

# Report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee

Review Incentive Award Structure of the ABCs of Public Education (Preliminary Report)

2006 Session of the General Assembly Senate Bill 1741, Section 7.6.(c)

Date Due: December 15, 2006

Report #25

DPI Chronological Schedule, 2006-2007

# STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

**HOWARD N. LEE** 

Chairman :: Raleigh

SHIRLEY E. HARRIS

Trov

JOHN TATE III

Charlotte

JANE P. NORWOOD

Vice Chair :: Charlotte

**MELISSA E. BARTLETT** 

Raleigh

PATRICIA N. WILLOUGHBY

Raleigh

KATHY A. TAFT

Greenville

**ROBERT "TOM" SPEED** 

Boone

**BEVERLY PERDUE** 

Lieutenant Governor :: New

Bern

MICHELLE HOWARD-VITAL

Wilmington

**WAYNE MCDEVITT** 

Asheville

**RICHARD MOORE** 

State Treasurer :: Kittrell

**EDGAR D. MURPHY** 

Durham

## NC DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

June St. Clair Atkinson, Ed.D., State Superintendent

301 N. Wilmington Street :: Raleigh, North Carolina 27601-2825

In compliance with federal law, NC Public Schools administers all state-operated educational programs,

employment activities and admissions without discrimination because of race, religion, national or ethnic origin, color, age, military service, disability, or gender, except where exemption is appropriate and allowed by law.

## Inquiries or complaints regarding discrimination issues should be directed to:

Dr. Elsie C. Leak, Associate Superintendent :: Office of Curriculum and School Reform Services 6307 Mail Service Center :: Raleigh, NC 27699-6307 :: Telephone 919-807-3761 :: Fax 919-807-3767

Visit us on the Web:: www.ncpublicschools.org Charge to the State Board of Education (SBE) The General Assembly in Section 7.6.(c) of Senate Bill 1741 of the 2006 Session, stated:

The State Board of Education shall review the incentive award structure described in this section to ensure that extraordinary performance is rewarded. In addition, the Board shall determine whether the relationship between awards for teachers and teacher assistants and the Board's strategic priorities is appropriate. The Board shall provide a preliminary report of its findings and recommendations to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee by December 15, 2006. (See Appendix A for the full text of Section 7.6 (a) through (c).)

# **Background**

The State Board of Education (SBE) developed the ABCs of Public Education in response to the School-Based Management and Accountability Program enacted by the General Assembly in June 1996. The program focuses on strong Accountability, teaching the Basics with an emphasis on high educational standards, and maximum local Control.

In 2002-03, the ABCs program was expanded to incorporate the new statutory accountability requirements of No Child Left Behind (NCLB). This federal legislation sets a proficiency goal of 100% for all schools by 2013-14. The SBE adopted AYP as a "closing the achievement gap component" of the ABCs in response to General Statute 115C-105.35.

The ABCs accountability program sets growth and performance standards for each elementary, middle, and high school in the state. End-of-Grade (EOG) and End-of-Course (EOC) test results and other selected components are used to measure a school's growth and performance. Schools that attain the standards are eligible for incentive awards or other recognition, i.e., Honor Schools of Excellence, Schools of Excellence, Schools of Distinction and Schools of Progress. Priority Schools may request assistance from the Department of Public Instruction. Schools where growth and performance fall below specified levels are designated as low-performing, and may receive mandated assistance based on action by the SBE.

#### **Current Incentive Structure**

- 1. Incentive awards in schools that achieve higher than expected improvements (initially referred to as making Exemplary Growth, later changed to High Growth) may be up to:
  - a. One thousand five hundred dollars (\$1,500) for each teacher and for certified personnel; and
  - b. Five hundred dollars (\$500.00) for each teacher assistant.
- 2. Incentive awards in schools that meet the expected improvements (referred to as making Expected Growth) may be up to:

- a. Seven hundred fifty dollars (\$750.00) for each teacher and for certified personnel; and
- b. Three hundred seventy-five dollars (\$375.00) for each teacher assistant.

# **Findings**

- 1. The initial ABCs legislation mandated that only certified staff (and teacher assistants) in schools that made Exemplary Growth would receive incentive awards (initially \$1,000 for certified staff and \$500 for teacher assistants).
- 2. Starting with the second year of operations of the ABCs, the General Assembly expanded the pool of eligible recipients for incentive awards to include certified staff and teacher assistants that were in schools that made Expected Growth. (See Appendix B for the number and percentages of schools making Expected and High Growth (and other classification designations) over the ten year period of the ABCs Program.
- 3. The standards for Expected Growth are at a lower level than for High Growth. Therefore, one would not consider the schools that made Expected Growth to have demonstrated "extraordinary performance."
- 4. The underlying premise of the ABCs program is to reward ALL certified staff in the schools that make either Expected or High Growth. This would encourage staff to share ideas of the best ways to teach students. It would foster the integration of the curriculum so that teachers, other than just those assigned to teach reading and mathematics in grades 3-8, would have a vested interest in seeing that students' reading and mathematics skills are enhanced through the other content areas.
- 5. Because of the underlying premise stated in number 4 above, the possibility exists for some "less successful" teachers to receive incentive awards in some schools while "more successful" teachers do not receive incentive awards in other schools.
- 6. Changing the system to award individual certified staff (and teacher assistants) rather than all certified staff (and teacher assistants) in a school that meets its growth expectation would involve the evaluation of pros and cons for making such a change and conducting a review of the research literature and this would take more time to complete.
- 7. The SBE's Future-Ready Strategic Plan includes goals such as
  - a. NC public schools will produce globally competitive students.
  - b. NC public schools will be led by 21<sup>st</sup> Century professionals.
  - c. NC public school students will be healthy and responsible.
  - d. Leadership will guide innovation in NC public schools.
  - e. NC public schools will be governed and supported by 21st Century systems.

The current system of providing incentive awards aligns with these priorities although more stakeholder input is needed to determine what changes, if any, could enhance the alignment.

8. Recent policy changes approved by the SBE will affect the ABCs Accountability Program at the high school level. These changes include the new high school exit standards and the move to a core course of study for graduation. The SBE will need to revise the ABCs Accountability Program in light of these changes and this will require more time to review options. The SBE could include a discussion of the

incentive structure award system as part of the process and a report of its recommendations can be presented to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee at a later point in time.

# APPENDIX A

# FUNDS TO IMPLEMENT THE ABCS OF PUBLIC EDUCATION

**SECTION 7.6.(a)** The State Board of Education shall use funds appropriated in this act for State Aid to Local School Administrative Units to provide incentive funding for schools that met or exceeded the projected levels of improvement in student performance during the 2005-2006 school year, in accordance with the ABCs of Public Education Program. In accordance with State Board of Education policy:

- (1) Incentive awards in schools that achieve higher than expected improvements may be up to:
  - a. One thousand five hundred dollars (\$1,500) for each teacher and for certified personnel; and
  - b. Five hundred dollars (\$500.00) for each teacher assistant.
- (2) Incentive awards in schools that meet the expected improvements may be up to:
  - a. Seven hundred fifty dollars (\$750.00) for each teacher and for certified personnel; and
  - b. Three hundred seventy-five dollars (\$375.00) for each teacher assistant.

SECTION 7.6.(b) Notwithstanding G.S. 143-23, the State Board of Education may use funds appropriated to the Department of Public Instruction and to the State Public School Fund to establish a consolidated, comprehensive program through which to provide assistance to low-performing schools. For this purpose only, the Board may, with approval from the Office of State Budget and Management, transfer funds between personal service and nonpersonal service line items currently supporting positions, related operating costs, and contracts for school improvement teams and for assistance teams. Funds transferred pursuant to this section shall not be used to raise the salary of existing employees.

The Board shall report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee and the Joint Legislative Commission on Governmental Operations by January 15, 2007, on any restructuring of the assistance program pursuant to this section.

SECTION 7.6.(c) The State Board of Education shall review the incentive award structure described in this section to ensure that extraordinary performance is rewarded. In addition, the Board shall determine whether the relationship between awards for teachers and teacher assistants and the Board's strategic priorities is appropriate. The Board shall provide a preliminary report of its findings and recommendations to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee by December 15, 2006.

(2006 Session of the General Assembly Senate Bill 1741)

# APPENDIX B

Ten -Year Summary Chart 1996-97 to 2005-06 (December 7, 2006) ABCs Results<sup>1</sup>

								ž Č	cemb	5 50 20 7	1996-97 to 2005-06 (December 7, 2006)										Revise	Revised
(	the model acreflected in the footnotes below:	3				1		, often	100	to the	, interest	m of H	pom o	130 [0]	effecte	d in th	e footn	otes be	low.		Model	F 2
9	1996-97	-012	Loss II	1997-98	-36-	ne maa	66-866I	.66	1999-00	8	2000-01		2001-02	Ş.	200	2002-03	200	2003-04 F. 8/HS	2004-05 K-8/HS	004-05" K-8/HS	2005-06 <sup>11</sup> K-8/HS	HS HS
	00 M	00	60 14	6a	HS		K-8'HS	HS	N-WHS	£	N-8/25	2	P-0-US	2	4	3	4			9	,	1
	#	9/6	:11:	2	#	9%	n	%	11	06	at:	°.	u		11:	ě	H	e	ı	20	ŧ	20
Honor Schools of																	563	15.2	496	22.0	\$	2.7
Crhaole of Twoollanes	2	0.3	24	4	0	00	50	2.5	in E	5	171	0,	300	13.7	473	21.3	33	1	4	1.9	'n	0.2
Schools of Distinction	158	6	289	16.8		0.2	408	20.6	509	24.1	040	79.7	647	29.5	886	39.9	949	28.7	808	27.0	305	13.0
Schools Making High Growth	531	32.5	1137	0.99	265	63.2	1156	58.2	956	45.2	521	24.1	779	35.5	1618	72.9	785	35.2	585	26.0	263	11.2
Schools Making Expected Growth	395	24.2	308	17.9	83	19.8	456	33.0	520	24.6	769	35.6	863	39.3	476	21.4	891	39.9	9.75 4	43.2	1013	43.1
Schools Not Making Expected Growth	706	£1.	276	16.0	\$3	15.5	371	18.7	639	30.3	\$65	40.1	552	25.2	127	5.7	556	24.9	90	30.8	1077	45.8
Low-Performing Schools	123	7.5	15	60	15	3.6	13	0.3	#	2.1	31	*	10	0.0	0	9	2	0.1	4	6	22	7.7
Made Expected or High Growth	976	926 56.7	345	83.9	348	83.1	1612	81.2	1476	8.69	1290	59.7		1642 74.8	2004	94.3	1676	75.1	1559	69.2	127	54.2
Total ABCs Schools	1632	2	1722	2	419	Ď	1985	12	2115	15	2158	28	215	71St	딤	2221	22	2232	12	2254	2353	23
2000	4	4	-	1							١		١	١	١	١						

ABCs wanter for 1996-97, 1997-98, 1998-99, 1999-00, 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03, and 2003-04 rathert State Board of Education actions through October 2, 1997, October 7, 1999, October 7, 1999, October 5, 2007, and December 7, 2005, respectively.

 $<sup>^2</sup>$  The first year of implementation of the ABCs was in 1996-97; cmly K-8 schools was included in the model

<sup>11</sup>s ABC high school model was first implemented in 1997-98. (Schools whose grained K-12 owes included in schicked summaries for both K-8 and high 1theols, 10 thurs is depleading in these counts.)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>the comprehensive ABCs model has been applied since 1998-99; thus is no depticative in those commit. Income Schools of Excellence, approved by the SBE in 2003-04, news to Schools of Excellence that met ATP.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>Beginning in 2002, Schools of Distoration was required to make at least expected growth for the first time.

<sup>8</sup> sobools Not Meding Espained Growth was inclined in two categories price to 1902: Schools Receiving No Recognition and Low Performing Schools. High Growth was reduced to as Rumplary Growth paint to 2002.

Proof APC. Behods is the total expects participating in the ABCs for a given year, the total does not reflect the total active column; Schools of Eurodiese, Schools of Dutherton, and Lon-Performing Schools are not

exclusive casegories and may include schools that expent in other categories.

10.All tools for 2004-05 do not include grade 6 reading in growth calculations, however, grade 6 reading is used in performance composite calculations.

11. Secular for 2005-06 are based on a revised accommbility model and new not comparable to those from previous years.