

District Awards for Teacher Excellence (D.A.T.E.) Program: Final Evaluation Report (2010). Springer, M.G., Lewis, J.L., Ehlert, M.W., Podgursky, M.J., Crader, G.D., Taylor, L.L., Gronberg, T.J., Jansen, D.W., Lopez, O.S., Stuit, D.A. Nashville, TN: National Center on Performance Incentives at Vanderbilt University.

This report presents findings from the final D.A.T.E. program evaluation, which describes the experiences and outcomes for Cycle 1 districts participating in the first two years of the program. Findings focus on the decisions made by districts whether or not to participate in the program, the local design preferences of D.A.T.E. incentive pay plans, and the program's influence on teachers and students (i.e., student achievement gains, teacher turnover, and educator attitudes and practice). An overview of key evaluation findings presented in this final evaluation report follows. First, information regarding actual dissemination of incentive awards to teachers is presented. This is followed by key findings from analysis of the program's impact on students and teachers. Finally, background information on program participation decisions and implementation experiences, the design of D.A.T.E. incentive pay plans, and educator and administrator attitudes about D.A.T.E. incentive plans is presented.

To view the entire report, please [click here](#).

Note: See Chapters 2-5 to learn more about design and implementation of the DATE program

District Awards for Teacher Excellence Program: Year One Evaluation Report (2010). Springer, M.G., Lewis, J.L., Podgursky, M.J., Ehlert, M.W., Taylor, L.L., Lopez, O.S., Ghosh-Dastidar, B., and Peng, A. Nashville, TN: National Center on Performance Incentives at Vanderbilt University.

District Awards for Teacher Excellence (D.A.T.E.) is a state-funded program in Texas that provides grants to districts for the implementation of locally-designed performance pay plans. All districts in the state are eligible to receive grants, but participation is voluntary. As D.A.T.E. continues in its second year of operation with approximately \$197 million in state funds during the 2009-10 school year, it stands alone as the sole state-funded performance pay program in Texas.

This report presents findings from the first year of D.A.T.E. (2008-09 school year), with emphasis on program participation decisions made by districts, the local design preferences for performance pay plans, and the early implementation experiences of D.A.T.E. participants. The first round of incentive awards for educators and other allowable grant funds were distributed in D.A.T.E. schools from May 2009 to February 2010, allowing evaluators to begin further examination of program outcomes to be presented in a later evaluation report.

To view the entire report, please [click here](#).

See Chapters 2-4 to learn more about design and implementation of the DATE program

Compensation Reform and Design Preferences of Teacher Incentives Fund Grantees (2010).
Heyburn, S.; Lewis, J., and Ritter, G. NCPI Policy Paper Series. Nashville, TN.

In U.S. K-12 public education, incentive pay for educators remains firmly fixed as a high-interest policy topic and has recently become a popular reform initiative in many school systems. The Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF), created in 2006 by the U.S. Department of Education, is at the forefront of this policy movement and has provided hundreds of millions of federal dollars for the implementation of incentive pay systems for teachers and principals. This paper examines the incentive pay plans implemented under the TIF program as of the 2009-10 school year, a reasonable starting point to understanding how federal dollars are being used to modify systems for compensating educators. Primarily drawing upon survey findings, researchers address the following questions: (a) What are the overall objectives of TIF plans? (b) How do sites determine bonus award eligibility? and (c) How are bonus awards distributed and to whom? Overall, TIF plans focus on rewarding educators' performance in addition to recruiting and retaining educators in hard-to-staff positions. Most plans are designed in ways that limit excessive competition between educators, but they differ considerably in the actual dollar amount of bonus awards offered to educators. As the TIF program is set to receive \$600 million dollars this year through federal appropriations and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, the findings from this report are particularly relevant and will allow policymakers and practitioners alike to learn more about how school systems are modifying educator compensation and what those choices might ultimately mean for teaching and learning within the nation's public schools.

To view the entire report, please [click here](#).

Design Components of Incentive Pay Programmes in the Education Sector (2009).
Springer, M. and Balch, R. Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development.

"Design Components of Incentive Pay Programmes in the Education Sector" appeared as a chapter in *Evaluating and Rewarding the Quality of Teachers: International Practices*, a 2009 publication of the Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD). In the chapter, Springer and Balch review the most common components of pay for performance programs, including:

- Incentive structure;
- Unit of accountability;
- Performance measures;
- Performance standards and thresholds;
- Size and distribution of bonus awards;
- Payout frequency; and

- Cultural considerations.

This chapter provides a solid foundation for understanding the multiple forms performance pay programs can take.

To read this chapter, please [click here](#).

For more information on the OECD, or to read the full book, please [click here](#).

Optimal Incentives for Public Sector Workers: The Case of Teacher-Designed Incentive Pay in Texas (2009). Taylor, L. and Springer, M. NCPI Working Paper Series No. 2009-05. Nashville, TN.

Pay for performance is a popular public education reform, and millions of dollars are currently being targeted for pay for performance programs. These reforms are popular because economic and management theories suggest that well-designed incentive pay programs could improve teacher effectiveness. There is little evidence about the characteristics of a well-designed incentive pay plan for teachers, however. This study takes advantage of a recent natural experiment in Texas to explore the optimal design of teacher incentive plans. We find that when given the opportunity, teachers design relatively weak incentive pay plans. In turn, those relatively weak incentives do not appear to have induced any significant changes in teacher productivity, although they did have a significant impact on teacher turnover. As such, our evidence suggests that the types of incentives that appeal to teachers (and their unions) may not be optimal from the employer perspective.

To view the entire report, please [click here](#).

An Interim Evaluation of Teacher and Principal Experiences During the Pilot Phase of AISD REACH. (2009).

Burns, S.F., Gardner, C.D., and Meeuwssen, J. National Center on Performance Incentives: Policy Evaluation Report. Nashville, TN.

This interim report provides an independent evaluation of Austin Independent School District's pay for performance program, REACH. Implemented in nine pilot schools in 2007-2008 and an additional two schools in 2008-2009, REACH targets three key areas: student growth, professional growth, and recruitment and retention of teachers and principals at highest needs schools. REACH combines an outcome-based pay for performance component based on student achievement measures with two input-based components – one for professional development and another for teaching in hard to staff schools. This interim, independent evaluation is designed to offer feedback about teacher and principal experiences with REACH and provide recommendations to inform the scaling-up of the program.

To view the entire report, please [click here](#).

Texas Educator Excellence Grant (TEEG) Program: Year Three Evaluation (2009).

Springer, M.G., Lewis, J.L., Podgursky, M.J., Ehlert, M.W., Gronberg, T.J., Hamilton, L.S., Jansen, D.W., Stecher, B.S., Taylor, L.L., Lopez, O.S., and Peng, A. Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency.

The Texas Educator Excellence Grant (TEEG) program was state-funded and provided annual grants to schools to design and implement performance pay plans during the 2006-07 to 2009-10 school year. This report builds on the previous TEEG evaluation reports, presenting findings from three years of the TEEG program. Overall, the report discusses the participation decisions of eligible schools, the implementation experiences of TEEG participants, the manner in which performance pay plans were designed, and the program's outcomes. Findings suggest that school and personnel characteristics, the criteria used to select schools into the TEEG program, and the plan design features of TEEG schools' performance pay plans influenced many outcomes of interest. The attitudes and behaviors of school personnel, school environment, and teacher turnover were certainly affected by these factors. However, evidence suggests that there is no strong, systematic treatment effect of TEEG on student achievement gains. Nor are there consistent associations between TEEG plan design features and student achievement gains.

To view the entire report, please [click here](#).

Note: See Chapters 2-5 to learn more about design and implementation of the TEEG program

Governor's Educator Excellence Grant (GEEG) Program: Year Three Evaluation (2009).

Springer, M.G., Lewis, J.L., Podgursky, M.J., Ehlert, M.W., Taylor, L.L., Lopez, O.S., and Peng, A. Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency.

This report presents findings from the third-year evaluation of the Governor's Educator Excellence Grant (GEEG) program. The GEEG program was federally- and state-funded and provided three-year grants to schools to design and implement performance pay plans from the 2005-06 to 2007-08 school years. GEEG was implemented in 99 high poverty, high performing Texas public schools.

This report builds on the previous GEEG evaluation reports, presenting findings from a three-year evaluation of the program. Overall, the report discusses the implementation experiences of GEEG program participants, paying close attention to the manner in which participating schools designed their performance pay plans, and program outcomes. Findings suggest that school and personnel characteristics and GEEG plan design features influenced many of the outcomes of interest for evaluating the GEEG program. The attitudes and behaviors of school personnel, school environment, and teacher turnover were certainly affected by these factors. However, there is limited evidence that GEEG had an effect on student achievement gains, and no evidence that GEEG plan design features influenced student achievement gains. Examination of GEEG's impact on student achievement is limited by the criteria for selecting schools into the program, other state-funded performance pay

programs operating concurrently with GEEG, and the likely volatility of student performance measures available to measure student performance outcomes.

To view the entire report, please [click here](#).

Note: See Chapters 2-4 to learn about design and implementation of the GEEG program

Governor's Educator Excellence Grant (GEEG) Program: Year Two Evaluation (2009).

Springer, M.G., Lewis, J.L., Podgursky, M.J., Ehlert, M.W., Taylor, L.L., Lopez, O.S., and Peng, A. Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency.

This report presents findings from the second-year evaluation of the Governor's Educator Excellence Grant (GEEG) program. The GEEG program was federally- and state-funded and provided three-year grants to schools to design and implement performance pay plans from the 2005-06 to 2007-08 school years. GEEG was implemented in 99 high poverty, high performing Texas public schools.

Overall, the report discusses the implementation experiences of GEEG program participants, paying close attention to the manner in which participating schools designed their performance pay plans and the program outcomes from those plans. The contents of this report addresses each of the following questions: (1). What is the national and state policy context – especially in regards to the use of performance pay programs – in which the GEEG program operates?; (2). What is the nature of performance pay plans developed by GEEG participants?; (3). What are the attitudes and behavior of school personnel in GEEG schools?; and (4). How do GEEG participation and design features of GEEG plans influence teacher turnover and student achievement gains?

To view the entire report, please [click here](#).

Note: See Chapters 3-5 to learn more about design and implementation of the GEEG program

Texas Educator Excellence Grant (TEEG) Program: Year Two Evaluation (2008).

Springer, M.G., Podgursky, M.J., Lewis, J.L., Ehlert, M., Gronberg, T.J., Hamilton, L.S., Jansen, D.W., Lopez, O.S., Peng, A., Stecher, B., and Taylor, L.L. Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency.

This report presents findings from the second year of a multi-year evaluation of the Texas Educator Excellence Grant (TEEG) program and background information about the design and implementation of the District Awards for Teacher Excellence (DATE) program. The TEEG and DATE programs operating in Texas make up the largest state-funded performance pay system in U.S. public education. Starting in the 2006-07 school year, the TEEG program operates annually in more than 1,000 schools, while 203 districts implemented district-wide performance pay plans using DATE funds in the 2008-09 school year.

Report findings suggest that school and personnel characteristics, schools' participation patterns in the TEEG program, and design features of schools' performance pay plans influence program outcomes. The attitudes and behaviors of school personnel and teacher turnover are certainly influenced by these factors. While evidence on any relationship between plan design features and student achievement gains is currently inconclusive, further analysis using additional years of data will continue to examine this matter.

Overall, the TEEG and DATE programs provide unique opportunities to learn about the differential effects performance pay plans have on the attitudes and experiences of school personnel, organizational dynamics within schools, teacher turnover, and student achievement gains.

To view the entire report, please [click here](#).

Note: See Chapters 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8 to learn more about design and implementation of the TEEG program

Toward a More Comprehensive Model of Teacher Pay (2008).

Koppich, J. NCPI Working Paper Series No. 2008-06. Nashville, TN.

Since the announcement in 1999 of a plan to tie teachers' salary increases to student achievement by Denver Public Schools, there has been a flood of nationwide policy activity around teacher compensation. This paper examines pay plans in Denver, Toledo, Minneapolis, and New York City, offering a snapshot of the changing landscape of teacher compensation while suggesting a number of factors and conditions that contribute to developing and implementing these new forms of teacher pay.

To view the entire report, please [click here](#).

From Data to Bonuses: a Case Study of the Issues Related to Awarding Teachers Pay on the Basis of Their Students' Progress (2008). McCaffrey, D., Han, B., and Lockwood, J.R. NCPI Working Paper Series No. 2008-14. Nashville, TN.

A key component to the new wave of performance-based pay initiatives is the use of student achievement data to evaluate teacher performance. As greater amounts of student achievement data are being collected, researchers have been developing and applying innovative statistical and econometric models to longitudinal data to develop measures of an individual teacher's contributions to his or her students' learning. These models are generally referred to as value-added models. A few studies have compared subsets of the various value-added estimators of teacher performance, but few have considered the alternative explicitly in the context of using the estimates as the basis of performance-based pay. Moreover, there has been little consideration of aspects of the process of generating performance measures and using them to award teacher bonuses or make other compensation

decisions. This paper directly addresses these issues, as it describes the process of taking a large administrative database of student test scores and class assignments and turning it into bonus decisions for teachers. The choices to be made at each step of the process are illuminated with careful consideration of impact on the types of teachers who receive awards, the choice of performance measures, and decision rules for awarding bonuses.

To view the entire report, please [click here](#).

Value-Added and Other Methods for Measuring School Performance: An Analysis of Performance Measurement Strategies in Teacher Incentives Fund Proposals (2008). Meyer, R., and Christian, M. NCPI Working Paper Series No. 2008-17. Nashville, TN.

One of the central challenges of designing and implementing a performance pay program is developing an approach for determining which schools, teachers, and administrators have performed well enough to have earned a bonus. The U.S. Department of Education's Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) program provides grantees substantial latitude to create incentive pay systems that fit their local needs. This paper reviews the methods proposed by TIF grantees for measuring the performance of schools, teachers, and administrators with respect to student achievement. One of the major objectives of this paper is to evaluate the different performance measurement approaches in terms of a specific statistical standard - a value-added model. To simplify this analysis, authors focus primarily on value-added models of grade-level performance. Most, if not all, of the papers' conclusions also apply to value-added models of classroom/teacher performance.

To view the entire report, please [click here](#).

Designing Incentive Systems for Schools (2008).
Neal, D. NCPI Working Paper Series No. 2008-16. Nashville, TN.

This chapter considers the design of incentive pay systems for teachers and principals and the challenges facing policy makers who seek to design them. The author argues that policy makers must direct the efforts of teachers and principals toward schools' mission – the acquisition of skills and knowledge among children – and must find ways to link the compensation of teachers and principals to the value of the educational services provided by their schools. However, the nature of the educational process creates at least three important challenges for those who design incentive systems for educators. Even when reliable measures of student achievement are available, it is difficult to value the outputs of schools and also difficult to identify whom within different schools is responsible for the observed variation in the outputs of schools. Further, the process of assessing achievement under high-stakes may create undesirable re-allocations of resources among various types of learning activities

within schools. The author's goal is to explain and analyze how these challenges affect the design of incentive systems for teachers and principals.

To view the entire report, please [click here](#).

Texas Educator Excellence Grant (TEEG) Program: Year One Evaluation (2007).
Springer, M.G., Podgurksy, M., Lewis, J.L., Ehlert, M.W., Ghosh-Dastidar, B., Gronberg, T.J., Hamilton, L.S., Jansen, D.W., Lopez, O., Patterson, C.H., Stecher, B.M., and Taylor, L.L.
Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency.

This report presents findings stemming from the first-year evaluation of the Texas Educator Excellence Grant (TEEG) program, one of several statewide performance incentive programs in Texas. In June 2006, Governor Perry and the 79th Texas Legislature created the Governor's Educator Excellence Award Program, one component of which is the TEEG program. TEEG Cycle 1 provided approximately \$100 million in noncompetitive, 12-month grants to over 1,100 public schools. Schools eligible to participate had records of academic success and high percentages of economically disadvantaged students.

More specifically, this report provides an overview of TEEG school selection criteria, program design features of schools' locally-designed performance incentive plans, teachers' attitudes and behaviors in TEEG schools, and interviews with schools that decided not to participate in TEEG.

Preliminary findings during the first year of TEEG implementation indicate that many of the traditional arguments against performance incentive policies, namely the negative impact on teacher collaboration and instructional quality, were not reported by teachers in Cycle 1 schools. While these findings do offer insight into the early experiences of educators, authors caution that it is too soon to attribute those findings to the TEEG program itself.

To view the entire report, please [click here](#).

Note: See Chapters 3, 4, 5, and 7 to learn more about design and implementation of the TEEG program

Characteristics and Determinants of Teacher-Designed Pay for Performance Plans: Evidence From Evaluations of Texas' Governor's Educator Excellence Grant (GEEG) Program (2008). Taylor, L., Springer, M., and Ehlert, M. NCPI Working Paper Series No. 2008-26. Nashville, TN.

This study describes the teacher pay for performance plans designed and implemented by the public schools participating in the Governor's Educator Excellence Grant (GEEG) program in Texas. GEEG is a federally funded, incentive pay program that awarded non-competitive grants, ranging from \$60,000 to \$220,000 each year for three years, to 99 Texas public schools. Schools participating in GEEG took advantage of the considerable discretion granted to them by the Texas Education Agency

to design incentive plans exhibiting an array of differences on several key plan variables. This study explores the following research questions: (1) How did schools propose to distribute awards to teachers and how were those awards actually distributed in practice? (2) What is the relationship between teacher characteristics and the dollar amounts awarded to teachers in the GEEG plans? (3) What are the determinants of GEEG plan characteristics and the distribution of awards?

To view the entire report, please [click here](#).

Governor's Educator Excellence Grant (GEEG) Program: Year One Evaluation Report (2007).
Springer, M.G., Podgurksy, M., Lewis, J.L., Ehlert, M.W., Gardner, C.D., Ghosh-Dastidar, B., Lopez, O., Patterson, C.H., and Taylor, L.L. Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency.

This report presents findings stemming from the first-year evaluation of the Governor's Educator Excellence Grant (GEEG) program, one of several statewide performance incentive programs in Texas. In the fall of 2006, the GEEG program made available non-competitive, three-year grants to 99 schools ranging from \$60,000 to \$220,000 per year. Grants were distributed to schools that were rated as high performing campuses in addition to having high proportions of economically disadvantaged students. More specifically, this report provides an overview of GEEG programs in 99 schools; the strategies used by schools to reward the performance of teachers and staff; and the apparent impact on schools' organizational dynamics, teachers' attitudes, and teachers' professional practice.

Overall findings about GEEG programs seem to abate the traditional critiques raised against performance incentive programs. Specifically, performance incentive programs appear to be having an encouraging impact on schools' organizational dynamics, teachers' perceptions of performance incentives, and teachers' instructional practice. Nonetheless, it is too soon to conclude that these outcomes are attributable to the inception of GEEG. Additionally, there is still much to be learned about the quality of schools' program designs and the impact of program characteristics on outcomes of teacher behavior, school culture, teacher workforce trends, and student achievement.

To view the entire report, please [click here](#).

Note: See Chapters 2-5 to learn more about design and implementation of the GEEG program