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Nationally, Not a New Idea
aka Pay for Performance Plan

- In Arizona, Student Success Funding under Governor Brewer
- Teacher performance-pay plans are often problematic
  - Measurement issues
  - Insufficient funding
  - Little, if any, improvement in student achievement
  - Many fail to outlive their political champion (e.g., Student Success Funding)
Arizona’s Results-Based Funding Differs from a Typical Pay for Performance Plan:

• Payment to schools, rather than teachers.
• Based solely on student test scores (first year), rather than growth or multiple measures. It doesn’t account for student demographics; instead it creates two tiers of payment based on poverty.
• Funding is less a reward and more like seed money to extend the reach of “successful” schools.
For FY2018, Awards Based on 2016 AzMerit

- $225 per student
  - Less than 60% FRL and
  - Top 10% of schools in the state based on AzMerit scores

- $400 per student
  - More than 60% FRL and
  - Top 10% of AzMerit scores in this group
  - OR A-Alternative school
For FY2019, Awards Based on A-F Letter Grades

- $225 per student
  - Less than 60% FRL and
  - A Letter Grade

- $400 per student
  - More than 60% FRL and
  - A Letter Grade
  - OR Alt-A
Use of Results-Based Awards (SB1530)

• “The monies shall be allocated directly to enhance, expand or replicate the school site that generated the results-based funding and shall not supplant monies budgeted or received from any other source that are generally provided to that school.

• The majority of the monies received from the fund by a school district or charter holder shall be used for teacher salaries, to hire teachers and to provide for teacher professional development.

• A portion of the monies received from the fund by a school district or charter holder may be used for the expansion and replication of that school site as a quality school model.

• The monies shall be used to sustain and replicate results, to serve more students on a waiting list at a school with a letter grade designation of A or B and to increase salaries for teachers, other classroom staff and school leaders closing the achievement gap in high-poverty schools.”
“Replication” Means:

1. Adding seats and serving more students at the awarded school site.
2. Using resources at a different location to improve that school or to sustain or accelerate academic growth.
3. Mentoring other schools and school leaders to replicate the model or to provide other types of school improvement supports.
4. Physically expanding at another location.

Schools receiving funding…must show steady improvement after three years to remain eligible for funding. (SB1530, page 10-11)
$23.77 million
188 schools
110,530 students

$14.86 million
100 schools
39,661 students
No awards in:
- Greenlee
- La Paz
- Navajo
For Schools and Districts to Consider

• Inconsistent funding due to changes in 2018-2019 to funding based on A-F Letter Grades.
• How does the allocation of results-based funding allocations fit within districts’ equity efforts?
• How does it fit within ESSA requirements for equity (e.g., comparability, school-level reporting?)
• Stated goal is to expand reach of “quality school models,” but data show district schools receiving awards are smaller than average, especially those with highest levels of poverty.
Questions?
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• Chris Kotterman —ckotterman@azsba.org