

Fridley Public Schools

Q Comp Summary Presentation

August 15, 2007

Fridley: Pre-Q Comp

- 2004-2005: Mini pilot of components of Teacher Advancement Program (TAP)
 - 4 of 5 buildings piloted (each voted 2/3 or more to adopt)
 - January to June
 - “Designated” temporary lead teachers (differentiated staffing)
 - Voluntary lead teacher evaluations
 - Initiated professional development cluster groups

Fridley: Pre-Q Comp

- 2004-2005: Bargaining Agreement (unrelated to TAP Pilot)
 - \$400 potential of “extra compensation” for teachers, based on building or program goals
 - Developed goal process
 - Goals directly linked to student achievement
 - Goals results measurable
 - Rubric used to determine payout – ½ based on process results, ½ based on product results

Fridley: Pre-Q Comp

- Staff voted not to continue TAP (68-32%)
- Regrouped with interested teacher leaders over the summer to discuss future
- Legislature finalized Q Comp legislation
- Re-formed a new, larger group to develop Fridley's Q Comp Plan
- Developed a plan with some components similar to TAP

Fridley's Q Comp Plan

- Plan approved by the department in late fall
- Initial implementation began in November 2005 – beginning of second trimester

Fridley's Alternative Compensation Plan

- Four basic components, which align to the compensation teachers may receive
 - 1. Ongoing, focused professional development
 - 2. Teacher evaluations of performance
 - 3. Building goals based on student achievement
 - 4. Individual Growth Plans

Fridley's ACP: Teacher Compensation Components

- Up to \$2000 possible per full time teacher
 - \$500 maximum for full attendance and participation in weekly professional training
 - \$500 maximum for teacher evaluations
 - \$500 maximum for reaching building or program student achievement goals
 - \$500 maximum for individual growth plans

Fridley's ACP

- Differentiated Staffing: Instructional Lead Teachers
 - Hired 7 Instructional Leaders, ½ time, to work directly with teachers and administration to ensure success of Fridley's program
 - Hired an additional .25 Instructional Leader to assist with program coordination
 - Stipends of \$6000 per Instructional Lead Teacher

Fridley's ACP

- Professional Development
 - Weekly, usually Thursday mornings
 - Focused on either IB, or teaching strategies related to building goals (example literacy)
 - High level of participation, attendance taken
 - Alternate types of groupings – rotate from vertical to horizontal to interdisciplinary

Fridley's ACP

- Teacher Evaluations
 - Use Charlotte Danielson model for most teachers
 - Use modified CD model for specialists
 - Both administrators and Instructional Leaders do evaluations
 - Is both an evaluative and instructional tool

Fridley's ACP

- Building or Program Goals
 - Mutually agreed-upon with administration and teacher leader teams
 - Focused on student achievement
 - Measurable, which means they are data-focused
 - Payout based 50/50 on both process and product

Fridley's ACP

- Individual Growth Plans
 - IGP's must tie to district and building goals
 - Focus is on teacher growth, not students
 - Payout based on:
 - Writing quality plan
 - Collaborating with Instructional Leader/Administrator
 - Providing evidence of follow-through
 - Reflection, including end of year conference

Challenges

- Cultural Challenges
- Communication Challenges
- Logistical Challenges
- Training Challenges
- Rate of Change Challenges

Cultural Challenges

- Trust
- Belief Systems - Strong
- Past Experiences
- Complex Change Management
- Organizational Emphasis Toward a More Articulated Systemic Approach
- Isolation to Collaboration
- Separating Personal and Professional

Communication Challenges

- Determining “best” ways – large group, small group, individual; oral, written, etc.
- Dealing with misunderstandings
- Dealing with intentional miscommunications
- Interpretation issues

Logistical Challenges

- Details matter more than concepts to people
- Developed and morphed our plan while implementing
- How, when, who, what format, etc.
- Time – managing, scheduling
- Anticipating multiple scenarios

Training Challenges

- Instructional Leader and Administrative Training
 - Identifying Knowledge and Skill Sets Needed (both the “what” and the “how”)
 - Cohesiveness and Consistency
 - Scheduling Training
 - Adding to an Already Full Plate

Rate of Change Challenges

- Complexity and Depth of Change is Highly Challenging
 - Implementing mid-year was difficult
 - Implementing Q Comp while undergoing significant “other” changes is challenging (IB, NWEA/data, All Day K, literacy, etc.)
 - Nine month change from no plan to development, implementation, and evaluation, on top of the “usual” can be overwhelming

Successes

- IGP's have been extremely positive
- Building Goals have seen outstanding results
- Professional Development is focused, articulated, beneficial
- Evaluations have been a great tool for teacher reflection

Successes

- Annual surveys are highly positive
- Staff has become more collaborative
- Staff is more goal-oriented now
- District has become better articulated and focused
- Level of professionalism has increased
- Capacity has increased both in our school system and in individual teachers

Successes, Continued

- Buy-in has increased – a “no” vote for TAP of 68-32%, to an initial Q Comp vote of 52-48%, to a embedding vote this spring of 72% in favor of continuing
- Staff focus has changed – from “what I may not get in payout” to a de-emphasis on the money, and an emphasis on personal improvement, goal-setting, and student achievement