

Presentation of the Teacher Advancement Program

by

Marilyn Baeker, Ph.D.

TAP Director

Minnesota Department of Education

marilyn.baeker@state.mn.us

Presentation of the Teacher Advancement Program

Karen Wilker, Mentor Teacher, Hartley Elementary

Doreen Oelke, Career Teacher, Hartley Elementary

Waseca

Jan Stefan-Friberg, Master Teacher, Seward
Montessori Minneapolis

WHY THE NEED FOR TAP?

**STUDY: TENNESSEE 5TH GR. MATH TEST
WITH 3 CONSECUTIVE YEARS OF EFFECTIVE
INSTRUCTION, AVERAGE STUDENTS SCORED
AT THE 83RD PERCENTILE**

**WITH 3 CONSECUTIVE YEARS OF INEFFECTIVE
INSTRUCTION, AVERAGE STUDENTS SCORED
AT THE 29TH PERCENTILE**

57% DIFFERENCE IN ACHIEVEMENT!

**Nothing Matters More Than a
Quality Teacher**

**Rivers longitudinal work found that
average achieving students assigned to 4
years of ineffective instruction had only a
40 percent chance of passing the
Tennessee high school exit examination.
The same students assigned to 4 years of
effective instruction had an 80 percent
chance of passing.**

Teachers Who Leave

- 20% of teachers leave within 3 years
- 50% of urban school teachers leave within 5 years
- Twice as likely to leave with no induction program
- Twice as likely to leave with top scores on high-stakes exams

Models for the Teaching Profession: Career Advancement

Traditional Model

Single Career Path

Teacher Position Only

Requiring the same level of:

- professional qualifications
- responsibility
- authority
- assessment rigor

TAP Model

Multiple Career Paths

Career, Mentor & Master Positions

Requiring increasing levels of:

- professional qualifications
- responsibilities
- authority
- assessment rigor

Models for the Teaching Profession: Compensation

Traditional Model

Salary Schedule Drives Compensation

Lock-step salary
determined only by years of
experience and training
units accrued

TAP Model

Performance and Responsibility Drive Compensation

Salary determined by level of
responsibilities and
effectiveness of performance

Models for the Teaching Profession: Professional Accountability

Traditional Model

Uneven Accountability

- Idiosyncratic evaluation standards & procedures
- Rewards and sanction unrelated to evaluation outcomes
- Support provided for deficiencies only

TAP Model

Instructionally Focused Accountability

- TAP standards, procedures and performance rubrics
- Hiring, advancement and compensation tied to evaluation
- Support provided for growth

Models for the Teaching Profession: Professional Growth

Traditional Model

In-service/Course-based Professional Development

- Individual commitment, intermittent activities
- Goals and activities tied to personal and financial interests of the individual
- Unconnected to evaluation

TAP Model

Ongoing Applied Professional Growth

- School-wide commitment, weekly, site-based, teacher lead activities
- Goals and activities tied to state standards, local SIP & analysis of student learning outcomes
- Used to support and reinforce evaluation growth goals

Costs of Implementation

- Nationally, TAP is being implemented at a cost of \$200 - \$400 per student
- TAP recommends \$400 per student (or 6% of current budget) for implementation
- Waseca is implementing TAP at a cost of \$400 per student with funding from a federal grant (Title II, Higher Ed)

How TAP Could be Funded

- 2% set aside staff development funds
- Title II funds
- State formula increases:

Governor's proposal is \$225 per student for alternative compensation programs that include all elements of TAP

The Stories We've Heard

- New teachers have support unheard of in other schools and in the past.
- Veteran teachers are leaving comfortable school environments to be at TAP schools (often lower SES).
- Teachers are collaborating and communicating much more.

The Stories We've Heard

- Seeing a great deal of flexibility and change among teachers' classroom practices.
- Developing/studying the rubrics helps teachers learn about and implement effective classroom practices.
- Immediate feedback from evaluations enables teachers to enhance their performance.

HANDOUT # 2

TAP Comments – Les Tlougan (Waseca Public Schools)
Senate K-12 Education Budget Committee
February 15, 2005

Timeline

June 2003:

Waseca Superintendent contacted by Minnesota Department of Education about grant proposal for TAP

Waseca Education Association (WEA) representatives agreed to participate with the understanding that the salary schedule structure would stay in place and the membership would vote on final approval.

November 2003:

Waseca is notified of grant approval

Committee is created to develop a proposal. Members of the committee were selected by building administrators and WEA negotiators. The Superintendent selected one teacher member. The final committee consisted of five (5) administrators and seven (7) teachers.

December 2003-February 2004:

Committee developed the TAP proposal for Waseca

Unique cluster meeting plans developed for each building

February-April 2004:

Building meetings held to refine proposal

Cluster group meeting plans revised based on teacher input

Vote of WEA membership

May 2004:

Testing: SAT-10 administered district wide

April-August 2004:

Planning Committee expanded. Building committees established.

Master and Mentor teacher applications, interviews, and selection

June-August 2004:

Master and Mentor teacher training

TAP Leadership Teams (TLTs) review test data and set goals for 2004-2005

September 2004:

Implementation

Timeline Issues

- Timeline to implementation was too short.
- More time was needed to develop the goals and researching strategies for meeting those goals.
- More lead time was needed for Master and Mentor teachers to prepare for clusters.
- More time was needed to educate career teachers on the TAP process.

Comments

- The major goal of TAP is to make good teachers better by improving classroom instructional strategies and techniques with the end result being a better education for students.
- The need for regular staff development time was one of the factors in teachers approving TAP.
- Regular cluster meetings have increased staff communication.
- New teachers, young teachers, and experienced teachers all have peer support.
- The “bonus pay” is in addition to the step and lane salary schedule

Concerns

- Loss of class time to cluster group meetings (loss of student contact time)
- Understaffed – Not enough master and mentor teachers
- Workload for master and mentor teachers is much higher than anticipated
- Workload for career teachers is higher
- Workload for administrators is higher
- Issues related to peer evaluations (master and mentor teachers)
- The “bonuses”
- TAP has been used mostly in K-6 schools. 7-12 schools are breaking some new ground in implementing TAP (testing, cluster structure, scheduling cluster time).
- Specialists do not always fit cleanly into the TAP process, but they need to be part of it.
- STRESS!!

Causes of Stress

- 5 years of teacher reductions (Excess levy passed that avoided reductions for 2004-2005).
- 5 years of increased class size
- 5 years of teachers wondering who would be cut next
- 5 years of support staff reductions
- Too many years of legislated changes (OBE, ROE, Profiles of Learning, Standards, NCLB)
- The challenge of being accountable for a constantly moving target
- Adding TAP to already stressed staff

Final comments

- If TAP is to work, it needs to be teacher driven.
- Proper planning time must be part of the implementation process.
- There needs to be a clear understanding that education is not an assembly line business. We have no control over the students we see each day and limited control over what makes those students who they are. We deal with growing, changing human beings every day, not things.
- Teacher pay should not be based entirely on accountability measures. Additional education (lanes) and experience (steps) still play a part in teacher quality. We had teachers voting for TAP for the staff development part – some of those teachers would have preferred to not have the bonuses in the program.
- To extend TAP past the 2-year grant will require teacher approval. If we had the vote right now, I am not sure it would pass.
- How well is TAP working? That is an open question. We are only six months into the TAP program. I question whether we will be able to adequately respond after the 2-year grant is completed. This requires a long-term commitment of time and funding.
- I have concerns about the Governor’s and legislators goal for a program like TAP. Is it to save money? Is it to rearrange existing education funding? Is it truly to consider ways of making sure our teachers are the best they can be?

HANDOUT # 3

The Teacher Advancement Program (TAP)

The Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) grant provides \$2.5 million over two years for 3 Minneapolis Public Schools (MPS) to improve instructional practice and increase student achievement. Five MPS schools designated as Professional Development Centers (PDC) have received \$183,000 for a “practice semester” to explore how TAP fits with a similar job-embedded professional development model.

Schools make the decision about how the money is spent within these parameters:

- Time for teachers to meet regularly during school day in professional development teams to
 - Select goal from the School Improvement Plan (SIP) and develop yearlong Individual Professional Development Plans to improve their instruction and to increase student achievement.
 - Analyze baseline student data using pre-tests, learn instructional strategies to increase student achievement with support from coaches/mentors, and post-test to measure results.
- Support teachers (mentors and coaches) selected because of their pedagogical expertise to
 - Plan and facilitate each professional development team meeting and provide follow-up demonstration teaching or co-teaching, coaching, and continuous feedback to teachers on the team.
 - Provide research-based job-embedded professional development by modeling instructional strategies from their classrooms, revisions made to improve instruction, and effect on student achievement.
- Instructional Leadership Team (mentors, coaches and administration) meet to ensure quality of program implementation.
 - Develop yearlong leadership team and professional development team goals.
 - Document outcomes of all meetings, observations, and participate in a program review.
- Performance awards allocated by a) a series of assessments of teacher practice by mentors, instructional coaches and principals and b) value-added analysis of student achievement gains on MCA and NALT.

Phase	Minneapolis School	Student Enrollment	Licensed Staff	TAP Vote	Mentors/Coaches
Implementation Funded by Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant (2004-2006)	Andersen Open	650	88	78%	3 Mentors/ 4 Coaches
	Seward Montessori	750	49	98%	3 Mentors/ 6 Coaches
	Webster Open	650	55	70%	3 Mentors/ 4 Coaches
“Practice Semester” or Planning Sites Funded by MDE through August 2005	Andersen Elementary	350	35	81%	2 Mentors/ 2-4 Coaches ¹
	Edison High School	1150	92	70%	5 Mentors/ 8-10 Coaches
	Folwell Middle School	530	50	81%	2 Mentors/ 2-4 Coaches
	Hall Elementary	160	30	77%	2 Mentors/ 2 Coaches
	Northeast Middle School	460	48	70%	2-3 Mentors/ 2-3 Coaches
Total		4,700	447		

Teachers value this program because it

1. “Reinforces the idea that teachers are professionals”;
2. Gives regularly scheduled time during the school day to meet as part of their teaching responsibilities;
3. “Values good instruction and gives time and real ‘implementable’ ideas that work”;
4. Recognizes importance of continuous, on-going support and feedback from qualified practitioners, who are classroom teachers and trained mentors or coaches;
5. Places emphasis on resources needed to support school-wide efforts to accelerate student achievement; and
6. Provides compensation because “the time invested pays off in improved instruction.”²

¹ The practice sites are in the midst of determining number of mentors/coaches for rest of planning year based on funding and staffing.

² Direct quotes from TAP coach.

Minneapolis Public Schools Professional Pay Plan (ProPay)

A Joint Venture with the Minneapolis Federation of Teachers

The MPS Professional Pay Plan is an optional alternative to the traditional teacher step and lane salary schedule that focuses on professional development, action research and increased student results as a means to enhance and improve teacher practice and student achievement.

The Vision: The Professional Pay Plan vision is to ensure that every student in every classroom has a teacher that is highly qualified not only in license but also in current content knowledge, effective instructional pedagogy, and essential professional practices (the what, the how, and the how well of teaching).

- The Goals:**
- 1) To improve student results by creating professional advancement incentives and opportunities for teachers through the acquisition and demonstration of knowledge and skills as measured by a variety of results based professional assessments.
 - 2) To ensure high quality teaching in MPS, the Professional Pay Plan will attract, develop, enrich, and retain teachers along a professional continuum.

MPS University(MPS-U) 1-2-3 System: A key component of MPS-U is the 1-2-3 System. MPS-U courses combine the rigor of a graduate level course with content that is based on the needs of MPS students and teachers. All MPS-U courses require in-depth data collection and analysis to determine effectiveness. The courses require teachers to meet learning objectives described below:

- 1) Instruction-based on new/enhanced teaching strategies to improve student achievement.
- 2) Implementation/Demonstration - of the strategies learned and applied in classrooms with students.
- 3) Reflection and Results – examination of how the strategies impact student learning, achievement and overall success.

Salary advancement does not occur unless the new skills are verified and assessed through expert coaching, action research projects/papers, video coaching, and student work/achievement. A standardized assessment rubric guides the scoring of results. Teachers must obtain a certain score in order to pass and be paid.

Area of Implementation	Status	# of Courses	# of Participants	Demonstration and Assessment	# of Action Research Projects Complete	# of Action Research in Progress	Next Steps
MPS University 1-2-3 Courses based on improving student achievement and results	Completed 2002-2004	24	996	Action Research and expert coaching of application of strategies Focus: improving student achievement through improving teacher practices. Results assessed against a standard rubric.	826	170	Assess remaining AR papers. Repeat courses
MPS University 1-2-3 Courses	In Progress 2004-2005	12	240		In progress	240	Continue
MPS University 1-2-3 Courses	Waiting For Approval	4	TBD		TBD	TBD	Present to District Steering Committee
Professional Skill Sets	Completed '03	4	1030		875		Repeat/ Expand
Quality Performance Awards	Awarded Spring 2003	N/A	35 Schools received award	Met or exceeded 33 indicators of student growth/success	N/A	N/A	Determine 2005 Awards
District Improvement Agenda Performance Awards	Awarded Summer 2003	N/A	1606	Report Card for District based on Student Scores	N/A	N/A	TBD
Responsibility Pay	In Progress 2004-05	Participation in 3 district meetings	86	Successful completion of job description as assessed by colleagues against a performance rubric	N/A	N/A	Review results and award pay if successful

Minneapolis Public Schools Professional Pay Plan The Four Components

Results-Based Awards	Capacity Building Incentives	Continuous Improvement Compensation	Responsibility Pay
<p>DIA Performance Awards</p> <p>Quality Performance Awards</p>	<p>Professional Skill Sets</p> <p>Achievement of Tenure</p>	<p>MPS – U Credits</p> <p>College credits and degrees</p> <p>National Certification</p>	<p>Teacher Leadership: For roles taken on beyond Instructional duties.</p>