

Performance Compensation Model Brief Description

Local School System: Anne Arundel County Public Schools

Local Contact (Name and contact information): Oscar N. Davis, Director of Employee Relations

Title of Model: Challenge Schools Performance Pay

Purpose of the Compensation Model: To recognize and reward employees who work in particularly challenging schools; to improve recruitment and retention in these schools.

Brief Description (Please include links, if available, for access to further information on the model):

Unit I - (Teachers and Other Certificated Professionals)

Unit I employees working in the following schools shall be paid an annual stipend of \$1500:

1. ELEMENTARY: Waugh Chapel, Tyler Heights, Free Town, Van Bokkelen. MIDDLE: Lindale, Meade, Annapolis, Brooklyn Park, Marley, MacArthur, Bates. HIGH: Meade, North County, Old Mill, Annapolis.
2. SCHOOLS DESIGNATED BY THE BOARD AS TITLE I SCHOOLS. Unit I employees who work in such schools shall be paid a second stipend of \$1500 if the schools makes Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) as defined by the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE).

Unit I employees who work in such schools on a part-time, itinerant, or part-year basis may receive pro-rated stipends.

The Board and the Superintendent reserve the flexibility to offer \$1500 stipends to other Unit I employees for stated reasons.

The Board and the Superintendent reserve the flexibility to pay pre-employment signing bonuses in increments over several years that may continue into active years of employment.

Unit II – (Building Administrators)

Continue assignment/performance pay for challenged schools [as is current provided for under ARTICLE 4, A. 2]. Effective July 1, 2007, increase assignment pay to \$6000 annually for those principals assigned to designated “challenged” schools. If the school makes AYP, an additional \$9000 will be paid to the principal. Increase assignment pay for Assistant Principals to \$3000, and AYP pay to \$5000.

Schools selected for participation in the challenged schools program will be at the sole discretion of the Board and the Superintendent. Criteria to be used in the selection process may include AYP status, MSA/HSA assessment data, FARMS, Title I status, staff and student turnover, and other cogent indicators.

Unit III - (AFSCME)

A stipend of \$350 shall be paid to those full-time, 12-month Unit III school-based employees who are working in designated "challenged" schools and receive a satisfactory performance appraisal.

An additional like amount shall be paid to these employees if the school achieves Annual Yearly Progress. These amounts may be pro-rated for those employees who are 10-month, or part-time, part-year, itinerant or who incur lost time during the school year.

The designation of challenged schools shall be as defined by the MSDE AYP Report, and/or any other schools as may be selected or determined at the sole discretion of the Superintendent and Board of Education. Such schools may change from year to year, accordingly.

Unit IV – (Secretaries, Assistants and Technicians)

A stipend of \$750 for teacher assistants and \$350 for secretaries shall be paid to those Unit IV employees who are working in designated "challenged" schools and receive a satisfactory performance appraisal. An additional like amount shall be paid to these employees if the school achieves Annual Yearly Progress. These amounts may be pro-rated for those employees who are part-time, part-year, itinerant or who incur lost time during the school year.

Targeted Employees: All employees assigned to “AYP” and Title 1 Schools

Pros: Provides a program through which employees may voluntarily choose to work in some of AACPS’s most challenging schools.

Cons: The program comes with a significant cost. Additionally, it requires extensive staff time to administer, particularly with regard to itinerant teachers who provide instruction at eligible schools as a portion of their work schedule.

Lessons Learned: There is some unrest among employees and union leaders about the perceived “unfairness” of the program when other employees are not receiving raises. Additionally, there must be an objective, clearly defined process for removing schools from the list of schools receiving money once they should no longer be characterized as a challenged school.

Implementation/Results (Is the model working? If not, why not?): It is difficult to determine a direct correlation between performance pay and student outcomes. Anecdotally, however, recruitment and staff retention has improved in the targeted schools.

Future Plans: The program will be reviewed to determine its efficacy, especially in light of scarce resources.