

NATIONAL CENTER ON
Performance Incentives

District
Awards
for Teacher
Excellence
(D.A.T.E.)
Program:
Final Evaluation Report

Texas Education Agency
William Travis Building
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701

Policy Evaluation Report
December 2010

LED BY



VANDERBILT
PEABODY COLLEGE

IN COOPERATION WITH:



Mizzou
University of Missouri - Columbia

THE NATIONAL CENTER ON PERFORMANCE INCENTIVES

(NCPI is charged by the federal government with exercising leadership on performance incentives in education. Established in 2006 through a major research and development grant from the United States Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences (IES), NCPI conducts scientific comprehensive and independent studies on the individual and institutional effects of performance incentives in education. A signature activity of the center is the conduct of two randomized field trials on testing student achievement related bonuses to teachers. The Center is committed to fair and rigorous research in an effort to provide the field of education with reliable knowledge to guide policy and practice.

The Center is housed in the Learning Sciences Institute on the campus of Vanderbilt University's Peabody College. The Center's management, under the Learning Sciences Institute along with the National Center on School Choice, makes Vanderbilt the only higher education institution to host two federal research and development centers supported by the Institute of Education Services.

This policy evaluation report was prepared by the National Center on Performance Incentives under contract with the Texas Education Agency. We would like to thank Bonnie Ghosh Dastidar (NCPI), Art Peng (NCPI), Susan Li (University of Missouri-Columbia), Radoslaw Marino (University of Missouri-Columbia) and Jose Pellerano (Texas A&M University) for their contributions to this evaluation report as well. The views in this report do not necessarily reflect those of sponsoring agencies or individuals acknowledged.

Please visit www.performanceincentives.org to learn more about our program of research and recent publications.

District Awards for Teacher Excellence (D.A.T.E.) Program: Final Evaluation Report

MATTHEW G. SPRINGER

*Vanderbilt University's Peabody College
National Center on Performance Incentives*

JESSICA L. LEWIS

National Center on Performance Incentives

MARK W. EHLERT

University of Missouri-Columbia

MICHAEL J. PODGURSKY

University of Missouri-Columbia

GARY D. CRADER

University of Missouri-Columbia

LORI L. TAYLOR

Texas A&M University

TIMOTHY J. GRONBERG

Texas A&M University

DENNIS W. JANSEN

Texas A&M University

OMAR S. LOPEZ

Corporation for Public School Education K16

DAVID A. STUIT

Basis Policy Research

**National Center on Performance Incentives
Vanderbilt University Peabody College
Peabody #43 • 230 Appleton Place
Nashville, Tennessee 37203**

Contributing Authors

Matthew G. Springer
Jessica L. Lewis
Mark W. Ehlert
Michael J. Podgursky
Gary D. Crader
Lori L. Taylor
Timothy J. Gronberg
Dennis W. Jansen
Omar S. Lopez
David A. Stuit

Contributors

National Center on Performance Incentives
Vanderbilt University's Peabody College
Corporation for Public School Education K16
Texas A&M University
University of Missouri-Columbia

Prepared for

Texas Education Agency
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494
Phone: 512-463-9734

Research Funded by

Texas Education Agency

COPYRIGHT NOTICE

Copyright © Notice The materials are copyrighted © and trademarked ™ as the property of the Texas Education Agency (TEA) and may not be reproduced without the express written permission of TEA, except under the following conditions:

- 1) Texas public school districts, charter schools and Education Service Centers may reproduce and use copies of the materials and related materials for the districts' and schools' educational use without obtaining permission from TEA.
- 2) Residents of the state of Texas may reproduce and use copies of the materials and related materials for individual personal use only without obtaining written permission from TEA.
- 3) Any portion reproduced must be reproduced in its entirety and remain unedited, unaltered and unchanged in any way.
- 4) No monetary charge can be made for the reproduced materials or any document containing them; however, a reasonable charge to cover only the cost of reproduction and distribution may be charged.

Private entities or persons located in Texas that are **not** Texas public school districts, Texas Education Service Centers, or Texas charter schools or an entity, whether public or private, educational or non-educational, located **outside the state of Texas** *MUST* obtain written approval from TEA and will be required to enter into a license agreement that may involve the payment of a licensing fee or a royalty.

For information contact: Office of Copyrights, Trademarks, License Agreements, and Royalties, Texas Education Agency, 1701 N. Congress Ave., Austin, TX 78701-1494; phone 512-463-9270 or 512-936-6060; email: copyright@tea.state.tx.us.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

District Awards for Teacher Excellence (D.A.T.E.) is a state-funded program in Texas that provides grants to districts for the implementation of locally-designed incentive pay plans. All districts in the state are eligible to receive grants, but participation is voluntary. D.A.T.E. incentive pay plans were first implemented in Texas districts during the 2008-09 school year, and the program is currently in its third year of operation during 2010-11 with approximately \$197 million in annual state funding.

The D.A.T.E. program currently stands as the sole state-funded incentive pay program in Texas. However, D.A.T.E.'s first year of implementation in 2008-09 occurred at a time when Texas was operating several state-funded incentive pay programs. The three-year Governor's Educator Excellence Grant (G.E.E.G.) program was coming to its expected completion,¹ while the Texas Educator Excellence Grant (T.E.E.G.) program was in its third year of operation. During the 2008-09 school year, these programs dedicated a combined \$247 million in state funds for the implementation of locally-designed incentive pay plans. However, the Texas Legislature opted not to reauthorize T.E.E.G. during the 2009 session, redirecting a portion of its funds to expand the D.A.T.E. program from approximately \$150 million to \$197 million annually starting with the 2009-10 school year.

Incentive pay for teachers entered Texas state policy deliberations during the 1980s, well before G.E.E.G., T.E.E.G., and D.A.T.E. came into existence. The 1980s was a decade marked as one of the most active periods of school reform in Texas. As early as the Texas Teacher Career Ladder program in 1984, policymakers attempted to reform the single-salary schedule and introduce incentive pay for educators. Several lessons emerged from those first-generation programs and play a significant role in the design and implementation of contemporary incentive pay programs in the state. Specific lessons that have informed programs such as D.A.T.E. include the importance of (1) adequate, sustainable funding; (2) teacher involvement in program design; (3) rewarding educators for their contribution to student performance and professional collaboration; and (4) conducting independent, comprehensive program evaluations.

This report presents findings from the final D.A.T.E. program evaluation, which describes the experiences and outcomes for Cycle 1 districts participating in the first two years of the program.² Findings focus on the decisions made by districts whether or not to participate in the program, the local design preferences of D.A.T.E. incentive pay plans, and the program's influence on teachers and students (i.e., student achievement gains, teacher turnover, and educator attitudes and practice).

An overview of key evaluation findings presented in this final evaluation report follows. First, information regarding actual dissemination of incentive awards to teachers is presented. This is followed by key findings from analysis of the program's impact on students and teachers. Finally, background information on program participation decisions and implementation experiences, the

¹ The G.E.E.G. program came to its expected completion on August 31, 2009.

² The required time frame to complete this evaluation report prevented evaluators from focusing on districts other than those in Cycle 1 of D.A.T.E. (i.e., those districts exclusively participating in the first two years of the program, 2008-09 and 2009-10). The final evaluation report was due November 2010, and the third year of the program (during which time Cycle 2 districts implemented their D.A.T.E. incentive plans) began with the 2010-11 school year

design of D.A.T.E. incentive pay plans, and educator and administrator attitudes about D.A.T.E. incentive plans is presented.

Distribution of Incentive Awards to Teachers³

- Among districts with district-wide incentive plans, 42% of full-time teachers received Part 1 awards.⁴ Among districts with only some schools eligible for participation in D.A.T.E. (referred to here as select school incentive plans), 41% of teachers in the selected schools received Part 1 awards. The average rates of teachers receiving awards can be misleading because Dallas ISD and Houston ISD are dominating the data. Excluding those two districts, 34% of full-time teachers in districts with district-wide incentive plans and 49% of full-time teachers in the selected schools received Part 1 awards, a statistically significant difference between districts with those two types of incentive plans.
- Slightly more than half (52%) of the teachers in schools participating in D.A.T.E. select school plans received either a Part 1 award or a Part 2 award, as did 54% of the teachers in districts with district-wide plans.
- The average total award (i.e., considering Part 1 and Part 2 awards) for teachers in districts with district-wide plans was \$1,361, while the average total award for teachers in districts with select school plans was \$3,344. Nearly all (96%) of the teachers in select school plans who received a Part 1 award received a *total* award of at least \$1,000, and 50% received a *total* award of at least \$3,000. In contrast, 70% of the teachers in district-wide plans who received a Part 1 award received a *total* award of at least \$1,000 and only 10% received a total award of at least \$3,000.

Student Achievement in D.A.T.E. Schools

- Overall student passing rates on Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) were lower in D.A.T.E. schools than in schools across the state that did not participate in D.A.T.E. However, D.A.T.E. schools had a higher percentage of economically disadvantaged (ED) students than non-D.A.T.E. schools. When looking at D.A.T.E. and non-D.A.T.E. schools that had a similar percentage of ED students, the average TAKS passing rates were similar between the two school groups.
- From the time period before to after the implementation of D.A.T.E., the difference between TAKS passing rates of D.A.T.E. and non-D.A.T.E. schools decreased, indicating that passing rates in D.A.T.E. schools were catching up to rates in non-D.A.T.E. schools.
- During the first two years of the D.A.T.E. program, students in D.A.T.E. schools had greater TAKS gains than those in non-D.A.T.E. schools.

³ Findings on distribution of incentive awards are based on Year 1 of the D.A.T.E. program exclusively. Data on award allocation for Year 2 were not available to evaluators by the time of the mandated report release.

⁴ Part 1 funds represented at least 60% of a district's total grant and were earmarked for teacher incentive awards. Part 2, representing no more than 40% of a district's grant, could be used for incentive awards to other school personnel or to implement other initiatives such as professional growth activities or enhancement of district data capacity.

- The design of incentive pay plans mattered for student TAKS gains. Students in D.A.T.E. districts that adopted a select school approach showed higher gains on TAKS reading and math tests compared to students in D.A.T.E. districts that implemented the pay plan district-wide. The size of the proposed maximum Part 1 award had a statistically significant and positive relationship with student TAKS gains in math, while the approach used to determine teachers' award eligibility was related to student TAKS gains in both reading and math but not in a consistent direction.
- There was also a notable difference between the highest and lowest-performing D.A.T.E. schools in terms of their students' TAKS performance during the first two years of the program. While the incentive plans used by high and low performing D.A.T.E. schools were similar in several regards, there were a few notable differences. High performing schools were more likely than their counterparts to use multiple funding streams to provide principals with incentive awards. These schools were also significantly more likely to base teachers' incentive awards on the performance of an entire school in combination with an individual teacher's performance. Finally, the average proposed award amounts in high performing D.A.T.E. schools were significantly higher than in other D.A.T.E. schools.

Teacher Turnover in D.A.T.E. Schools

- The probability of turnover surged among teachers who did not receive a D.A.T.E. award, while it fell sharply among teachers who did receive such an award. Awards greater than \$100 were associated with a significant decrease in the probability of teacher turnover under district-wide plans, while awards greater than \$283 were associated with significant decreases in the probability of teacher turnover under select schools plans. For district-wide plans, awards received by teachers in excess of \$1,500, and \$2,500 for select schools plans, were not associated with any further decrease in the probability of teacher turnover.
- Overall teacher turnover rates in D.A.T.E. schools were lower than expected during Year 1 of the program. The decline in turnover rates for schools with district-wide plans was fully attributable to a decline in internal turnover (i.e., teachers moving to another school within the same district). Districts with select school plans did experience statistically significant declines in the share of teachers who were leaving for other districts, or leaving teaching altogether.
- District-wide plans using a combination of individual and group performance to determine teachers' award eligibility were associated with smaller declines in turnover than plans with only group or only individual incentives. There were no significant differences in turnover by the proposed unit of accountability in select school D.A.T.E. plans.
- Teacher turnover was related to the size of the maximum Part 1 award proposed under the D.A.T.E. plan. Teacher turnover increased for districts with relatively small proposed maximum awards, and decreased as the proposed maximum award amount increased, until the maximum award exceeded roughly \$6,000.

Factors Associated with Distribution of Incentive Awards to Teachers

- The distribution of Part 1 awards among eligible teachers was more unequal for districts with district-wide plans than for districts with select school plans. Select school plans were more equal because their plans were more likely to give Part 1 awards to more than one-quarter of their teachers.
- Newly-arrived teachers in a school had a 12 percentage point lower probability of receiving a Part 1 award, a finding that remained even when accounting for teachers' years of experience. More experienced teachers were less likely to receive Part 1 awards and received smaller average Part 1 awards than their less experienced counterparts.
- Teachers with self-contained classrooms in TAKS-tested grades received by far the largest Part 1 awards, all other things being equal, while fine arts teachers, foreign language teachers, and vocational/technical teachers received the smallest Part 1 awards, on average. This pattern could indicate that TAKS teachers responded more sharply to the awards, but could also indicate that districts targeted awards to teachers in tested subjects or grades.

D.A.T.E. Participation Decisions and Implementation Experiences

- While participation was open to all public school districts in Texas, 16% participated in Cycle 1 of the program. Compared to other districts throughout Texas, participating districts had, on average, lower district wealth, larger student enrollment, a greater share of at-risk students (i.e., minority, ED, and LEP students), and were more likely to have participated in past state-funded incentive pay programs.
- According to district officials, districts most often participated in the D.A.T.E. program because they believed it would improve the quality of student learning and teaching practices in schools and less because school personnel deserved extra pay for the work they were already doing.
- A broad representation of district and school personnel were involved in the decisions made by districts to participate in D.A.T.E. However, in districts opting not to participate in the program, decisions were most often made by high-ranking officials without input from teachers.
- Among districts participating in both Year 1 and Year 2 of D.A.T.E., district officials held highly positive views of their participation experience. However, several common and consistent concerns were reported in both years. Primarily, district officials reported concerns about what they perceived as inflexible design guidelines; insufficient and unstable state funding; communication with TEA that was untimely, inaccurate, or inconsistent; underdeveloped internal communication strategies within districts; and insufficient personnel and technical capacity within districts to implement incentive pay plans.

Design of D.A.T.E. Incentive Pay Plans

- During Year 1 of the program, 53% of the districts designed D.A.T.E. plans to be implemented district-wide while the other half designed the incentive plans for only select schools. In Year 2

of the program, 64% of districts chose to implement D.A.T.E. plans district-wide. In both years, at least 70% of all D.A.T.E. districts dedicated more than the minimum requirement of 60% of their total grant (i.e., Part 1) to fund incentive awards for classroom teachers.

- Districts made similar decisions about how to use Part 2 funds during both years of the D.A.T.E. program. Districts had to use no more than 40% of their total grant to fund Part 2 activities. In both years, Part 2 funds were most often designated for the provision of additional awards to school personnel, including administrators, teachers, and other personnel.
- In both Year 1 and Year 2, all districts adhered to state guidelines and designed plans in which teachers were eligible for Part 1 incentive awards. The state's guidelines for D.A.T.E. were revised for Year 2 to allow districts to use Part 1 funds to provide awards to principals in addition to teachers, and 41% of Year 2 districts used Part 1 funds for such purposes.
- Overall, there were considerable differences across D.A.T.E. districts with respect to the share of teachers eligible for Part 1 awards. Most often, D.A.T.E. districts designed plans in which all teachers were *not* eligible for Part 1 awards. Among districts with district-wide plans, only 21% in Year 1 and 6% in Year 2 designed plans that made more than 90% of their teachers eligible for Part 1 awards. For both Year 1 and Year 2 most districts with a select school plan made less than half of their teachers eligible for a Part 1 award.
- During Year 1 of the D.A.T.E. program, teachers' eligibility for incentive awards was most often determined by some combination of individual and group-based performance. There was a greater tendency to base awards on individual teacher performance exclusively during Year 2 of D.A.T.E.
- Evaluators could not be certain from grant applications whether or not districts adhered to the state's requirement that teachers have the opportunity to earn awards of no less than \$1,000 or the recommendation that they be no lower than \$3,000. There was evidence that in order to meet the state minimum requirement of \$1,000, a significant number of grantees would have needed to contribute significant Part 2 funds because Part 1 funds alone were not achieving the minimum of \$1,000.

Educator Attitudes about D.A.T.E. Program, School Climate, and Instructional Practices

- Overall, teachers in D.A.T.E. schools believed the incentive pay plans were fair, the goals targeted by the plans were worthy, and that the correct teachers were identified to receive awards. Teachers did not perceive negative effects from D.A.T.E., but they also did not indicate that the incentive plans were contributing much to school improvements.
- The most important predictor of teachers' perceptions of the quality and impacts of their schools' D.A.T.E. plans was whether or not teachers expected to receive a D.A.T.E. award. Those who expected to receive an award held much more positive views about their schools' plans, were more likely to believe they could achieve performance criteria, and were more willing to alter their professional practices to try to earn an award. Attitudes about school climate and reported use of instructional practices also improved when teachers expected to receive a D.A.T.E. award.

- How awards were determined for teachers influenced their attitudes about the incentive plans, as well. Including awards based on school-wide performance contributed to positive perceptions about a school's D.A.T.E. plan. However, when a school's D.A.T.E. plan based award eligibility on individual performance, teachers were more likely to report higher motivational ratings and more teacher competitiveness.
- The more years a school had participated in a Texas state-funded incentive pay program (i.e., G.E.E.G., T.E.E.G., or D.A.T.E.), the more likely teachers in that school were to report higher ratings of teacher competition and the less likely they were to report increased use of instructional practices.
- The size of awards in schools' D.A.T.E. plans and whether or not a teacher expected to receive an award influenced teachers' perceptions about school climate and teacher relations as well as their reported use of instructional and professional practices.

These findings suggest that, more often than not, participants in the D.A.T.E. program had a positive experience, student achievement gains and teacher turnover moved in a generally desirable direction, and teacher attitudes were favorable towards D.A.T.E. However, there was evidence of variation in these outcomes between D.A.T.E. schools, influenced in part by school, student, and educator characteristics as well as by the design features of incentive pay plans operating in those schools.

These findings come at a relevant time for Texas and national policy. In Texas, the state legislature will soon convene to consider the future direction of D.A.T.E., while at the same time Texas and various districts within the state have become recent recipients of federal Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) grants. Nationally, incentive pay and compensation reform are moving ahead with significant financial resources, through federal grant programs such as Race to the Top and TIF, along with many other notable locally-driven initiatives. The report's objective is to inform policymakers and practitioners as they consider how to move forward, how to design and implement incentive pay and compensation reform for educators, and the implications of those policy choices

Faculty and Research Affiliates

Matthew G. Springer

Director
National Center on Performance Incentives

Assistant Professor of Public Policy
and Education
Vanderbilt University's Peabody College

Dale Ballou

Associate Professor of Public Policy
and Education
Vanderbilt University's Peabody College

Leonard Bradley

Lecturer in Education
Vanderbilt University's Peabody College

Timothy C. Caboni

Associate Dean for Professional Education
and External Relations
Associate Professor of the Practice in
Public Policy and Higher Education
Vanderbilt University's Peabody College

Mark Ehlert

Research Assistant Professor
University of Missouri – Columbia

Bonnie Ghosh-Dastidar

Statistician
The RAND Corporation

Timothy J. Gronberg

Professor of Economics
Texas A&M University

James W. Guthrie

Senior Fellow
George W. Bush Institute

Professor
Southern Methodist University

Laura Hamilton

Senior Behavioral Scientist
RAND Corporation

Janet S. Hansen

Vice President and Director of
Education Studies
Committee for Economic Development

Chris Hulleman

Assistant Professor
James Madison University

Brian A. Jacob

Walter H. Annenberg Professor of
Education Policy
*Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy
University of Michigan*

Dennis W. Jansen

Professor of Economics
Texas A&M University

Cory Koedel

Assistant Professor of Economics
University of Missouri-Columbia

Vi-Nhuan Le

Behavioral Scientist
RAND Corporation

Jessica L. Lewis

Research Associate
National Center on Performance Incentives

J.R. Lockwood

Senior Statistician
RAND Corporation

Daniel F. McCaffrey

Senior Statistician
PNC Chair in Policy Analysis
RAND Corporation

Patrick J. McEwan

Associate Professor of Economics
Whitehead Associate Professor
of Critical Thought
Wellesley College

Shawn Ni

Professor of Economics and Adjunct
Professor of Statistics
University of Missouri-Columbia

Michael J. Podgursky

Professor of Economics
University of Missouri-Columbia

Brian M. Stecher

Senior Social Scientist
RAND Corporation

Lori L. Taylor

Associate Professor
Texas A&M University

NATIONAL CENTER ON
Performance Incentives

**EXAMINING PERFORMANCE INCENTIVES
IN EDUCATION**

National Center on Performance Incentives
Vanderbilt University Peabody College

Peabody #43
230 Appleton Place
Nashville, TN 37203

(615) 322-5538
www.performanceincentives.org

