

*Universal
files*

INTRODUCTION

Our American school system is an expression of the value we hold for education for all who wish to avail themselves of it, and it provides a social process of opportunity for all children. But public -- and governmental -- concern has often been like a roller coaster ride: sudden ascents and even more rapid declines. Too often we as a people have failed to adequately finance our schools, then criticized them for not training students as we hoped. We have blamed our schools for not doing enough, while blaming them equally for trying to do too much. Where there is illiteracy, it is the school which is to blame. Where there is social unrest, youth unemployment, drug and alcohol abuse, we tend to say that it is the fault of the school.

We are one of the leading nations in agricultural production, manufacturing, high technology, medicine, the arts, banking and other fields, yet the schools are not appropriately accorded their share of the credit for these achievements. We should do more to applaud our successes. Outstanding performances in mathematics in classrooms from Montgomery County, Maryland, to East Los Angeles, California, do not make headlines, nor does the mainstreaming of handicapped students. We too easily ignore the increased integration of student bodies in colleges and universities, and we do not relate that to what has been good in our elementary and secondary schools. We tend to concentrate our attention on the failures.

But there can be no denying that there are serious problems, and if we fail to confront those problems we shall imperil the future economy and security of this country. Those problems vary from homes that do not encourage study to a curriculum that is not adequate in its challenge. But the one essential ingredient for a superior educational opportunity is a talented, dedicated teacher. Yet we pay teachers less than most professionals.

AVERAGE SALARY OF EMPLOYEES
IN SELECTED WHITE COLLAR OCCUPATIONS
IN PRIVATE ESTABLISHMENTS, MARCH 1982

Occupation	Average Annual Salary	Occupational Class Avg. Entry to Top Level
Accountant	\$26,306	\$18,260-48,549
Attorney-Salaried	43,249	25,162-76,202
Programmers/Analysts	24,809	17,535-35,430
Chemist	32,844	19,640-53,658
Engineer	34,745	23,622-62,494
Drafters	19,816	11,739-25,909
Computer Operators	16,231	11,896-23,267
Secretary	16,539	14,000-21,546
Typists	11,915	10,893-13,723
Teachers	18,945	12,966-23,437

Source: Calculations based on White Collar Salaries, March 1982, U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Moreover, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching recently reported that the percentage of public elementary and secondary school expenditures for teaching have dropped from 49 percent to 41 percent in the last ten years. In the 1973-74 school year, the United States spent \$43.7 billion on instruction in the public schools; \$21.4 billion went to teacher salaries. Last year public school expenditures for the nation added up to \$106 billion. Teacher salaries made up \$43.9 billion of the total. While education expenditures have gone up, the proportion of the money spent on teacher salaries has fallen, and the proportion of the instructional dollar earmarked for other services and personnel has increased.

What statement does our nation make when podiatrists are required to study longer, face much more vigorous career entrance tests, and are paid considerably more than teachers? What statement do we make when we offer teachers few incentives and inadequate compensation but constantly increase their responsibilities? What statement does our nation make when we fail to convey the simple message to students, their parents and teachers that education is important?

School administrators and boards of education must help create an atmosphere in which education can thrive and learning is encouraged and respected. That means fewer excuses to cut classes, fewer interruptions by public address systems and less scheduling of events that reduce classroom time. Teachers sense that a school administration believes their role is important not only with the salary level offered, but also when they feel the "little" actions by a school administration support the teachers' activities and educational endeavors.

Education is an opportunity, but it is an opportunity which requires partnership -- among levels of government, the community, parents, teachers and students. If we are "a nation at risk" as stated in the recent National Commission on Excellence in Education report -- and we share their serious concerns about educational deficiencies -- then the risk is posed not only by educational systems, but by this nation walking the path of indifference, lack of commitment and inadequate funding. However, there is today substantial evidence that the American public wants to improve our schools and that they are willing to pay the bill.

BACKGROUND AND FINDINGS

On June 17, 1983, Representative Carl Perkins, Chairman of the Education and Labor Committee of the House of Representatives, appointed a Task Force on Merit Pay to review the issue of merit pay for educators and issue a report. The Task Force membership is both independent and bipartisan, with seventeen of the twenty-one members from the private sector. Those appointed were:

U. S. Rep. Paul Simon, Chairman, D-Ill.
U. S. Rep. William F. Goodling, Vice-Chairman, R-Pa.
U. S. Rep. E. Thomas Coleman, R-Mo.
U. S. Rep. Ron Wyden, D-Ore.

LeRoy Hay, 1983 National Teacher of the Year, Manchester, Conn.
Jaime Escalante, Mathematics Teacher, Los Angeles, Calif.

State Senator Robert Martin, Kentucky
Former Governor Albert Quie, Minnesota

Ernest Boyer, President, Carnegie Foundation for the
Advancement of Teaching
Anne Flowers, President, American Association of Colleges
of Teacher Education

Elaine Stienkemeyer, President, National P.T.A.

Mary Hatwood Futrell, President, National Education
Association

Albert Shanker, President, American Federation of Teachers

James Sanders, President, Illinois School Boards
Association

Raymond Barber, Superintendent of Public Instruction,
Commonwealth of Kentucky

Leslie R. Fisher, Superintendent of Public Instruction,
State of Oklahoma

Floretta McKenzie, Superintendent, District of Columbia
Public Schools

Wilson Riles, Former Superintendent of Public Instruction,
State of California

Frank Tracy, Principal, High Point High School,
Beltsville, Maryland

Paul Salmon, Executive Director, American Association of
School Administrators

Robert L. Smith, Executive Director, Council for American
Private Education

The Task Force heard witnesses from three major commissions on education which had recently issued reports, in addition to receiving testimony from Governors, State Legislators, deans of schools of education, students, teachers, principals and school board members.

Witnesses who came before the Task Force agreed that our educational system is confronting a crisis in the number of high quality teachers entering and remaining in the profession. Low salaries for elementary and secondary school teachers have always been the dominant pattern of compensation in this nation, but the problem is now worsening. Women and minorities serving in the field of teaching have provided a form of controlled,

in-kind subsidy to public education. However, expanding opportunities for women and minorities in other professions have decreased this traditional pool of teacher candidates.

Students are not being encouraged to become teachers. Far too often the ablest young people feel challenged by opportunities in law, medicine and engineering rather than teaching. Academic scores for education majors, measured by college entrance examinations and grade point averages, show a marked decline over the last decade. Although test scores measure talent, they cannot gauge qualities such as dedication and love for children. But it is probable that these latter qualities are present in the same numbers among students with high test scores as among students with low test scores. The fact that some of these qualities are difficult to measure should not be used to camouflage a major educational problem in the nation. Too often we are not attracting the finest students to teaching, and too often we are not keeping the finest teachers. These generalized truths, however, should not detract from another reality: we are still attracting and keeping many fine teachers. They deserve our gratitude, and they deserve it in more concrete terms than they are now receiving it.

Teachers should not be the sole focus of questions about the quality of education. Social problems, such as drug and alcohol abuse, have disrupted the education process. Changing family patterns have created additional problems for the educational system. Lower college admission standards have led to reduced high school graduation requirements. The Carnegie Foundation for

the Advancement of Teaching has found that electives and courses that demand too little of students have multiplied, while the number of courses required for all students has declined and attendance at the more academically rigorous classes has fallen. A host of other things could be mentioned.

Yet the key educational role played by teachers suggests that the most rapid improvement in education may be made by upgrading that profession. In recent months, policy makers and educators have increased their interest in merit pay as one method to attract and retain the most able teachers.

EXISTING OR PROPOSED MERIT PAY OR CAREER LADDER PLANS

Existing or proposed plans of performance-based pay take two general forms: merit pay and a structured advance system, sometimes called the career ladder approach.

Merit pay is a system that rewards exemplary teaching by either a bonus or an increased annual salary. The career ladder system creates levels of teachers from apprentice teacher through several intermediate steps to the highest level of master teacher. Different salaries and responsibilities are associated with each step on the career ladder.

There are several examples of merit pay or master teacher plans now being debated in various state legislatures. Local school districts in Houston, Texas; Lower Dauphin, Pennsylvania; and Seiling, Oklahoma; and many others have implemented plans which follow the basic patterns. Many private schools have used merit pay plans for decades.

Merit pay. This reward system attempts to base salary on performance. The performance gauged may be by the individual teacher, an individual classroom, or meeting school-wide or district-wide goals. For example, an individual teacher may meet performance standards of increased reading ability in the classroom and receive merit pay. A school building of grades K-6 may see a multi-class increase in standardized scores for students and all teachers in that building may be rewarded. A school district may set system-wide goals such as general levels of increased competency in reading and writing, access for all students and increased attendance for teachers and students. Teachers fulfilling these system-wide goals would receive merit pay.

Merit pay defines the reward for performance in dollar terms, although this may include sabbaticals, tuition assistance or other bonuses.

Under merit pay systems, there often is no sustained pay increase, although teachers may be eligible each year. There is no increase in duties per se, nor is a "merit" teacher differentiated from other teachers through special recognition.

The Career Ladder System. This system creates tiers from entry level through master teacher with varying pay and responsibilities at each level. The designation of master teacher is judged by panels composed of teachers, administrators, school board members and parents or variations of this combination. The master teacher has an extended contract, along with a substantial salary differential from lower levels of teachers. A master teacher might have responsibilities which include developing curriculum, aiding other teachers in the classroom and serving on panels to evaluate others to be master teachers.

An example of a career ladder would be:

- * Apprentice Teacher -- Must meet all state requirements for initial certification and hold degree from an accredited college or university. Entry-level salary of at least \$15,000.
- * Professional Teacher -- fully certified teacher with five years' experience and at least four positive, annual evaluations and some in-service training or postgraduate course work. Base Fifth Year Salary \$20,000.
- * Senior Teacher -- certified teacher, Master's degree in discipline taught or area of concentration, and at least 8 of 10 positive annual evaluations. Base Tenth Year Salary \$30,000.
- * Master Teacher -- certified teacher, 'best practice' demonstrated, additional study beyond Master's degree, more than ten years of consistently positive evaluations, willing to accept in-service or summer-training responsibility for other teachers. Base Pay after Tenth Year when requirements met \$35,000. Minimum Annual Bonus for continuing positive evaluations and in-service contribution \$10,000.

The experience of proposed and existing systems merit pay raises many questions that must be carefully examined, including:

- * What criteria are to be used to determine merit?
- * Who is to establish and judge merit? How are teachers to be involved in the establishment of a merit pay or structured elevation plan?
- * What appeal mechanism is included in the process?
- * Can these plans address other problems in the classroom and school system?

Polls show that both the public and educators are willing to move ahead with some form of performance-based pay, and we applaud that attitude, but no one should be deceived that its achievement is easy. Experience suggests that it is not. There is no plan that is acceptable to all. But the fact that there are problems should not cause immediate rejection of the idea.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Performance-based pay as a method to elevate the teaching profession cannot be viewed in isolation. Those who view merit pay as some easy, inexpensive, painless method of solving the nation's education problems are not realistic. Merit pay is but one of many pieces in a puzzle. It can be an important piece, but it is neither inexpensive nor easy to achieve, and other pieces of the puzzle must be put into place also. In some school districts performance-based pay will result in an improved educational product, and an ability to attract and keep high quality teachers; in other school districts, for a variety of reasons, it may not work. From our deliberations, this Task Force has determined that the question the nation must face is not simply how to implement performance-based pay for educators but how we can lift the standards of instruction in the nation.

We recommend:

1. School districts and states must raise the basic pay of teachers. Without this, other steps will have limited impact. We recognize this is easier to recommend than to achieve, but it is an essential action.

2. The pay of starting teachers must receive immediate attention. Higher pay for beginning teachers should be accompanied by higher state-imposed standards for those entering the profession. Prospective teachers should pass an examination on their subject matter as a necessary, but not sufficient condition of employment.

3. Despite mixed and inconclusive results with performance-based pay in the private sector and in education, we support and encourage experiments with performance-based pay. States, such as Tennessee, California, Florida, and Oklahoma, which appear to be on the verge of major experiments, should share their experience with others. The Department of Education, perhaps through the National Institute of Education, should evaluate the experience of states and school districts and disseminate its information widely.

The opportunity for economic improvement and professional advancement for a teacher should not be dependent on moving into school administration. A superior teacher should be able to receive a superior salary. No state pays a good teacher more than an average or a poor teacher. Polls have shown that the public regards this fact as an impediment to improving teacher performance.

Experiments in performance-based pay should include the following features:

A. Involve teachers and administrators as well as the community in establishing the evaluation criteria and the benefits of a merit pay plan. Teachers, school administrators and boards of education must be firmly committed to spend the time and energy to develop and implement a plan if it is to be successful.

B. In developing criteria and procedures to be used in merit pay systems, special care should be taken to avoid abuses that would grant rewards for reasons other than outstanding teacher performance.

C. All teachers participating in such programs should be afforded periodic review. Incentives should be built in for teachers to continue self-improvement.

D. Once established, the system should be subject to periodic review for refinement, improvement or abandonment.

E. In establishing some form of performance-based pay, a school district should recognize the needs and contributions of competent teachers who do not fall into a superior category. These teachers are the lifeblood of the school system.

4. College and university presidents should consider the level of institutional support given to their departments of education and increase the percentage of the budget that is directed to teacher education. Departments of education should be encouraged to assess their programs and to consider increasing entrance standards and developing more rigorous course work requirements for students. Colleges and universities should develop strategies to build more effective elementary and secondary school-college partnerships. The federal government should assist collegiate departments of education to upgrade programs, and to build and enhance the higher education and K-12 relationship.

5. School districts should devote at least three percent of their budget to faculty growth and development.

This can take any number of avenues, from guest lectures, to bringing in outstanding teachers from other areas for evaluation (which should be more than judgment; it should help a teacher improve) to an annual award of an opportunity to travel or study abroad for an outstanding teacher in each school building, perhaps selected by his or her peers.

6. The federal government should inaugurate an expansion of the summer institutes and other inservice training opportunities for educators that are now part of the science-math-foreign language bills pending in the Senate and passed by the House.

Such institutes should be available for approximately 200,000 of elementary and secondary school teachers each year beginning with the summer of 1985. The institutes would include advanced instruction in subject matter, updating teaching techniques and evaluating teacher performance.

7. School districts should institute a system of sabbatical leaves for educators.

This should include encouragement for further study, research and foreign study and travel. Selection should be based on objective criteria.

8. A scholarship program available to the brightest high school graduates should be inaugurated by the federal government. Such a program should be available regardless of need, requiring the student who accepts the scholarship -- at perhaps \$5,000 a year -- to teach for two years for each year of scholarship help,

or to repay the scholarship at prevailing interest rates if another field is chosen. If 10,000 scholarships were made available -- twenty-three in each congressional district -- to the top five percent of a high school graduating class, the cost would be \$50 million per year at the most, a modest investment which would pay off many times over.

9. A talented teacher fellowship program should be inaugurated by the federal government, to begin in 1985. Each year teachers in each congressional district would be selected by a process similar to selection of "Teacher of the Year" or by a national selection board, to be awarded a year's salary and a one-year leave of absence from their local school district, for additional study, research or travel than can be demonstrated to improve the teaching strengths of the individual or the teaching strength of others. The award should be provided with the stipulation that the awardee will return to the same school to teach for at least two years following the one-year fellowship.

10. School districts should regularly and carefully evaluate administrative personnel. Special attention should be paid to principals. School after school has discovered that a change in principal can result in either marked improvement or marked deterioration of the educational product and the atmosphere in which teachers must work.

11. Experimentation in organizational styles for school districts and schools should be undertaken to improve the work environment for teachers. School officials can call on the combined intelligence and experience of business and industry, and, where appropriate, develop business-school partnerships

for improving school management. Experiments could include restructuring the supervision of teachers, introducing participatory management and adapting quality circles and other methods used in industry to increase productivity.

12. Action must be taken to address school discipline and violence problems. One important step is the establishment of alternative education settings for chronically disruptive or violent children. Students who consistently act out in the regular classroom not only fail to learn, but also are an impediment to the education of all other children.

13. Federal research agencies and bodies should make grants to several independent, educational research organizations or individuals for the purpose of developing objective criteria and teacher performance evaluation models that could be used to implement performance-based pay systems. Results from such research should be made available to states or local school districts to assist them in their development of performance-based pay systems.

The national self-examination of education that is now taking place should be more than a fad, and if it is sustained with the type of follow-through suggested in this report, the nation will be better, both in the quality of its life and in its economy. The recommendations in this report will result in modest increases in expenditures by federal, state and local resources, but is an increment that will be repaid many times over, both economically and culturally. State leaders at all levels are involved in a

serious examination of their educational programs. We believe that all states and local school districts, as well as educational organizations and the federal government should join in the search for improvement, a search that inevitably leads to the educators who have contributed so much, who deserve our gratitude, and whose concrete problems must be addressed in concrete terms.

	California	Florida	Tennessee
DESIGNATION	Mentor Teachers	Master Teachers and Associate Master Teachers.	Apprentice Teachers, Professional Teachers, Senior Teachers, and Master Teachers.
NUMBER ELIGIBLE	5% as mentor teachers	No limit	15% as master teachers 25% as senior teachers
SUPPLEMENT AMOUNT	\$4,000 per mentor	Not specified	\$1,000 for professional \$2,000 for senior--10 mo. \$4,000 for senior--11 mo. \$3,000 for master--10 mo. \$5,000 for master--11 mo. \$7,000 for master--12 mo.
EVALUATION	Local district staff	Local district principal and teacher plus outsider with expertise in the teacher's area.	On-site observations by master teachers.
EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS	"Recent experience"	For associate master teachers--four years, at least two in Florida; for master teachers--seven years, at least five in Florida, and three as an associate master teacher.	For the professional teacher, three years as an apprentice teacher; for the senior teacher, three years as a professional teacher; and for the master teacher, five years as a senior teacher.
CERTIFICATION	Permanent status	Professional service certificate, or continuing contract.	Professional certificate
SELECTION PROCESS	Local school board	State Commissioner of Education after transmission of information by local school board.	State Master Teacher Commission
TERM OF DESIGNATION	3 years	3 years	5 years
RESPONSIBILITIES	Mentor teachers are <u>not</u> to evaluate other teachers, but are to assist other teachers and work with curriculum development.	No responsibilities are stipulated in the legislation.	Master teachers would be involved in the evaluation of other teachers, assist other teachers, and develop curriculum materials.
COST	Approximately \$45,000,000 (\$12 p/p)	Specific amount not available, but \$80,000,000 appropriated for this program and extended day program. (\$53 p/p)	\$116,000,000 (\$138 p/p)

09/12/83



AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS
CONVENTION RESOLUTION

MERIT RATING
SINGLE-SALARY SCHEDULE

MERIT RATING

WHEREAS, there is a growing tendency on the part of school boards to include "merit rating" factors in determining a teacher's salary, and

WHEREAS, rating plans are, of necessity, based on subjective judgments into which personalities and pressures are certain to enter, and

WHEREAS, "merit rating" weakens teacher tenure, threatens academic freedom, and places the teacher in the impotent position of bargaining individually with administration, and

WHEREAS, "merit rating" plans create a false salary maximum which few teachers will ever attain, and

WHEREAS, "merit rating" has failed to measure and improve the quality of instruction in the classroom, and

WHEREAS, "merit rating" has greatly damaged the morale of teaching personnel, and

WHEREAS, "merit rating" adversely affects the professional relationship between teachers and administrators;

RESOLVED, that the AFT oppose the use of "merit rating" in all salary schedules, and

RESOLVED, that the AFT support the principle of a single salary schedule based on training and experience, and

RESOLVED, that the AFT vigorously condemn all plans which base teachers' salaries on "merit rating." (1968)

