or content areas.
- Specialists are included in each cluster or meet separately.
- Mentors and coaches field-test instructional strategies and bring student work to the cluster meeting (i.e., data-driven).
- Through modeling, teachers are taught the new instructional strategy.
- Teachers are given time during cluster meetings to develop their own lessons using the strategy.
- Mentors and coaches follow-up with each teacher to ensure the strategy is implemented via observations and coaching.
- After using the strategy, teachers bring student work to cluster meetings for analysis.

Component #3: Performance Pay

- Why performance pay?
- Attract and retain quality teachers
 - Beginning salaries perceived as too low.
 - Experienced teachers have cap on salary increases later in their career.
 - Teacher movement on steps and lanes salary schedule is slow and not based on performance

Component #3: Performance Pay

How does it work? Performance pay requires:

- ✓ Individual evaluations
 - ✓ School and student achievement gains (local assessment and/or state assessment – local option)
 - ✓ Measures of student achievement
-

Component #3: Performance Pay Requirement for Q Comp

Statutory Language in State Law:

Describe how at least 60 percent of teacher compensation increases align teacher performance measures with student academic achievement using:

- (i) school wide student achievement gains under section [120B.35](#) or locally selected standardized assessment outcomes, or both; (ii) measures of student achievement; and*
- (iii) an objective evaluation program that includes: (A) individual teacher evaluations aligned with the educational improvement plan under section [122A.413](#) and the staff development plan under section [122A.60](#); and (B) objective evaluations using multiple criteria conducted by a locally selected and periodically trained evaluation team that understands teaching and learning;*

Components #3: Example of Implementation

The 60 percent of teacher compensation aligned with performance pay system will be divided equally as follows:

- (1) 50% based on professional growth or how much change in teacher practice and the effect on student achievement is documented by an Instructional Standards Rubric (i.e., based on classroom observations/lesson evaluations).
- (2) 50% based on student achievement measures that include local standardized tests, teacher assessments, and school-wide student achievement as measured by the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments (MCAs are used to determine AYP status).

Component #4: Teacher Evaluations

Goals:

- Improve teacher quality
 - Identify areas of strength and have teacher share with colleagues
 - Identify areas of need to design individual support and professional development
 - Encourage collaboration and collegiality
 - Reward professional growth individually, by team, and by school.
-

Component #4: Teacher Evaluations and Observations

Statutory language in state law:

....individual teacher evaluations aligned with the educational improvement plan under section [122A.413](#) and the staff development plan under section [122A.60](#); and (B) objective evaluations using multiple criteria conducted by a locally selected and periodically trained evaluation team that understands teaching and learning;

Component #4: Example of Implementation

- Using the instructional rubric, each teacher (including teachers in career ladders) is observed **at least** three times per year. The instructional rubric must be tightly aligned with the Minnesota Standards of Effective Practice (based largely on the work of Charlotte Danielson).
- Each teacher is observed by an administrator, mentor and coach (trained evaluators).
- The instructional rubric includes three areas for observation and evaluation: Instruction, Designing & Planning, and Environment.
- Mentors, Coaches and Classroom Teachers are also scored using a Responsibility Rubric. This rubric is weighted accordingly (based on the responsibilities of each career ladder position).

Component #5: Salary Schedule Historical Background

Phases of the development of teacher pay:

- **Phase I:** Lasted until roughly the 20th century, teacher pay was negotiated between an individual teacher and school board. As districts grew and consolidated, this became a problematic process and unpopular with teachers due to favoritism.
 - **Phase II:** Salary schedule included some merit pay components, and the pay differed based on grade levels, with high school teachers being paid more than elementary teachers and generally men being paid more than women. This lasted until 1920's/pre-WW II.
 - **Phase III:** The “single salary schedule” was accelerated around the WWII time period and pay was based on the level of experience and personal development through advanced education degrees and course credits, not by merit or grade level. The unification of the salary schedule was eventually embraced by NEA and AFT.
 - **Phase IV:** States and local school districts moving away from “single salary schedule” to alternative salary schedules based on performance, knowledge and skills.
-

Component #5: Alternative Salary Schedule

Types of Salary Schedules not based on “steps and lanes” (or “steps and columns”):

- **Knowledge- and skill-based pay:** Base pay progression that rewards teachers for developing and using skills required for achieving high performance standards.
- **School-based Performance Award:** Goal-oriented incentive program that rewards teachers when goals regarding student performance are met or exceeded.
- **Pay Competitiveness:** Salary levels that are adequate to recruit and retain top talent, including higher salaries for teachers in license shortage areas or hard-to-staff schools.

Q Comp allows districts to take the “best” in each of the three above and incorporate them.

Component #5: Alternative Salary Schedule

Under the Q comp program, a school district will need to negotiate a new salary schedule that is not based exclusively on, but “reforms” the lockstep steps and lanes system. School district and teachers will need to design a new salary schedule.

Initial Results – Minneapolis Public Schools

- First report issued in February 2007 and second report will be issued in February 2008
- Minneapolis is featured in February 2007 report because it is the longest serving school district
- Initial results for Minneapolis:
 - All schools made improvements in student achievement and increased their Quality Performance Index (QPI) overall and when compared to control or like schools.
 - All schools reported higher teacher satisfaction with program

Initial Results – Andersen Open (K-8)

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%

Looking to the Future: Opportunities and Challenges in Q Comp

Opportunities:

- Focus on teacher quality and effectiveness
- Teacher collaboration
- Professional development based on student needs
- Attract and retain quality teachers

Challenges:

- Sustainability of funding
 - Must be a transparent process for teachers and public
-

Department of Education Contact Information

Q Comp Program

Pat King, Director of School Improvement

651-582-8655 or patricia.k.king@state.mn.us

Chas Anderson, Deputy Education Commissioner

651-582-8207 or chas.anderson@state.mn.us

Q Comp Funding:

Terri Yetter, Program Finance Specialist

651-582-8868 or terri.yetter@state.mn.us

Tom Melcher, Director of Program Finance

651-582-8828 or tom.melcher@state.mn.us

WEBSITE: www.education.state.mn.us
