

District Awards for Teacher Excellence (D.A.T.E.) Program: Final Evaluation Report (2010). Springer, M.G., Lewis, J.L., Ehlert, M.W., Podgursky, M.J., Crader, G.D., Taylor, L.L., Gronberg, T.J., Jansen, D.W., Lopez, O.S., Stuit, D.A. Nashville, TN: National Center on Performance Incentives at Vanderbilt University.

This report presents findings from the final D.A.T.E. program evaluation, which describes the experiences and outcomes for Cycle 1 districts participating in the first two years of the program. Findings focus on the decisions made by districts whether or not to participate in the program, the local design preferences of D.A.T.E. incentive pay plans, and the program's influence on teachers and students (i.e., student achievement gains, teacher turnover, and educator attitudes and practice). An overview of key evaluation findings presented in this final evaluation report follows. First, information regarding actual dissemination of incentive awards to teachers is presented. This is followed by key findings from analysis of the program's impact on students and teachers. Finally, background information on program participation decisions and implementation experiences, the design of D.A.T.E. incentive pay plans, and educator and administrator attitudes about D.A.T.E. incentive plans is presented.

To view the entire report, please [click here](#).

Note: See Chapter 9 for educator attitudes and perceptions

Teacher Pay for Performance: Experimental Evidence from the Project on Incentives in Teaching (2010). Springer, M.G., Ballou, D., Hamilton, L., Le, V., Lockwood, J.R., McCaffrey, D., Pepper, M., and Stecher, B. Nashville, TN: National Center on Performance Incentives at Vanderbilt University.

The Project on Incentives in Teaching (POINT) was a three-year study conducted in the Metropolitan Nashville School System from 2006-07 through 2008-09, in which middle school mathematics teachers voluntarily participated in a controlled experiment to assess the effect of financial rewards for teachers whose students showed unusually large gains on standardized tests. The experiment was intended to test the notion that rewarding teachers for improved scores would cause scores to rise. It was up to participating teachers to decide what, if anything, they needed to do to raise student performance: participate in more professional development, seek coaching, collaborate with other teachers, or simply reflect on their practices. Thus, POINT was focused on the notion that a significant problem in American education is the absence of appropriate incentives, and that correcting the incentive structure would, in and of itself, constitute an effective intervention that improved student outcomes

By and large, results did not confirm this hypothesis. While the general trend in middle school mathematics performance was upward over the period of the project, students of teachers randomly assigned to the treatment group (eligible for bonuses) did not outperform students whose teachers

were assigned to the control group (not eligible for bonuses). The brightest spot was a positive effect of incentives detected in fifth grade during the second and third years of the experiment. This finding, which is robust to a variety of alternative estimation methods, is nonetheless of limited policy significance, for as yet this effect does not appear to persist after students leave fifth grade. Students whose fifth grade teacher was in the treatment group performed no better by the end of sixth grade than did sixth graders whose teacher the year before was in the control group. However, we will continue to investigate this finding as further data become available, and it may be that evidence of persistence will appear among later cohorts.

To read the executive summary, please [click here](#).

To view the entire report, please [click here](#).

An Interim Evaluation of Teacher and Principal Experiences During the Pilot Phase of AISD REACH. (2009).

Burns, S.F., Gardner, C.D., and Meeuwsen, J. National Center on Performance Incentives: Policy Evaluation Report. Nashville, TN.

This interim report provides an independent evaluation of Austin Independent School District's pay for performance program, REACH. Implemented in nine pilot schools in 2007-2008 and an additional two schools in 2008-2009, REACH targets three key areas: student growth, professional growth, and recruitment and retention of teachers and principals at highest needs schools. REACH combines an outcome-based pay for performance component based on student achievement measures with two input-based components – one for professional development and another for teaching in hard to staff schools. This interim, independent evaluation is designed to offer feedback about teacher and principal experiences with REACH and provide recommendations to inform the scaling-up of the program.

To view the entire report, please [click here](#).

Texas Educator Excellence Grant (TEEG) Program: Year Three Evaluation (2009).

Springer, M.G., Lewis, J.L., Podgursky, M.J., Ehlert, M.W., Gronberg, T.J., Hamilton, L.S., Jansen, D.W., Stecher, B.S., Taylor, L.L., Lopez, O.S., and Peng, A. Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency.

The Texas Educator Excellence Grant (TEEG) program was state-funded and provided annual grants to schools to design and implement performance pay plans during the 2006-07 to 2009-10 school year. This report builds on the previous TEEG evaluation reports, presenting findings from three years of the TEEG program. Overall, the report discusses the participation decisions of eligible schools, the implementation experiences of TEEG participants, the manner in which performance pay plans were designed, and the program's outcomes. Findings suggest that school and personnel characteristics, the criteria used to select schools into the TEEG program, and the plan design features of TEEG schools'

performance pay plans influenced many outcomes of interest. The attitudes and behaviors of school personnel, school environment, and teacher turnover were certainly affected by these factors. However, evidence suggests that there is no strong, systematic treatment effect of TEEG on student achievement gains. Nor are there consistent associations between TEEG plan design features and student achievement gains.

To view the entire report, please [click here](#).

Note: See Chapters 6 & 7 for educator attitudes and perceptions

Governor's Educator Excellence Grant (GEEG) Program: Year Three Evaluation (2009).

Springer, M.G., Lewis, J.L., Podgursky, M.J., Ehlert, M.W., Taylor, L.L., Lopez, O.S., and Peng, A. Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency.

This report presents findings from the third-year evaluation of the Governor's Educator Excellence Grant (GEEG) program. The GEEG program was federally- and state-funded and provided three-year grants to schools to design and implement performance pay plans from the 2005-06 to 2007-08 school years. GEEG was implemented in 99 high poverty, high performing Texas public schools.

This report builds on the previous GEEG evaluation reports, presenting findings from a three-year evaluation of the program. Overall, the report discusses the implementation experiences of GEEG program participants, paying close attention to the manner in which participating schools designed their performance pay plans, and program outcomes. Findings suggest that school and personnel characteristics and GEEG plan design features influenced many of the outcomes of interest for evaluating the GEEG program. The attitudes and behaviors of school personnel, school environment, and teacher turnover were certainly affected by these factors. However, there is limited evidence that GEEG had an effect on student achievement gains, and no evidence that GEEG plan design features influenced student achievement gains. Examination of GEEG's impact on student achievement is limited by the criteria for selecting schools into the program, other state-funded performance pay programs operating concurrently with GEEG, and the likely volatility of student performance measures available to measure student performance outcomes.

To view the entire report, please [click here](#).

Note: See Chapters 5 & 6 for educator attitudes and perceptions

Governor's Educator Excellence Grant (GEEG) Program: Year Two Evaluation (2009).

Springer, M.G., Lewis, J.L., Podgursky, M.J., Ehlert, M.W., Taylor, L.L., Lopez, O.S., and Peng, A. Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency.

This report presents findings from the second-year evaluation of the Governor's Educator Excellence Grant (GEEG) program. The GEEG program was federally- and state-funded and provided three-year

grants to schools to design and implement performance pay plans from the 2005-06 to 2007-08 school years. GEEG was implemented in 99 high poverty, high performing Texas public schools.

Overall, the report discusses the implementation experiences of GEEG program participants, paying close attention to the manner in which participating schools designed their performance pay plans and the program outcomes from those plans. The contents of this report addresses each of the following questions: (1). What is the national and state policy context – especially in regards to the use of performance pay programs – in which the GEEG program operates?; (2). What is the nature of performance pay plans developed by GEEG participants?; (3). What are the attitudes and behavior of school personnel in GEEG schools?; and (4). How do GEEG participation and design features of GEEG plans influence teacher turnover and student achievement gains?

To view the entire report, please [click here](#).

Note: See Chapter 6 for educator attitudes and perceptions

New York City's School-Wide Bonus Pay Program: Early Evidence From a Randomized Trial (2009). Springer, M.G., and Winters, M.A. NCPI Working Paper Series No. 2009-02. Nashville, TN.

In this paper, we examine the impact of New York City's School-Wide Performance Bonus Program (SPBP) on student outcomes and the school learning environment. The SPBP is a pay-for-performance program that was implemented in approximately 200 K-12 public schools midway into the 2007-08 school year. Participating schools can earn bonus awards of up to \$3,000 per full-time union member working at the school if the school meets performance targets defined by the city's accountability program. Our sample includes 186 SPBP-eligible elementary, K-8, and middle schools and 137 control-condition schools in New York City over a two-year period. Overall, we find that the SPBP had little impact on student proficiency or school environment in its first year. However, it is important to remember the short-run results reported in this study provide only very limited evidence of the SPBP's effectiveness. An evaluation of the program's impact after two years should provide more meaningful information about the impact of the SPBP.

To view the entire report, please [click here](#).

Texas Educator Excellence Grant (TEEG) Program: Year Two Evaluation (2008). Springer, M.G., Podgursky, M.J., Lewis, J.L., Ehlert, M., Gronberg, T.J., Hamilton, L.S., Jansen, D.W., Lopez, O.S., Peng, A., Stecher, B., and Taylor, L.L. Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency.

This report presents findings from the second year of a multi-year evaluation of the Texas Educator Excellence Grant (TEEG) program and background information about the design and implementation of the District Awards for Teacher Excellence (DATE) program. The TEEG and DATE programs

operating in Texas make up the largest state-funded performance pay system in U.S. public education. Starting in the 2006-07 school year, the TEEG program operates annually in more than 1,000 schools, while 203 districts implemented district-wide performance pay plans using DATE funds in the 2008-09 school year.

Report findings suggest that school and personnel characteristics, schools' participation patterns in the TEEG program, and design features of schools' performance pay plans influence program outcomes. The attitudes and behaviors of school personnel and teacher turnover are certainly influenced by these factors. While evidence on any relationship between plan design features and student achievement gains is currently inconclusive, further analysis using additional years of data will continue to examine this matter.

Overall, the TEEG and DATE programs provide unique opportunities to learn about the differential effects performance pay plans have on the attitudes and experiences of school personnel, organizational dynamics within schools, teacher turnover, and student achievement gains.

To view the entire report, please [click here](#).

Note: See Chapters 9 & 10 for educator attitudes and perceptions

Teacher Attitudes on Pay for Performance: Evidence from Hillsborough County, Florida (2008). Jacob, B. and Springer, M. 2008 NCPI Conference, **Performance Incentives: Their Growing Impact on American K-12 Education.**

This study examines teacher attitudes toward PFP policies, and how these views vary by teacher experience, subject area specialization, grade level(s) taught, educational background, risk and time preferences, and feelings of efficacy. Data were collected through a voluntary, online survey instrument fielded over a two-week period at the end of the 2006-2007 school year. The sample comprised all full-time instructional personnel in 199 traditional public and magnet schools in a large, urban school district in Florida. Results suggest only modest support for PFP policies among teachers. We detect some association between teacher demographics and views on PFP policies. Moreover, we find that teachers who have a more positive view of their principals' leadership ability and more confidence in their own teaching ability are more supportive of incentive pay. In addition, teachers who are more risk-seeking and who have higher discount rates express support for incentive pay. Finally, we find that teachers appear to have very little understanding of how the two most recent PFP initiatives in Florida operate.

To view the entire report, please [click here](#).

Performance Incentives in Texas: Why Schools Chose Not to Participate (2008). Lewis, J., and Springer, M. NCPI Working Paper Series No. 2008-18. Nashville, TN.

This study examines why 51 schools declined in invitation to participate in a state-funded educator incentive initiative, the Texas Educator Excellence Grant (TEEG) program. Using data from an ongoing evaluation of the TEEG program conducted by the National Center on Performance Incentives (NCPI) under contract with Texas Education Agency, this article examines reservations that school leaders expressed about participating in the program. Findings suggest that schools' decisions were less about outright opposition to performance incentive policies in education and more about the interplay between a school's organizational context and particular features of the TEEG program. Specific concerns included that: (1) guidelines for distributing awards to school personnel were inequitable; (2) performance incentives might be detrimental to a school's culture; (3) the school selection process did not recognize other teachers' or schools' contribution to students' academic success; and (4) time demands and technical expertise needed to implement the program outweighed perceived benefits. Many school leaders described these concerns as being even more problematic in small districts and schools. Future efforts to implement similar programs should consider the appropriate balance between state guidelines and local flexibility, clearly communicate program guidelines and regulations, offer technical assistance, and allow sufficient time for schools to plan their educator incentive programs.

To view the entire report, please [click here](#).

Texas Educator Excellence Grant (TEEG) Program: Year One Evaluation (2007).

Springer, M.G., Podgursky, M., Lewis, J.L., Ehlert, M.W., Ghosh-Dastidar, B., Gronberg, T.J., Hamilton, L.S., Jansen, D.W., Lopez, O., Patterson, C.H., Stecher, B.M., and Taylor, L.L.
Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency.

This report presents findings stemming from the first-year evaluation of the Texas Educator Excellence Grant (TEEG) program, one of several statewide performance incentive programs in Texas. In June 2006, Governor Perry and the 79th Texas Legislature created the Governor's Educator Excellence Award Program, one component of which is the TEEG program. TEEG Cycle 1 provided approximately \$100 million in noncompetitive, 12-month grants to over 1,100 public schools. Schools eligible to participate had records of academic success and high percentages of economically disadvantaged students.

More specifically, this report provides an overview of TEEG school selection criteria, program design features of schools' locally-designed performance incentive plans, teachers' attitudes and behaviors in TEEG schools, and interviews with schools that decided not to participate in TEEG.

Preliminary findings during the first year of TEEG implementation indicate that many of the traditional arguments against performance incentive policies, namely the negative impact on teacher collaboration and instructional quality, were not reported by teachers in Cycle 1 schools. While these

findings do offer insight into the early experiences of educators, authors caution that it is too soon to attribute those findings to the TEEG program itself.

To view the entire report, please [click here](#).

Note: See Chapter 6 for educator attitudes and perceptions

Governor's Educator Excellence Grant (GEEG) Program: Year One Evaluation Report (2007).
Springer, M.G., Podgurksy, M., Lewis, J.L., Ehlert, M.W., Gardner, C.D., Ghosh-Dastidar, B., Lopez, O., Patterson, C.H., and Taylor, L.L. Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency.

This report presents findings stemming from the first-year evaluation of the Governor's Educator Excellence Grant (GEEG) program, one of several statewide performance incentive programs in Texas. In the fall of 2006, the GEEG program made available non-competitive, three-year grants to 99 schools ranging from \$60,000 to \$220,000 per year. Grants were distributed to schools that were rated as high performing campuses in addition to having high proportions of economically disadvantaged students. More specifically, this report provides an overview of GEEG programs in 99 schools; the strategies used by schools to reward the performance of teachers and staff; and the apparent impact on schools' organizational dynamics, teachers' attitudes, and teachers' professional practice.

Overall findings about GEEG programs seem to abate the traditional critiques raised against performance incentive programs. Specifically, performance incentive programs appear to be having an encouraging impact on schools' organizational dynamics, teachers' perceptions of performance incentives, and teachers' instructional practice. Nonetheless, it is too soon to conclude that these outcomes are attributable to the inception of GEEG. Additionally, there is still much to be learned about the quality of schools' program designs and the impact of program characteristics on outcomes of teacher behavior, school culture, teacher workforce trends, and student achievement.

To view the entire report, please [click here](#).

Note: See Chapter 5 for educator attitudes and perceptions