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NCES Fast Facts 2015 – snapshot of the teaching force and compensation

<http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=28>

Vigdor, 2008 – Scrap the single salary schedule

<http://educationnext.org/scrap-the-sacrosanct-salary-schedule/>

Roza, 2015 – Updated view of Vigdor

<http://www.brookings.edu/blogs/brown-center-chalkboard/posts/2015/11/23-disproportionate-funds-small-segment-teaching-force-roza?rssid=browncenterchalkboard>

Roza, M. (2015) – Fixed COLA

<http://edunomicslab.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/Breaking-Tradition-paper.pdf>

Rock and Jones, HBR, 2015 – Scrap performance ratings (consider this in relation to compensation)

<https://hbr.org/2015/09/why-more-and-more-companies-are-ditching-performance-ratings>

McGregor and Doshi, 2016 – factors that influence motivation

<https://hbr.org/video/4701966304001/what-really-influences-employee-motivation>

McGregor and Doshi, 2015 – related article

<https://hbr.org/2015/11/how-company-culture-shapes-employee-motivation?utm_campaign=harvardbiz&utm_source=twitter&utm_medium=social>
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Measures of Effective Teaching, final report brief – this is the summary of the $45 million Gates Foundation study to determine if effective teaching could be measured

<http://www.edweek.org/media/17teach-met1.pdf>

[TAP](http://www.niet.org), formerly the Teacher Advancement Program, has been operating in schools since 1999. TAP emphasizes multiple career paths, ongoing applied professional development, instructionally focused accountability, and performance-based compensation. Below are the basics of the TAP System:

* “Master” teachers receive 80% release from their classrooms (roughly 1 for every 15 teachers)
* “Mentor” teachers receive 20% release time from their classrooms (roughly 1 for every 8 teachers)
* Weekly 90 minute job-embedded professional development led by the master or mentor teacher with small groups of teachers.
	+ Master or mentor presents a strategy.
	+ The following week, that strategy is implemented or co-taught with students.
	+ The next meeting, teachers bring work from students with high, middle, and low examples.
	+ The strategy is revised or a new strategy based on needs identified in student work is introduced.
	+ Increased compensation based on additional work and student learning outcomes.

The most challenging aspects of TAP are the cost and “performance-based compensation.” To pay for the release of master and mentor teachers, funding is typically derived from existing district funds for professional development or administrative support, Title I, Title II, or grant funds. In lieu of grant funding, paying for the release of master and mentor teachers can be daunting. Additionally, at most TIF sites, student test scores account for 50% of teachers’ evaluations which are the basis of the performance-based compensation. In many instances, value-added scores are used which can be controversial, particularly for teachers in untested grade or subject areas. In cases where test scores are not available, TAP typically uses test score gains by the entire school to determine that portion of the evaluation. While some teachers in these schools express frustration at the evaluation framework, most teachers in these schools say they appreciate the additional compensation. However the primary benefit they cite is the ability to improve their practice with colleagues (Eckert, 2010, 2013).
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