# RESEARCH

## Educational Program Report

HOUSTON
Independent School District

Creating a College-Bound Culture

# 2005-2006 Teacher Performance-Pay
# and
# 2006-2007 ASPIRE Award Survey

## 2008 Board of Education

**Harvin C. Moore**
PRESIDENT

**Paula M. Harris**
FIRST VICE PRESIDENT

**Natasha M. Kamrani**
SECOND VICE PRESIDENT

**Carol Mims Galloway**
SECRETARY

**Lawrence Marshall**
ASSISTANT SECRETARY

**Diana Dávila**
**Dianne Johnson**
**Greg Meyers**
**Manuel Rodríguez Jr.**

**Abelardo Saavedra, Ph.D.**
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

**Carla Stevens**
ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT
DEPARTMENT OF RESEARCH AND ACCOUNTABILITY

**Laurie Zimmerman, Ph.D.**
**Jennifer O'Brien**
RESEARCH SPECIALISTS

**Chris Huzinec**
RESEARCH MANAGER

## 2005–2006 TEACHER PERFORMANCE-PAY AND
## 2006–2007 ASPIRE AWARD SURVEY

**Purpose**

The purpose of the Teacher Performance-Pay Model (TPPM) and ASPIRE Award Survey was to gain insight regarding the level of knowledge and perceptions of Houston Independent School District (HISD) teachers and staff toward the first two years of implementation of growth based performance pay in HISD, as well as their perceptions regarding the overall concept of teacher performance pay. Additionally, participants had the opportunity to identify strengths, provide criteria for a teacher award model from their perspective, and provide recommendations for making changes to the current model.

**Key Findings**

1. **What were the perceptions of respondents regarding the concept of teacher performance pay overall?**

- Of the 16,296 and 16,504 Houston Independent School District (HISD) staff who were eligible to participate in the performance pay programs in 2005–2006 and 2006–2007, respectively, there were 1,851 participants who responded to the survey (11.3 percent) in December ("pre-survey") prior to 2006–2007 payout and 6,383 respondents in May (38.7 percent) ("post-survey") after 2006–2007 payout. Among the HISD staff who returned the pre-survey, 68.4 percent were core teachers and 31.6 percent were non-core instructional staff or "*Other*."

- Pre-survey results indicated that the largest percentage of respondents were *in favor* or *somewhat in favor* of the concept of teacher performance pay (69.2 percent), while 18.8 percent of the respondents indicated that they were *somewhat opposed* or *opposed* to the concept.

- Post-survey results indicated that the largest percentage of respondents were *in favor* or *somewhat in favor* of the concept of teacher performance pay (57.2 percent), while 22.1 percent were *somewhat opposed* or *opposed* to the concept.

- There was a decline in the percentage of respondents who were *in favor* or *somewhat in favor* of the concept of teacher performance pay by 12.0 percentage points, and an increase by 8.6 percentage points of respondents who were *neutral* to the concept of teacher performance pay based on pre-and post-survey data.

- When comparing pre-survey and post-survey respondents indicating favorability (*in favor* or *somewhat in favor*) toward the concept of teacher performance pay based on individual student growth, there was a decline from 62.2 to 55.2 percent.

- The percentage of core teachers who were *in favor* or *somewhat in favor* of teacher performance pay exceeded that of non-core instructional staff by 8.4 percentage points on the pre-survey. The

percentage of instructional staff that was *in favor* or *somewhat in favor* of teacher performance pay slightly exceeded non-instructional staff, principals, professional support, regional/central office personnel and *others* by less than one percentage point on the post-survey.

- Approximately 24 percent of non-core instructional staff indicated that they were *somewhat opposed* or *opposed* toward the concept of teacher performance pay compared to only 19.3 percent of core teachers.

- At least 50 percent of core teachers and non-core instructional staff indicated that they were *opposed* or *somewhat opposed* to a Teacher Performance-Pay model based on passing rates only. Alternatively, 43.2 percent of instructional staff and 33.0 percent of non-instructional staff indicated that they were *opposed* or *somewhat opposed* toward the concept of teacher performance pay based on passing rates only on the post-survey.

2. **What were the perceptions of respondents and level of understanding of respondents regarding the Teacher Performance-Pay Model (TPPM) and ASPIRE Award programs?**

- When comparing pre-and post-survey results, the percentage of respondents that indicated they were *in favor* or *somewhat in favor* toward the concept of the Teacher Performance-Pay Model and to the ASPIRE Award Program was comparable (44.4 percent vs. 44.5 percent). After the payout of both models, however, opposition decreased by 9.2 percentage points.

- For the 2005–2006 Teacher Performance Pay Model, only 46.2 percent of the respondents indicated that they *understood it completely* or *understood most aspects of it*; alternatively, for the 2006–2007 ASPIRE Award program (pre-survey), 66.5 percent of respondents indicted that they *understood it completely* or *understood most aspects of it*.

- ASPIRE post-survey results indicated that 55.2 percent of respondents perceived they had *sufficient* understanding, while 27.4 percent felt their level of understanding was *high* or *very high* with regard to the ASPIRE Award program.

- Of the 1,513 pre-survey respondents, 65.6 percent received a 2005–2006 Teacher Performance-Pay Award in January 2007. Of the 5,376 post-survey respondents, 79.7 percent received a 2006–2007 ASPIRE Award in January 2008.

3. **What were the perceptions of respondents regarding the training sessions when comparing the 2005–2006 to 2006–2007 performance pay models?**

- The percentage of respondents that received training increased from 58.1 percent for the 2005–2006 model to 91.9 percent for the 2006–2007 model (pre-survey). Post-survey results indicated a decline in respondents reporting that they received training by 6.8 percentage points.

- For the 2005–2006 Teacher Performance Pay Model, the highest percentage of respondents indicated that they attended one training session prior to payout (46.6 percent).

- For the 2006–2007 ASPIRE Award, the highest percentage of post-survey respondents indicated that they attended two sessions (34 percent), with 31.8 percent reporting attending three or more.

- There was an overall reduction in the percentage of respondents that did not attend any training sessions when comparing the results from the Teacher Performance-Pay Model (9.1 percent) to post-survey ASPIRE (3.7 percent).

- When comparing pre-and post-survey data, a higher percentage of post-survey respondents indicated attending one or more training sessions (72.5 percent) than pre-survey respondents (57.1 percent) after payout.

- When comparing 2005–2006 Teacher Performance-Pay Model and 2006–2007 ASPIRE (pre-survey) results, 68.9 percent and 79.6 percent of respondents indicated that *I trained others on the difference* or *I understood most aspects of the difference* between student achievement and student growth/academic progress, representing an increase of 10.7 percentage points from the previous year.

- Post-survey results indicated that 88.4 percent of respondents rated their understanding of the difference between student achievement and student growth/academic progress as *very high, high*, or *sufficient*.

- There was a decline in the percentage of respondents that indicated *not really* or *they are totally unrelated* regarding the connection between classroom instruction and performance pay based on pre-post survey results (42.1 percent vs. 38.2 percent).

- The training component for which the largest percentage of respondents indicated a *high* or *very high* level of understanding centered on how value-added information can help educators (36.6 percent).

- On the post-survey, the component for which the highest percentage of respondents indicated a *very low* or *low* level of understanding centered on how the 2007 ASPIRE Awards were calculated/determined (33.9 percent).

4. **What were the criteria that respondents indicated they would prefer when choosing a teacher award model?**

- Over half of the respondents selected a model based on a combination of student growth at the classroom and campus levels when comparing pre-and post-survey results (56.1 and 57.5 percent).

- Only 8.9 percent of pre-survey respondents and 7.5 percent of post-survey respondents provided answers to the question about preferred criterion in a performance pay model. The highest percentage of respondents indicated that they would prefer to develop a model based upon criteria other than student test scores from standardized assessments or for the teacher award model to incorporate other performance measures as well as standardized test scores.

- Respondents indicating that they did not want a teacher award model reflected one of the largest increases when comparing pre-and post-survey results (9.4 percentage points) for the small percentage of respondents answering this question.

- When comparing pre-and post-survey results, 15.3 percent of 209 pre-survey responses and 10.6 percent of 521 post-survey responses indicated that teachers or other staff members wanted a pay raise across the board, representing a decline by 4.7 percentage points.

**5. What were the recommendations for changing the 2006–2007 ASPIRE Award suggested by respondents?**

- For the pre-survey, 1,042 of 1,851 respondents provided at least one response for recommended changes to the 2006–2007 ASPIRE Award (56.3 percent). For the post-survey, 2,071 of 6,383 respondents provided at least one response for recommended changes to the 2006–2007 ASPIRE Award (32.4 percent).
- Out of 19 emergent categories, the category receiving the highest percentages for both pre-and post-survey results centered on *equitability regarding levels of compensation and eligibility*.
- Recommendations for improving communication included changing the way information about ASPIRE reaches HISD staff by incorporating multimedia pod casts and multimedia tutorials, in addition to more timely reports, web-based modules, and e-mail.
- Based on post-survey feedback, communication about changes in the ASPIRE program need to be communicated more effectively, especially regarding eligibility criteria.

**6. What was the best part of the 2006–2007 ASPIRE Award as perceived by respondents?**

- For the pre-survey, 943 of 1,851 of respondents provided at least one response (50.9 percent). For the post-survey, 1,515 of 6,383 respondents provided at least one response for identifying the best part of the 2006–2007 ASPIRE Award (23.7 percent).
- Out of 17 emergent categories, the category receiving the highest percentages for both pre-and post-survey results centered on *the idea/concept of receiving an award or receiving the award itself* (29.4 percent).
- The highest change when comparing pre-to-post survey results centered on a 10.4 percent increase in respondents that indicated there was *no best part* of the ASPIRE Award program.

# 2005–2006 Teacher Performance-Pay and 2006–2007 ASPIRE Award Survey

# Introduction

**Purpose**

The purpose of the Teacher Performance-Pay Model (TPPM) and ASPIRE Award Survey was to gain insight regarding the level of knowledge and perceptions of Houston Independent School District (HISD) teachers and staff toward the first two years of implementation of growth-based performance pay in HISD, as well as their perceptions regarding the overall concept of teacher performance pay. Additionally, participants had the opportunity to identify strengths, provide criteria for a teacher award model from their perspective, and provide recommendations for making changes to the current model. Data will be used to make program improvements. The following research questions were addressed:

1. What were the perceptions of respondents regarding the concept of teacher performance pay overall?

2. What were the perceptions and level of understanding of respondents regarding the Teacher Performance-Pay Model (TPPM) and ASPIRE Award programs?

3. What were the perceptions of respondents regarding the training sessions when comparing the 2005–2006 to 2006–2007 performance pay models?

4. What were the criteria that respondents indicated they would prefer when choosing a teacher award model?

5. What were the recommendations for changing the 2006–2007 ASPIRE Award suggested by respondents?

6. What was the best part of the 2006–2007 ASPIRE Award as perceived by respondents?

**Program Rationale, Goals, and Principles**

On January 12, 2006, the Houston Independent School District (HISD) Board of Education approved a teacher performance-pay program awarding teachers financial incentives based on three strands of performance pay. These strands involved campus-level performance on the state accountability rating and individual teacher performance on the basis of student progress on state and district assessment programs. The awards were paid out in January, 2007. The experience gained in the first year and consultations with national experts and teachers provided the impetus for recommending the improvement and enhancement of the model which then became, "Accelerating Student Progress: Increasing Results and Expectations" (ASPIRE). The 2006–2007 ASPIRE Award was successfully paid out on January 30, 2008.

The purpose of the Houston Independent School District (HISD) ASPIRE Award Model is to reward teachers for their efforts in improving the academic growth of their students. ASPIRE Award employs a value-added methodology that provides teachers with the information that they need to facilitate and measure student progress at the student, classroom, and campus levels. The ASPIRE Award is dedicated to achieving the following goals:

- Encourage cooperation in Professional Learning Communities;

- Be aligned with the district's other school-improvement initiatives;
- Use value-added data based on a national expert's methodology to reward teachers reliably and consistently for student progress;
- Pay instructional staff members and non-instructional staff members at a campus on the basis of value-added data;
- Include core teachers at all grade levels, early childhood through grade 12; and
- Address alignment of curriculum to tests on which awards are based.

The ASPIRE Award is based on the following principles:
- Performance pay drives academic performance;
- Good teaching occurs in all schools;
- Teamwork is valuable;
- Performance pay does not replace a competitive base salaray, and
- Performance pay systems are dynamic and evolve over time.

Given these goals and principals, the ASPIRE Award involves three different strands of academic performance: Strand I–Value-added Campus Improvement (Campus-Level Performance); Strand II–Value-added Core Teacher Improvement (Individual Teacher, Campus, and Department Performance); and Strand III–Campus Improvement and Achievement based on Texas Education Agency (TEA) accountability and Comparable Improvement on the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) (Campus-Level Performance). Under the model, every HISD teacher has the opportunity to participate in at least two strands of the ASPIRE Awards (Strands I and III).

# Methods

### Data Collection
To determine the perceptions and level of knowledge of participants regarding the 2005–2006 Teacher Performance-Pay Model (TPPM) paid out in January 2007 and the 2006–2007 ASPIRE Award program paid out in January 2008, pre-and post-surveys were administered from Tuesday, December 4, 2007 to Wednesday, December 12, 2007 and from Tuesday, May 13, 2008 to Thursday, May 21, 2008. The survey instrument was designed to allow participants to give their opinions and attitudes regarding the concept of performance pay and their level of understanding regarding the TPPM and ASPIRE Award program. Questions employed a Likert-type scale or single-response format, with respondents given the opportunity to provide additional comments on open-ended questions.  Open-ended questions centered on identifying strengths of the ASPIRE Award program, providing criteria for a teacher award model from the perspective of the respondents, and providing recommendations for making changes to the current model. The responses were completely anonymous.

For the administration of the pre-survey, the Assistant Superintendent of Research and Accountability notified all principals directly (via e-mail) for accessing the survey on the Research and Accountability Website.  Principals were asked to  distribute the notice to all teachers. In addition, a notification flag about accessing the survey was posted on the employee portal site. Participants were instructed to complete the survey and return it via e-mail or print the survey and FAX the completed form.  The data obtained from the completed surveys were collected and entered into ACCESS. For the post-survey, participants were sent an e-mail with a link to the survey.

**Survey Participants**

Of the 16,296 and 16,504 Houston Independent School District (HISD) staff who were eligible to participate in the performance pay programs in 2005–2006 and 2006–2007, there were 1,851 participants who responded to the survey (11.3 percent) in December and 6,383 respondents in May (38.7 percent).  If survey participants were employed by HISD during the 2005–2006 and/or 2006–2007 school year, they were asked to indicate the type of teaching position held. Of the 1,851 respondents, 1,494 and 1,643 indicated the type of position that was held for the 2005–2006 and 2006–2007 school years for the pre-survey, respectively, while 6,283 indicated their position for the post-survey (**Table 1)**.

Table 1.  Number and Percent of Survey Respondents Based on Position Held, 2005–2006 and 2006–2007

|  | TPPM 2005–2006 | | ASPIRE (Pre) Dec. 2007 | |  | ASPIRE (Post) May 2008 | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | N | % | N | % |  | N | % |
| EC-2nd grade Core teacher | 410 | 27.4 | 448 | 27.3 | Instructional Staff | 5,007 | 79.7 |
| Grade 3-8 Core teacher | 415 | 27.8 | 486 | 29.6 | Non-Instructional Staff | 687 | 10.9 |
| High School Core teacher | 161 | 10.8 | 190 | 11.6 | Principal | 96 | 1.5 |
| EC-2nd grade Non-core instructional staff | 53 | 3.5 | 61 | 3.7 | Professional Support | 162 | 2.6 |
| Grade 3-8 Non-core instructional staff | 78 | 5.2 | 72 | 4.4 | Regional/Central Office Personnel | 16 | 0.3 |
| High School Non-core instructional staff | 137 | 9.2 | 148 | 9.0 |  |  |  |
| Other (specify) | 240 | 16.1 | 238 | 14.5 | Other (please specify) | 315 | 5.0 |
| **Total** | **1,494** | **100.0** | **1,643** | **100.0** | **Total** | **6,283** | **100.0** |

**Data Analysis**

Both quantitative and qualitative research methods were employed to analyze the results of the surveys.  Descriptive statistics in terms of frequencies, percentages, and crosstabs were used to examine the single-response and Likert-type questions. Items marked "N/A" indicated that the item did not apply and was treated as missing data. For the pre-survey, if a respondent indicated that they were not employed by HISD in 2005–2006, their responses were excluded from the analysis for questions 5 through 15. Similarly, if a respondent indicated that they were not employed by HISD in 2006–2007, their responses were excluded from the analysis for questions 17 through 24.  If respondents indicated that they did not receive training for the 2005–2006 TPPM, their responses to questions 10 and 11 were excluded from the analysis. Similarly, if respondents indicated that they did not receive training for the 2006–2007 ASPIRE Award, their response to question 21 was not included in the analysis. For the post-survey, raw data were provided by *Battelle For Kids* in an excel spreadsheet. Data were recoded and analyzed in SPSS. Items that were skipped were coded as missing data, and not included in the analysis. For the open-ended questions, qualitative analysis was employed by developing emergent categories.  The data are presented using descriptive statistics.

**Data Limitations**

The limitations to pre-survey administration centered on the short time frame for completing the pre-survey coupled with distribution and access to the survey. Additionally, there were changes in the structure of the survey instrument as well as changes in coding.

# Results

**What were the perceptions of respondents regarding the concept of teacher performance pay overall?**

### All Respondents

Tables 2–4 summarize the results of pre-post survey questions focusing on perceptions and level of understanding towards teacher performance pay.

Table 2. Comparison of the Number and Percent of Respondents Indicating Favorability Toward the Concept of Teacher Performance Pay Overall, Pre-Post Survey Results

|  | ASPIRE (Pre) Dec. 2007 | | ASPIRE (Post) May 2008 | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | N | % | N | % |
| In favor | 831 | 45.6 | 2,185 | 37.5 |
| Somewhat in favor | 430 | 23.6 | 1,145 | 19.7 |
| Neutral | 218 | 12.0 | 1,200 | 20.6 |
| Somewhat opposed | 167 | 9.2 | 608 | 10.4 |
| Opposed | 175 | 9.6 | 684 | 11.7 |
| **Total** | **1,821** | **100.0** | **5,822** | **100.0** |

- Pre-survey results indicated that the largest percentage of respondents were *in favor* or *somewhat in favor* of the concept of teacher performance pay (69.2 percent), while 18.8 percent of the respondents indicated that they were *somewhat opposed* or *opposed* to the concept.
- Post-survey results indicated that the largest percentage of respondents were *in favor* or *somewhat in favor* of the concept of teacher performance pay (57.2 percent), while 22.1 percent were *somewhat opposed* or *opposed* to the concept.
- There was a decline in the percentage of respondents who were *in favor* or *somewhat in favor* of the concept of teacher performance pay by 12.0 percentage points based on pre-and post-survey data.

Table 3. Number and Percent of Respondents Indicating Favorability Toward the Concept of Teacher Performance Pay Based on Individual Student Growth, Pre-Post Survey Results

|  | ASPIRE (Pre) Dec. 2007 | | ASPIRE (Post) May 2008 | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | N | % | N | % |
| In favor | 651 | 35.8 | 1,856 | 32.2 |
| Somewhat in favor | 480 | 26.4 | 1,329 | 23.0 |
| Neutral | 243 | 13.4 | 1,179 | 20.4 |
| Somewhat opposed | 217 | 11.9 | 681 | 11.8 |
| Opposed | 229 | 12.6 | 721 | 12.5 |
| **Total** | **1,820** | **100.0** | **5,766** | **100.0** |

- When respondents on the pre-survey were asked how favorable they were toward the concept of teacher performance pay based on individual student growth, 62.2 percent indicated they were *in favor* or *somewhat in favor*, compared to 55.2 percent of the post-survey respondents.
- The percentage of pre-and post-survey respondents indicating that they were *somewhat opposed* or *opposed* toward the concept of teacher performance pay based on individual student growth slightly declined from 24.5 percent to 24.3 percent.

Table 4.  Number and Percent of Respondents Indicating Favorability Toward the Concept of Teacher Performance Pay Based on Passing Rates, Pre-Post Survey Results

| | ASPIRE (Pre) Dec. 2007 | | ASPIRE (Post) May 2008 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % |
| In favor | 216 | 12.0 | 893 | 15.6 |
| Somewhat in favor | 323 | 17.9 | 1,032 | 18.0 |
| Neutral | 361 | 20.0 | 1,468 | 25.6 |
| Somewhat opposed | 350 | 19.4 | 1,028 | 17.9 |
| Opposed | 553 | 30.7 | 1,311 | 22.9 |
| **Total** | **1,803** | **100.0** | **5,732** | **100.0** |

- Approximately 50 percent of pre-survey respondents and 41 percent of post-survey respondents indicated that they were *somewhat opposed* or *opposed* to teacher performance pay based on passing rates only.
- When comparing pre-and post-survey results, there was an increase from 29.9 percent to 33.6 percent of respondents that indicated they were *in favor* or *somewhat in favor* toward the concept of teacher performance pay based on passing rates only.

**Core Teachers  and Non-Core Instructional Staff**

To determine whether there were differences in perceptions toward the concept of performance pay overall, comparisons were made between core teachers/ non-core instructional staff and instructional staff/non-instructional staff as summarized in **Table 5**. On the post-survey instrument, core teachers and non-core instructional staff were not distinguished in the instructional staff category.

Table 5.  Number and Percent of Respondents Indicating Favorability Toward the Concept of Teacher Performance Pay Overall by Core/Non-Core Instructional Staff and Instructional Staff/Non-Instructional Staff*

| | ASPIRE (Pre-Survey) | | | | ASPIRE (Post-Survey) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Core Teachers | | Non-Core Instructional Staff | | Instructional Staff | | Non-Instructional Staff * | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| In favor | 457 | 46.6 | 103 | 39.0 | 1,587 | 37.1 | 410 | 37.7 |
| Somewhat in favor | 234 | 23.9 | 61 | 23.1 | 837 | 19.6 | 206 | 19.0 |
| Neutral | 100 | 10.2 | 36 | 13.6 | 773 | 18.1 | 292 | 26.9 |
| Somewhat opposed | 93 | 9.5 | 25 | 9.5 | 472 | 11.0 | 98 | 9.0 |
| Opposed | 96 | 9.8 | 39 | 14.8 | 570 | 13.3 | 81 | 7.5 |
| **Total** | **980** | **100.0** | **264** | **100.0** | **4,239** | **100.0** | **1,087** | **100.0** |

*Non-Instructional Staff also incorporates responses from principals, professional support, regional/central office personnel, and *other*.

- The percentage of core teachers who were *in favor* or *somewhat in favor* of teacher performance pay exceeded that of non-core instructional staff by 8.4 percentage points.
- Alternatively, 24.3 percent of non-core instructional staff indicated that they were *somewhat opposed* or *opposed* toward the concept of teacher performance pay compared to only 19.3 percent of core teachers.

- The percentage of instructional staff *in favor* or *somewhat in favor* of teacher performance pay was comparable to non-instructional staff on the post-survey.
- A higher percentage of instructional staff (24.3 percent) was *somewhat opposed* or *opposed toward* the concept of teacher performance pay than non-instructional staff (16.5 percent).

Two questions addressed how favorable respondents were towards the concept of teacher performance pay based on individual student growth or passing rates only. The results are summarized in **Tables 6** and **7** for core/non-core instructional staff and instructional staff/non-instructional staff.

Table 6. Number and Percent of Respondents Indicating Favorability Toward the Concept of Teacher Performance Pay Based on Individual Student Growth by Core/Non-Core Instructional Staff and Instructional Staff/Non-Instructional Staff*

|  | ASPIRE (Pre-Survey) | | | | ASPIRE (Post-Survey) | | | |
|  | Core Teachers | | Non-Core Instructional Staff | | Instructional Staff | | Non-Instructional Staff * | |
|  | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In favor | 395 | 40.3 | 71 | 27.0 | 1,337 | 31.8 | 355 | 33.1 |
| Somewhat in favor | 256 | 26.1 | 73 | 27.8 | 974 | 23.2 | 237 | 22.1 |
| Neutral | 99 | 10.1 | 32 | 12.2 | 770 | 18.3 | 285 | 26.5 |
| Somewhat opposed | 116 | 11.8 | 32 | 12.2 | 530 | 12.6 | 103 | 9.6 |
| Opposed | 113 | 11.5 | 55 | 20.9 | 588 | 14.0 | 94 | 8.8 |
| **Total** | **979** | **100.0** | **263** | **100.0** | **4,199** | **100.0** | **1,074** | **100.0** |

*Non-Instructional Staff also incorporates responses from principals, professional support, regional/central office personnel, and *other*.

- The percentage of core teachers who were *in favor* or *somewhat in favor* of teacher performance pay based on individual student growth exceeded that of non-core instructional staff by 11.6 percentage points.
- Alternatively, 31.3 percent of non-core instructional staff indicated that they were *somewhat opposed* or *opposed* toward the concept of teacher performance pay based on individual student growth compared to only 23.3 percent of core teachers.
- The percentage of instructional staff *in favor* or *somewhat in favor* of teacher performance pay based on individual student growth was comparable to non-instructional staff.
- A higher percentage of instructional staff (26.6 percent) was *somewhat opposed* or *opposed toward* the concept of teacher performance pay based on individual student growth than non-instructional staff (18.4 percent).

Table 7.  Number and Percent of Respondents Indicating Favorability Toward the Concept of Teacher Performance Pay Based on Passing Rates Only by Core/Non-Core Instructional Staff and Instructional Staff/Non-Instructional Staff*

| | ASPIRE (Pre-Survey) | | | | ASPIRE (Post-Survey) | | | |
| | Core Teachers | | Non-Core Instructional Staff | | Instructional Staff | | Non-Instructional Staff * | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In favor | 124 | 12.8 | 22 | 8.5 | 640 | 15.3 | 177 | 16.5 |
| Somewhat in favor | 178 | 18.4 | 45 | 17.4 | 737 | 17.6 | 223 | 20.8 |
| Neutral | 162 | 16.7 | 57 | 22.1 | 994 | 23.8 | 317 | 29.6 |
| Somewhat opposed | 184 | 19.0 | 55 | 21.3 | 748 | 17.9 | 183 | 17.1 |
| Opposed | 322 | 33.2 | 79 | 30.6 | 1,057 | 25.3 | 170 | 15.9 |
| **Total** | **970** | **100.0** | **258** | **100.0** | **4,176** | **100.0** | **1,070** | **100.0** |

*Non-Instructional Staff also incorporates responses from principals, professional support, regional/central office personnel, and *other*.

- The percentage of core teachers who were *in favor* or *somewhat in favor* of teacher performance pay based on passing rates only exceeded that of non-core instructional staff by 5.3 percentage points.
- Approximately 52 percent of core teachers and non-core instructional staff indicated that they were *somewhat opposed* or *opposed* toward the concept of teacher performance pay based on passing rates only.
- The percentage of non-instructional staff *in favor* or *somewhat in favor* of teacher performance pay based on passing rates only exceeded that of instructional staff by 4.4 percentage points.
- A higher percentage of instructional staff (43.2 percent) was *somewhat opposed* or *opposed toward* the concept of teacher performance pay based on passing rates only than non-instructional staff (33.0 percent).

**What were the perceptions and level of understanding of respondents regarding the Teacher Performance-Pay Model (TPPM) and ASPIRE Award programs?**

**All Respondents**

Two of the Likert-type questions related to the perceptions of the TPPM and ASPIRE Award programs, and one question asked whether respondents received an award from the 2005–2006 Teacher Performance-Pay Model (TPPM) and the 2007 ASPIRE Award Program. **Table 8** summarizes the perceptions of respondents towards the two models.

Table 8. Number and Percent of Respondents Indicating Favorability Toward the Concept of the 2005–2006 Teacher Performance-Pay Model (TPPM) and the ASPIRE Award Program

| | 2005–2006 TPPM | | ASPIRE (Pre) December 2007 | | ASPIRE (Post) May 2008 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| In favor | 355 | 23.7 | 517 | 31.4 | 1,571 | 27.7 |
| Somewhat in favor | 311 | 20.7 | 478 | 29.0 | 950 | 16.8 |
| Neutral | 247 | 16.5 | 280 | 17.0 | 1,446 | 25.5 |
| Somewhat opposed | 220 | 14.7 | 160 | 9.7 | 699 | 12.3 |
| Opposed | 368 | 24.5 | 214 | 13.0 | 1,004 | 17.7 |
| **Total** | **1,501** | **100.0** | **1,649** | **100.0** | **5,670** | **100.0** |

- When comparing pre-and post-survey results, the percentage of respondents that indicated they were *in favor* or *somewhat in favor* toward the concept of the Teacher Performance-Pay Model and to the ASPIRE Award Program was comparable (44.4 vs. 44.5 percent). These results were after the payout of both models.
- When comparing how favorable respondents were toward the 2005–2006 Teacher Performance-Pay Model after payout to the 2006–2007 ASPIRE Award prior to payout (pre-survey), there was an increase of 16 percentage points (*in favor* or *somewhat in favor*).
- When comparing pre-and post-survey results, the percentage of respondents that indicated they were *somewhat opposed* or *opposed* toward the concept of the 2005–2006 Teacher Performance-Pay Model and to the ASPIRE Award Program decreased by 9.2 percentage points.
- Alternatively, the percentage of respondents indicating that they were *neutral* toward the concept of the 2006–2007 ASPIRE Award after payout increased by 8.5 percentage points from before payout.

**Table 9** summarizes the results regarding the level of understanding respondents indicated toward the 2005–2006 Teacher Performance-Pay model and the 2007–2008 ASPIRE Award program.

Table 9. Number and Percent of Survey Respondents Level of Understanding of the 2005–2006 Teacher Performance-Pay Model (TPPM) and the 2006–2007 ASPIRE Award Program

| | TPPM 2005–2006 | | ASPIRE (Pre) December 2007 | | ASPIRE (Post) May 2008 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | | N | % |
| I understood it completely | 272 | 18.0 | 373 | 22.5 | Very High | 396 | 6.7 |
| I understood most aspects of it | 427 | 28.2 | 729 | 44.0 | High | 1,217 | 20.7 |
| I understood some of it | 381 | 25.2 | 400 | 24.1 | Sufficient | 3,247 | 55.2 |
| I understood a little of it | 309 | 20.4 | 148 | 8.9 | Low | 780 | 13.3 |
| I didn't know anything about it | 125 | 8.3 | 7 | 0.4 | Very Low | 242 | 4.1 |
| Total | **1,514** | **100.0** | **1,657** | **100.0** | **Total** | **5,882** | **100.0** |

- For the 2005–2006 Teacher Performance Pay Model, only 46.2 percent of the respondents indicated that they *understood it completely* or *understood most aspects of it*; alternatively, for the 2006–2007 ASPIRE Award program (pre-survey), 66.5 percent of respondents indicted that they *understood it completely* or *understood most aspects of it*.

- ASPIRE post-survey results indicated that 55.2 percent of respondents perceived they had *sufficient* understanding, while 27.4 percent felt their level of understanding was *high* or *very high* with regard to the ASPIRE Award program.

Respondents were asked whether they received an award from the 2005–2006 Teacher Performance-Pay Model (TPPM) and/or the 2006–2007 ASPIRE Award Program. **Table 10** summarizes the results.

Table 10. Number and Percent of Respondents Receiving an Award from the 2005–2006 Teacher Performance-Pay Model (TPPM ) and/or 2006–2007 ASPIRE, Pre-Post Survey Results

|  | **2005–2006 TPPM** | | **ASPIRE (Post) May 2008** | |
|  | **N** | **%** | **N** | **%** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| No | 521 | 34.4 | 1,093 | 20.3 |
| Yes | 992 | 65.6 | 4,283 | 79.7 |
| **Total** | **1,513** | **100.0** | **5,376** | **100.0** |

- Of the 1,513 pre-survey respondents, 65.6 percent received a 2005–2006 Teacher Performance-Pay Award in January 2007. Of the 5,376 post-survey respondents, 79.7 percent received a 2006–2007 ASPIRE Award in January 2008.

**Core Teachers  and Non-Core Instructional Staff**

To determine whether there were differences in perceptions regarding the level of understanding toward ASPIRE, pre-post survey comparisons were made between core teachers/non-core instructional staff and instructional staff/noninstructional staff* as summarized in **Table 11**.

Table 11. Number and Percent of Respondents Indicating their Level of Understanding Toward the 2006–2007 ASPIRE Award by Core/Non-Core Instructional Staff and Instructional Staff/Non-Instructional Staff*

|  | **ASPIRE (Pre-Survey)** | | | |  | **ASPIRE (Post-Survey)** | | | |
|  | **Core Teachers** | | **Non-Core Instructional Staff** | |  | **Instructional Staff** | | **Non-Instructional Staff *** | |
|  | **N** | **%** | **N** | **%** |  | **N** | **%** | **N** | **%** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I understand it completely | 249 | 22.4 | 55 | 20.8 | Very High | 280 | 6.6 | 97 | 8.7 |
| I understand most aspects of it | 488 | 43.9 | 68 | 25.8 | High | 895 | 21.0 | 223 | 20.0 |
| I understand some of it | 267 | 24.0 | 65 | 24.6 | Sufficient | 2,374 | 55.7 | 609 | 54.7 |
| I understand a little of it | 105 | 9.4 | 56 | 21.2 | Low | 551 | 12.9 | 136 | 12.2 |
| This is the first I've heard of it | 3 | 0.3 | 20 | 7.6 | Very Low | 161 | 3.8 | 49 | 4.4 |
| **Total** | **1,112** | **100.0** | **264** | **100.0** | **Total** | **4,261** | **100.0** | **1,114** | **100.0** |

*Non-Instructional Staff also incorporates responses from principals, professional support, regional/central office personnel, and *other.*

- On the pre-survey, core teachers indicated a greater level of understanding than non-core instructional staff with regard to the ASPIRE Award program.
- On the post-survey, at least 54 percent of instructional and non-instructional staff indicated a *sufficient* level of understanding regarding the ASPIRE Award program.
- On the post-survey, the differences in the level of understanding when comparing instructional to non-instructional staff did not exceed 2.1 percentage points for any of the rating categories.

**What were the perceptions of respondents regarding the training sessions when comparing the 2005–2006 to 2006–2007 performance pay models?**

### All Respondents

Eleven items were designed to address participation and frequency of training, perceptions of the training, and the level of understanding of the models. **Table 12** provides a comparison of the number and percent of respondents receiving training for the 2005–2006 and 2006–2007 performance pay models.

Table 12. Number and Percent of Respondents Receiving Training for the 2005–2006 Teacher Performance-Pay Model (TPPM ) and the 2006–2007 ASPIRE Award Program, Pre-Post Survey Results

|  | 2005–2006 TPPM | | ASPIRE (Pre) Dec. 2007 | | ASPIRE (Post) May 2008 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| No | 628 | 41.9 | 135 | 8.1 | 812 | 12.7 |
| Yes | 871 | 58.1 | 1,528 | 91.9 | 4,642 | 85.1 |
| **Total** | **1,513** | **100.0** | **1,663** | **100.0** | **5,454** | **100.0** |

- The percentage of respondents that received training increased from 58.1 percent in 2005–2006 to 91.9 percent in 2006–2007 (pre-survey). Post-survey results indicate a decline in respondents reporting receiving training by 6.8 percentage points.

There were three questions designed to determine the number of training sessions respondents attended regarding the two models. The results are summarized in **Tables 13** and **14**.

Table 13. Number and Percent of Respondents Indicating the Number of Training Sessions Attended Before the Awards were Granted for the 2005–2006 Teacher Performance-Pay Model (TPPM) and ASPIRE Award Program

|  | 2005–2006 TPPM | | ASPIRE (Pre) December 2007 | | ASPIRE (Post) May 2008 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| No training sessions before payout | 81 | 9.1 | 48 | 3.1 | 167 | 3.7 |
| One training session before payout | 416 | 46.6 | 389 | 25.1 | 1,400 | 30.6 |
| Two training sessions before payout | 273 | 30.6 | 539 | 34.8 | 1,553 | 34.0 |
| 3 or more training sessions before payout | 123 | 13.8 | 573 | 37.0 | 1,452 | 31.8 |
| **Total** | **893** | **100.0** | **1,549** | **100.0** | **4,572** | **100.0** |

- The highest percentage of respondents prior to payout for the Teacher Performance-Pay Model indicated that they attended one training session (46.6 percent), while pre-survey ASPIRE respondents attended three or more training sessions (37 percent). The highest percentage of post-survey respondents attended two training sessions before payout (34 percent), and 31.8 percent reported attending three or more.
- There was an overall reduction in the percentage of respondents that did not attend any training sessions when comparing the results from the Teacher Performance Pay (9.1 percent) to post-survey ASPIRE (3.7 percent).

Table 14. Number and Percent of Respondents Indicating the Number of Training Sessions Attended After the Awards were Granted for the 2005–2006 Teacher Performance-Pay Model (TPPM) and ASPIRE Award Program

|  | TPPM (2007) | | ASPIRE (2008) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | N | % | N | % |
| No training sessions after payout | 383 | 42.9 | 1,246 | 27.4 |
| One training session after payout | 340 | 38.1 | 1,708 | 37.6 |
| Two training sessions after payout | 120 | 13.4 | 936 | 20.6 |
| 3 or more training sessions after payout | 50 | 5.6 | 650 | 14.3 |
| **Total** | **893** | **100.0** | **4,540** | **100.0** |

- There was an overall reduction in the percentage of respondents that did not attend any training sessions after the awards were granted when comparing the pre-survey (42.9 percent) to post-survey (27.4 percent) results by 15.5 percentage points.
- When comparing pre-and post-survey data, a higher percentage of post-survey respondents indicated attending one or more training sessions (72.5 percent) than pre-survey respondents (57.1 percent) after payout.

Two questions focused on the level of understanding regarding specific components of the two models, while four questions from the post-survey centered on specific components of the ASPIRE Program. **Table 15** compares the number and percent of respondents who indicated that they had a clear understanding of TAKS objectives for the 2005–2006 school year (TPPM), 2006–2007 school year (ASPIRE pre-survey), and 2007–2008 school year (ASPIRE post-survey). The response sets changed slightly from the pre-survey to the post-survey and the differences are illustrated in Table 15.

Table 15. Number and Percent of Survey Respondents Indicating Their Level of Understanding of TAKS Objectives, 2005–2006 and 2006–2007, Pre-Post Survey Results

|  | TPPM 2005–2006 | | ASPIRE (Pre) December 2007 | |  | ASPIRE (Post) May 2008 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | N | % | N | % |  | N | % |
| I trained others on the TAKS objectives | 224 | 15.3 | 232 | 14.3 | I can train others | 1,639 | 31.9 |
| I understood most aspects | 1,076 | 73.4 | 1,226 | 75.8 | I understand most aspects | 2,821 | 54.9 |
| I understood some | 133 | 9.1 | 141 | 8.7 | I understand some aspects | 578 | 11.2 |
| I had heard the term used | 15 | 1.0 | 9 | 0.6 | I've heard the term used | 66 | 1.3 |
| Not at all | 18 | 1.2 | 10 | 0.6 | Not at all | 36 | 0.7 |
| **Total** | **1,466** | **100.0** | **1,618** | **100.0** | **Total** | **5,140** | **100.0** |

- Respondents indicated their level of understanding of TAKS objectives in 2005–2006, and 88.7 percent of respondents indicated that *I trained others on the TAKS objectives* or *I understood most aspects.*
- Pre-Survey ASPIRE Award respondents indicated the highest level of understanding of TAKS objectives for the 2006–2007 school year with 90.1 percent selecting *I trained others on the TAKS objectives* or *I understood most aspects*.
- There was a slight decline in the percentage of post-survey ASPIRE respondents that indicated *I can train others* or *I understand most aspects* regarding their level of understanding of TAKS objectives for the 2007–2008 school year (86.8 percent).

**Table 16** compares the number and percent of respondents who indicated that they had a clear understanding of Stanford objectives/content clusters for the 2005–2006 school year (TPPM), 2006–2007 school year (ASPIRE pre-survey), and 2007–2008 school year (ASPIRE post-survey).

Table 16.  Number and Percent of Survey Respondents Indicating Their Level of Understanding of Stanford Objectives/Content Clusters, 2005–2006 and 2006–2007, Pre-Post Survey Results

| | TPPM 2005–2006 | | ASPIRE (Pre) December 2007 | | | ASPIRE (Post) May 2008 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | | N | % |
| I trained others on the Stanford objectives | 127 | 8.6 | 129 | 8.0 | I can train others | 993 | 19.6 |
| I understood most aspects | 1,049 | 71.2 | 1,164 | 72.4 | I understand most aspects | 2,789 | 55.0 |
| I understood some | 189 | 12.8 | 220 | 13.7 | I understand some aspects | 898 | 17.7 |
| I had heard the term used | 38 | 2.6 | 34 | 2.1 | I've heard the term used | 154 | 3.0 |
| Not at all | 71 | 4.8 | 61 | 3.8 | Not at all | 236 | 4.7 |
| **Total** | **1,474** | **100.0** | **1,608** | **100.0** | **Total** | **5,070** | **100.0** |

- Respondents indicated their level of understanding of Stanford objectives/content clusters in 2005–2006, and 79.8 percent of respondents indicated that *I trained others on the Stanford objectives* or *I understood most aspects.*
- Pre-Survey ASPIRE Award respondents indicated the highest level of understanding of Stanford Objectives/content clusters for the 2006–2007 school year with 80.4 percent selecting *I trained others on the Stanford objectives* or *I understood most aspects*.
- There was a slight decline in the percentage of post-survey ASPIRE respondents that indicated *I can train others* or *I understand most aspects* regarding their level of understanding of Stanford objectives/content clusters for the 2007–2008 school year (74.6 percent).

**Table 17** compares the number and percent of respondents who indicated that they had a clear understanding of the difference between student achievement and student growth/academic progress for the 2005–2006 school year (TPPM), the 2006–2007 school year (ASPIRE pre-survey), and the 2007–2008 school year (ASPIRE post-survey).

Table 17.  Number and Percent of Survey Respondents Level of Understanding of the Difference Between Student Achievement and Student Growth/Academic Progress, Pre-Post Survey Results

|  | TPPM 2005–2006 | | ASPIRE (Pre) December 2007 | | | ASPIRE (Post) May 2008 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | N | % | N | % |  | N | % |
| I trained others on the difference | 70 | 4.6 | 121 | 7.4 | Very High | 833 | 14.2 |
| I understood most aspects | 978 | 64.3 | 1,189 | 72.2 | High | 1,770 | 30.3 |
| I understood some | 303 | 19.9 | 264 | 16.0 | Sufficient | 2,556 | 43.9 |
| I had heard the term used | 71 | 4.7 | 36 | 2.2 | Low | 521 | 8.9 |
| Not at all | 100 | 6.6 | 36 | 2.2 | Very Low | 158 | 2.7 |
| **Total** | **1,522** | **100.0** | **1,646** | **100.0** | **Total** | **5,848** | **100.0** |

- When comparing 2005–2006 TPPM and 2006–2007 ASPIRE (pre-survey) results, 68.9 percent and 79.6 percent of respondents indicated, *I trained others on the difference* or *I understood most aspects* of the difference between student achievement and student growth/academic progress, representing an increase of 10.7 percentage points.
- Post-survey results indicated that 44.5 percent of respondents rated their understanding of the difference between student achievement and student growth/academic progress as *very high* or *high*, plus an additional 43.9 percent rated their understanding as *sufficient* for a total of 88.4 percent.

One question asked respondents whether they perceived a connection between classroom instruction and performance-pay results. The responses are summarized in **Table 18**.

Table 18. Number and Percent of Respondents Indicating a Connection Between Classroom Instruction and Performance Pay Results

|  | TPPM Paid January 2007 | | ASPIRE (Post) Paid January 2008 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | N | % | N | % |
| Absolutely | 207 | 14.7 | 828 | 16.5 |
| Mostly | 356 | 25.3 | 1,186 | 23.6 |
| About half the time | 252 | 17.9 | 1,094 | 21.8 |
| Not really | 465 | 33.1 | 1,422 | 28.3 |
| They were/are totally unrelated | 126 | 9.0 | 497 | 9.9 |
| **Total** | **1,406** | **100.0** | **5,027** | **100.0** |

- When comparing pre-post survey results, only 40 percent of the respondents perceived a connection between classroom instruction and performance-pay results by indicating *absolutely* or *mostly*.
- There was a decline in the percentage respondents from 42.1 percent to 38.2 percent that perceived little or no connection to classroom instruction and performance-pay results by indicating *not really* or t*hey were totally unrelated* based on pre-post survey results.

On the post-survey, there were five items that were designed to determine the level of understanding for different training components related to the ASPIRE Award. Baseline data were collected in May. **Table 19** depicts the results.

Table 19.  Number and Percent of Survey Respondents Indicating Their Level of Understanding for Training Components of the 2006–2007 ASPIRE Award, Baseline Data from Post-Survey Results

|  | N | Very Low % | Low % | Sufficient % | High % | Very High % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| My understanding of value-added analysis is: | 5,844 | 5.6 | 15.7 | 50.0 | 21.0 | 7.7 |
| My understanding of how value-added information can help me as an educator is: | 5,832 | 5.0 | 13.3 | 45.1 | 25.9 | 10.7 |
| My understanding of how to read/interpret value-added reports is: | 5,817 | 5.7 | 18.0 | 47.0 | 21.6 | 7.7 |
| My understanding of the different stands of the 2007 ASPIRE Award Program was: | 5,835 | 6.1 | 17.1 | 48.7 | 20.6 | 7.5 |
| My understanding of how 2007 ASPIRE Awards were calculated/determined is: | 5,852 | 12.6 | 21.3 | 43.9 | 16.2 | 6.0 |

- The training component for which the largest percentage of respondents indicated a *very high* or *high* level of understanding centered on how value-added information can help educators (36.6).
- The training component for which the largest percentage of respondents indicated a *very low* or *low* level of understanding focused on understanding how the 2007 ASPIRE Awards were calculated/determined (33.9 percent).
- At least 43.9 percent of the post-survey respondents indicated they had a *sufficient* level of understanding for the five training components: value-added analysis, how value-added information can help educators, how to read/interpret value-added reports, the different strands of the 2007 ASPIRE Award Program, and how 2007 ASPIRE Awards were calculated/determined.

**Core Teachers and Non-Core Instructional Staff**

To determine whether there were differences in the level of understanding regarding student achievement and student growth, comparisons were made between core teachers/non-core instructional staff and instructional staff/non-instructional staff as summarized in **Table 20**. The percentage of core teachers indicating *I trained others on the difference* or *I understood most aspects* between student growth and student achievement increased by 10.1 percentage points from 2005–2006 to 2006–2007. For non-core instructional staff, there was an increase of 12.2 percentage points when examining the same response sets for 2005–2006 and 2006–2007. When comparing the level of understanding of core teachers to non-core instructional staff in 2005–2006, 70.1 and 62.1 percent, respectively, indicated *I trained others on the difference* or *I understood most aspects*. For 2005–2006, a higher percentage of core teachers indicated they understood the difference between student achievement and student growth by 7.4 percentage points. When comparing core teachers to non-core instructional staff in 2006–2007, 80.2 percent of core teachers and 74.9 percent of non-core instructional staff indicated *I trained others on the difference* or *I understood most aspects*, representing a difference of 5.3 percentage points.

Table 20. Number and Percent of Respondents Indicating a Clear Understanding of the Difference Between Student Achievement and Student Growth/Academic Progress by Core/Non-Core Instructional Staff and Instructional Staff/Non-Instructional Staff*

| | ASPIRE (Pre-Survey) | | | | | ASPIRE (Post-Survey) | | | |
| | Core Teachers | | Non-Core Instructional Staff | | | Instructional Staff | | Non-Instructional Staff * | |
| | N | % | N | % | | N | % | N | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I understand it completely | 71 | 6.5 | 25 | 9.1 | Very High | 596 | 14.0 | 168 | 15.2 |
| I understand most aspects of it | 809 | 73.7 | 181 | 65.8 | High | 1,305 | 30.8 | 302 | 27.4 |
| I understand some of it | 167 | 15.2 | 55 | 20.0 | Sufficient | 1,852 | 43.6 | 513 | 46.5 |
| I understand a little of it | 26 | 2.4 | 6 | 2.2 | Low | 377 | 8.9 | 93 | 8.4 |
| This is the first I've heard of it | 24 | 2.2 | 8 | 2.9 | Very Low | 113 | 2.7 | 28 | 2.5 |
| **Total** | **1,097** | **100.0** | **275** | **100.0** | **Total** | **4,243** | **100.0** | **1,104** | **100.0** |

*Non-Instructional Staff also incorporates responses from principals, professional support, regional/central office personnel, and *other*.

- When comparing pre-survey results, 80.2 percent of core teachers and 74.9 percent of non-core instructional staff indicated that, *I understood it completely* or *I understood most aspects* of the difference between student achievement and student growth/academic progress, representing a difference of 5.3 percentage points.
- When comparing post-survey results, 44.8 percent of instructional staff and 42.6 percent of non-instructional staff rated their understanding of the difference between student achievement and student growth/academic progress as *very high* or *high*.
- Post-survey results indicated that 43.6 percent of instructional staff and 46.5 percent of non-instructional staff rated their understanding of the difference between student achievement and student growth/academic progress as *sufficient*.

Comparisons were made between core and non-core instructional staff to determine if there were differences in perceptions regarding the connection between classroom instruction and Performance-Pay results (see **Table 21**). For respondents who indicated *absolutely* or *mostly*, a higher percentage of core teachers indicated that that there was a connection between classroom instruction and performance-pay results by 14.5 percentage points. Alternatively, 16.6 percent of core teachers indicated that a connection existed *about half the time* compared to 23.7 percent of non-core instructional staff. A higher percentage of non-core instructional staff indicated that there was little to no connection between classroom instruction and performance-pay results as compared to core teachers by 7.5 percentage points. However, the percentage of core teachers indicating there was a connection was comparable to the percentage of core teachers indicating there was little to no connection (42.1 percent vs. 41.2 percent). Alternatively, only 27.6 percent of non-core instructional staff indicated there was a connection compared to 48.7 percent who indicated there was little to no connection.

Table 21. Number and Percent of Respondents Indicating a Connection Between Classroom Instruction and Performance Pay Results by Core/Non-Core Instructional Staff and Instructional Staff/Non-Instructional Staff*

| | TPPM (Paid January 2007) | | | | ASPIRE (Paid January 2008) | | | |
| | Core Teachers | | Non-Core Instructional Staff | | Instructional Staff | | Non-Instructional Staff * | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Absolutely | 143 | 15.4 | 20 | 8.6 | 619 | 15.2 | 207 | 22.0 |
| Mostly | 247 | 26.7 | 44 | 19.0 | 920 | 22.7 | 258 | 27.4 |
| About half the time | 154 | 16.6 | 55 | 23.7 | 888 | 21.9 | 199 | 21.1 |
| Not really | 293 | 31.6 | 88 | 37.9 | 1,194 | 29.4 | 224 | 23.8 |
| They are total unrelated | 89 | 9.6 | 25 | 10.8 | 440 | 10.8 | 53 | 5.6 |
| **Total** | **926** | **100.0** | **232** | **100.0** | **4,061** | **100.0** | **941** | **100.0** |

*Non-Instructional Staff also incorporates responses from principals, professional support, regional/central office personnel, and *other*.

- For respondents that answered *absolutely* or *mostly*, a higher percentage of core teachers indicated that that there was a connection between classroom instruction and performance pay results by 14.5 percentage points for the Teacher Performance-Pay Model.
- Alternatively, 16.6 percent of core teachers indicated that a connection existed between classroom instruction and performance pay results *about half the time* compared to 23.7 percent of non-core instructional staff for the Teacher Performance-Pay Model.
- The percentage of core teachers indicating there was a connection between classroom instruction and performance pay results for the Teacher Performance-Pay Model was comparable to the percentage of core teachers indicating there was little to no connection (42.1 percent vs. 41.2 percent).
- For the Teacher Performance-Pay Model, a higher percentage of non-core instructional staff indicated *not really* or *they are totally unrelated* regarding the connection between classroom instruction and performance pay compared to non-instructional staff that indicated *absolutely* or *mostly* (48.7 vs. 27.6 percent).
- For respondents that indicated *absolutely* or *mostly*, a higher percentage of non-instructional staff indicated that that there was a connection between classroom instruction and performance pay results by 11.5 percentage points for the ASPIRE Award Program.
- For the ASPIRE Award, a higher percentage of non-instructional staff indicated *not really* or *they are totally unrelated* regarding the connection between classroom instruction and performance pay compared to non-instructional staff that indicated *absolutely* or *mostly* (40.2 percent vs. 37.9 percent).
- The percentage of instructional staff indicating there was a connection between classroom instruction and performance pay results about half the time was comparable to the percentage of non-instructional staff for the ASPIRE Award Program (21.9 percent and 21.1 percent, respectively).

**What were the criteria that respondents indicated they would prefer when choosing a teacher award model?**

One question asked respondents what factor would be preferred when choosing a teacher award model. The results are presented in **Table 22**.

Table 22. Number and Percent of Respondents Indicating the Preferred Factor to Base the ASPIRE
Awards/Teacher Award Model

| | TPPM Paid January 2007 | | ASPIRE (Post) Paid January 2008 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % |
| Student growth at the classroom level only | 342 | 19.5 | 944 | 18.1 |
| Campus-wide student growth only | 265 | 15.1 | 796 | 15.3 |
| A combination of student growth at the classroom and campus levels | 986 | 56.1 | 2,999 | 57.5 |
| Other (please specify) | 165 | 9.4 | 473 | 9.1 |
| **Total** | **1,758** | **100.0** | **5,212** | **100.0** |

- Over half of the respondents selected a model based on a combination of student growth at the classroom and campus levels when comparing pre- and post-survey results.

For the pre-survey, of the 165 or 8.9 percent who indicated *Other*, a total of 163 provided at least one response. The data were grouped into emergent categories for a total of 209 responses. For the post-survey, a total of 473 (7.5 percent) respondents provided at least one response. The data were grouped into emergent categories for a total of 521 responses. **Table 23** presents the number and percent of responses describing the criteria suggested by respondents for a teacher award model. The top four emergent categories reflected at least 63 percent of the responses for the pre-and post-survey.

The highest percentage of respondents indicated that they would prefer to develop a model based upon criteria other than student test scores from standardized assessments or for the teacher award model to incorporate qualitative measures as well as standardized test scores. The following criteria were suggested: teacher performance (i.e. teacher participation or involvement in the school/district and traditional measures such as years of experience, and educational degree(s)), school characteristics, student characteristics, appropriate assessments relative to academic ability or content area, growth at the grade level (teams) or department level, teachers set performance goals, and negotiation. A more comprehensive list is provided in **Appendix A**.

Table 23.   Number and Percent of Responses Describing Preferred Criteria for a Teacher Performance Pay Model, ASPIRE Pre-Post Survey Results

| | ASPIRE (Pre) | | ASPIRE (Post) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % |
| Developing a model based upon criteria other than standardized test scores or Incorporating criteria other than standardized test scores into a model | 56 | 26.8 | 152 | 29.2 |
| Pay raise across the board | 32 | 15.3 | 55 | 10.6 |
| Equitability regarding levels of compensation and eligibility | 23 | 11.0 | 65 | 12.5 |
| No teacher award model | 20 | 9.6 | 99 | 19.0 |
| Student growth at the classroom level | 19 | 9.1 | 35 | 6.7 |
| Factors impacting the model | 18 | 8.6 | 23 | 4.4 |
| Campus growth | 12 | 5.7 | 11 | 2.1 |
| Passing Rates (TAKS) | 10 | 4.8 | 29 | 5.6 |
| Miscellaneous | 9 | 4.3 | 13 | 2.5 |
| Student Achievement | 7 | 3.3 | 21 | 4.0 |
| Don't Know/Not Sure | 3 | 1.4 | 11 | 2.1 |
| No Changes to the model | - | - | 4 | 0.8 |
| **Total** | **209** | **100.0** | **521** | **100.0** |

- When comparing pre-post survey results, the highest percentage of respondents answering this question indicated that they would prefer to develop a model based upon criteria other than student test scores from standardized assessments or for the teacher award model to incorporate other performance measures as well as standardized test scores.
- Pre-survey respondents provided a greater variety of suggestions for performance measures to incorporate into a teacher award model than post-survey respondents did.
- Respondents indicating that they did not want a teacher award model reflected one of the largest increases when comparing pre-and post-survey results (9.4 percentage points).
- Reasons cited for having no teacher award model included "children are too different," or "I don't believe there is any fair way to do this. We are dealing with too many variables."
- When comparing pre-and post-survey results, 15.3 percent of the 209 pre-survey responses and 10.6 percent of the 521 post-survey responses indicated that teachers/staff wanted a pay raise across the board, representing a decline by 4.7 percentage points.

**What were the recommendations for changing the 2006–2007 ASPIRE Award suggested by respondents?**

Question 27 asked respondents if they could change one aspect of the ASPIRE Award program what would it be and how should it be changed. Of the 1,851 pre-surveys completed, 1,042 surveys (56.3 percent) provided at least one response.  Of the 6,383 post-surveys completed, 2,071 (32.4 percent) provided at least one response. The data were grouped into 19 emergent categories. Since multiple responses were provided, the percentages were based on the total number of responses (N=1,108 and N=2,329).   **Table 24** presents the number and percent of responses describing the recommendations for changing the ASPIRE Award model.  The top five emergent categories reflected at least 60 percent of the responses. The highest percentage of pre-and post-survey respondents indicated that they would change the model so that there was equitability regarding levels of compensation and eligibility (27.0 percent  and

Table 24.  Numbers and Percentages of Pre- and Post-Survey Responses for Recommended Changes to the 2006–2007 ASPIRE Award

| | Pre-ASPIRE | | Post-ASPIRE | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % |
| Equitability regarding levels of compensation and eligibility | 299 | 27.0 | 647 | 27.8 |
| Factors impacting student academic growth/calculation of growth/logistical aspects of verification | 113 | 10.2 | 230 | 9.9 |
| No change/Nothing/None | 96 | 8.7 | 190 | 8.2 |
| Other performance measures or criteria/appropriate assessment | 79 | 7.1 | 274 | 11.8 |
| Allocate more money for awards/allocate money or resources for specified group(s)/reallocate money so that particular groups benefit and designated groups receive no award or their award is capped | 78 | 7.0 | 246 | 10.6 |
| Miscellaneous | 75 | 6.8 | 60 | 2.6 |
| No comment/NA | 62 | 5.6 | 106 | 4.6 |
| Not sure/Don't Know | 54 | 4.9 | 2.6 | 1.1 |
| No model | 50 | 4.5 | 95 | 4.1 |
| Put it in salaries/raises | 40 | 3.6 | 61 | 2.6 |
| Improve training/Provide clearer explanations | 30 | 2.7 | 58 | 2.5 |
| Too complex-simplify model and explanation | 23 | 2.1 | 9 | 0.4 |
| Student growth only (classroom-based) | 21 | 1.9 | 47 | 2.0 |
| Student growth based on campus-wide rates | 16 | 1.4 | 40 | 1.7 |
| Time of payout | 16 | 1.4 | 41 | 1.8 |
| Improve communication about awards with a clear explanation of the calculations, and incorporate a variety of dissemination mechanisms (multimedia pod casts, reports, e-mail). | 16 | 1.4 | 109 | 4.7 |
| Not just test scores | 15 | 1.4 | 17 | 0.7 |
| Level of aggregation (student, teacher, grade, department, campus) | 14 | 1.3 | 46 | 2.0 |
| Keep award results confidential | 11 | 1.0 | 27 | 1.2 |
| | 1,108 | 100.0 | 2,329 | 100.0 |

27.8 percent).  For the 2006–2007 ASPIRE Award, non-core instructional personnel such as ancillary teachers, special education teachers, technologiest, librarians, nurses, foreign language teachers, Early Childhood through Grade 2, and Assistant Principals were only eligible for campus awards. Some respondents perceived that the differences in eligibility and compensation were divisive for campuses. Moreover, respondents indicated that many of the non-core instructional personnel assisted in tutoring or provided instructional activities that strengthened learning objectives, and they perceived their efforts as not being valued. At the high school level, awards were based on departmental performance, and some respondents indicated that they would like to have an appropriate assessment for their subject area so they would be eligible for an individual award. Regarding eligbility, pre-and post-survey respondents indicated that more flexibility in the model was needed so that first year teachers could be included, teachers who left the district, or a more equitable way of including teachers that provided instruction to multiple campuses or multiple grade levels.

There were a number of factors that pre-post survey respondents indicated impacted student growth, the calculation of growth, and the logistical aspects of verification for growth calculations, and respondents indicated a need to either refine or include these factors in the model (10.2 percent and 9.9 percent).  Some of these included: how to incorporate staff who tutor or assist other grade level teachers, multi-grade classrooms or classrooms with less than ten students, special populations such as gifted and talented who consistently perform at the highest levels and have little room to grow, special education populations, English language learners who are testing in English for the first time and are compared to the

regular population, immigrant students, student factors such as motivation, behavior/discipline, external personal factors (death, terminal illness), and attendance ("if they aren't present, how can they learn?"), teacher-student classroom ratio, measuring the percent of contribution of a teacher towards a student, measuring early childhood growth, measuring a subject area, like science, with no previous data, school factors such as the number of at-risk students, level of parent support, language spoken in the home, socioecomic status, differences in school resources, and the date of Stanford testing (move it to later in the year).

Although 8.7 and 8.2 percent of pre-post survey responses indicated that no changes were necessary, approximately seven percent of the pre-survey responses and twelve percent of post-survey responses centered on developing other performance measures or criteria and/or appropriate assessments. This emergent category reflected the highest percentage of increase when comparing pre-post survey results (4.7 percent). Respondents indicated a need to "get away from test scores being the only measure of growth. Award teachers who consistently achieve at high levels and who effect how students perceive learning." For non-core instructional staff, respondents suggested , "…create other measures of performance so they could earn the same amount of money that the core instructional staff can earn." Teacher evaluations, principal input, teacher input, and pre-post assessments that were appropriate measures for a subject area reflected suggestions made by respondents. High school teachers providing Advanced Placement instruction indicated that they would like Advanced Placement exams to be incorporated into the model rather than using TAKS so that there is an assessment aligned with their area of instruction.  This would also permit them to be eligible for individual awards rather than only a departmental award.

When comparing pre-post survey results, the emergent category centering on *allocating more money for awards or allocating money or resources for specified groups or reallocating awards so that some groups benefit while others receive no award or their award is capped* increased by 3.6 percentage points. Non-instructional personnel, such as special education teachers or early childhood teachers, requested more money since they were not eligibile for all of the strands. After payout, some respondents indicated that TAKS teachers should receive more money, teachers providing instruction to students in low-performing schools, or teachers providing instruction to students with disabilities should receive more of an award. Alternatively, some respondents felt that the awards paid to teachers should be larger than those paid to administrators. More specifically, one respondent cited,  "*I feel more stipends should go to the teachers, not just huge bonuses to administrators who already have large salaries*."

There was an increase of 3.3 percentage points when comparing pre-to post-survey results for improving communication about the awards.  Recommendations for improvement included changing the way information about ASPIRE reaches HISD staff by incorporating multimedia pod casts and multimedia tutorials, in addition to more timely reports and through e-mail.  Based upon some of the open-ended responses, changes to the ASPIRE model need to be communicated more effectively, especially regarding eligibility.

**What was the best part of the 2006–2007 ASPIRE Award as perceived by respondents?**

Question 28 asked respondents to identify the best part of the ASPIRE Award and to support their answer with a reason. Of the 1,851 pre-surveys completed, 943 surveys (50.9 percent) provided at least one response. Of the 6,383 post-surveys completed, 1,515 (23.7 percent) provided at least one response. The data were grouped into 17 emergent categories. Since multiple responses were provided, the percentages were based on the total number of responses (N=1,062 and N=1,626).  **Table 25** presents the number and percent of responses describing the "best part" of the ASPIRE Award model.  The highest category of response for both pre-and post-surveys focused on *The idea/concept of receiving an award or receiving the award itself* (24.5 percent and 29.4 percent). The highest change when comparing pre-to-post survey results centered on a 10.4 percent increase in respondents that indicated *there was no best part* of

the ASPIRE Award program. There were two emergent categories applicable to only post-survey respondents: *communication abut the award* and *timely distribution of awards*.

Table 25.  Numbers and Percentages of Responses Describing the Best Part of the 2006–2007 ASPIRE Award

| | Pre-ASPIRE | | Post ASPIRE | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % |
| The idea/concept of receiving an award or receiving the award itself | 260 | 24.5 | 478 | 29.4 |
| Using value-added analysis/Basing model on student growth | 202 | 19.0 | 125 | 7.7 |
| The ASPIRE Award model is more inclusive/fair/better model | 97 | 9.1 | 162 | 10.0 |
| Receiving recognition/respect/acknowledgement | 71 | 6.7 | 92 | 5.7 |
| There is no best part/none/nothing | 72 | 6.8 | 280 | 17.2 |
| Not sure/Don't know | 66 | 6.2 | 17 | 1.0 |
| Supportive miscellaneous comments | 59 | 5.6 | 25 | 1.5 |
| The ASPIRE Award model is inequitable in terms of levels of compensation and eligibility/External factors impact the fairness or accuracy of the model | 59 | 5.6 | 63 | 3.9 |
| No comment/NA | 50 | 4.7 | 157 | 9.7 |
| Increases motivation/teamwork (n=38, n=48)/Decreases motivation/teamwork (n=4, n=14) | 42 | 4.0 | 62 | 3.8 |
| Not supportive miscellaneous comments | 28 | 2.6 | 25 | 1.5 |
| Student learning/success/Improving teaching/learning | 34 | 3.2 | 67 | 4.1 |
| Training was useful (n=22,n=8)/Training was a waste of time (n=0,n=3) | 22 | 2.1 | 11 | 0.7 |
| Communication about the award/program/breakdown of results/verification process/feedback survey/appeals process | - | - | 47 | 2.9 |
| The timely distribution of awards | - | - | 15 | 0.9 |
| **Total** | **1,062** | **100.0** | **1,626** | **100.0** |

# Conclusions

The purpose of the Teacher Performance-Pay Model (TPPM) and ASPIRE Award Survey was to gain insight regarding the level of knowledge and perceptions of Houston Independent School District (HISD) teachers and staff toward the first two years of implementation of growth based performance pay in HISD, as well as their perceptions regarding the overall concept of teacher performance pay. In addition, the surveys were designed to allow stakeholders to provide recommendations regarding model development and implementation of ASPIRE.

Overall, there were five key areas showing a positive direction for the ASPIRE Award program: support for the program, increase in the number of participants who received training, increase in the knowledge gained from training, an increase in the number of survey respondents, and recommendations made by respondents. First, when comparing pre-survey to post-survey results, the number of respondents increased from 1,851 to 6,383. By capturing a larger number of respondents, perceptions and feedback can be generalized to a greater degree. Based on pre-survey and post-survey results, the percentage of respondents that indicated they were *somewhat opposed* or *opposed* toward the concept of pay for performance models decreased by 9.2 percentage points after the payout of both models. There was an increase in the number of teachers and staff receiving training, and the increase in training led to an increase in their understanding of the ASPIRE model and its components.  More specifically, the

component for which the largest percentage of respondents indicated a *sufficient* level of understanding centered on understanding value-added analysis (50 percent).

Recommendations were made by respondents to improve the program.  These included, but were not limited to, issues pertaining to eligibility, factors that may impact the fairness of the model, streamlining the verification process, and requests for increased compensation.  Many of their recommendations were incorporated into the 2007–2008 model approved by the Board of Education on June 12, 2008.

# APPENDIX A

26A. Other (specify):

| | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Developing a model based upon criteria other than standardized test scores or Incorporating criteria other than standardized test scores into a model (see below for more specific criteria) | 56 | 26.8 |

Teacher Performance (teacher participation/involvement in the school/district and traditional measures):
- Leadership positions in the school and district,
- Participation in school/district committees,
- Mentoring/tutoring,
- Contact logs with parents,
- Extra duties,
- Special awards/recognition received by the teacher and the school,
- Direct sponsorship for extracurricular activities,
- PDAS scores,
- Professional development,
- Educational degree(s),
- Teaching experience (content or special population),
- Years of teaching experience,
- Number of teacher preparations, and
- Number of students taught, and teacher performance.

School Characteristics
- School climate,
- Low SES/low achieving students,
- Accountability rating,
- High school graduation rates,
- Increase in IB diploma candidates,
- Student attendance,
- Parent/ community involvement.

Student Characteristics
- Promotion status,
- Student attendance,
- Student conduct, and
- Student grades.

Appropriate Assessments relative to academic ability or content area
- Teacher assessments for electives,
- End of Course exams per teacher in every area not just core,
- Portfolio,
- Authentic assessments,
- Assessments appropriate for G/T population

Growth at the grade level (teams)/Department level

Teachers set performance goals

Negotiation

| | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Pay raise across the board | 32 | 15.3 |
| Equitability regarding levels of compensation and eligibility | 23 | 11.0 |
| No model | 20 | 9.6 |
| Student growth at the classroom level | 19 | 9.1 |
| Factors Impacting the model | 18 | 8.6 |
| Campus growth | 12 | 5.7 |
| Passing Rates (TAKS) | 10 | 4.8 |
| Miscellaneous | 9 | 4.3 |
| Student Achievement | 7 | 3.3 |
| Don't Know/Not Sure | 3 | 1.4 |
| **Total** | **209** | **100.0** |

# APPENDIX A

27. If you could change one thing about the 2006–2007 ASPIRE Award, what would it be? How would you change it?

|  | N | % |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Equitability regarding levels of compensation and eligibility | 299 | 27.0 |
| Factors impacting student academic growth/calculation of growth | 113 | 10.2 |
| No change/Nothing/None | 96 | 8.7 |
| Other performance measures or criteria/appropriate assessment | 79 | 7.1 |
| More money allocated for awards/allocate money or resources for specified group(s) | 78 | 7.0 |
| miscellaneous | 75 | 6.8 |
| No comment/NA | 62 | 5.6 |
| Not sure/Don't Know | 54 | 4.9 |
| No model | 50 | 4.5 |
| Put it in salaries/raises | 40 | 3.6 |
| Improve training/Provide clearer explanations | 30 | 2.7 |
| Too complex-simplify model and explanation | 23 | 2.1 |
| Student growth only (classroom-based) | 21 | 1.9 |
| Student growth based on campus-wide rates | 16 | 1.4 |
| Time of payout | 16 | 1.4 |
| Improve communication about awards | 16 | 1.4 |
| Not just test scores | 15 | 1.4 |
| level of aggregation (student, teacher, grade, department, campus) | 14 | 1.3 |
| Keep award results confidential | 11 | 1.0 |
| **Total** | **1,108** | **100.0** |

28. What is the best part of the **2006–2007 ASPIRE Award**, and why?

|  | N | % |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Receiving money/award/reward | 260 | 23.9 |
| Using value-added analysis/Basing model on student growth | 202 | 18.6 |
| The ASPIRE Award model is more inclusive/fair/better model | 97 | 8.9 |
| Receiving recognition/respect/acknowledgement | 71 | 6.5 |
| There is no best part/none/nothing | 68 | 6.3 |
| Not sure | 66 | 6.1 |
| Supportive miscellaneous comments | 60 | 5.5 |
| No comment | 50 | 4.6 |
| The ASPIRE Award model is inequitable in terms of levels of compensation and eligibility/unfair | 46 | 4.2 |
| Increases motivation (n=38)/Decreases motivation (n=4) | 42 | 3.9 |
| Not supportive miscellaneous comments | 38 | 3.5 |
| student learning/success/improving teaching/learning 1 negative) | 33 | 3.0 |
| Training | 22 | 2.0 |
| External factors impact the ASPIRE Award model | 10 | 0.9 |
| **Total** | **1,065** | **100.0** |