

District Changes in Teacher Compensation Practices When Collective Bargaining Disappears

March 1, 2017

Steven M. Kimball, Ph.D., Herbert G. Heneman, III, Ph.D., Robin Worth, Ph.D., Jessica Arrigoni, and Daniel Marlin

Wisconsin Center for Education Research
University of Wisconsin–Madison
steven.kimball@wisc.edu

Contact: Steven Kimball: steven.kimball@wisc.edu

Paper presented at the 42nd Annual Conference of the Association for Education Finance and Policy



**Wisconsin Center for
Education Research**
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN–MADISON

Support for this study was provided by the Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction. The authors gratefully acknowledge Sarah Archibald and Brad Carl for their feedback on prior versions of this paper, and Karen FASTER for her careful editing of the final draft.

District Changes in Compensation Practices When Collective Bargaining Disappears

Steve Kimball, Herb Heneman, Robin Worth, Jessica Arrigoni, and Dan Marlin

Over many decades, teachers' compensation has been determined through standard practices, commonly represented by the single salary schedule. While these practices served districts well in a number of respects, many argue that new forms of teacher pay could provide powerful levers for changing teacher performance and improving student achievement by enhancing recruitment, development, and retention efforts for effective educators (Committee for Economic Development, 2009; Odden & Kelley, 2002; Odden & Wallace, 2008; TNTP, 2014).

Historically, experiments with alternative compensation programs have been rare or episodic. Notable reforms included Kentucky's school-based performance award program, the Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina, school-based performance award program, and the Los Angeles Vaughan charter school knowledge and skills-based compensation system.¹ Multiple school systems in several states implemented the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching's teacher career management and compensation program known as the TAP System. The well-documented Denver ProComp system also involved a broad compensation and associated career management system.

To encourage broader experimentation with compensation and human resource reforms, the U.S. Department of Education administered the Teacher Incentive Fund, in which states and districts competed for millions of dollars in grants to implement new performance-based forms of teacher pay in high-need schools (U.S. Department of Education, 2016, July 18). Additionally, the Race to the Top program (U.S. Department of Education, 2016, June 6) embraced an improvement agenda that included uses of new educator effectiveness measures to support professional growth, and educational equity and accountability goals. As a result, the prevalence and pace of compensation reform has increased nationally.

Many Wisconsin school districts initiated their own teacher pay design and delivery transformations following the passage of Wisconsin Act 10 in 2011 (Beck, 2014; Mendez, 2014; Richards, 2012, August 19; Richards, 2012, November 22). Act 10 eliminated collective bargaining rights for most public employees, retained teacher compensation bargaining only for base pay increases, and limited that bargaining to the percentage change in the consumer price index (Wisconsin Act 10, 2011). With new flexibility at their disposal, and an undercurrent comprising many national compensation experiments, Wisconsin districts have begun moving away from standard compensation practices. Although pay changes are the focus of state media coverage, there are few information sources about the variety and scope of Wisconsin compensation revisions.

¹ For more information, see early studies on teacher compensation experimentation at <http://cpre.wceruw.org/ecomprod/products.php>.

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

In this paper, we first provide an overview of two standard compensation practices that are common around the United States. We include terminology and exhibits that illustrate the basics of such practices. We then summarize seven major types of compensation reform initiatives occurring throughout the country. The focus next turns to school district teacher compensation changes in Wisconsin. We describe key findings obtained from interviews with Wisconsin district leaders, along with our review of compensation-related district documents. We situate our findings within standard compensation practice to illustrate where and how much Wisconsin compensation practices have changed. The paper concludes with implications for research and practice.

Standard Teacher Compensation Practices

Single Salary Schedule

The single salary schedule, also referred to as the “steps and lanes” schedule, is a standard way of determining and delivering teacher pay throughout the country. Exhibit 1 shows a typical single salary schedule, with 30 steps on the left side and seven lanes across the top. Each step represents a year of service (seniority) in the district. The lanes represent increasing levels of educational attainment in the form of degrees (bachelor’s, master’s, doctorate), and additional completed academic course credits (15, 30, 45). A teacher’s salary (also known as base pay) is determined by locating the appropriate cell (years of service and level of education) for a given teacher. A teacher’s base pay increase may come about in two ways. First, the entire schedule may be increased, such as applying a 2% increase to the amounts in the cells. Second, the teacher may receive a raise for additional seniority or education.

Exhibit 1: Example of a Single Salary (Steps and Lanes) Schedule

Years of Service	Bachelor of Arts	Bachelor of Arts 15	Bachelor of Arts 30	Master of Arts	Master of Arts 30	Master of Arts 45	Master of Arts 60/ Doctorate
0	\$28,000	\$29,400	\$30,870	\$32,414	\$34,034	\$35,736	\$37,523
1	\$28,560	\$29,988	\$31,487	\$33,062	\$34,715	\$36,451	\$38,273
2	\$29,131	\$30,588	\$32,117	\$33,723	\$35,409	\$37,180	\$39,039
3	\$29,714	\$31,200	\$32,759	\$34,397	\$36,117	\$37,923	\$39,819
4	\$30,308	\$31,824	\$33,415	\$35,085	\$36,840	\$38,682	\$40,616
5	\$30,914	\$32,460	\$34,083	\$35,787	\$37,576	\$39,455	\$41,428
6	\$31,533	\$33,109	\$34,765	\$36,503	\$38,328	\$40,244	\$42,257
7	\$32,163	\$33,771	\$35,460	\$37,233	\$39,095	\$41,049	\$43,102
8	\$32,806	\$34,447	\$36,169	\$37,978	\$39,876	\$41,870	\$43,964
9	\$33,463	\$35,136	\$36,893	\$38,737	\$40,674	\$42,708	\$44,843
10	\$34,132	\$35,838	\$37,630	\$39,512	\$41,487	\$43,562	\$45,740
11	\$34,814	\$36,555	\$38,383	\$40,302	\$42,317	\$44,433	\$46,655
12	\$35,511	\$37,286	\$39,151	\$41,108	\$43,164	\$45,322	\$47,588
13	\$36,221	\$38,032	\$39,934	\$41,930	\$44,027	\$46,228	\$48,540
14	\$36,945	\$38,793	\$40,732	\$42,769	\$44,907	\$47,153	\$49,510

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

Years of Service	Bachelor of Arts	Bachelor of Arts 15	Bachelor of Arts 30	Master of Arts	Master of Arts 30	Master of Arts 45	Master of Arts 60/ Doctorate
15	\$37,684	\$39,569	\$41,547	\$43,624	\$45,806	\$48,096	\$50,501
16	\$38,438	\$40,360	\$42,378	\$44,497	\$46,722	\$49,058	\$51,511
17	\$39,207	\$41,167	\$43,225	\$45,387	\$47,656	\$50,039	\$52,541
18	\$39,991	\$41,990	\$44,090	\$46,294	\$48,609	\$51,040	\$53,592
19	\$40,791	\$42,830	\$44,972	\$47,220	\$49,581	\$52,060	\$54,663
20	\$41,607	\$43,687	\$45,871	\$48,165	\$50,573	\$53,102	\$55,757
21		\$44,561	\$46,789	\$49,128	\$51,584	\$54,164	\$56,872
22		\$45,452	\$47,724	\$50,111	\$52,616	\$55,247	\$58,009
23		\$46,361	\$48,679	\$51,113	\$53,668	\$56,352	\$59,169
24		\$47,288	\$49,652	\$52,135	\$54,742	\$57,479	\$60,353
25		\$48,234	\$50,646	\$53,178	\$55,837	\$58,629	\$61,560
26		\$49,198	\$51,658	\$54,241	\$56,953	\$59,801	\$62,791
27		\$50,182	\$52,692	\$55,326	\$58,092	\$60,997	\$64,047
28		\$51,186	\$53,745	\$56,433	\$59,254	\$62,217	\$65,328
29		\$52,210	\$54,820	\$57,561	\$60,439	\$63,461	\$66,634
30		\$53,254	\$55,917	\$58,713	\$61,648	\$64,731	\$67,967

Source: Odden, A., & Wallace, M. (2008). *How to Create World Class Teacher Compensation*. Available at: WWW.FRELOADPRESS.COM.

Salary Supplements

Many districts provide additional pay to teachers via various supplements or “add-ons” to base pay delivered as stipends or bonuses. Exhibit 2 shows the definitions of these two terms, along with examples of rewarded activities and accomplishments. The use of salary supplements indicates district administrators believe many teacher actions beyond normal classroom instruction are worthy of pay in their own right.

Exhibit 2: Examples of Supplements to Base Pay

Stipend
<i>Definition: An upfront addition to base pay that is not permanent.</i>
Examples of activities by which teachers can earn stipends: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leading extracurricular activities • Playing expertise role (e.g., master teacher) • Taking on administrative leadership role (e.g., department chair) • Gaining special certification (e.g., National Board for Professional Teaching Standards)
Bonus
<i>Definition: A one-time, after-the-fact payment not built into base pay.</i>
Examples of bonuses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hiring bonus • Bonus for completion of new skill (e.g., web design)

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

- Performance bonus for meeting performance targets such as a specific performance rating (“highly effective”) or a student achievement goal (85% of students in a class reach growth target)
- Bonus for teaching hard-to-staff subject or at hard-to-staff school

Advantages and Disadvantages of Standard Pay Practices

The single salary schedule offers several advantages. It treats teachers equitably based on seniority and education, thus minimizing pay bias possibilities (e.g., favoritism, gender, and race). It has mechanical rules (negotiation aside) for determining pay and pay increases, and it allows a teacher to view career progression in a known and predictable way. Teacher acceptance of the single salary schedule is typically very high because of these features, particularly among teachers with more seniority (Odden & Kelley, 2002).

Criticisms include perception that the single salary schedule is too rigid because it limits flexibility for compensation discretion in attracting, rewarding, and retaining teachers (Hanushek, 2007). Typical single salary schedules favor teachers that are more experienced because across-the-board pay increases are weighted toward teachers with more seniority. Moreover, primarily rewarding seniority and education is problematic since research findings question the impact of these factors on student performance (Odden, 2001; Protsik, 1995; Firestone, 1994). While predictable, career and pay progression is slow and does not allow newer teachers to leapfrog quickly into high pay based on their accomplishments or effectiveness. Finally, automatic step and lane pay increases lock in pay that a district may not be able to afford because of revenue decreases resulting from enrollment or other funding declines.

Turning to salary supplements, their major advantage is that they provide district with needed compensation flexibility to encourage and reward many different school or district activities. However, supplements often require qualitative assessments of teachers in terms of their eligibility and appointment. Educators and other stakeholder groups may question soundness and validity of such subjective assessments. To counter such contentions, districts must develop assessment systems, rules, and training for assessors, all of which require expertise and incur cost. Finally, though pay supplements are not permanent, outright elimination of pay supplement programs is difficult due to their “pay sweetener” status and organizational need for the awarded roles.

Teacher Compensation Reforms

Against the standard practice backdrop, districts across the country are developing many types of compensation reforms and programs. The following presents brief and generic highlights of seven such initiatives.

Modification to the Single Salary Schedule

Maintaining a commitment to the single salary schedule is possible while making changes to step and lane practices (see, for example, Heneman & Kimball, 2008), as shown in Exhibit 3.

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

Generally, step and lane changes may reduce the impact of seniority and education on base pay and pay increases, and lessen the financial impact of automatic pay increases.

Exhibit 3: Modifications to the Single Salary Schedule

Changes to Steps <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Increase/decrease number of steps• Change length of time between steps• Create conditional step movement (e.g., the teacher must receive an “effective” performance evaluation to receive a step increase)
Changes to Lanes <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Increase/decrease number of lanes• Redefine lanes (e.g., to clarify what is an acceptable master’s degree or what specific coursework will count)• Drop use of lanes

Performance Pay

Teacher performance pay encompasses a wide variety of specific types of pay plans. They share a common objective of trying to link pay increases to individual or school measures of teacher performance. Exhibit 4 represents performance measures and monetary payouts possible in teacher performance pay plans.

Exhibit 4: Teacher Performance Pay

Individual Performance <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Teacher evaluation ratings compared to performance standards• Percentage of teacher’s students meeting proficiency standard• Percentage increase in students meeting proficiency standard• Value-added test score gains by teacher’s students
School Performance <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Percentage of school’s students meeting proficiency and/or growth measure• Percentage increase in school’s students meeting proficiency standard• School value-added measures for determining test score gains• Graduation, attendance, advanced placement rates
Payouts <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Qualification for a step increase on single salary schedule• Payout schedule for bonus• Payout schedule for base pay increase• Payout schedule based on combined performance measures

Knowledge and Skills-Based Pay

Also known as competency pay, knowledge and skills-based pay programs target specific knowledge and skills (competencies). The teacher must acquire and demonstrate the identified competencies as critical for teacher classroom or team performance or for other assignments.

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

Payouts range from one-time bonuses to multi-year base pay increases. The latter must be re-earned after some interval. Examples are provided in Exhibit 5.

Exhibit 5: Teacher Knowledge and Skills-Based (Competency) Pay

Knowledge/Skill	Payout
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completion of new skill training (e.g., data analysis and usage; instructional team building) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bonus \$750
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completion of instructional portfolio 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bonus \$1,200
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completion of specialist certification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Base pay increase \$1,500
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completion of National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Base pay increase \$6,000

Career Levels, Bands, Ladders

These systems feature progressively higher base pay categories, such as apprentice teacher, novice teacher, career teacher, advanced teacher, and accomplished teacher. These replace the single salary schedule. There are defined criteria for each category, such as performance rating levels, educational attainment, years of teaching and additional roles served. There may also be step increases adding to base pay within each category, along with an indication of how long the teacher can remain in the category. There is often an implied “up or out” progression from Apprentice to the Career level. Refer to Exhibit 6 for an illustration of a pay (career) band.

Exhibit 6: Teacher Career Levels/Bands/Ladders

Career Band	Qualifications
<i>Accomplished</i> (no maximum years)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distinguished ratings on instruction and at least two other domains Master’s degree Leadership roles
<i>Advanced</i> (no maximum years)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distinguished ratings on instruction and one other domain At least proficient ratings on other domains Master’s degree Instructional coach experience (3 years)
<i>Career</i> (no maximum years)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proficient on all domains
<i>Novice</i> (5-year maximum)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mix of basic and proficient ratings on all domains
<i>Apprentice</i> (2-year maximum)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Basic rating on all domains Complete induction program

Competitive Pay

Competitive pay is used for attraction and retention purposes in response to labor market pressures. These approaches award bonuses or stipends beyond the normal base pay. Exhibit 7 includes examples. District administrators may create formal or informal approaches to competitive pay (i.e., when they apply and what amount to offer).

Exhibit 7: Teacher Competitive Pay

A bonus or stipend is given for:

- Attracting exceptionally qualified job candidates
- Teaching in a hard-to-staff school
- Teaching a hard-to-staff subject
- Retaining a valued teacher who has a job offer

Pay for Leadership Roles

Districts increasingly identify teachers to take on numerous new leadership roles. Districts may identify teachers to promote into roles or teachers may have to apply for these roles through formal selection processes. Stipends are usually paid while the teacher is in the role, which may be full or part time (allowing teachers to remain in the classroom). Exhibit 8 shows types of leadership roles.

Exhibit 8: Teacher Leadership Pay

A stipend is provided for leadership roles or additional duties, such as:

- Team leader
- Demonstration teacher
- Instructional coach or specialist
- Master teacher
- Mentor teacher
- Peer evaluator
- Department chair
- Athletic coaching, club sponsorship, district committee membership

Combined Plans

The above plans may be combined or blended. A teacher performance pay plan, for example, could be combined with a teacher leadership plan, allowing teachers to be rewarded for both instructional and leadership success. In a more blended way, combined plans contain multiple components from other pay plans, including performance pay, seniority pay, and leadership role pay. Denver's ProComp pay plan (Denver Public Schools, 2014) is a widely cited example of a highly developed combined plan.

Wisconsin Study

Interest in alternative compensation strategies existed in Wisconsin prior to the passage of Act 10 (Carlson, 2006; Ford, 2012), but the interest and pace of change in compensation practices across the state accelerated following enactment of this controversial law. While no data exist on the number of districts revising compensation strategies, media reports suggest widespread activity (Beck, 2014; Mendez, 2014; Richards, 2012, August 19; Richards, 2012, November 22; Taylor, 2015; Uhlig, 2014). This descriptive study fills a void in information about the types of compensation practices implemented in school Wisconsin districts.

This study identifies and describes the types of compensation changes Wisconsin districts were considering or implementing as of December 2015. Although not exhaustive, the study indicates the wide variety of practices and current volatility relating to compensation for teaching roles. The review focuses on reasons for changing pay practices, the change process, modifications to the single salary schedule, and ways of determining base pay increases, bonus, and stipend pay. The findings provide information to districts, state policymakers and agencies, and professional associations about the nature of teacher compensation changes occurring within Wisconsin. They also suggest many research needs and implications for practice. We close the report with suggested material for additional reading about teacher compensation reform.

Study Methodology

We sought documentation, then interviewed leaders from 25 (out of 424) Wisconsin school districts we identified from news reports and word of mouth that were implementing or considering alternative compensation structures for their teachers. Multiple sources led to the districts identified for this study. First, the study team consulted the Wisconsin Association of School Boards for recommendations given its work with many districts around school board policy, including compensation reform.² The association also provided website access to its compilation of teacher handbooks. Three study team members reviewed 50 handbooks to identify information related to compensation changes. The sample included every fifth handbook from a total of 269 handbooks accessed on the association site. To capture more recent compensation descriptions, we limited the review to handbooks dated 2013-14 or later. In most cases, the handbooks lacked information about compensation designs, but districts pursuing changes did tend to reference a change process or district board policy. We reviewed websites for those districts referencing compensation changes. Additionally, the team searched online media for any mentions of compensation changes in Wisconsin, which led us to include other districts in the study. Finally, the team sought recommendations from initial study participants for other districts they learned about during their compensation searches. Ultimately, 25 districts were included in the sample. See Appendix A for a list of participating districts.

² We are grateful for the time and assistance provided by Barry Forbes of the Wisconsin Association of School Boards for this project and for the participation of district administrators who patiently answered our questions about their compensation policies.

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

We reviewed each district's website to obtain teacher compensation-related documents. Phone interviews were conducted with one leader in each district using a semi-structured protocol (see Appendix B). The questions pertained to the basic structure of prior compensation approaches; the impetus for pursuing compensation changes; the design features for the new base pay, bonus, and supplemental pay elements; performance pay approaches; and the design process. We asked district leaders what sources, if any, they used to inform their work (i.e., other models within Wisconsin or in other states) and for any other documents relating to their system design that were not on the district website. Interviewers took detailed notes during the conversations, which averaged approximately 45 minutes in length.

The research team developed a basic template to summarize notes from the calls and document reviews. The template allowed the team to identify specific compensation features outlined earlier in this brief about compensation structures. Several team meetings were held to discuss themes emerging from reviews and plan for additional analysis. Each team member created analytical memos using the notes from interviews and district documents, focusing on the compensation structure elements and initial themes identified by the group. The study results are based on the cumulative evidence collected from these sources.

Results

Using the seven types of teacher compensation reforms outlined above, the paper next describes the variety of compensation changes initiated by the Wisconsin study districts. First, we summarize the main themes relating to the impetus for the pay changes and the change process. Next, we report on the compensation design elements, along with illustrative examples.

Impetus for changes. Districts reported a variety of reasons for pursuing pay changes. Common themes involve fiscal concerns with prior systems, a desire to create compensation systems that embrace district goals and recognize teacher contributions to the organization, alignment with the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness System, moving to a career pathway approach, the flexibility allowed by Act 10, and the increased pressure to compete with other districts for teaching talent.

Several districts sought to move away from automatic step increases or lane movement based on additional educational credits and advanced degrees. One district leader asserted that, "There was no connection between what we were paying people with advanced degrees and their output." Another administrator stated that, "the biggest driver was to find something more equitable and fair. Everyone agrees that basing compensation on years and degrees just doesn't make sense anymore." These leaders, and others, want their compensation systems to embrace professional development opportunities more applicable to current roles as well as the performance expectations of the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness System.

One district articulated the following multiple purposes for the new evaluation system:

- Ensure the district is able to attract and retain highly qualified professionals

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

- Establish clear and consistent definition of quality teaching
- Support professionals as they strive for teaching excellence
- Recognize contributions of professionals who are dedicated to advancing district goals
- Encourage professionals to experiment with innovative teaching methods to improve productivity and performance

Finances and sustainability of new systems loomed large for almost all of the districts. Most respondents mentioned that enrollment instability and cuts to state aid rendered the prior salary schedules unsustainable before Act 10. The new law allows flexibility to adjust compensation systems. School boards now have the ability to unilaterally change the salary structure or modify increases if finances become too prohibitive. With or without Act 10, however, given shrinking state education funding and enrollment changes in many districts, interviewees were clear that teacher compensation systems across the state were unstable.

Change process. Respondents mentioned that although Act 10 provided a means to pursue change, they were still concerned about how educators would react to the change process. Due to the sensitive nature and complexity of compensation reform, almost all districts formed compensation committees and engaged stakeholders in redesign. Districts varied, however, in the time involved with design planning and transition to the new plans, as well as the depth of involvement by teachers, administrators, and school board members. Despite the Act 10 allowance for districts to unilaterally change compensation structures, all of the districts involved teachers to some extent in planning, design, and implementation feedback. In only one district did it appear that the district administrator created the system with limited educator involvement.

Planning, design, and implementation proceeded differently in the districts. While some moved quickly following Act 10 or were investigating changes prior to Act 10, others took a more cautious approach to see what leading districts were doing and to learn from their first steps. The time from review of plan options to implementation ranged from one to three years. Some districts had formal committees that regularly met, while others had a limited design team that periodically sought feedback from educators and school leaders on options. Many districts included school board members, and some included retired educators, teachers' association representatives, and occasionally outside consultants. Among consultants, Wisconsin Association of School Boards staff provided background information or facilitated the design for most districts referencing external support.

Most districts engaged in a careful, and what appeared to be collaborative, approach to the design of the new compensation systems. For example, one district that focused heavily on communication used a survey at the front end to ask teachers what they wanted to see in a compensation system, frequently solicited feedback from stakeholders, provided updates on the district website, presented at board meetings, and held four design team meetings at each school.

Another district also pursued a very deliberate change process, with a compensation committee including seven teachers, one principal, three district leaders (including the

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

superintendent), three school board members, and a consultant from Wisconsin Association of School Boards. The superintendent was deeply involved and compiled comprehensive, web-based resources that included meeting agendas, district model examples, and cost projections. The committee's goal was to design a compensation system that (a) aligned with the district mission and vision, (b) would promote professional learning, (c) would be financially feasible, and (d) would recognize rigor and relevance with professional evaluations. The district surveyed all teachers at the beginning stages to learn what they valued in a compensation system and used that information to inform proceedings. The district also gathered information on several other district models, carried out cost analyses of different options, and held about 12 structured meetings throughout the planning year to frame the system. The district intends to review the system quarterly.

No district found new funding to support the pay changes. Many indicated that the amount of payouts could change with funding shortfalls, but overall believed the funding amounts would be similar to their prior schedules. The tenuous nature of funding could contribute to educator unease with the financial security of promised pay adjustments and have an impact on retention.

The districts differed in the depth of planning and review of alternative compensation strategies. Administrators reported being aware of neighboring districts' compensation plans and did limited comparisons, but some districts, such as the two noted above, extensively reviewed compensation approaches within the state and beyond. A few other districts appeared to develop their own approach with little research on alternative designs or compensation issues. Twelve districts involved outside consultants, with eight of those working with a Wisconsin Association of School Boards counsel to help facilitate planning or to provide input on compensation issues.

No districts reported having pilot tested their compensation plans, but most districts indicated that they will regularly review their systems to make necessary adjustments.

Transition. Although the districts did not pilot test their new approaches, leaders expressed that the changes would evolve over time, with adjustments made based on periodic review and reports by the design committee, district leadership, and the school board. Several districts reported being sensitive to issues typical of large scale educational change, including resistance among teachers and some school administrators, the need for clear and constant communication, time constraints in the design to implementation process, and transition challenges (i.e., making sure teachers were placed appropriately on the new salary schedule).

Districts took similar steps to transition teachers into the new system. All but one district moved teachers over in a way in which they did not lose salary. Placement in the new systems was often based on a level matching or slightly above current salary. Many added a sweetener by increasing all teachers' pay by a range of \$500 to \$1,000. Some offered across-the-board salary increases, such as one district that provided a 2% increase for all teachers. The transition process took careful planning. Adjustments were needed in several districts to make sure teachers were placed appropriately in the new schedules.

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

One district sought to hold teachers harmless in transition from the steps and lanes levels in the prior schedule to the new system using career levels, so they chose to extend the number of steps in the new schedule. This district's professional educator level, for example, now features 61 steps. Another district "red-circled" or "grandfathered" teachers who were making more than the maximum salary for their placement in the new schedule. Those teachers must re-earn performance stipends each year to maintain their prior pay level.

Modifications to salary structure. All of the districts previously used a single salary schedule based on steps and lanes. Each moved away from that structure to some degree. The districts limited the number of lanes or changed the lanes from education-based to a more career-level approach. All districts modified the steps.

Lane reductions. Most districts reduced the number of lanes and changed them from designations based on completion of higher education credits and degrees to other designations using career levels. As referenced above, several district leaders mentioned that research did not support the link between completion of higher education credits and degrees and more effective performance. Although some still recognized completion of master's degrees and district approved education credits, others dropped them completely from salary considerations.

Several districts have changed the salary structure so that newer educators can move up the salary schedule more quickly. These adjustments are in stark contrast to across-the-board increases under prior single salary schedule approaches, which favored senior educators regardless of performance.

Step modifications. In the past, step increases were granted for each year worked. Some districts in our sample increased the length of time for step increases (i.e., 2 to 3 years), while others maintained the annual step increase, but the step was conditional on "satisfactory" performance evaluation results or other factors. The definition of satisfactory evaluation results varies, but typically implies that there are no unsatisfactory ratings or that the educator is not on a plan of improvement. The step increase amount is often linked to the consumer price index.

Performance pay. Almost all district administrators expressed an interest in tying compensation to performance, but only about a third had specific linkages between teacher performance measures and pay. Six used performance elements to determine placement in the salary schedule. Two had school-based performance bonuses. Only one district used classroom-level student outcomes explicitly for performance pay.

Districts used a variety of ways to measure performance for pay decisions. Some reported rating performance using adapted measures from the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness System. Northland Pines, for example, uses a knowledge and skills-based pay approach, based on an adapted version of the Cooperative Educational Service Agency # 6 Effectiveness Project teacher evaluation rubric. Appendix C includes an excerpt from the Northland Pines district's staff salary schedule. This district applies the locally adapted effectiveness rubric to assess a set of teaching evidence (referred to as an evidence log) that includes examples of professional practice and

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

related teacher reflections. Principals review the evidence to judge performance. Teachers are given a rating of 1 through 5 on each indicator. Level 5 is reserved for those who have master's degrees or national board certification. Scores are averaged across indicators with a range of 22-110. Each range has a corresponding pay level from \$35,000 for Level 1 to \$64,263 for Level 5. Unlike other districts in our sample, Northland Pines also allows for pay reductions if a teacher is placed lower on the new pay scale than on the prior scale or if a teacher receives an evaluation that places her or him at a lower level on the scale. There is a \$2,000 per year cap on reductions until he or she reaches the pay amount associated with the lower rating. The pay can increase with improved performance ratings.

Neenah Joint School District also bases salary level increases in part on performance determinations using the evaluation system. For example, a teacher in this district must receive all "effective" ratings on all standards in order to reach the third level of the salary schedule. To move to the next level, teachers must receive at least two "distinguished" and four "effective" ratings on the six standards. Movement to the higher levels also requires documented evidence of student learning gains, although the specific measures are not specified. The district's staff salary schedule is reproduced in Appendix D.

Another district using the state model evaluation approach uses a similar strategy, with level movement contingent on minimum evaluation ratings for each tier of its career level system as follows:

- Initial: no subdomain ratings at the unsatisfactory level
- Building: fewer than five subdomain ratings at the basic level; no ratings at the unsatisfactory level
- Professional: no subdomain ratings in the basic or unsatisfactory levels
- Advanced: all subdomain ratings at the proficient or distinguished levels; more than one subdomain rating at the distinguished level
- Exemplary: all subdomain ratings at the proficient or distinguished levels; more than five subdomain ratings at the distinguished level

In this district, principals also assess teacher-submitted portfolios to determine between-level and within-level advancement.

In contrast to the prior two examples, which base evaluation and resulting compensation decisions on evaluator (primarily principal) judgments, some districts use a panel (peer or peer and administrators) to review teaching portfolios during the year. In one district, contingent on satisfactory performance evaluation and peer review, teachers are eligible for \$2,000 salary increases following their summative evaluation year and \$6,000 increases every sixth year. Teachers with two or more unsatisfactory ratings on their evaluation are not eligible for salary increases.

Another district with a portfolio approach uses an administrator panel and a district-developed rubric to initially place teachers on the new salary schedule. In subsequent years, a review panel made up of three administrators and three teachers reviews the teacher portfolios.

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

The panel uses a review rubric to assess teachers on several dimensions, including evidence of satisfactory performance (at the early career stages) and evidence of advanced performance at the upper levels of the new pay schedule.

In addition to other stipends, another district uses knowledge and skills assessments from the state teacher evaluation system to determine bonuses. The district's two bonus levels are based on scores from the measures of teaching practice using domain scores from the Framework for Teaching. Level 1 provides a \$2,500 bonus and Level 2 provides a \$1,000 bonus. The bonuses are awarded during the fall following completion of summary (summative) evaluation years.

Almost all districts chose not to include classroom-level student outcomes for performance pay. The one district including student results awards small bonuses to advanced placement teachers whose students pass advance placement tests with scores of 3 or higher in the previous year. For example, if students meet the state average or greater, the teacher receives a \$1,000 bonus; 60% or greater, \$500 bonus; and 55% or greater, \$200 bonus. Additionally, two districts used an adapted measure from the teacher evaluation system based on teacher-developed student learning objectives and professional practice goal attainment.³

Knowledge and skills-based pay. Our selected Wisconsin districts are experimenting with two main types of knowledge and skills-based pay. The first is based on a point system, where educators accumulate a set number of points related to professional development and other activities that are used to justify a pay increase as one-time stipends or points qualifying for a step or level movement. This type of system is also referred to as a micro-credential system. The second type relates to separate, district approved training, master's degrees and certifications, and national board certification.

Point systems are commonly used to substitute for what was previously automatic approval for lane movement based on accumulation of higher education credits and degrees. The new point systems include a mix of professional development training and/or leadership activities. Some districts have created extensive opportunities, including teacher-created options, while others list a limited set of options. Whether extensive or limited, these point systems represent the knowledge and skills the districts value. In some instances, teachers can choose their own professional learning activities, but must submit a request for approval before the district will allow the activity to count in the point system.

As reflected in Appendix E, the School District of the Menominee Area identified 35 professional point options, with four categories ranging from 5-point activities to 50-point

³ Student learning objectives in Wisconsin are key measures used in the state Educator Effectiveness System. Student learning objectives represent student growth targets, related instructional practices, and student outcome assessments that are teacher-identified and informed by peers and/or evaluators. The student learning objective results are self-scored on quality and outcome dimensions by teachers annually using a standard scoring rubric. Using the same scoring rubric, evaluators provide an aggregate score every three years of the evaluation cycles based on holistic assessments of the collection of student learning objectives completed by each teacher.

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

activities. These points depend on the intensity/complexity of the training or professional activity. To illustrate, these activities include acting as a non-paid community education course instructor (5 points), taking a graduate course with prior approval (10 points/credit hour), participating on the building leadership team (25 points), and acting as a district trainer (50 points). The district includes a mix of professional growth activities, service-oriented activities, and teacher leader roles within its point system. A district supervisor, usually the building principal through the evaluation process, approves points teachers submit.

Several districts awarded separate knowledge and skills stipends for national board certification or for district-approved master's and doctoral degrees. In some cases, an annual stipend accompanied reimbursement for completing national board certification, in addition to stipends the state funded. One district reimbursed national board certified teachers with \$2,500 toward application costs and awarded \$2,500 annual stipends as long as the teachers maintain certification. In this district, national board certified teachers are also eligible for a \$5,000 stipend for teaching in high-poverty schools (those with more than 60 percent of students living in poverty) if they demonstrate proof of receiving an effective or highly effective teacher evaluation rating. Another district provides annual \$3,000 stipends for completion national board certification or a district-approved doctorate.

Regardless of the point system approach, other than the national board certification recognition, districts do not appear to require teachers to demonstrate they obtained knowledge and skills. Before points are accepted, they may have had to submit a form for approval in advance of pursuing the opportunity and/or they have to show that they have completed the activity.

Career levels/bands/ladders. To reflect a professional path for educators (as opposed to a uniform step and lane system), about half of the districts in our sample adopted a career level approach, also referred to as career bands or ladders. With this approach, districts use the state licensure categories of initial, professional, and master educator to designate compensation-related career levels. Others used their own titles or generic descriptions, such as “Level 1, 2, 3, 4” or “Level A-E.” The career level model applies knowledge and skills-related activities or accomplishments and, in some cases, performance elements, to determine advancement to different levels. Districts also used a number of steps within each level that allow for incremental pay increases to recognize experience while the teacher remains at the career level. Two examples of career level approaches are presented in Appendices F and G, and described briefly below.

Mosinee (Appendix F) is one district that applied a career level approach, with six “levels” and three “tiers” (steps) within each level (with exception of Level 1, which includes five steps (1A-1E)). Teachers move up each tier/step based on a “successful year of teaching” as determined by principals when they recommend annual contract renewal. Principals use their judgment based on teacher evaluation evidence. Teachers earn a \$650 stipend in alternate years. Movement to the next level is determined by a “successful year of teaching” and accumulation of

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

professional development points. A teacher needs 18 to move to each subsequent level. The district must approve and offer undergraduate, graduate, or professional development on non-contract days or allow self-directed professional learning (webinars, conferences, etc.). A master's degree is required to move from Level 4 to Level 5. Mosinee also created a pay schedule for miscellaneous additional leadership, duty, or coaching positions.

Monona Grove (Appendix G) created a career ladder system with five professional teacher levels: mentorship, post-mentorship, professional, professional teacher-leader, and distinguished. The district aligned the levels with Wisconsin licensure categories. Each level is bounded by a time frame, and includes a basic description, performance expectations, and pay ranges. Movement between levels is based on a compilation of evidence reviewed by a committee made up of administrators and teacher peers using a district-developed rubric. All educators receive base pay increases linked to the consumer price index as determined by the district, which is subject to negotiation. Teachers in Levels 3-5 also receive within-level pay increases every 3 years based on a percentage of the salary range mid-point of their current salary level. The amount may fluctuate depending on district finances.

Competitive pay. Almost all of the district representatives interviewed mentioned that they could use incentives to lure or retain employees in high demand positions or who were highly skilled. These incentives were negotiated as part of teacher's individual contracts. Most districts did not have an overt policy on recruitment and retention incentives nor did they use the incentives as a marketing tool to lure prospective educators. Instead, districts addressed case-by-case situations in which a valued current teacher received an offer from another district or if a high-demand position was required. Counter offers tended to be negotiated arrangements between the district administrator and the employee in the form of increased placement on the salary schedule or one-time stipends. No district offered incentives for hard-to-staff schools; it is notable, however, that most of the districts either comprised few schools or did not have any identified as hard-to-staff.

To recruit a high quality candidate to a hard-to-fill position, one district offered a school psychologist from another district a substantial raise over what they were earning. The district administrator placed this person at the top of the pay scale, which amounted to a \$10,000 raise. Some districts offered other incentives, such as assistance toward tuition payment or student loan forgiveness to lure or retain employees in highly competitive fields. Another sought to help teachers gain experience and knowledge for high demand or specialty areas (e.g., educators in science, technology, and math) by offering training opportunities.

Districts wanting to retain teachers sought by other districts also used compensation on a case-by-case basis to keep valued educators. In one instance, to retain a teacher being recruited by another district, the home district matched the \$5,000 pay increase offered the teacher.

A couple of districts mentioned examples of more experienced teachers expressing concerns when a newer teacher in a high-demand field was placed higher on the salary schedule than their

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

veteran colleagues. One district stopped pursuing highly desirable candidates to avoid this type of situation.

In contrast to these ad hoc approaches to competitive pay, one district is more strategic. The district first identifies critical shortage areas as defined by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction or national shortage definitions and then examines local data on the number of applications in each teaching field. Teachers in critical shortage areas in this district receive a guaranteed 3-year stipend in a band between 90%-110% of what benchmark districts are paying for those positions. The district then re-evaluates after 3 years to see if the market has adjusted.

Leadership roles. The new systems include leadership roles that are recognized with separate stipends or within point systems. Districts award stipends or points for many varied roles. District documents contained little to no information about the structure, job descriptions, qualifications, or performance assessment for teachers taking on formal leadership roles. Although our interview protocol did not explore these roles and qualifications in depth, Exhibit 9 summarizes our findings as to the types of leadership roles recognized through stipends or accepted within point systems for advancement on salary schedules.

Exhibit 9: Rewards for Formal Teacher Leadership Roles

Reward for Teacher Leadership Role	Examples of Teacher Leadership Roles
Points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee service (district or school) • Professional development lead • Supervisor of student teachers • Community outreach activity coordinator • District program chair
Stipend	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher mentor • Effectiveness coach • Peer coach for teacher on plan of improvement • Department chair

As reflected in Appendix G, Monona Grove School District included a “professional leader teacher” designation in its career ladder framework. To meet this designation, teachers must hold and maintain a Wisconsin professional educator or master educator license and demonstrate “clear, convincing, and consistent evidence of advanced standards of classroom teaching practice, collaboration with colleagues, and formal or informal leadership.” Additionally, the district planned to recognize other teacher leader roles that may supplement or replace classroom assignments. These roles could include mentors or teachers on special assignment who are released for a specific period (i.e., 2-3 years). The district anticipated that they may include other teacher leader roles for classroom teachers (e.g., curriculum coordinators).

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

Additionally, most districts also retained stipends for extra duty or co-curricular activities, such as coaching a sports team, sponsoring a student club, and working at sporting events or other extracurricular activities.

Combined plans. Many districts combine multiple features from the above categories; these approaches often utilize career levels. The combined systems clearly moved away from a static steps and lanes model, and included new requirements for annual increases, knowledge and skills components, leadership stipends, and extra duty pay. The School District of Elmbrook’s design is described below, and Appendix H summarizes sections from its plan.

The Elmbrook compensation approach represents a combined plan centered on a career level approach, referred to as a career pathway. The plan includes five levels: developing, establishing, mastery 1, mastery 2, and exemplary. Each level includes a different pay range.

The district adjusts teacher base pay using an accumulation of performance evaluation results and other factors assessed every 3 to 5 years by school administrators. Since the state-required evaluation occurs over 3 years and culminates in ratings in the 3rd year, the district developed a “short-cycle” assessment during interim years. The short-cycle form assesses educators on several points related to knowledge, skills, and dispositions. The practice component assesses performance on their student learning objective measure and a district-created measure of professional practice goal completion, which the teacher evaluation system requires annually. Based on the annual short-cycle or 3rd-year effectiveness evaluation, teachers may receive an annual 2% salary increase for proficient performance and 4% for distinguished performance. This district also created a \$650 annual bonus for all teachers in schools that received the highest level state school report card rating. A shift in state testing and legislation requiring “a pause” in use of state test results for high stakes decisions prompted the district to suspend this aspect of the program.

In addition, the district includes provisions for teachers in critical shortage areas. The district examines the market for high demand positions (i.e., technology, special education, speech/language, English language learner instructors) and provides stipends to bring employees within 90-110% of the market rate.

The district also recognizes professional learning for teachers taking part in district-approved opportunities that align with school goals and district strategic priorities. A steering committee that includes teachers and administrators develops a menu of opportunities, including approved degrees and certifications. Additional learning opportunities are identified for different career levels, job responsibilities, and improvement focus areas. Completion of the professional learning activities results in a bonus commensurate with the time and value of the learning opportunity to support district goals and objectives. Teacher identified learning opportunities are assigned points by the district based on the time investment and their overall support of the district goals and objectives. The accumulated points correspond to a bonus amount in three levels (Level 1 = \$250, Level 2 = \$500; Level 3 = \$800). Teachers identify their learning paths

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

in the fall and submit documentation prior to the start of the next year to receive the appropriate stipends.

Finally, the district has placed a value on teacher leadership but has not specified how it will compensate teacher leaders. Eventually, promotion opportunities and base pay increases will be tied to mentoring, leadership, and collaboration.

Implementation challenges. Districts expressed a number of challenges about the compensation plan implementation at various stages. These included challenges from teacher associations, difficult meetings during the design phase, concerns about changing relationships between teachers and principals, fragile trust following passage of Act 10, confusion over complexity of plan designs, concerns about availability of professional development opportunities to advance based on professional development units, and tension created when younger teachers were compensated at higher levels than more veteran teachers. The districts appear aware of challenges to their compensation systems. They have tried to address the challenges during the planning steps and continue to monitor the systems for possible revisions.

All districts have processes for teachers to challenge placement in the new systems or decisions related to factors that govern salary movement, but districts mentioned few or no cases of challenges.

Summary of Findings

The following points summarize and highlight key study findings on Wisconsin teacher compensation changes in the 25 sampled districts:

- Small and mid-sized districts throughout the state have designed and implemented new teacher pay systems to modify or replace the single salary schedule since Fall 2011 and passage of Act 10. Although how representative these districts are of other districts across the state is not clear, most in our sample made substantial changes, creating hybrid plans involving several specific reform components.
- The changes were driven by multiple factors, including the new flexibility to transform compensation; a desire to have a pay system that would better attract, reward, and retain teachers; and a need for financial sustainability.
- Pay system changes were mostly designed to meet district needs, rather than simply trying to match or model what other districts were doing. Some districts consulted the Wisconsin Association of School Boards or others for assistance.
- Districts involved teachers, administrators, and teacher association staff (where present) in pay system design and implementation. The involvement aided discussion and the resolution of many challenging issues.
- New pay systems were implemented without a pilot test, but districts were receptive to making changes as the systems unfolded.
- In transition to the new systems, teachers received the same or somewhat greater pay (except in one district).
- In terms of specific pay reforms:
 - All sampled districts modified or eliminated traditional steps and lanes.

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

- About one third of the districts created performance pay tied to teacher evaluations; only one district tied pay to student test score outcomes.
- Several districts created point systems in which teachers received various amounts of bonus or stipend pay for specific activities, roles, or accomplishments.
- About half of the districts created career ladder/pay band systems, and step increases within each level or band were common.
- Competitive pay was used on an ad hoc basis to attract high quality recruits and/or to fill hard-to-staff positions.
- A few districts began payments to teachers in non-traditional leadership roles, such as teacher mentors.
- Implementation of the new pay systems, and their continuance, were met with several challenges centered around relationship and fairness issues.

Implications

The findings of our study have numerous implications for research and practice highlighted below.

The study districts demonstrate a variety of approaches to compensation reform when collective bargaining is no longer in place. Most of the 25 districts were small, with the largest district at about 10,000 students. None of the 5 largest districts in the state had embarked on compensation reform at the time of the study.

Reluctance to change compensation is not an isolated phenomenon. Districts have considerable flexibility in the types of compensation practice to adopt in Missouri, including various forms of incentive pay. Yet, a study of such practices in mid-to-large districts estimates that all used the single salary schedule, and only 32% had experimented with any type of compensation reform. For those reformers, the most common types were additional pay for national board certification or for additional duties (Liang & Akiba, 2015). As another example, almost all New Orleans public schools switched to charter schools without collective bargaining after Hurricane Katrina. Yet, the charter schools continued to reward teachers for education and experience in ways similar to districts with collective bargaining agreements (Lincove, Barrett & Strunk, 2015).

In short, there appears to be a sizeable experimentation reluctance when it comes to teacher compensation practices. What exactly accounts for such rigidity is in need investigation. Providing the opportunity for experimentation is a rather hollow offering if few take advantage of it.

For those districts that did opt for compensation experimentation, the types of changes in compensation practice were primarily district crafted and idiosyncratic. There was thus a wide variety of new types of pay delivery that were created by the districts, and ones that were not “cookie cutter” or merely copied from other sources. Exactly why and how did this occur? Were the practices and their specific features driven by strategic concerns or were they merely a hodge-podge of practices created by the different collaboration process? Knowing more about

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

how the new practices emerged would be helpful to districts thinking of going forward with compensation reforms.

Most compensation reforms create additional administrative complexity and time requirements, relative to the single salary schedule. While the examples we provide illustrate these requirements, we did not explore how the districts changed to administer the compensation designs or whether they thought the reforms were “worth” the extra burdens.

An often-overlooked potential advantage of compensation reform is the possibility for greater financial flexibility than that provided by the single salary schedule. Such flexibility may help districts better match compensation costs to changing (and often declining) revenue streams that result from funding formula changes and shrinking student enrollment. What has been the districts’ actual experience with their reforms and financial flexibility? Were they able to in fact “unfreeze” compensation costs and better align them with changing revenue?

None of the districts had conducted rigorous evaluations of their new compensation practices, so their effectiveness is essentially unknown. There is a wide range of potential topics for such evaluation. First, evaluation studies could explore teacher reactions to the program in terms of multiple factors: distributive and procedural fairness, pay satisfaction, retention, changes in teaching practice, and changes in student outcomes. Reactions of administrators should also be explored, with particular emphasis on administrative burden and school climate. The design teams that were used in the district to guide the development of the new pay practices could also be evaluated in terms of engagement in the decision-making process, communication effectiveness, collegiality, suggestions for process improvement, and whether the process was a reasonable substitute for collective bargaining over the pay practice changes.

Finally, stability and sustainability issues loom large as evaluation topics. Once implemented, what types of subsequent changes were made to the various practices and why? Did such instability in practice cause unsettling reactions among teachers? Going further, were some or all of the new compensation practices simply discarded and if so, why?

Implications for Practice

The research issues and questions raised above indicate that there is much yet to learn about new teacher compensation practices these districts put in place. The knowledge vacuum might be viewed as so large as to discourage district leaders and staff from going down the reform path. Yet, districts also have a broad opportunity, and accompanying flexibility, to experiment with reconfiguring their compensation practices in ways that might be more effective than those presently used. So, how might districts proceed?

A first suggestion is to strategically approach compensation change possibilities. Identify district problems and strategic initiatives under consideration. Then begin to question the degree to which various compensation reforms might be helpful to the district in meeting these challenges. For example, if the district discerns instructional quality challenges, it might decide

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

to embark on a path of teacher knowledge and skill improvement. A combination of a knowledge and skill-based pay plan, coupled with a career ladder that rewards continued successful demonstration of desired knowledge and skills in the classroom, might be a viable alternative. Micro-credential approaches represent an emerging practice that might also have implications for districts pursuing these strategic teacher quality improvement priorities.

A second suggestion is to make such exploration both a collaborative and analytic endeavor. Collaboration will help instill buy-in as well as provide multiple sources of special expertise needed to provide design and implementation foresight. The collaborators should proceed to use analytic tools such as logic models to help guide them, and they should keep issues of design and implementation complexity front and center. The examples of new compensation plans we provide clearly demonstrate the level of complexity and detail requiring attention.

Third, it is important to recognize that pay reforms should not be stand-alone programs, but should instead align with other parts of the human capital system (Heneman, Milanowski, & Kimball, 2007). A knowledge and skill-based pay system, for example, will need to be meshed with professional development opportunities – current or awaiting development – that provide the needed learning platform for teachers.

Finally, districts should build in plans upfront for conducting an evaluation of the new compensation practices. Complex changes do not necessarily result in desired outcomes, and they may cause unintended consequences. Districts need to learn about the effectiveness and sustainability of compensation changes, especially given the high and costly stakes inherent with compensation changes.

Further Readings/Resources

- Committee for Economic Development. (2009). *Teacher compensation and teacher quality. A statement by the policy and impact committee of the Committee for Economic Development*. Available at: <https://www.ced.org/pdf/Teacher-Compensation-and-Teacher-Quality.pdf>
- Forbes, B. (2013, August 6). Teacher compensation systems. Session presented at the conference of the Wisconsin Association of School Boards, Milwaukee, WI.
- Hanover Research. (2015). *Strategic teacher compensation models*. Available at: Council of Chief State School Officers, State Consortium on Educator Effectiveness website: http://scee.groupsie.com/file_cabinet/files/777348/download/Strategic%20Teacher%20Compensation%20Models.pdf?m=1443217586
- Hawley Miles, K., Pennington, K., & Bloom, D. (2015). *Do more, add more, earn more: Teacher salary redesign lessons from 10 first-mover districts*. Available at Center for American Progress website: <https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/TeacherCompensation-report2.pdf>
- Heneman III, H. G., & Kimball, S. (2008). *How to design new teacher salary structures*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, Wisconsin Center for Education Research, Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Strategic Management of Human Capital series. Retrieved from <http://www.smhc-cpre.org/download/50/>
- Heneman III, H. G., Milanowski, A., Kimball, S. M., & Odden, A. (2006). *Standards-based Teacher Evaluation as a Foundation for Knowledge-and Skill-Based Pay (RB-45)*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania, Graduate School of Education, Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Available at: http://www.cpre.org/sites/default/files/policybrief/885_rb45.pdf
- Milanowski, A. T. (2008). *Do teacher pay levels matter? A summary*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, Wisconsin Center for Education Research, Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Strategic Management of Human Capital series. Available at: <http://www.smhc-cpre.org/download/49/>
- Odden, A. (2008). *How to fund teacher compensation changes*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, Wisconsin Center for Education Research, Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Strategic Management of Human Capital series. Available at: <http://www.smhc-cpre.org/download/55/>

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

- Odden, A. (2008). *New teacher pay structures: The compensation side of the strategic management of human capital, a summary*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, Wisconsin Center for Education Research, Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Strategic Management of Human Capital series. Retrieved from <http://www.smhc-cpre.org/download/47/>
- Sielaff, J., & Zelazoski, S. (2016, January). *A primer on teacher compensation models*. Presentation at the state convention of the Wisconsin Association of School Boards, Milwaukee, WI.
- Pyatigorsky, M., Heneman, H., Steele, C., Finster, M., & Milanowski, T. (2016). *Teacher leader programs: Structure and staffing in four TIF districts*. Available on request from any of the authors of the working paper.

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

References

- Beck, M. (2014, September 7). A teacher 'marketplace' emerges in post-Act 10 Wisconsin. *Wisconsin State Journal*. Retrieved from http://host.madison.com/wsj/news/local/education/local_schools/a-teacher-marketplace-emerges-in-post-act-wisconsin/article_ab019b52-6ae5-5022-a698-604e5c7bab92.html
- Carlson, J. (2006). *Alternative teacher compensation in Manitowoc, Wisconsin Six Years Later*. Kettle Moraine UniServ Council. Retrieved from Washington State Legislature website: <http://leg.wa.gov/JointCommittees/Archive/BEF/Documents/Mtg04-14-08/Carlson3.pdf>
- Committee for Economic Development. (2009). *Teacher compensation and teacher quality. A statement by the policy and impact committee of the Committee for Economic Development*. Retrieved from: <https://www.ced.org/pdf/Teacher-Compensation-and-Teacher-Quality.pdf>
- Denver Public Schools. (2014). Welcome to teacher ProComp. Retrieved from <http://denverprocomp.dpsk12.org/>
- Firestone, W. A. (1994). Redesigning teacher salary systems for educational reform. *American Educational Research Journal*, 31(3), 549–574. Retrieved from <http://aer.sagepub.com/content/31/3/549.full.pdf>
- Ford, M. (2012). *A modern teacher compensation system for Wisconsin*. Wisconsin Policy Research Institute reports, 25(1). Retrieved from <http://www.wpri.org/WPRI/Reports/2012/A-Modern-Teacher-Compensation-System-for-Wisconsin.htm>
- Hanushek, R. (2007). The single salary schedule and other issues of teacher pay. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 82(4), 574–586. Retrieved from Stanford University website: [http://hanushek.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/publications/hanushek.2007%20PeabodyJEd%2082\(4\).pdf](http://hanushek.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/publications/hanushek.2007%20PeabodyJEd%2082(4).pdf)
- Heneman III, H.G., Milanowski, A., Kimball, S.M. (2007). Teacher performance pay: A synthesis, research and guidelines for practice. *Policy Brief*, Consortium for Policy Research in Education, University of Pennsylvania.
- Heneman III, H. G., & Kimball, S. (2008). *How to design new teacher salary structures*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, Wisconsin Center for Education Research, Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Strategic Management of Human Capital series. Retrieved from <http://www.smhc-cpre.org/download/50/>

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

- Liang, G., Akiba, M. (2015). Characteristics of teacher incentive pay programs: A statewide district survey. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 53(6), 702-717.
- Lincove, J.A., Barrett, N., Strunk, K.O. (2015). How do schools pay teachers when there is no union contract?: Evidence from New Orleans. Paper presented at the 41st annual meeting of the Association for Education Finance and Policy, Denver.
- Mendez, E. (2014, August 18). In the wake of Act 10, school districts changing teacher pay formulas. *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*. Retrieved from <http://www.jsonline.com/news/education/in-wake-of-act-10-school-districts-changing-teacher-pay-formulas-b99321049z1-271617971.html>
- Odden, A. (2001). Rewarding expertise. *Education Next*, 1(1). Retrieved from <http://educationnext.org/rewarding-expertise/>
- Odden, A., & Kelley, C. (2002). *Paying teachers for what they know and can do: New and smarter compensation strategies to improve student achievement*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Odden, A., & Wallace, M. (2008). *How to create world class teacher compensation*. Freeload Press.
- Protsik, J. (1995). *History of teacher pay and incentive reforms*. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED380894.pdf>.
- Richards, E. (2012, August 19). School districts explore performance-based pay models: Hartland-Lakeside among Wisconsin districts trying new systems. *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*. Retrieved from <http://www.jsonline.com/news/education/school-districts-explore-performancebased-pay-models-186es4a-166708646.html>.
- Richards, E. (2012, November 22). Waukesha School District considering rewarding teachers for performance. *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*. Retrieved from <http://www.jsonline.com/news/education/waukesha-school-district-considering-rewarding-teachers-for-performance-fe7Is9r-180541341.html>.
- Taylor, J. (2015). School committee mulls merit raises, stipends. *Northwoods River News*. Retrieved from <http://www.rivernewsonline.com/main.asp?SectionID=6&SubSection>.
- TNTP. (2014). *Shortchanged: The hidden costs of lockstep teacher pay*. Retrieved from http://tntp.org/assets/documents/TNTP_Shortchanged_2014.pdf.
- Uhlig, K. (2014, July 26). Wausau schools hike teacher pay under new salary model. *Wausau Daily Herald*. Retrieved from <http://www.wausaudailyherald.com/story/news/local/2014/07/26/teacher-salaries-rising/13209803/>.

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

U.S. Department of Education. (2016, July 18). Teacher incentive fund [Web page]. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/teacherincentive/index.html>

U.S. Department of Education. (2016, June 6). Race to the top [Web page]. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/index.html>

Wisconsin Act 10. (2011). Retrieved from Wisconsin Legislature website:
<https://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/2011/related/acts/10.pdf>

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

Appendix A: Participating Districts

District	Student Enrollment (2015-16)
Adams-Friendship	1,567
Athens	414
Beloit-Turner	1,528
DeForest	3,636
Elmbrook	7,055
Fall Creek	839
Goodman-Armstrong Creek	105
Grafton	2,214
Greenfield	3,638
Kiel	1,300
Menomonie Area	4,049
Middleton-Cross Plains	7,006
Monona Grove	3,333
Mosinee	2,080
Neenah	6,570
Northland Pines	1,311
Oak Creek-Franklin	6,617
Oshkosh	9,913
Ripon	1,639
Sheboygan Area	10,405
Stanley-Boyd	1,080
Sun Prairie	8,118
Verona	5,420
Wausaukee	468
Wauwatosa	7,262

Appendix B: Telephone Interview Protocol for School District Leaders about Teacher Compensation

1. Prior to your new compensation system, did your district use the single salary schedule for teachers?
 - a. *[if yes]* How many steps and lanes did it have?
 - b. *[if no]* What system was used?
2. In your new system, did you make modifications to the single salary schedule or eliminate it? *[if modified]* What general modifications were made? (e.g., reducing the number of steps or lanes, creating salary tiers or career bands)
3. Under the new compensation system, on what basis will teachers receive salary increases that are built into their base pay?
 - a. teacher evaluation ratings?
 - b. student test scores?
 - c. completion of specific activities: (professional development, formal educational credits, participation in special events or programs)
 - d. experience/seniority?
 - e. New instructional leadership roles or responsibilities, such as master or mentor teacher
 - f. any other? (please describe)
4. Are teachers eligible for bonus pay (i.e., compensation **not built into base pay**)?
 - a. *[if yes, what actions or accomplishments can lead to a bonus?]*
5. How is starting salary determined for teachers new to teaching?
6. How is starting salary determined for teachers new to the district?
7. Does your district offer incentives to recruit and retain teachers in **certain positions**?
 - a. *[if yes, please describe].*
8. Does your district offer incentives to recruit and retain teachers in **hard-to-staff schools**?
 - a. *[if yes, please describe]*
9. Is participation in these new compensation systems required of all teachers?
 - a. *[If no, which teachers are exempt?]*
10. How are you funding the new compensation system? (using the same amount in compensation budget, but using it differently; getting additional revenue)

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

Moving to the New Compensation System

11. What factors led the district to change its compensation system for teachers?
12. How are the changes related to district goals or priorities?
13. Who was involved in the design of the changes and how long did the design phase take?
14. What were the key barriers to the design process and how did you work through those?
15. What other factors helped with the design process?
16. Did you model any other district's system? *(if so, which one(s)?)*
17. Did you utilize the Wisconsin Association of School Boards or other professional associations?

Current Implementation of the New System

18. Was there a pilot of the new system?
 - a. *[If yes]*, who was involved?
19. How far along is the district in implementation? *(e.g., 100%, 80% etc.)*
20. How well has the implementation process proceeded?
 - a. Have there been any stumbling blocks to implementation?
 - b. What about positive attributes helping with implementation?
21. One last question: Is it possible for us to receive a copy of a description of your new compensation system?

[If yes, offer to send an email reminder to the participant so that he/she can send you the document.]

[If no, "OK, well you've already given us plenty of helpful information today."]
22. Those are all the questions I have for you today, but is there anything else you would like to add?

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

**Appendix C: Northland Pines School District 2015-16
All Classroom Instructors Salary Schedule**



Standards and Benchmarks	I Developing \$40,000	II Proficient \$47,564	III Highly Effective \$55,093	IV Distinguished \$65,263
(1) Professional				
Understanding of Subject Content	Lessons demonstrate deep understanding of differentiated learning	Lessons demonstrate deep understanding of differentiated learning above and below grade level	Demonstrates extensive understanding of subject matter and guides others within grade level/ department and building	Demonstrates extensive understanding of subject matter and consistently provides leadership within the district
Understanding of Student Growth and Development	Demonstrates understanding of the social, emotional, intellectual, and physical development of students	Successfully accommodates the unique needs and interests of students	Enhances the individual learning experience through differentiation	Consistently promotes academic gains through differentiated instruction while enhancing individual learning experience as evidenced by student products
Curriculum	Implements the adopted district curriculum/standards to fidelity	Improves the adopted district curriculum through collaboration	Assumes teacher-leader responsibilities in area of curriculum and shares expertise within the district	Assumes teacher-leader responsibilities in area of curriculum and shares expertise within the district, region, and educational field
(2) Instructional Planning				
District Standards	Implements standards-based instruction using various strategies to enhance student growth	Evaluates the effectiveness of standards-based instruction as measured by student growth	Revises instruction as needed based on student growth regarding district standards	Collaboratively revises instruction as needed based on district standards, updating when necessary in relation to district-approved standards
Data and Research	Uses data to drive instruction	Collaborates with colleagues to review and adjust instruction based on data	Collects data and uses findings to make data-driven decisions for instruction in the classroom and school	Collects data and uses findings to make data-driven decisions for instruction in the classroom, school and district
Interdisciplinary Learning Experiences	Collaborates with colleagues to develop lessons containing more than one content area or standard	Collaborates with grade-level team or departments within own building community to develop interdisciplinary lessons containing more than one content area or standard	Collaborates with colleagues to consistently expand interdisciplinary learning to participants beyond the classroom and applied to real world applications	Collaborates with community members in planning lessons and consistently provides interdisciplinary experiences that apply to real world applications
(3) Instructional Delivery				
Technology	Infuses technology into instruction	Strategically uses a variety of technologies to meet student needs	Classroom technology redefines the learning experience to increase student outcomes	Impacts students and colleagues beyond own classroom in the use of technology to increase student outcomes
Differentiated Instruction	Understands and implements differentiated instruction	Implements differentiated instruction based on formal and informal data	Differentiates instruction based on multiple intelligences to meet the diverse needs and interests of students	Classroom structure models differentiation by continually adjusting instruction based on ongoing assessment
Questioning	Uses questioning to improve student outcomes	Uses a wide variety of questioning techniques to engage learners	Questions at various cognitive levels and provides opportunities for feedback from and between students	Students regularly demonstrate higher level questioning and thinking

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin




(4) Assessment				
Summative I Formative I Common	Develops and uses multiple forms of assessments	Instruction is based on pre/post assessment results and methods	Analyzes data to write, revise and maintain the grade level or department assessments	Analyzes data to write, revise and implement the grade-level or department assessments to help with districtwide curriculum decisions
Student Feedback	Provides opportunity for student feedback	Creates and implements diverse methods to acquire student feedback	Individual student feedback impacts teacher practice	Collaborating with students to develop independent learning
(5) Learning Environment				
Physical	Classroom provides a safe environment	Classroom stimulates learning and establishes routines	Physical environment of classroom is thoughtfully arranged, reflecting teaching and learning characteristics of class	Classroom physical environment is dynamic and changes to suit purposes of instruction
Classroom Culture	Acknowledges Students' interests and abilities in and out of school	Incorporates students' interests and abilities in and out of school and inclusive learning environment	Students are openly engaged and participating in a variety of classroom roles and activities within a trusting and respectful environment	Students and teachers cooperatively participate in creating a safe environment for risk-taking opportunities
Classroom Management	Expectations are posted, taught, modeled and practiced	Expectations are consistently modeled and demonstrated by the students in a variety of settings	Students understand expectations and are self-managed	Students understand expectations and are consistently self-managed
Student Engagement	Teacher directs learning for students engagement	Teachers uses a variety of instructional strategies to increase student engagement	Teacher facilitation promotes self-directed learning	Teacher consistently facilitates student learning and provides authentic learning experiences
(6) Professionalism				
Professional Development	Participates in professional development opportunities	Applies acquired practices in classroom	Consistently collaborates with colleagues on acquired knowledge	Impacts students and colleagues beyond own classroom in the use of best practice to increase student outcomes
Building Positive Relationships	Builds positive relationships with students, families, and colleagues	Builds positive relationships across the district	Builds positive relations within the community	Builds positive partnerships with community that result in authentic learning opportunities
Professional Responsibility	Adheres to school district, legal, ethical and procedural requirements	Accepts additional responsibilities when asked	Independently pursues additional responsibilities, duties, roles, tasks	Independently pursues additional responsibilities outside of school hours
Ability to Self-Reflect	Uses EE as a self-reflection tool to improve practice	Positive change occurs based on reflections	Shares reflections and seeks feedback from colleagues	Ongoing self-reflection enhances student outcomes
Parent/Guardian Communication	Creates and contributes to building and/or classroom communication tools	Utilizes multiple formats to enhance personal communication	Facilitates appropriate two-way communication based on family needs	Effectively utilizes feedback from all stakeholders to increase student outcomes

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

Appendix D: Neenah Joint School District 2014-15 Staff Salary Schedule

PERFORMANCE LEVEL	INDICATORS			COMPENSATION RANGE*
Exemplary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has met the highest level at Quality 5 • Distinguished in all standards • Regularly contributes to innovative improvements that benefit the entire District • Continues to elicit new ideas and initiatives that benefit and enrich the entire District. • Contributes to recognized District-wide enhancements that align with the District mission, vision and strategic areas of focus • Provides innovative ideas that have led to District-wide change • Is highly respected at the building and District levels 			\$69,352 - \$77,452
Quality 5 	<p align="center">5.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has fulfilled all criteria in 5.2 • Leads building level teams • Contributes to recognized improvements at the District level • Exhibits instructional leadership school-wide that evidences documented gains in student learning • Distinguished in all areas or at least five standards and effective in the other 	<p align="center">5.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has fulfilled criteria in 5.1 • Provides assistance and expertise to colleagues to gain knowledge and skills in pedagogy or use of resources • Documented evidence of student gains is recognized in a consistent manner 	<p align="center">5.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has met the highest criteria at Quality 4 • Distinguished in at least four standards and at least effective in the others 	\$61,708 - \$72,352
Quality 4 	<p align="center">4.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has fulfilled all criteria in 4.2 • Provides leadership for school improvement • Demonstrates advanced knowledge and application of best practices pertaining to instruction and assessment • Distinguished in at least three standards and at least effective in the others • Takes initiative to find solutions to potential gaps and challenges at the building and/or District level 	<p align="center">4.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has fulfilled criteria in 4.1 • Applies high level inquiry-based learning 	<p align="center">4.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has met the highest level at Quality 3 • Distinguished in at least two standards and at least effective in the others • Analyzes and interprets student data that includes District improvement trends and provides documented evidence of student performance gains 	\$55,000 - \$65,708

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

<p>Quality 3</p> 	<p>• 3.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has fulfilled all criteria in 3.2 • Understands and exhibits the use of best instructional practices • Exhibits and encourages collaboration • Distinguished in at least one standard and at least effective in the others 	<p>• 3.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has fulfilled criteria in 3.1 • Implements The District curriculum, instruction, and assessment with fidelity (e.g. balanced literacy) 	<p>• 3.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has met the highest level at Quality 2 • At least Effective in all areas of performance standards • Applies use of resources and demonstrates knowledge in content areas • Provides evidence of documented student growth and proficiency 	<p>\$47,000 - \$59,735</p>
<p>Quality 2</p> 	<p>2.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has fulfilled criteria in 2.2 • Presents and contributes a positive and professional approach in problem solving and responses to school or District initiatives and challenges 	<p>2.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has fulfilled the criteria in 2.1 • Establishes and has documented evidence of strong positive relationships with students, parents, and colleagues 	<p>2.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has met the highest level at Quality 1 • Effective in at least five areas of performance and developing/ needs improvement in not more than one area of standards 	<p>\$43,880 - \$49,980</p>
<p>Quality 1</p> 	<p>1.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has fulfilled the criteria in the 1.2 category • Effective in at least four standard areas • Evaluates student learning that guides instructional practice • Maximizes the use of class time 	<p>1.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets expectations related to deadlines or other areas defined by the principal and/or District • Provides developmentally appropriate interventions and accommodations for students. 	<p>1.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates ability to meet minimal expectations aligned with his/her position • Performance is inconsistent and improvement will be necessary 	<p>\$41,000 - \$44,880</p>
<p>Plan of Assistance</p>	<p>Employees may be placed on a Plan of Assistance at any time throughout the school year if there are concerns by the administration. During this period, the employee will be expected to fulfill all components as prescribed by the Plan.</p>			
<p>*Compensation ranges may adjust annually based upon negotiated base wages and/or Board of Education decisions. Note: Before advancing to the next "cell," all areas must be met in the next cell. For example, prior to moving from 3.3, all indicators in 3.3 and before must be fulfilled. This process is how we approach determining the EP performance of distinguished, effective, etc.</p>				

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

Appendix E: School District of the Menominee Area Professional Performance Point Examples

	Points	Examples/Contact Person
Workshop and Implementation Report w/prior approval Approved form required	5 pts/per event/day	CESA workshops, SLATE, UW sponsored training, DPI workshops, resiliency training, district after-hours workshops Contact Supervisor and/or Director
Community Education Course Instructor (non-paid)	5 pts per session	Contact Community Ed Coordinator
Volunteer at district sponsored event	5 pts per event	PTO Event, game worker, supervision, chaperone, family night event
Instructional Study Team w/prior approval Approved form required	10 pts	Integrating technology, researching or studying a new idea for possible implementation.
Graduate Course w/prior approval Approved form required	10 pts/credit hour	Contact HR
Grant Writing/Facilitation (requires prior approval)	10 pts < \$5,000	Contact Supervisor and Business Office
PDP Reviewer (must be actively serving on a team)	10 pts	Self-Application
Peer Coaching	10 pts/per teacher	Contact Supervisor and Dir. Of Instr.
Workshop/PD Presenter (choice of pay or points) Approved form required	10 pts/per session	Contact Supervisor and Dir. Of Instr.
District Sponsored Athletic Youth Clinic	10 pts/per session	Summer, evening, or weekend clinic for sports
Community Outreach Activity - Coordinator	10 pts/per session	Group Service learning projects, group community service projects, Homecoming parade, coordinating family events, participating on a community board as a school district rep. for specific projects with a need to coordinate with district programming
Supervising student teacher (limit: 2 per year) w/approval	10 pts/per qtr.	Contact HR
Obtaining and maintaining specialized certification(s) or training - w/prior approval	25 pts/per certification	Provide proof of certification to HR (i.e. PLTW, AP, EMT, National Board)
Grant Writing/Facilitation	25 pts > \$5,000	Contact Supervisor and Business Office
Mentor	25 pts	Contact HR
Publishing in professional journal	25 pts	Provide copy of article to Supervisor
Presenting at Conferences/Conventions w/approval	25 pts	Professional Conferences, CESA Events
Action Research Project/Team w/ prior district approval Approved form required	25 pts	Implementation and study of a new or revised instructional practice

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

Innovative Curriculum Project w/prior district approval	25 pts	Integrated subject matter project, Implementing a special topics course, Innovative project-based learning, Integrated technology project, Reality Zone, Poverty Simulation, School-Wide Project, Special Projects with UW System
Building Leadership Team	25 pts	Site team, building leadership teams, PBIS team, governance team, data retreat team, parent advisory boards, PTO board, Site wellness committee, Gifted and talented program site coordinators
District Leadership Team	25 pts	Instructional Leadership Team, district technology team, Quality Improvement Team, Wellness Committee, Strategic Plan Action Team, New resource study team, Pupil Services Team, Building Assessment SAC
Department, Grade Level, Project Chair	25 pts	Contact Dir. Of Instruction
Professional Association State-wide Officer Position	25 pts	Contact Supervisor
Adviser to Student with State-wide Officer Position	25 pts	Contact Supervisor
District Special Project Participant – prior district approval	25 pts	Dept. or grade level curriculum project, strategic plan project, assessment project, technology integration project
Book/Literature Study Group - prior district approval Approved form required	25 pts	Book Studies, Literature and/or resource review with specific topic
International Travel with Students – Board Approval Required	25 pts/per trip	Contact HS Principal
Intensive Tutoring or Mentoring to reach approved Ind. Student Learning Objective(SLO)/extension of student day (Requires prior approval)	25 pts/per plan	Before and after school study sessions, Big Brother/Little Sister program,
Enrichment Activity to reach approved individual Student Learning Objective (SLO)/extension of student day (requires prior approval)	25 pts/per plan	Non-pointed co/extra-curricular clubs, Special student projects
District Program Coordinator	50 pts	Reading Specialist, Chemical Hygiene, Library Media, Wellness, Health Coordinator, Webmaster for department or building
District Trainer	50 pts	Technology Trainers, Literacy Coach, Assessment Trainers, External and Internal PBIS Coaches, Health Realization, Curriculum Trainer, Health Related Training
Exchange 2 pts. of a Co-curricular or Extra-curricular Activity (limit 2 per year)	50 pts	Contact Supervisor and HR
Coaching two or more MS/HS extracurricular or co-curricular activities	50 pts	Contact Supervisor and HR
SPECIAL REQUEST (i.e. Fulbright Teacher Exchange)	To be determined by HR	Contact Supervisor and HR

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

Appendix F: Mosinee School District Compensation Schedule for Professional Educators

The Mosinee Compensation Schedule will be implemented as presented here. A quarterly review of the compensation schedule will be conducted each year with a final review occurring prior to April 1 of each year. At the end of the annual review recommendations for changes, additions or deletions to the Compensation Schedule will be brought to the Board of Education for their consideration.

Professional Educators must be in *good standing*, as defined by satisfactory performance and will not be on a *plan of improvement* in order to enter into and continue to progress through the compensation schedule or to receive a stipend.

Professional Educators will move vertically on the schedule one tier after each successful year of teaching (recommended for contract renewal through professional evaluations). Professional Educators will advance to different levels of the Compensation Schedule or be eligible to receive a stipend based on a positive evaluation and the attainment of Professional Development points provided funds are available as determined by the District. The level of points required are outlined within each level.

Grandfathered	Yearly Stipend	Compensation Level Increase \$0	Level 6+ Requirements
	\$650	Over \$71,000	<p>While on Level 6, teachers will move vertically on the schedule one tier after each successful year of teaching (recommended for contract renewal) Teachers must earn 6 approved Professional Development Points to move to 6C.</p> <p>Teachers in tier 6C and those who have been grandfathered at their old salary must earn a minimum of 3 Professional Development Points annually and be a teacher in good standing to earn the Yearly Stipend.</p>
Level 6	Alternate Year(s) Stipend	Compensation Level Increase \$1,200	
6C	\$650	\$71,000	
6B		\$69,800	
6A		\$68,600	
Level 5 to Level 6 Increase \$3,000			Level 5 Requirements
			<p>While on Level 5, teachers will move vertically on the schedule one tier after each successful year of teaching (recommended for contract renewal) Teachers must have 18 approved Professional Development Points to move on to Level 6.</p> <p>Teachers initially placed at Level 5C may move to Level 6A after 1 year if they earn 12 approved Professional Development points. If not, in year two they shall receive the Alternate Year Stipend at the end of their second year and every year after if they are a teacher in good standing until 12 approved Professional Development points have been earned.</p>
Level 5	Alternate Year(s) Stipend	Compensation Level Increase \$1,200	
5C	\$650	\$65,600	
5B		\$64,400	
5A		\$63,200	
Level 4 to Level 5 Increase \$3,000			Level 4 Requirements
			<p>While on Level 4, teachers will move vertically on the schedule one tier after each successful year of teaching (recommended for contract renewal) Teachers must earn 18 approved Professional Development Points <u>and must have a master's degree</u> to move on to Level 5.</p>
Level 4	Alternate Year(s) Stipend	Compensation Level Increase \$1,200	
4C	\$650	\$60,200	
4B		\$59,000	
4A		\$57,800	

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

Level 3 to Level 4 Increase \$3,000			Teachers initially placed at Level 4C may move to Level 5A after 1 year if they earn 12 approved Professional Development points. If not, in year two they shall receive the Alternate Year Stipend at the end of their second year and every year after if they are a teacher in good standing until 12 approved Professional Development points have been earned.
			Level 3 Requirements
Level 3	Alternate Year(s) Stipend	Compensation Level Increase \$1,200	While on Level 3, teachers will move vertically on the schedule one tier after each successful year of teaching (recommended for contract renewal) Teachers must earn 18 approved Professional Development Points to move on to Level 4.
3C	\$650	\$54,800	
3B		\$53,600	
3A		\$52,400	
Level 2 to Level 3 Increase \$3,000			
			Level 2 Requirements
Level 2	Alternate Year(s) Stipend	Compensation Level Increase \$1,200	While on Level 2, teachers will move vertically on the schedule one tier after each successful year of teaching (recommended for contract renewal). Teachers must earn 18 approved Professional Development Points to move on to Level 3.
2C	\$650	\$49,400	
2B		\$48,200	
2A		\$47,000	
Level 1 to Level 2 Increase \$3,000			
			Level 1 Requirements
Level 1	Alternate Year(s) Stipend	Compensation Level Increase \$1,000	While on Level 1, teachers will move vertically on the schedule one tier after each successful year of teaching (recommended for contract renewal). Teachers must earn 18 approved Professional Development Points to move on to Level 2.
1E	\$650	\$44,000	
1D		\$43,000	
1C		\$42,000	
1B		\$41,000	
1A		\$40,000	
Level 1 to Level 2 Increase \$3,000			Teachers initially placed at Level 1E may move to Level 2A after 1 year if they earn 12 approved Professional Development points. If not, in year two they shall receive the Alternate Year Stipend at the end of their second year and every year after if they are a teacher in good standing until 12 approved Professional Development points have been earned.

Teacher Compensation in Wisconsin

How can a teacher earn Professional Development Points?

- **Professional Development Points** are calculated based on the amount of time, rigor and relevance of the professional development.
- Professional Development Points will be awarded if the Professional Development has been approved by the district. Approval of Professional Development Points occurs by submitting one of the following forms:
 - The Mosinee School District Professional Development Point Request Form for graduate credit
 - The Mosinee School District Professional Development Point Request Form for undergraduate credit
 - The Mosinee School District Professional Development Point Request Form for locally provided or self-directed professional development

1 Professional Development Points = 10 hours of Professional Development
3 Professional Development Points = 1 Credit = 30 Hours of Professional Development
6 Professional Development Points = 2 Credits = 60 Hours of Professional Development
9 Professional Development Points = 3 Credits = 90 Hours of Professional Development
12 Professional Development Points = 4 Credits = 120 Hours of Professional Development
15 Professional Development Points = 5 Credits = 150 Hours of Professional Development
18 Professional Development Points = 6 Credits = 180 Hours of Professional Development

- **Professional Development Points** must be earned during non-contracted time or during a personal day.
- **Professional Development Points** will be calculated for changes in compensation in the following manner: When you are ready to move to the **next** level you are required to turn in your documentation of approved Professional Growth by **April 1** so that your correct contract for the following year can be issued to you by June 1.
- **Professional Development Points** earned **will not** be carried over from level to level.
- Initial placement in the compensation model will occur at the discretion of the Administration.

What is a stipend?

- Stipends are not part of the individual teacher's contract but would be provided as a non-recurring supplemental pay.
- During the 2015-2016 school year, a one time, up to \$650.00 stipend will be paid to employees on the first pay roll (August 28, 2015) to those employees who would have had less than an increase of \$650.00 during the crossover to the new Compensation System.
- In subsequent years, stipends may be earned by Professional Educators at the top tier of each level if they have not achieved the Professional Development points needed to move **up to** the next level. During this time, if the teacher has a positive evaluation (recommended for contract renewal) and is not on a Plan of Improvement they will be eligible to receive the stipend provided funds are available as determined by the district. Stipends would not be part of the individual teacher's contract, but would be provided as non-recurring supplemental pay.

Examining Faculty Reflective Practice

Appendix G: Monona Grove School District Career Ladder Framework

Career Ladder Steps	Performance Expectations	Advancement Process	Salary Range
Distinguished Teacher Entry Criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wisconsin Professional Educator or Master Educator License • Pre-approved Master's or Doctorate Degree • 11 years of 4K-12 teaching experience • Evidence of Advanced- level teaching practice • Formal and Informal Leadership 	Performance Expectations include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintains Wisconsin Professional Educator License or Master Educator License • Actively participates and/or leads in district-required professional development • Maintains Monona Grove PD Plan • Collaborates with colleagues • Maintains Advanced Teaching Practices over time (see rubric) • Formal and informal leadership 	Review Committee recommendation to Superintendent	To be Determined prior to 2016-2017 school year.
Professional Leader Teacher Entry Criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wisconsin Professional Educator License or Master Educator License • Pre-approved Master's Degree • 8 years of 4K-12 teaching experience • Evidence of Advanced- level teaching practice • Formal or Informal Leadership 	Performance Expectations include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintains Wisconsin Professional Educator License or Master Educator License • Actively participates and/or leads in district-required professional development • Maintains Monona Grove PD Plan • Collaborates with colleagues • Maintains Advanced Teaching Practices over time (see rubric) • Formal or informal leadership 	Review Committee recommendation to Superintendent	To be Determined prior to 2016-2017 school year.
Professional Teacher Minimum Criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wisconsin Professional Educator License • 5 years of 4K-12 teaching experience 	Performance Expectations include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintains Wisconsin Professional Educator License • Actively participates and/or leads in district-required professional development • Maintains Monona Grove PD Plan • Collaborates with colleagues • Maintains high standards of Teaching • Practices over time (Danielson Framework) 	Administrative recommendation to Superintendent	\$42,000 - \$67,000
Post-Mentorship Minimum Criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wisconsin Initial Educator License • 2-4 years of 4K-12 teaching experience 	Performance Expectations include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completes PDP and obtains Wisconsin Professional Educator License • Actively participates in district-required professional development • Maintains Monona Grove PD Plan • Collaborates with colleagues • Satisfactory performance evaluations 	Administrative recommendation to Superintendent	\$40,000 - \$47,000
Mentorship Minimum Criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wisconsin Initial Educator License • 0-1 year of 4K-12 teaching experience 	Performance Expectations include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintains Wisconsin Initial Educator License • Actively participates in MGSD New Teacher Mentor Program • Actively participates in district-required professional development • Maintains Monona Grove PD Plan • Collaborates with colleagues • Satisfactory performance evaluations 	Initial hiring recommendation	\$38,000 - \$44,000

Examining Faculty Reflective Practice

Definitions

Mentorship Teacher. The Mentorship Teacher holds a Wisconsin Initial Educator License. This teacher is new to the profession and actively participates in the district induction program to improve his or her teaching practice for the benefit of student learning. The Mentorship Teacher is expected to participate in collaborative work with colleagues, and participate in professional development. The Mentorship Teacher is not expected to assume formal or informal leadership roles.

Post-Mentorship Teacher. The Post-Mentorship Teacher holds a Wisconsin Initial Educator License. This teacher is an early-career teacher who has successfully completed the district induction program and is engaging in continuous improvement of his/her teaching practice. The Post-Mentorship Teacher also develops a Monona Grove Professional Development Plan (MGPD) that includes requirements for a Wisconsin Professional Educator license. The Post-Mentorship Teacher participates in collaborative work with colleagues and professional development, and may choose to assume leadership responsibilities.

Professional Teacher. The Professional Teacher holds and maintains a Wisconsin Professional Educator license. This teacher consistently meets high performance standards for classroom teaching, collaborative work with colleagues, professional development (including the MGPD), and other professional responsibilities. The Professional Teacher is encouraged to take on leadership responsibilities.

Professional Leader Teacher. The Professional Leader Teacher holds and maintains a Wisconsin Professional Educator or Master Educator license. This teacher demonstrates clear, convincing, and consistent evidence of advanced standards of classroom teaching practice, collaboration with colleagues, and formal or informal leadership as defined in the Professional Advancement Rubric. This teacher also maintains such practice over time. This teacher participates in professional development including completing the MGPD.

Distinguished Teacher. The Professional Leader Teacher holds and maintains a Wisconsin Professional Educator or Master Educator license. This teacher demonstrates clear, convincing, and consistent evidence of master educator-level standards of classroom teaching practice, collaboration with colleagues, and formal and informal leadership as defined in the Professional Advancement Rubric. This teacher also maintains such practice over time. This teacher participates in professional development including completing the MGPD.

Teacher Leader Positions. Teacher Leader positions are specific roles in the district that may be in addition to or in lieu of a classroom teaching assignment. Currently these roles would include positions such as Full Release Mentor, Teacher on Special Assignment (TOSA), and MG21 Lead Teacher. In the future additional Teacher Leader roles for classroom teachers may emerge, such as content- area curriculum coordinator. Teacher Leader roles are not permanent assignments and service in one of these roles may be limited to a range of years (e.g. The Full Release Mentor serves in that role for approximately five years before returning to the classroom. Other roles may serve 2-5 years.)

MGSD Professional Development Plan (MGPD). Every Monona Grove School District teacher shall develop and carry out an individual professional development plan consistent with the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness Professional Practice Goals Process (e.g., the *Effectiveness Plan*) and Wisconsin Teacher License renewal. The MGPD should be developed and periodically reviewed in consultation with the evaluating administrator and with counsel and advice from colleagues, instructional coaches, teacher leaders, and/or distinguished teachers. The MGSD shall establish a program of training for teachers to develop and revise their MGPD's and also for evaluating administrators and others to consult, counsel, and advise in their development and revision.

Examining Faculty Reflective Practice

Appendix H: Elmbrook School District Total Reward System Summary

Career Pathway

Career Level	Description	Pay Range
Developing: Domain of Self	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initial educators, within 1-5 years Focus developing classroom teaching skills 	\$42,326- \$48,674
Establishing: Domain of PLC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Novice teachers within 4-10 years of experience. Developed instructional practices with focus growing from self to team, gaining collaboration, shared decision-making and leadership skills. 	\$46,741- \$56,089
Mastery 1: Domain of School	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers with 8-15 years of experience. Evidence of ongoing formal education (i.e., district approved masters or certification. Recognized building leader with influence beyond grade-level peers. May be coach, mentor, grade-level leader or department chair. 	\$52,817- \$63,381
Mastery 2: Domain of District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> About 10 or more years of experience, with district approved masters or certifications. Demonstrates influence at district level through committee work. May be teaching and learning specialists or National Board Certified. 	\$58,357- 72,947
Exemplary: Domain of Region	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> About 15 or more years of experience, with multiple advanced degrees and/or certifications. Demonstrates influence in the region or state through associations, conference presentations, grant writing, etc. 	\$64,510- \$83,863

Pay Overview

Type of Increase	Definition	Influencing Factors
Base Wage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permanent addition to employees' base salary. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Performance appraisal rating – Educator Effectiveness rating or short-cycle rating Career Ladder Progression- education, professional learning, continuous improvement, collaboration and leadership
Stipend	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remains in place for duration of time employee continuous serving in recognized capacity. Do not increase base wage and ends when circumstance no longer exists. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Critical shortage area Extra duty contracts – compensation for extra duty (e.g., coaching, department chair, grade-level leader) not included in the new plan, but may be going forward
Bonus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One time payments to acknowledge a significant performance or contribution Bonuses do not increase base wage and do not carry over annually. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Professional Learning School report card

Examining Faculty Reflective Practice

Copyright © 2016 by Steven M. Kimball, Herbert G. Heneman, III., Robin Worth, Jessica Arrigoni, and Daniel Marlin

All rights reserved.

Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for noncommercial purposes by any means, provided that the above copyright notice appears on all copies. WCER working papers are available on the Internet at <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/publications/working-papers>.

The authors gratefully acknowledge Sarah Archibald and Brad Carl for their feedback on prior versions of this paper, and Karen FASTER for her careful editing of the final draft.