

## **Performance Compensation Model Brief Description**

**Local School System:** Board Of Education of Queen Anne's County  
202 Chesterfield Avenue  
Centreville, Maryland 21617

**Local Contact:** James R. Jennings, Jr.  
Human Resources Officer  
202 Chesterfield Avenue  
Centreville, Maryland 21617  
Phone: 410-758-2403 ext. 118

**Title of Model:** Administrator's Salary Compensation with Student Achievement Factor

**Purpose of the Compensation Model:**

1. Provided 13% additional compensation for administrators based on 10 identifiable objectives and student achievement factors
2. Directly linked a percentage of salary to student achievement outcomes
3. Based on a variety of outcomes that included but was not limited to state required student achievement test
4. Provided additional compensation in order to attract and retain qualified administrators

**Brief Description:**

The model was designed to provide up to an additional 13% increase of salary based on predetermined student achievement and other objectives/goals set by the Associate Superintendent and the Superintendent of Schools. Management personnel met annually with the Superintendent and developed strategies and goals for the coming school year. There was a percentage assignment to reach objectives/goals, and depending on if the manager met the goals, he/she received the percentage increased in his/her salary. The factors in percentage assignments were reached collaboratively with the Superintendent, the Associate Superintendent, and the employee. See attached 2007-2008 factors for one manager as a representative sample of the model.

**Targeted Employees:**

The model was targeted for instructional facilitators, assistant principals, academic deans, instructional supervisors, and principals. This was a negotiated item with our certificated administrative unit; therefore, support administrators and senior staff were not eligible for the additional compensation.

**Pros:**

The model was a collaborative effort between the Queen Anne's County Administrators and Supervisors Association and the Board of Education. It was developed at a time when management salaries were under attack by the County Commissioners/public. It provided a way for management personnel to maintain a cost-of-living increase that was viewed as positive by the Board of Education and County Commissioners/public and, at the same time, making them accountable in a quantitative way for the performance of their school.

**Cons:**

The model relied on the data being provided by the State Department of Education and regrettably that was not always received in a timely manner. We found ourselves halfway through the next school year before we could finalize a manager salary. In addition, the managers' salary could decrease from one year to the next. The possibility of experiencing decreases, at that time, from one year to the next was generally not the case in education. In addition, the program was viewed negatively by our teaching staff. There was a common complaint that the managers were receiving a bonus based on the work the teachers were doing. Although the achievement factors were clearly listed as part of management salary, it was perceived by the teachers as well as in some cases the general public as a bonus. Lastly, the funding level to increase the factors in place of a COLA was unable to be maintained.

**Lessons Learned:**

The key to having this type of model to be successful would be to have timely data, clear communication with all employees, not just management, on the purpose and the structure.

**Implementation/Results:**

The model was implemented through the negotiations process. Once agreement was reached at the table, the Superintendent met with all management personnel and outlined how the goals and percentages would be collaboratively agreed to. While the collaborative setting of goals and achievement factors was viewed positively by all personnel involved, the reality was there was no clear indication that this had a positive effect on student achievement.

**Future Plans:**

Since there was not any definitive data that indicated the plan had a positive effect on student achievement and funding had dried up across the board, there are no plans at this point to continue the model or reinstate it.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Below are performance indicators for the 2007-2008 school year. As agreed upon at your evaluation meeting, your performance indicators for this school year will be as follows:

Percent	Indicator	Level of Attainment	Performance Indicator Met (√)	Data Points	
2%	English II Special Ed	<i>Score at or above the state average</i>	√	2008 State	43.3% 33.0%
1%	English II Minority	<i>Meet AMO or have a positive gain of 5%</i>	√	2008 2007	70.0% 41.7%
1%	Algebra Special Ed	<i>Score at or above the state average</i>	√	2008 State	53.6% 44.0%
1%	Algebra Minority	<i>Meet AMO or have a positive gain of 5%</i>	√	2008 2007	63.0% 30.3%
2%	Government Special Ed	<i>Score at or above the state average</i>	√	2008 State	83.0% 51.0%
1%	SAT – Reading and Math	<i>You must be at or above state average</i>	---	School State	985 1001
1%	Biology Special Ed	<i>Score at or above the state average</i>	---	2008 State	29.0% 40.0%
1%	AP Composite	<i>Increase by 10% the number of tests scored 3, 4, or 5</i>	√	2008 2007	73.0% 51.0%
2%	Algebra Aggregate	<i>You must meet AMO</i>	√	2008 2007	87.7% 57.1%
1%	Staff Attendance	<i>Your staff must have an average attendance rate of 95%</i>	√		95.02%

**ARTICLE IX**

**Differentiated Compensation for Administration 2007-2008**

<b>Position</b>	<b>Base Salary</b>	<b>School Level Certificated Staff</b>	<b>(%)</b>	<b>Experience Level</b>	<b>Education</b>	<b>Student Enrollment (based on 9/30 enrollment)</b>	<b>(%)</b>	<b>Student Achievement Factor</b>
Principal	\$80,300	Prin/AD 1 - 20	6%	1.5% per year	Doctorate 2%	Prin/AP 1 - 499	6%	13%
Supervisor	\$77,000	Prin/AD 21-50	8%	(up to - 5 years)	Doctorate 2%	Prin/AP 500 - 799	8%	13%
Academic Dean	\$70,600	Prin/AD 50+	10%	(7.5% max)	Doctorate 2%	Prin/AP 800 plus	10%	13%
Assistant Principal	\$68,500	Sup/Facil/AP	6%		Doctorate 2%	Supervisor	6%	13%
Facilitator	\$68,500	Sup/Facil/AP	6%		Doctorate 2%	Facil/AD	4%	13%

- A. All salaries of A & S employees placed on this model will start at the appropriate base salary.
- B. All variables will be calculated using the appropriate base salary and be added in total to the base salary for each individual employee.
- C. All variables will be calculated using June 30 data from the Maryland State Department of Education website with the exception of high school variables. High school variables will be previous school year data. Adjustment will be made by the first payroll in December.
- D. The Superintendent may, at his/her sole discretion, grant an employee an Exceptional Responsibility Stipend, not to exceed 5% of the employee's salary. Factors that the Superintendent may consider include, but are not limited to: construction, reconfigured staff, reconfigured school, and unusual circumstance.
- E. Upon retirement, the Board agrees to pay the retiree a lump sum amount for the student achievement factors earned during the last year of employment.