

Governor's Educator Excellence Award Program: Governor's Educator Excellence Grants

Year One Interim Report: Campus Plans and Teacher Experiences

Matthew G. Springer Vanderbilt University's Peabody College National Center on Performance Incentives

> Michael J. Podgursky University of Missouri-Columbia

Jessica L. Lewis National Center on Performance Incentives

James W. Guthrie Vanderbilt University's Peabody College National Center on Performance Incentives

> Mark W. Ehlert University of Missouri-Columbia

Jeffrey A. Springer National Center on Performance Incentives

Omar S. Lopez *Corporation for Public School Education K16*

Christine H. Patterson *Corporation for Public School Education K16*

Catherine D. Gardner National Center on Performance Incentives

> **Lori L. Taylor** Texas A&M University

¹ The authors wish to thank Corey Bower, Kelly Fork, Alicen Hatter, and Brian McInnis for research assistance. The views expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect those of sponsoring agencies or individuals acknowledged.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is the first in a series of evaluation deliverables reporting on the landscape, implementation, and impact of the Governor's Educator Excellence Grant (GEEG). This report provides an overview of GEEG during its first year of implementation, including the defining features of schools' incentive plans and early implementation experiences as evident through teachers' attitudes and professional practice. Findings from future years of the GEEG program will be provided in subsequent evaluation reports.

Key Policy Points

This report highlights and expands upon the following key policy points.

• Recently, Texas education policy efforts have focused on improving teaching quality throughout the state, culminating in the creation of the nation's largest statewide performance incentive system.

• The Governor's Educator Excellence Grant (GEEG) program is the first of several multimillion dollar statewide programs committed to the development of performance incentives for high-performing educators.

• Campus GEEG plans tend to focus on measures of student performance and teacher collaboration as criteria for distributing awards to teachers; schools are less inclined to use measures of teacher initiative and hard-to-staff areas, even though they are permitted under GEEG guidelines.

• GEEG award amounts for teachers are consistently poorly aligned with state recommended parameters (\$3,000 minimum; \$10,000 maximum); most awards are lower than the advised minimum.

• Teachers are in consistent agreement that school staff were involved in the development of GEEG plans, with the most involved stakeholders being administrators, teachers, and then non-instructional staff.

• On average, teachers agree that GEEG plans are both fair and having beneficial effects at their respective schools.

• Even during the first year of GEEG implementation, some – but not all – teachers appear to be adapting their professional practice in response to the opportunity to earn a financial incentive.

i

• What is the landscape of public education reform in Texas, and what have its implications been for the development of a statewide performance incentive system?

• What are the key components and common characteristics of campus GEEG plans?

• What performance measures do campuses most frequently use in creating incentive plans to promote student achievement?

• What are teachers' attitudes toward campus GEEG plans?

• How are teachers changing their professional practices and behaviors – if at all – in response to the implementation of campus GEEG plans? Link to full text: http://www.tea.state.tx.us/opge/progeval/TeacherIncentive/GEEG_051107.pdf

.: 11