



Denver Public Schools
Professional Compensation System for Teachers

ProComp

Teacher ProComp: Attitudes and Reported Behaviors 2011 Report Brief

Kate Allison & Eleanor S. Fulbeck
University of Colorado at Boulder
School of Education

Internal Report; DO NOT CITE WITHOUT AUTHORS' PERMISSION.

INTRODUCTION

This report brief presents general findings from the 2010 ProComp teacher survey. Both teacher and principal surveys included questions that asked respondents to reflect on their beliefs regarding the effectiveness and appropriateness of different aspects of Teacher ProComp. As there was concern about non-response on the teacher survey that was not random, teacher survey data was weighted to the survey population on characteristics predictive of response.¹

SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

Table 1 (all tables referenced herein can be found in the Appendix) describes the characteristics of the survey sample (i.e., non-weighted respondents). There were more compulsory teachers than voluntary teachers in the sample (56.0 percent, compared to 44.0 percent). This is perhaps due to teachers retiring, moving to administrative positions, or leaving the district for other jobs, which would make room for new teachers who would be automatically enrolled in ProComp. As veteran teachers retire and new teachers enter the district, we would anticipate the percentage of compulsory ProComp participants to continue to increase. Respondents were more likely to be female and white, representative of the teacher population in DPS and nationally. Additionally, respondents were more likely to be tenured elementary/K-8 school teachers who had attained a Master's degree or other advanced degree.

GENERAL BELIEFS ABOUT APPROPRIATENESS AND EFFECTIVENESS OF PROCOMP

Table 2 shows an overview of the 2010 teacher survey results disaggregated by ProComp status. Not surprisingly, teachers who voluntarily entered into ProComp tended to report more favorable opinions with regard to the effectiveness and appropriateness of the program, while teachers who elected not to enroll in ProComp held the least favorable opinions of the program. This trend is consistent with findings from surveys in previous years. In contrast to previous findings however, beliefs of new teachers who were automatically enrolled in ProComp tended to be more positive than either those who voluntarily joined or those who were not in ProComp. While contrary to findings from years past, extant research has linked positive attitudes towards alternative teacher compensation to new, younger teachers.²

Voluntary teachers and compulsory teachers were more than twice as likely (42.5 percent and 37.0 percent, respectively) than non-ProComp teachers (18.3 percent) to strongly agree or agree that ProComp would help DPS attract and retain qualified teachers. Responses for voluntary and compulsory teachers remain comparable across questions regarding general

¹ Teacher characteristics predictive of non-response included the following: 1) school type; 2) post-bachelor's degree attainment; 3) years of service; 4) plan to leave district in following year.

² See for example, The Center for Educator Compensation Reform's Research Synthesis, *What factors affect teachers attitudes and beliefs about performance pay?* Retrieved, January 2, 2011 from: http://www.cecr.ed.gov/researchSyntheses/Research%20Synthesis_Q_C13.pdf

beliefs about ProComp, indicating that the population of compulsory teachers reported attitudes that were more aligned with those of voluntary teachers than those of non-ProComp teachers. It is expected that those enrolled in ProComp would hold attitudes more similar to each other than those of teachers not enrolled in ProComp. However, the data suggest a general trend of new teachers having more similar response patterns to those voluntarily enrolling in ProComp than those choosing to remain on the traditional salary schedule.

Of those enrolled in ProComp, the majority of teachers responded that ProComp is aligned with district goals; 57.1 percent of voluntary teachers and 58.6 percent of compulsory teachers either agreed or strongly agreed. In contrast, only 37.4 percent of those not enrolled in ProComp indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed. Approximately equal percentages of voluntary and compulsory teachers (26.0 percent and 27.8 percent, respectively) agreed or strongly agreed that ProComp helps create a positive working environment, with over 40 percent of both of these groups responding neutrally to this statement. Only 11.3 percent of those not enrolled in ProComp indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed that ProComp creates a positive working environment, with 32.2 percent responding neutrally.

Predictably, those not in ProComp were most likely to disagree or strongly disagree that ProComp helps create a positive work environment (56.4 percent), as compared to voluntary (33.8 percent) and compulsory teachers (28.2 percent). Moreover, non-ProComp teachers were most likely to disagree or strongly disagree that ProComp provided them a more focused way to think about their work (51.4 percent, compared to 31.3 percent for voluntary and 29.7 percent for compulsory teachers).

Surprisingly, 16.9 percent of those not enrolled in ProComp said that it provides a more focused way for them to think about their work. Other than indirect benefits associated with goal setting and professional evaluation for teachers at schools with many ProComp teachers, no explanation for this was readily available from teacher responses to open-ended questions. Further inquiry through surveys or interviews may shed some light on why those not enrolled in ProComp believe in provides greater focus for their work.

PRINCIPAL BELIEFS ABOUT THE APPROPRIATENESS AND EFFECTIVENESS OF PROCOMP

Table 3 presents results from principals' general beliefs about Teacher ProComp. Items on the principal and teacher surveys were not identical; however, questions on both surveys aimed to understand respondents' beliefs regarding the effectiveness and appropriateness of Teacher ProComp. Generally speaking, principals reported more favorable responses to ProComp than teachers did. Approximately 60 percent of principals, compared to 42.5 percent of voluntary teachers and 47.0 percent of compulsory teachers, agreed or strongly agreed that ProComp would help DPS attract and retain qualified teachers. It is not immediately clear why principals support Teacher ProComp at greater rates than teachers. It is possible principal's attitudes are influenced by their own (required) participation in

Principal ProComp or that they are able to see benefits of Teacher ProComp that may be more noticeable to those in leadership positions at a school level. Interviews with principals about Teacher ProComp may help illuminate this pattern.

With respect to ProComp creating a positive working environment, principal responses were more closely aligned with responses for teachers enrolled in ProComp. Here, just 25.4 percent of principals, compared to 26.0 percent of voluntary teachers and 27.8 percent of compulsory teachers, indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed that ProComp helps to create a positive working environment.

Similar to teachers' beliefs about ProComp's alignment with district goals (i.e., 57.1 percent voluntary, 58.6 percent compulsory, and 37.4 percent non-ProComp), 60 percent of principals agreed or strongly agreed that ProComp is aligned with the professional goals of their teachers. Moreover, 50.0 percent of principals agreed or strongly agreed that ProComp provides a more focused way for teachers to think about their work, as compared to 41.2 percent of voluntary teachers, 39.4 percent of compulsory teachers, and 16.9 percent of those not enrolled in ProComp.

TEACHER ATTITUDES ABOUT PROCOMP GENERALLY

For nearly all questions, compulsory teachers were more likely to agree or strongly agree with positive statements about ProComp than their voluntary counterparts (see Table 4). For example, 64.0 percent of compulsory teachers and 59.0 percent of voluntary teachers agreed or strongly agreed that ProComp can motivate participants to improve instructional practices. With respect to whether ProComp will help DPS attract and retain qualified teachers, 47.0 percent of compulsory teachers agreed to strongly agreed, compared to 42.5 percent of voluntary teachers.

The sole exception to this pattern was for the question regarding ProComp providing a more focused way to think about work; here, 41.2 percent of voluntary teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, compared to 29.5 percent of compulsory teachers. Compulsory teachers were also more likely to report that they felt more pressure and job stress as a result of ProComp, with 41.9 percent of compulsory teachers agreeing or strongly agreeing, compared to 36.4 percent of voluntary teachers. It is unclear if the stress and job pressure felt by these new teachers is due entirely to ProComp or is also connected to the process of learning the profession, becoming familiar with the incentive structure under ProComp, or some other source of stress that impacts new teachers disproportionately.

PRINCIPAL ATTITUDES ABOUT PROCOMP GENERALLY

Table 5 shows principal responses with respect to general questions about Teacher ProComp. Overall, principal attitudes toward teacher ProComp were positive. For example, 65.6 percent of principals agreed or strongly agreed that Teacher ProComp can motivate participants to improve instructional practices. Moreover, 60.6 percent of respondents indicated that ProComp can ultimately improve student achievement, while 60.2 percent of

respondents agreed or strongly agreed that ProComp will help DPS attract and retain qualified teachers, and 73.5 percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that ProComp is aligned with district goals. Responses about ProComp being a fair program, ProComp incentives leading to improved instructional practice, and ProComp providing a more focused way for teachers to think about their work were all similarly positive.

Questions regarding ProComp improving collaboration yielded slightly less positive responses—37.3 percent of principals agreed or strongly agreed that ProComp will improve teacher collaboration in DPS, while 38.0 percent of principals responded neutrally.

The least positive responses centered around work environment and job pressure—44.8 percent of principals responded neutrally when asked if ProComp helps create a positive work environment, while 29.7 percent disagreed or strongly disagreed that ProComp helps create a positive work environment. Additionally, 43.9 percent of principals agreed or strongly agreed that their teachers feel more pressure and job stress as a result of ProComp, which is consistent with teacher survey findings.

TEACHERS' BELIEFS ABOUT THE TRADITIONAL SALARY SCHEDULE RELATIVE TO PROCOMP

In addition to asking teachers and principals to report their beliefs about ProComp in general, respondents were also asked to report their beliefs about the traditional salary schedule relative to ProComp. Tables 6-10 present teachers' beliefs about the effectiveness and appropriateness of the traditional salary schedule relative to ProComp³.

Table 6 shows that teachers enrolled in ProComp were *least* likely to agree or strongly agree that the traditional salary schedule will improve instructional practices (21.6 percent for voluntary teachers and 23.0 percent for compulsory teachers), compared to 26.1 percent of teachers not in ProComp. Teachers enrolled in ProComp were *more* likely to agree or strongly agree that ProComp could motivate participants to improve instructional practices (i.e., 59.7 percent of voluntary, 63.7 percent of compulsory, and 30.2 percent of non-ProComp teachers). That is, those enrolled in ProComp were more likely to believe that it would improve instructional practices relative to the traditional salary schedule.

Teachers voluntarily enrolled in ProComp showed the least favorable responses toward the traditional salary schedule, with 38.3 percent of voluntary teachers disagreeing or strongly disagreeing that the traditional salary schedule could motivate teachers to improve their instructional practice. Compulsory teachers' and non-ProComp teachers' responses were similar: 31.1 percent of compulsory teachers and 31.6 percent of non-ProComp teachers for the same question. Not surprisingly, 39.3 percent of those not enrolled in ProComp disagreed or strongly disagreed that ProComp could motivate participants to improve instructional practices. In contrast to questions regarding general attitudes towards

³ It is important to note that questions about the traditional salary schedule and ProComp were not mutually exclusive; that is, respondents could report favorable or unfavorable beliefs on the same question for both the traditional salary schedule and for ProComp.

ProComp, compulsory teachers reported beliefs that were somewhere in the middle of those reported by voluntary teachers and teachers not in ProComp. It is unclear at this time why questions regarding the ability of ProComp or the traditional salary schedule to improve instructional practices resulted in a different response trend among compulsory teachers. Perhaps these teachers are new to the district and profession and therefore may be hesitant to comment on the role of pay in differentiating between improved instructional practices.

Readers will notice a similar pattern throughout the following comparative tables. Table 7 shows a comparable pattern to that observed in Table 6; however, all teachers tended to be less likely to strongly agree or agree that either the traditional salary schedule *or* ProComp had the potential to ultimately improve student achievement. That is, teachers reported more confidence in the potential for either compensation system to improve teachers' instructional practices and behaviors than they did about abilities of either compensation system to improve student achievement. There is no data available at this time to further explain teacher attitudes on improving student achievement; however, differing ideas about what constitutes improved student achievement may be a factor in these responses. That is, measuring student achievement through standardized assessments is a difficult and controversial process. Teacher skepticism about the ability of standardized assessments to accurately represent student growth and achievement may contribute, at least in part, to teacher response patterns observed in the data.

The percentages of those who disagreed or strongly disagreed that either ProComp or the traditional salary schedule could improve student achievement are similar to the opinions expressed for instructional practices; thus, while fewer respondents believed that either the traditional salary schedule or ProComp could improve student achievement, these same respondents were more likely to indicate a neutral opinion on the matter, rather than disagreeing or strongly disagreeing.

Regardless of ProComp status, Table 8 shows that teachers were more likely to strongly disagree or disagree that the traditional salary schedule improves teacher collaboration in DPS than they were to strongly agree or agree. However, teachers not in ProComp were slightly more likely to think that (with 19.5 percent agreeing or strongly agreeing) the traditional salary schedule could improve teacher collaboration than teachers enrolled in ProComp (14.0 percent for voluntary teachers and 15.2 percent for compulsory teachers).

Voluntary and compulsory ProComp teachers were more likely to agree that ProComp improves teacher collaboration in DPS, while a majority (53.4 percent) of non-ProComp teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. Taken together, teachers did not report strong beliefs that either compensation system would improve teacher collaboration in DPS, though more teachers enrolled in ProComp agreed or strongly agreed that ProComp had the potential to do so.

Table 9 shows teachers' beliefs about the fairness of the traditional salary schedule relative to ProComp. Voluntary and Compulsory teachers enrolled in ProComp were more likely to report that ProComp is a fair program (43.1 percent and 47.3 percent, respectively) than that

the traditional salary schedule is fair (37.7 percent and 38.0 percent respectively). Conversely, 51.0 percent of teachers not in ProComp agreed or strongly agreed that the traditional salary schedule is fair, compared to just 19.6 percent indicating that ProComp is a fair program. These figures are consistent with findings throughout the survey. Moreover, 51.7 percent of those not in ProComp disagreed or strongly disagreed that ProComp is a fair program. Compulsory teachers were more likely than either voluntary teachers or those not enrolled in ProComp to respond neutrally with respect to the fairness of the traditional salary schedule (40.8 percent, compared to 33.9 percent for voluntary teachers and 28.8 percent for those not in ProComp). Again, this may be due to the fact that compulsory teachers are all relatively new to the district and possibly the profession and may have yet to form strong opinions about the fairness of ProComp relative to the traditional salary schedule.

The question in Table 10 sought to gather information about teachers' beliefs regarding the potential of each compensation system to actually result in improved instructional practices (as opposed to merely motivating teachers to improve their instructional practices). Responses for teachers enrolled in ProComp were far more supportive of ProComp than those for the traditional salary schedule. However, fewer teachers were likely to agree that either the traditional salary schedule or ProComp will result in improved instructional practices than were to agree that either compensation system had the potential to motivate teachers to improve instructional practices (see Table 4). These responses indicate that teachers have more faith in ProComp's potential to motivate teachers than to actually change teachers' instructional practice.

PRINCIPALS' BELIEFS ABOUT THE TRADITIONAL SALARY SCHEDULE RELATIVE TO PROCOMP

Table 11 shows principal responses with respect to aspects of teacher ProComp as compared to the traditional salary schedule. Across all five questions, principals were much more likely to report positive attitudes about ProComp than the traditional salary schedule.

Of those responding, 65.4 percent of principals agreed or strongly agreed that ProComp could motivate participants to improve instructional practices, compared to 21.1 percent for the traditional salary schedule. Moreover, 60.6 percent of principals agreed or strongly agreed that ProComp would ultimately improve student achievement, compared to 15.7 percent for the traditional salary schedule.

These trends remain consistent for beliefs about either compensation program to improve teacher collaboration (37.3 percent, compared to 14.5 percent), beliefs of general fairness of either compensation program (46.9 percent, compared to 29.1 percent), and whether each program is aligned with district goals (73.5 percent, compared to 15.8 percent).

Similar to response patterns throughout the survey, voluntary teachers, compulsory teachers, and principals tended to report more favorable beliefs about the effectiveness and appropriateness of ProComp relative to the traditional salary schedule.

POTENTIAL EFFECTS OF PROCOMP ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Table 12 presents teachers' responses about the potential of ProComp in general to ultimately increase student achievement. More ProComp teachers (41.9 percent of voluntary and 44.0 percent of compulsory teachers) strongly agreed or agreed that ProComp can ultimately improve student achievement than disagreed. The pattern was reversed for non-ProComp teachers, most (48.3 percent) of whom disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement.

Table 13 shows principals' beliefs about the potential of ProComp, in general, to ultimately improve student achievement. A majority of principals (60.6 percent) strongly agreed or agreed that ProComp could ultimately improve student achievement. Compared with ProComp teachers (41.9 percent and 44.0 percent, respectively), principals were much more likely to report beliefs that ProComp could meet the goal of improved student achievement. As mentioned earlier, this could be attributed to the fact that all principals are enrolled in Principal ProComp or are in a position to better observe school level benefits of Teacher ProComp.

Both teacher and principal survey results suggest that most ProComp teachers and principals believe ProComp has the potential to ultimately improve student achievement.

POTENTIAL EFFECTS OF PROCOMP ON INSTRUCTIONAL BEHAVIORS

In addition to directly improving student achievement, ProComp may also motivate participants to improve their instructional practices and behaviors which may in turn increase student achievement. To this end, teachers and principals were surveyed about their beliefs regarding the potential of ProComp to motivate participants to improve their instructional practices and behaviors.

Table 14 shows teachers' beliefs about the potential of ProComp to motivate participants to improve their instructional practices and behaviors. Most ProComp participants (59.7 percent of voluntary teachers and 63.7 percent of compulsory teachers) agreed or strongly agreed that ProComp can motivate participants to improve instructional practices. Those not in ProComp were more likely respond neutrally to the question (30.6 percent, compared to 21.5 percent and 19.7 percent); they were also more likely than those in ProComp to disagree or strongly disagree that ProComp can motivate participants to improve instructional practices (39.3 percent, compared to 18.8 percent and 16.6 percent).

As Table 15 shows, principals were again more likely to indicate (with 65.6 percent of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing) that ProComp can motivate participants to improve instructional practice than were teachers enrolled in ProComp.

TEACHER IMPRESSIONS OF SPECIFIC PROCOMP INCENTIVES

Table 16 shows teacher impressions of ProComp with respect to each individual incentive. Respondents were asked to indicate the impact of each incentive on the following: 1) instructional practice; 2) student achievement; 3) professional growth; 4) appropriateness; and 5) understanding/transparency. Results were disaggregated by ProComp status.

With respect to the completion of PDUs, both voluntary and compulsory teachers were more likely to respond favorably across all questions than their non-ProComp counterparts. For example, 74.4 percent of voluntary and 73.9 percent of compulsory teachers indicated that the bonus associated with salary increases for the completion of PDUs will improve instructional practice, compared to 48.7 percent of those not in ProComp. Moreover, 61.7 percent of voluntary teachers and 58.1 percent of compulsory teachers believe that these salary increases will increase student achievement, compared with 35.9 percent of non-ProComp teachers. These figures are consistent with responses regarding salary increases for earning an advanced degree or license, though more teachers not in ProComp (63.2 percent) reported these increases would improve instructional practices. This may be attributed to the fact that those not in ProComp can still receive salary increases as part of the traditional salary schedule.

Salary increases for satisfactory comprehensive professional evaluations received fewer positive responses from all teachers—65.5 percent of voluntary, 60.0 percent of compulsory, and 36.4 percent of those not in ProComp reported these salary increases would improve instructional practice. Only 57.5 percent of compulsory teachers indicated that they understand the requirements for receiving the bonus.

Hard to Staff and Hard to Serve bonuses received similar responses from all types of teachers—76.9 percent of voluntary, 78.4 percent of compulsory, and 55.0 percent of non-ProComp teachers indicated that the Hard to Staff bonus is appropriate (these figures are 08.7, 82.0, and 58.6 percent respectively for the Hard to Serve bonus).

Bonuses for Exceeds CSAP Expectations, Top Performing Schools, and High Growth schools received the least favorable responses. Only 27.5 percent of voluntary, 26.6 percent of compulsory, and 13.8 percent of those not in ProComp indicated that the Exceeds CSAP Expectations incentive would help teachers achieve professional growth. The figures are even lower for the Top Performing School bonus—24.8 percent of voluntary, 22.3 percent of compulsory, and 10.0 of those not in ProComp believed this incentive would help teachers achieve professional growth. These findings are consistent with comments provided in the open response fields of the survey. Teachers were more likely to approve of Hard to Staff and Hard to Serve bonuses and less likely to approve of Top Performing, High Growth, and Exceeds Expectations bonuses.

All teachers were less likely to indicate that they understood the requirements for bonuses related to students Exceeding CSAP Expectations (57.2 percent for voluntary, 47.0 percent for compulsory, and 51.9 percent for those not in ProComp) and for employment in a Top

Performing school (58.2 percent, 49.5 percent, and 56.6 percent, respectively). This may be connected in part to teachers' attitudes about incentives tied to standardized assessments or stem from a lack of transparency in how these incentives can be earned. Teachers indicated that they understood bonuses relating to SGOs (91.9 percent, 86.2 percent, and 78.8 percent, respectively), and Hard to Serve schools (89.8 percent, 89.7 percent, and 90.0 percent, respectively).

SUMMARY

In the 2010 ProComp teacher survey, compulsory teachers were more likely to agree with positive statements about ProComp than even voluntary teachers, though all ProComp participants reported similar attitudes and beliefs. This may be related to the increase in compulsory teachers as veteran teachers retire or seek employment outside the district. Research tells us that young professionals are more receptive towards performance pay programs than those more established in their careers.

Principals were more likely to respond favorably to questions about ProComp than were teachers. While no data is available to provide an explanation for this trend, it is possibly influenced by mandatory principal participation in Principal ProComp. Thus, principals are more likely to respond like voluntary or compulsory teachers than those who choose to remain on the traditional salary schedule. These principals may also be more familiar with particular incentives that are part of ProComp, as they are required to answer questions about the program and conduct professional evaluations of teachers.

In short, as the population of ProComp teachers increases within DPS, general teacher attitudes towards ProComp are likely to become more positive over time.

APPENDIX

Table 1. *Demographic characteristics of respondents.*

Demographic characteristic	Percentage
<i>ProComp entry type</i>	
Voluntary	44.0
Compulsory	56.0
<i>Gender</i>	
Female	77.3
Male	22.7
<i>School type</i>	
Elementary/K-8	56.8
Secondary	36.3
Other	6.9
<i>Educational attainment</i>	
Bachelor's Degree	43.4
Master's and above	56.4
<i>Seniority</i>	
No tenure	28.9
Tenured	71.1
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>	
White, not Latino	78.2
Minority	21.7

Table 2. General beliefs of teachers regarding the effectiveness and appropriateness of ProComp.

	%Strongly Agree	%Agree	%Neutral	%Disagree	%Strongly Disagree
<i>ProComp will ultimately help DPS attract and retain qualified teachers.</i>					
Voluntary	9.9	32.6	29.4	17.8	10.3
Compulsory	11.3	35.7	28.7	16.1	8.1
Not in ProComp	1.8	16.5	32.7	27.8	21.2
<i>ProComp is aligned with the goals of our district.</i>					
Voluntary	8.6	48.5	32.4	7.0	3.5
Compulsory	8.5	50.1	31.8	5.9	3.6
Not in ProComp	3.1	34.3	40.1	13.1	9.4
<i>I feel more pressure and job stress as a result of ProComp.</i>					
Voluntary	10.4	25.9	30.6	25.1	7.9
Compulsory	11.5	30.5	27.1	23.9	7.1
Not in ProComp	17.9	23.0	38.1	14.6	6.4
<i>ProComp helps create a positive work environment.</i>					
Voluntary	3.8	22.2	40.2	23.4	10.4
Compulsory	4.7	23.1	44.0	21.6	6.6
Not in ProComp	0.1	11.2	32.2	33.7	22.7
<i>ProComp provides a more focused way to think about my work.</i>					
Voluntary	6.6	34.6	27.4	21.1	10.2
Compulsory	6.6	32.8	31.0	21.7	8.0
Not in ProComp	0.3	16.6	31.6	28.0	23.4

Table 3. General beliefs of principals regarding the effectiveness and appropriateness of ProComp.

	%Strongly Agree	%Agree	%Neutral	%Disagree	%Strongly Disagree
<i>ProComp will ultimately help DPS attract and retain qualified teachers.</i>	7.2	53.0	21.7	13.3	4.8
<i>ProComp is aligned with the professional goals of my teachers.</i>	5.5	54.5	26.1	10.9	3.0
<i>My teachers feel more pressure and job stress as a result of ProComp.</i>	9.1	34.8	31.1	23.2	1.8
<i>I know how to answer my teachers' questions about ProComp.</i>	4.8	47.9	23.0	21.8	2.4
<i>ProComp helps to create a positive work environment.</i>	0.6	24.8	44.8	25.5	4.2
<i>ProComp provides a more focused way for teachers to think about their work.</i>	3.6	46.4	30.7	16.3	3.0

Note: Approximately 3% of survey respondents did not respond to these items.

Table 4. Teacher attitudes toward ProComp.

	%Strongly Disagree	%Disagree	%Neutral	%Agree	%Strongly Agree
<i>ProComp can motivate participants to improve instructional practices.</i>					
Voluntary	4.5	14.5	21.8	50.4	8.8
Compulsory	4.2	12.3	19.4	54.1	9.9
<i>ProComp can ultimately improve student achievement.</i>					
Voluntary	6.8	16.7	34.9	34.3	7.2
Compulsory	7.1	16.6	32.5	35.0	8.7
<i>ProComp will help DPS attract and retain qualified teachers.</i>					
Voluntary	10.4	17.7	29.4	32.7	9.8
Compulsory	8.2	16.1	28.7	35.6	11.4
<i>ProComp will improve teacher collaboration in DPS.</i>					
Voluntary	9.9	20.9	36.4	26.4	6.4
Compulsory	7.3	22.2	34.0	29.6	6.9
<i>ProComp is aligned with the goals of our school district.</i>					
Voluntary	3.5	6.9	32.5	48.5	8.6
Compulsory	3.6	6.0	31.8	50.0	8.6
<i>ProComp is aligned with my goals as an educator.</i>					
Voluntary	7.2	9.3	26.8	45.7	11.0
Compulsory	6.2	10.6	25.5	46.1	11.5
<i>I feel more pressure and job stress as a result of ProComp.</i>					
Voluntary	8.0	25.2	30.5	25.9	10.5
Compulsory	7.2	23.9	27.0	30.4	11.5
<i>ProComp is a fair program.</i>					
Voluntary	12.1	19.4	25.3	37.7	5.6
Compulsory	6.8	17.9	27.9	41.0	6.4
<i>ProComp helps to create a positive work environment.</i>					
Voluntary	10.4	23.4	40.1	22.4	3.7
Compulsory	6.7	21.6	44.0	23.1	4.7
<i>The financial incentives in ProComp will lead to improved instructional practice.</i>					
Voluntary	11.8	19.0	28.1	34.1	7.1
Compulsory	7.7	19.6	29.2	35.8	7.8
<i>ProComp provides a more focused way to think about my work.</i>					
Voluntary	10.3	21.2	27.3	34.6	6.6
Compulsory	8.0	21.5	31.0	32.9	6.6

Table 5. *Principal attitudes toward Teacher ProComp.*

	%Strongly Disagree	%Disagree	%Neutral	%Agree	%Strongly Agree
<i>ProComp can motivate participants to improve instructional practices.</i>	2.4	13.3	18.7	60.8	4.8
<i>ProComp can ultimately improve student achievement.</i>	3.0	11.5	24.8	54.5	6.1
<i>ProComp will help DPS attract and retain qualified teachers.</i>	4.8	13.3	21.7	53.0	7.2
<i>ProComp will improve teacher collaboration in DPS.</i>	4.2	20.5	38.0	31.9	5.4
<i>ProComp is aligned with the goals of our school district.</i>	1.8	5.4	19.3	66.9	6.6
<i>ProComp is aligned with the professional goals of my teachers.</i>	3.0	10.9	26.1	54.5	5.5
<i>My teachers feel more pressure and job stress as a result of ProComp.</i>	1.8	23.2	31.1	34.8	9.1
<i>ProComp is a fair program.</i>	4.3	13.4	35.4	44.5	2.4
<i>ProComp helps to create a positive work environment.</i>	4.2	25.5	44.8	24.8	0.6
<i>The financial incentives in ProComp will lead to improved instructional practice.</i>	5.4	15.7	30.7	44.6	3.6
<i>ProComp provides a more focused way for teachers to think about their work.</i>	3.0	16.3	30.7	46.4	3.6

Note: Approximately 2% of survey respondents did not respond to these items.

Table 6. Teachers' beliefs about traditional salary schedule.

	%Strongly Agree	%Agree	%Neutral	%Disagree	%Strongly Disagree
<i>Motivate participants to improve instructional practices</i>					
<i>Traditional Salary Schedule</i>					
Voluntary	1.5	20.1	40.1	31.8	6.5
Compulsory	2.0	21.0	45.9	26.4	4.7
Not in ProComp	4.0	22.1	42.3	25.6	6.0
<i>ProComp</i>					
Voluntary	9.0	50.7	21.5	14.4	4.4
Compulsory	9.8	53.9	19.7	12.4	4.2
Not in ProComp	2.3	27.9	30.6	23.9	15.4

Table 7. Teachers' beliefs about traditional salary schedule.

	%Strongly Agree	%Agree	%Neutral	%Disagree	%Strongly Disagree
<i>Ultimately improve student achievement</i>					
<i>Traditional Salary Schedule</i>					
Voluntary	1.4	14.5	48.3	29.7	6.1
Compulsory	1.8	14.3	52.5	25.9	5.5
Not in ProComp	3.0	16.0	45.1	29.2	6.6
<i>ProComp</i>					
Voluntary	7.4	34.5	34.7	16.8	6.6
Compulsory	8.6	35.4	32.5	16.5	7.0
Not in ProComp	1.6	18.8	31.3	28.4	19.9

Table 8. Teachers' beliefs about traditional salary schedule.

	%Strongly Agree	%Agree	%Neutral	%Disagree	%Strongly Disagree
<i>Improve teacher collaboration in DPS</i>					
<i>Traditional Salary Schedule</i>					
Voluntary	1.6	12.4	47.9	32.1	6.0
Compulsory	1.8	13.4	54.2	25.5	5.1
Not in ProComp	3.8	15.7	48.6	26.6	5.3
<i>ProComp</i>					
Voluntary	6.7	26.3	36.4	20.9	9.8
Compulsory	6.8	29.4	34.2	22.4	7.2
Not in ProComp	1.0	14.7	30.8	30.3	23.1

Table 9. Teachers' beliefs about traditional salary schedule.

	%Strongly Agree	%Agree	%Neutral	%Disagree	%Strongly Disagree
<i>Fairness</i>					
<i>Traditional Salary Schedule</i>					
Voluntary	4.5	33.2	33.9	22.3	6.1
Compulsory	4.4	33.6	40.8	15.5	5.6
Not in ProComp	9.4	41.6	28.8	15.6	4.7
<i>ProComp</i>					
Voluntary	5.6	37.5	25.7	19.1	12.0
Compulsory	6.4	40.9	27.9	17.9	6.9
Not in ProComp	0.5	19.1	28.7	31.7	20.0

Table 10. *Teachers' beliefs about traditional salary schedule.*

	%Strongly Agree	%Agree	%Neutral	%Disagree	%Strongly Disagree
<i>Financial incentives will lead to improved instructional practices</i>					
<i>Traditional Salary Schedule</i>					
Voluntary	1.6	13.8	44.4	32.3	2.9
Compulsory	2.2	15.3	52.6	23.8	6.1
Not in ProComp	4.1	17.7	46.3	24.5	7.3
<i>ProComp</i>					
Voluntary	7.4	33.9	28.2	18.8	11.6
Compulsory	7.8	35.6	28.9	20.0	7.7
Not in ProComp	0.6	18.0	24.6	31.8	25.0

Table 11. *Beliefs of principals about ProComp relative to traditional salary schedule.*

	%Strongly Agree	%Agree	%Neutral	%Disagree	%Strongly Disagree
<i>Motivate participants to improve instructional practices</i>					
Traditional Salary Schedule	1.2	19.9	27.7	41.0	10.2
ProComp	4.8	60.8	18.7	13.3	2.4
<i>Ultimately improve student achievement</i>					
Traditional Salary Schedule	0.6	15.1	36.7	34.9	12.7
ProComp	6.1	54.5	24.8	11.5	3.0
<i>Improve teacher collaboration in DPS</i>					
Traditional Salary Schedule	0.6	13.9	40.6	33.3	11.5
ProComp	5.4	31.9	38.0	20.5	4.2
<i>Fairness</i>					
Traditional Salary Schedule	1.2	27.9	38.8	21.8	10.3
ProComp	2.4	44.5	35.4	13.4	4.3
<i>Aligned with the goals of the school district</i>					
Traditional Salary Schedule	0.6	15.2	39.4	34.5	10.3
ProComp	6.6	66.9	19.3	5.4	1.8

Note: Approximately 2% of survey respondents did not respond to these items.

Table 12. *Beliefs of teachers about ProComp and student achievement.*

	%Strongly Agree	%Agree	%Neutral	%Disagree	%Strongly Disagree
<i>ProComp can ultimately improve student achievement</i>					
Voluntary	7.4	34.5	34.7	16.8	6.6
Compulsory	8.6	35.4	32.5	16.5	7.0
Not in ProComp	1.6	18.8	31.3	28.4	19.9

Table 13. *Beliefs of principals about ProComp and student achievement.*

	%Strongly Agree	%Agree	%Neutral	%Disagree	%Strongly Disagree
<i>ProComp can ultimately improve student achievement.</i>					
	6.1	54.5	24.8	11.5	3.0

Table 14. *Beliefs of teachers about ProComp and instructional practices.*

	%Strongly Agree	%Agree	%Neutral	%Disagree	%Strongly Disagree
<i>ProComp can motivate participants to improve instructional practices.</i>					
Voluntary	9.0	50.7	21.5	14.4	4.4
Compulsory	9.8	53.9	19.7	12.4	4.2
Not in ProComp	2.3	27.9	30.6	23.9	15.4

Table 15. *Beliefs of principals about ProComp and instructional practice.*

	%Strongly Agree	%Agree	%Neutral	%Disagree	%Strongly Disagree
<i>ProComp can motivate participants to improve instructional practice.</i>					
	4.8	60.8	18.7	13.3	2.4

Table 16. *Teacher impressions of ProComp*

	Improving Instructional Practice	Improving Student Achievement	Achieving Professional Growth	Appropriate- ness of Financial Incentives	Understandin g of Incentive
<i>Salary increases for the completion of PDUs.</i>					
Voluntary	74.4	61.7	82.5	84.5	85.6
Compulsory	73.9	58.1	81.6	79.9	77.2
Not in ProComp	48.7	35.9	59.1	58.0	74.9
<i>Salary increases for earning an advanced degree/license.</i>					
Voluntary	79.2	62.6	85.0	88.9	82.6
Compulsory	79.0	59.1	84.7	86.5	70.7
Not in ProComp	63.2	41.8	71.7	76.3	74.2
<i>Salary increases for satisfactory CPE.</i>					
Voluntary	65.5	52.6	57.5	75.6	74.2
Compulsory	60.0	46.3	54.5	71.5	57.5
Not in ProComp	36.4	25.3	34.9	46.5	57.5
<i>Bonuses for employment in a Hard to Staff assignment.</i>					
Voluntary	62.5	55.3	35.9	76.9	89.2
Compulsory	58.3	51.2	29.7	78.4	82.6
Not in ProComp	34.8	29.9	19.3	55.0	88.3
<i>Bonuses for employment in a Hard to Serve school.</i>					
Voluntary	64.9	58.7	37.2	80.7	89.8
Compulsory	60.9	54.7	31.0	82.0	89.7
Not in ProComp	37.9	33.7	20.3	58.6	90.0
<i>Bonuses and salary increases for achieving SGOs.</i>					
Voluntary	70.0	63.3	53.7	76.9	91.9
Compulsory	64.4	59.8	46.3	70.7	86.2
Not in ProComp	37.9	33.6	24.7	41.4	78.0
<i>Bonuses for having students who Exceed CSAP Expectations.</i>					
Voluntary	44.6	43.1	27.5	48.2	57.2
Compulsory	45.2	47.2	26.6	53.7	47.0
Not in ProComp	21.8	21.9	13.8	25.1	51.9
<i>Bonuses for employment at a Top Performing School.</i>					
Voluntary	39.0	34.3	24.7	41.1	58.2
Compulsory	37.8	34.3	22.3	43.6	49.5
Not in ProComp	17.3	14.1	10.0	19.6	56.8
<i>Bonuses for employment at a Top Performing School.</i>					
Voluntary	50.5	43.4	30.7	56.7	62.2
Compulsory	51.3	46.5	28.4	62.7	53.6
Not in ProComp	24.1	21.8	15.3	32.2	59.0
<i>None of the above.</i>					
Voluntary	7.0	14.9	6.0	3.2	2.5
Compulsory	8.1	14.4	7.1	4.9	6.2
Not in ProComp	23.8	34.3	20.6	15.1	13.5