

L
184
.06
1960

Library
State Legislative Building
North Carolina

REPORT

OF
THE COMMISSION FOR THE STUDY OF TEACHER
MERIT PAY
AND
IMPLEMENTATION OF A REVISED
PUBLIC SCHOOL CURRICULUM,
W. C. HARRIS, JR., CHAIRMAN

TO
THE HONORABLE LUTHER H. HODGES
GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA



LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY

As directed by Resolution 80 of the
North Carolina General Assembly,
ratified June 20, 1959.

Y-3-14M
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

Honorable Luther H. Hodges
Governor of North Carolina
Raleigh, North Carolina
Dear Governor Hodges:

December 16, 1960

The Commission for the Study of Teacher Merit Pay and Implementation of a Revised Public School Curriculum, established by Resolution 80 of the General Assembly of 1959, herewith transmits to Your Excellency its report.

The problems which this Commission was directed to study concern two subjects: the first is restricted to merit pay, and the second to implementation of the curriculum study.

The task assigned to this Commission has required much homework on the part of each member. Your appointees should be awarded excellent marks. Each exhibited a high degree of diligence, ability and imagination. Not all will agree with the Conclusions and Recommendations, but none can complain of the dedication of the members to a difficult assignment.

All members of your Commission have requested me to express our appreciation and indebtedness to Dr. Cameron West, who served as our consultant and Executive Secretary. Dr. West did a remarkable job, and as a result of his efforts, we were able to discharge our duties in the study of merit pay. We are also indebted to Dr. I. E. Ready and his staff for their able assistance in connection with the implementation of the curriculum study.

The two ex-officio members of this Commission, Charles F. Carroll and Dallas Herring were unable to attend the last two meetings and did not participate in the formulation of the Recommendations and Conclusions, but each made valuable contributions in the discussions of the Commission.

It was a pleasure to serve as Chairman of this group and each of the fifteen members respectfully submits these reports.

Sincerely,

W. C. Harris, Jr., Chairman
Elbert Peel, Jr., Vice-Chairman
Hazel Curtright, Secretary
Garland S. Garriss
Frank N. Patterson, Jr.
Edward H. Wilson
J. L. Cashwell
G. T. Proffit
C. Reid Ross
Demint F. Walker
E. E. Boyer
Mrs. Frank B. Meacham
Joseph S. Moye
S. Tom Proctor
Prince A. Simmons

LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	3
I. Teacher Merit Pay	4
Previous Study of Merit Rating in North Carolina	4
History of Merit Rating	5
Definition of Merit Rating and Merit Salary Schedule....	7
Findings	9
Conclusions and Recommendations	13
II. Implementation of a Revised Public School Curriculum	15
Recommendations	15
Recommended Revision of School Law and/or State School Board Regulations	18
Appendix A Resolution No. 80	19
Appendix B Sample Plan for Merit Experimentation	21
Appendix C Sample Instrument for the Evaluation and Measure of the Total Service of the Teacher	22
Appendix D Example of Merit Salary Plan	27

INTRODUCTION

The Commission for the Study of Teacher Merit Pay and Implementation of a Revised Public School Curriculum was established by Resolution No. 80 of the North Carolina General Assembly ratified June 20, 1959.

In August, 1959, Governor Luther H. Hodges appointed a seventeen-member Commission to Report Upon the Pay of Public School Teachers Based Upon the Ability of the Individual Teacher and to Study and Report Means of Implementing Curriculum Studies in the Public School. The following North Carolinians were appointed to the Commission with Charles F. Carroll, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and Dallas Herring, Chairman of the State Board of Education, ex-officio members.

Representing the Legislature: Representative W. C. Harris, Jr., Raleigh, Chairman; Representative Frank N. Patterson, Jr., Albemarle; Representative Edward H. Wilson, Blanche; Senator Elbert S. Peel, Jr., Williamston; and Senator Garland S. Garriss, Troy.

Representing the School Profession: Mrs. Hazel Curtright, Chapel Hill; Demint F. Walker, Edenton; C. Reid Ross, Fayetteville; G. T. Proffit, Lillington; and J. L. Cashwell, Albemarle.

Representing the Public: Mrs. Frank Blakeney Meacham, Roanoke Rapids; Joseph S. Moye, Greenville; S. Tom Proctor, Fuquay Springs; E. E. Boyer, Statesville; and Prince A. Simmons, Winston-Salem.

In September, 1960, the Commission appointed Dr. Cameron West, Academic Dean of Pfeiffer College, Misenheimer, to serve as a consultant and Executive Secretary.

The first part of this report is restricted to the findings, conclusions, and recommendations concerning the Committee's deliberations and study of the merit pay aspects of Resolution No. 80 (See Appendix A). The second part of the report concerns the implementation of the Curriculum Study.

TEACHER MERIT PAY

PREVIOUS STUDY OF MERIT RATING IN NORTH CAROLINA

In 1945 the General Assembly authorized Governor R. Gregg Cherry "to appoint a Commission of seven persons who shall fully investigate and report to the next General Assembly their findings as to the methods by which the compensation of teachers in the public schools of the State may be based upon merit and the individual capacity and ability of the respective teachers, to the end that such capacity and ability may be recognized and compensation provided therefor in the salaries paid such teachers in the State."

Governor Cherry appointed seven prominent North Carolinians to serve on this Commission. The Commission invited the Board of Directors of the North Carolina Education Association to appoint from the Association's membership an Advisory Committee on Merit Rating of Teachers. Thirty-three outstanding educators of North Carolina served as members of the Committee with Mrs. Ethel P. Edwards as an ex-officio member.

Three university professors were also used as consultants by both the Commission and the Committee.

Basic definitions and guiding principles were agreed upon by the Commission. Specific recommendations and suggestions were submitted for the experimental program. After prolonged study and research, no system of measuring teacher merit was recommended as a basis for paying the salaries of all teachers. The report of this Commission, commonly known as the McCall Report, is available for study.

On Thursday, October 1, 1959, the State Board of Education announced the appointment of seventeen persons to make a study of Teacher Evaluation, Rating and Certification, with particular attention to methods by which some determination of the degree of quality exemplified by different persons may be made.¹ This 17-member group will report its findings to the Board before the 1961 session of the General Assembly. This Committee has worked separately from the Commission for the Study of Teacher Merit Pay and will report directly to the State Board of Education.

¹ Implementation of Resolution No. 73, 1959 North Carolina General Assembly.

HISTORY OF MERIT RATING²

During the early days of education in the United States evaluation of teachers was conducted by the town selectmen or some other governmental body. Seated at the front of the schoolroom, the members watched the lessons, examined the copybooks, and sometimes asked questions of the class to determine its progress. Probably teachers had a good idea as to the sort of questions that would be asked and drilled the youngsters accordingly. Undoubtedly the ideas of the selectmen in regard to the efficiency of the teacher were largely fixed before the visit was made because communities were small and there was ample opportunity to judge by firsthand observation how things were going at school. With a very narrow curriculum and somewhat fixed ideas as to how teaching should be conducted, evaluation was not too difficult a process.

A later development seems to have been for the selectmen or school committees to visit the school or schools but to have the examination conducted by the teacher. This plan permitted the teacher to keep the examination on safe ground. Children were drilled on the answers to certain questions until they could parrot back the answers quickly and accurately.

By the latter part of the nineteenth century, communities had become too large, curricula too expanded, and teaching methods too complex for laymen to feel competent to evaluate the work of the teacher. Professional school administrators, who had become common to most school districts, inherited the task of rating teachers.

Ratings of teachers by professional educators have generally been of two kinds: (1) an evaluation of the teaching process, and (2) an evaluation of the progress that pupils have made. While sometimes the two have been combined, by far the most common rating method was one of the evaluation of the teaching process. The rater noted the discipline, interest, respect for the teacher, and methods of presentation. Often, order was the primary item which was judged, with the actual methods of presentation second in attention. These administrators used rating to pressure for the use of certain methods of presentation such as the five formal steps advocated by Herbert. Others advocated a review period, either oral or written, then presentation of the materials assigned for that day and, finally, the next day's assignment, or some other formal method.

² Taken from *Professional Problems of Teachers* by Albert J. Huggett and T. M. Stinnett. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956. and "Objective Look at the Merit Pay Issue" by George E. Holloway, *School Executive*, April, 1959.

Most of the efforts to rate teachers by means of pupil progress came in the 1920's as a corollary to the testing movement. At that time many educators believed that they could accurately judge pupil progress by means of standardized tests covering such subjects as reading, arithmetic, spelling, grammar, and history. These were given at the beginning of the year to measure status before instruction. At the end of the year, similar tests were given. The differences in the results indicated the gains. Some administrators assumed that teaching was responsible for whatever gains were made.³ If this assumption were correct, then the efficiency of the teacher could be judged by standardized tests. Completely disregarded were the natural abilities to learn, the effects of incidental learning and the growth that had taken place in some of the intangibles such as social adjustment, character, and personality.⁴

Until about 1900 salaries of public school teachers were dependent primarily upon the bargaining ability of the individual and the judgment of the administrator and school board members. Some states and individual school systems still operate without salary schedules. To some, these earlier arrangements might be considered merit.

The Newton, Massachusetts, School Committee adopted a merit plan in 1908. Its application diminished until, by 1920, it was no longer used. In 1947, Newton once again instituted a merit plan.

When salary schedules were first adopted, many operated on a merit basis. In 1911 the New York State Legislature mandated a salary schedule for New York City teachers which was quite similar in form and terminology to the state-wide merit salary law of 1947. Ithaca, New York, began giving attention to merit in 1919. Scarsdale has had a merit plan for twenty years. Minneapolis, Cleveland, Detroit, Kansas City, Lynchburg, and Milwaukee all had merit plans prior to 1930.

With the development of the single salary schedule, many districts abolished the merit plan and teachers' compensation was determined solely by training and years of experience. Of the school systems retaining merit, most were smaller districts. Since 1946 merit plans have been adopted by such school systems as West Hartford, Connecticut; Ladue Public Schools, Creve Coeur, Missouri; Grosse Points, Michigan; Alton, Illinois; Glencoe, Illinois; Summit, New Jersey; many in California; and the sixty-seven county districts of Florida.

³ The earlier investigative study of Merit Rating in North Carolina was based on this assumption.

⁴ Huggett and Stinnett, *op. cit.*, pp. 134-136.

The NEA Research Bulletin for December, 1958, reports that of 2,003 teachers' schedules reported last year (1957-1958), 3.6 per cent specified and 8.4 per cent authorized a superior service reward.

DEFINITION OF MERIT RATING AND MERIT SALARY SCHEDULE

In 1956 representatives of the National Education Association found general agreement in the following as a working definition of merit rating according to past and present practices:

Merit rating is a subjective, qualitative judgment of a teacher made administratively by one or more persons, with or without the participation or the knowledge of the person rated, for purposes of determining salary.⁵

Note: The Commission for Study of Teacher Merit Pay believes that merit rating should **always** be "with" the participation or knowledge of the person rated.

Some authorities would say that merit rating is possible by objective means but little support or agreement is found for this statement. No matter the means, merit rating to be significant for this study must include as an integral complement a salary schedule which may be classified as a merit schedule.

No common understanding exists of what a merit schedule is. Some people feel that a plan of formal efficiency ratings, on which salaries are based, is prerequisite before a salary policy can be called a "merit schedule." But there can be a "merit schedule" without formal ratings, just as there can be formal ratings without a merit schedule. Where merit provisions are stated specifically, with known amounts scheduled to reward superior service and known conditions stated for qualifying, the definiteness that is essential to a true salary schedule is more nearly maintained.

The key of a true merit schedule is reward of quality. Devices for extra pay for extra duties which reward **quantity** of service, not **quality**, are not merit provisions. Some districts have a separate salary class to recognize and pay for added responsibilities such as play coaching, sponsorship of the school paper or yearbook, and like activities. This is not a merit provision.

⁵ Classroom Teachers Speak on Merit Rating, Report of the Study Conference on Merit Rating, Department of Classroom Teachers, NEA, November 1956.

Another type of salary schedule sometimes represented as a merit schedule requires that every so many years the teacher must show or present evidence of professional growth before receiving the next increment step. Considered as professional growth may be the completion of a given number of semester hours of college study, educative travel, research studies, participation in workshops, or related activities. An evaluation committee may decide if such activities should be recognized as professional growth.

Penalty provisions are not recognized as merit provisions. Many schedules maintain that the normal annual increments that recognize experience in advancing from minimum to maximum are given only to recognize satisfactory service, or may be withheld if service is unsatisfactory. The withholding of increments is used to penalize unsatisfactory service, sometimes as a warning of dismissal. One system penalizes unsatisfactory service but apparently does not require superior service for the salary steps.

Another penalty device is a smaller-than-average annual increment for the teacher whose service is below average.

Two devices are found, either of which added to a schedule makes it a "merit schedule": (a) acceleration through the schedule, and (b) superior-service maxima.

(a) **Acceleration**—acceleration refers to the practice of giving either double increments or any larger-than-normal increment as a teacher advances from minimum salary, to reward above-average service.

(b) **Superior-Service Maxima** — the teacher judged to be superior may advance to a maximum salary higher than can be paid to the teacher who is not judged to be superior. This type usually provides for two or more promotional levels, which must be qualified for successively.

FINDINGS

The Commission examined intensively over thirty major arguments for and against merit rating. Commission members or representatives of the Commission studied the literature and research findings concerning merit evaluation, talked to personnel of national educational organizations such as the National Education Association and the U. S. Office of Education, investigated a number of school districts which have adopted merit salary schedules, and considered at length the teaching process, philosophy, and demands of education in the future. At all times the Commission members kept uppermost the desire to consider only those changes or recommendations which would contribute to better education for children through the promotion of superior teaching.

All deliberations were founded upon the belief that no merit rating plan should be attempted nor would it be successful without first establishing a basic salary schedule for beginning and experienced teachers which would attract and retain in sufficient numbers enough quality teachers to assure an adequate supply for any demand the future may bring. The Commission for the Study of Merit Pay finds that while merit rating is no substitute for intelligent professional leadership; vigorous in-service training programs for teachers; adequate pre-service preparation leading to qualified beginning teachers; an atmosphere conducive to learning; and the provision of teaching facilities and materials, it does become a complementing factor to all of these listed aspects of the pattern for quality education.

There is much written and said against merit rating. In general the objection revolve around the means of determining relative merit with specific reference to:

1. The definition of good teaching,
2. The measuring instrument, and
3. The evaluators and merit evaluation process.

There is significant evidence that differences in teaching ability may be identified and while there is no single validated instrument acceptable to the entire teaching profession, there are many instruments of varying degrees of comprehensiveness which are satisfactory to individual districts including the favorable opinion of the teachers of that district.

It should also be said that the assumption of the original study in North Carolina (the McCall Report) which attempted to identify good teaching by measurable achievement change is

but one possible factor of many in measuring relative teaching ability or success and far from being an acceptable basis in itself.

Thus one of the problems which must be immediately faced is the cooperative development of criteria of superior teaching which are acceptable to teachers and school patrons. That this has been accomplished in certain districts is a hopeful sign.

The third chief objection concerning the evaluators and evaluation process is a legitimate concern. It is clear to the Commission that evaluators must be highly skilled in the process of evaluation. This, too, is one of the critical points in establishing a merit pay program.

A fourth objection is that of teacher morale under merit rating. Evidence here would indicate that there are cases in which morale suffered under merit rating. However, one extensive investigation found that there is actually no significant difference in morale between systems using merit plans and those not using them. So many other factors contribute to morale that merit pay becomes of lesser consequence.

Three additional points are pertinent:

1. Merit rating is not a money saving device nor one which will serve to keep taxes down in itself. If merit is rewarded financially, based upon a fair salary for all teachers, then extra funds will be necessary. Otherwise merit rating becomes so only in name and will not survive.

2. Merit rating will require additional administrative staff and will demand that the principal return to a supervisory role, which should inevitably lead to better teaching. The Utah study found that a ratio of one principal, plus clerical help, for each fifteen to twenty-four teachers would be required for implementing a merit program.

3. Merit rating in industry is often a reclassification of jobs. Other reasons enter into merit in business such as promotion, transfer, up-grading, and evaluation. In teaching with only one rung on the success ladder, the job content, advancement opportunities, and relation between individual goals and organizational goals are marked differences which render less than significant the argument that what is used in industry may be directly applicable to teaching.

The Commission found that since 1946 merit plans have been adopted by such school systems as West Hartford, Connecticut; Ladue Public Schools, Creve Coeur, Missouri; Grosse Points,

Michigan, Alton, Illinois; Shaker Heights, Ohio; Glencoe, Illinois; Ithaca, New York; Summit, New Jersey; Newton, Massachusetts; and Lexington, Massachusetts. The Florida Legislature in 1957 directed the development of a plan of career increments in the sixty-seven county school systems of the State.

Utah and California give live and current evidence of the prospects in favor of merit rating. In three Utah districts, where 80 per cent of the teachers voted recently to experiment with merit rating, the argument that those teachers do not want it is dispelled. Three hundred districts in California are currently employing cooperative personnel policies which emphasize **locally** developed patterns of action.

The Commission believes that it is imperative that effort be continued to find an ideal merit system and that sound personnel evaluation and merit salary programs for teachers will be beneficial if the people are willing to pay the price in terms of leadership, financial support, and effort to develop and use the necessary criteria and procedures. Not only is it possible to up-grade the level of teaching ability and performance through a constant and fair system of personnel evaluation, but also the level of the teaching profession will be raised in both the eyes of the public and those who desire to enter a progressive profession. It is felt that with the raising of salaries merit rating will be demanded by the public; at the same time merit rating makes the public more willing to support higher salaries.

There are instruments and criteria for evaluation which are satisfactory to teachers, administrators, and the public in specific districts.

One of the greatest advantages may come from the provision of additional administrative personnel who will be charged with supervisory responsibilities leading to the promotion of better teaching.

The Commission after considering all the pro's and con's concluded as did the American Association of School Administrators in 1958 that "accelerated systematic experimentation in teacher evaluation to the end that professional pay can be attached to professional rating by merit"⁶ should be continued. The Commission believes that the General Assembly of North Carolina should consider the establishment of appropriate procedures to implement this process of experimentation. The plan recom-

⁶ Quoted from Resolutions, annual meeting of American Association of School Administrators, 1958.

mended for experimental study in general calls for super-maximum pay for teachers judged superior. Only those teachers who have reached the maximum steps now allowable for training and experience would be eligible for consideration in this pilot study.

The ultimate coverage in a state-wide merit plan would not be limited to those who reach the present maximum, but would also accelerate superior teachers prior to that time.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Merit rating should be based on a salary schedule capable of attracting and holding qualified individuals in numbers sufficient to meet the demands for teachers.

It is recommended that a basic salary schedule competitive within the region be established.

2. Merit rating should be accompanied by a vigorous and positive plan to improve the preparation of teachers in both (a) the pre-service level and (b) in-service.

It is recommended that the Board of Higher Education and/or State Board of Education continue efforts to improve the pre-service preparation of teachers; and further, that the State Board of Education set high standards for teacher certification in academic subjects, not overlooking the necessity for adequate pre-service professional training culminating in a strong student teaching experience; and further that the State Board of Education establish a broad program of in-service training for the teachers in the several academic subject fields.

3. The principle of paying teachers according to quality of performance is sound. In addition the factors of preparation and experience should be considered in the over-all salary schedule. As the science of teacher evaluation has not developed a completely acceptable instrument upon which to adopt a general system of merit rating, the Commission feels that systematic experimentation in merit rating should be instituted.

In all of the experimental and permanent plans studied by the Commission the necessity for a plan tailored to the individual system, either local district or state-wide, is plainly seen. The involvement and general agreement of teachers, administrators, and school patrons is inevitable for success. It should also be stated that the Commission believes that not less than four years should be spent in this experimentation; one year in planning and implementation and three years for investigation and validation.

It is recommended that a program be established for the next two bienniums. This experimental program would award merit salary allowances above maxima which are reached through the factors of training and experience. The plan for super-maximum pay should be aimed directly at determining the level of teaching ability and performance for experienced teachers and rewarding those found to be definitely superior.

4. Realizing that the recommended program involves an expenditure of funds, the Commission recommends an appropriation to make possible recommendation Number One and the in-service program part of Number Two. In addition a sum of \$350,000 should be appropriated for an experimental program of superior service recognition in two or more selected school districts of North Carolina along with funds for necessary expenses to administer the study and program for a total of four years. Of this total an amount of \$150,000 would be necessary for 1961-63 and an additional \$200,000 for 1963-65.

II

IMPLEMENTATION OF A REVISED PUBLIC SCHOOL CURRICULUM

This Commission has been charged with the responsibility of studying any and all problems involved in "the implementation of a revised public school curriculum, to the end that our public school system may be strengthened and the public relations improved." The Resolution establishing this Commission also states the following: "The Commission shall work with and in consultation with the State Board of Education, or its representatives, in conducting its studies."

In developing this section of its report, this Commission has been in consultation with the State Board of Education's Curriculum Study staff. The curriculum improvement recommendations that have grown out of the Curriculum Study have been examined carefully by the Commission members. This report, however, is the outgrowth of study by this Commission and it assumes full responsibility for the recommendations made.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **Make teachers salaries competitive with salaries in other states.**

A quality curriculum cannot be implemented without quality teachers in the classrooms. Unless salaries are made competitive, few of the most able young people will enter the teaching profession.

2. **Provide funds so that the State Board of Education can reduce class size and provide for librarians, guidance counselors, non-teaching principals, special education teachers, teachers for gifted students, etc.**

Students cannot learn effectively without a reasonable amount of individual and small-group instruction. Students also need the services of faculty members who have special training in certain fields. An adequate staff is essential.

3. **Provide adequate funds for clerical help and teachers' aides for teachers and principals.**

It is false economy and poor educational management to require teachers capable of quality instruction to spend their time and energy on routine, non-teaching tasks.

- 4. Provide for adequate professional leadership by making professional salaries on the State level competitive with salaries in the University system and by providing adequately for local school administrative and supervisory positions.**

Private enterprise has found that quality leadership is essential. Public education finds the same thing true. Both public education and higher education are essential to the welfare of the State. Their equal importance should be recognized by equal qualifications and pay for leadership.

- 5. Provide adequate funds for textbooks, library books, instructional supplies, etc.**

No one would employ a skilled craftsman and then deny him the tools he needs. To deny skilled teachers the tools they need is equally foolish.

- 6. Strengthen support for education through television.**

A progressive state cannot afford to neglect the educational possibilities in the rapidly advancing electronic media of communication. The possibility that through television quality instruction in special subjects may be placed within reach of many rural youth is only one of the reasons why this area should be supported.

- 7. Provide National Defense Education Act matching funds to permit local school units to buy needed equipment.**

National Defense Education Act funds do not carry with them Federal control. For the state to deny its share of matching funds is to deny to children in the poorer counties the advantages of an adequate educational program. In these schools, time taken from class work to raise funds outside of the regular budget means that much less time is available for quality instruction.

- 8. Provide adequate funds for a program of in-service education of teachers now on the job.**

Most of the instruction for sometime to come will be provided by teachers now in the schools. An urgent need is to provide opportunities for these teachers to improve their training in depth and to keep up with new knowledge in their fields.

- 9. It is recommended that educational research, including experimental programs, on both the State and the local level be strengthened materially as a basis for giving direction to school improvement.**

If the public school curriculum is to be made and kept effective, research and experimentation developed in a planned and properly supported program are essential.

- 10. Support in the colleges and the University the teacher education programs as strongly and with as high a salary schedule as is provided for medicine, law, engineering, and agriculture.**

Teacher education must be accorded the priority that it requires as an essential part of the effort to improve the quality of public education. Unless these programs and the salaries of teachers in these programs are made competitive with other programs in the same and other state-supported colleges and universities, teacher education cannot be expected to achieve the quality needed.

- 11. Support scholarship loan funds for teachers and administrators.**

The scholarship loan program already provided has proven its worth in attracting young people to the teaching profession. This program must be expanded and made to include teachers and administrators in service.

- 12. Initiate a state-level program of training for local school board members.**

An expanded and improved curriculum must be understood and supported by the taxpaying-parent public. Local school boards must provide leadership and liaison between the public and the school operation. To accomplish this, school board members need organized help in a concentrated course of finances, school laws, Legislature and local government functions, curriculum, and public relations.

It is recommended that a LOCAL SCHOOL BOARD INSTITUTE be established, operating under the auspices of the Institute of Local Government, or other appropriate agency. Annual or semi-annual seminars would offer comprehensive instruction and review of vital factors and procedures.

This should be an objective training project for the sole purpose of enabling school board members to keep better informed and qualified to provide leadership in an efficient, representative manner.

**RECOMMENDED REVISION OF SCHOOL LAW AND/OR STATE
SCHOOL BOARD REGULATIONS**

1. Revise the legal restrictions that may make it difficult for local school authorities to buy equipment for an improved curriculum. This will require joint study by the State Board of Education and the State Division of Purchase and Contract.
2. Revise the restrictions on the use of tax funds for kindergarten instruction and for summer school instruction.
3. Legalize the use of state school funds to employ teacher aids in order to promote team teaching.
4. Free the State Board of Education and the State Department of Public Instruction from personnel and budget restrictions to the extent that professional positions needed and salaries of professional personnel may be made competitive with positions and salaries in the University. This refers to State-level positions.
5. Leave to the State Board of Education and to local boards of education the authority to make decisions on what subjects and activities should be a part of the public school curriculum, but give these boards the financial, legal, and moral support they need in order to do a good job.
6. Eliminate non-educational activities of schools and relieve teachers of non-teaching duties.
7. Implement the subject recommendations of the Curriculum Study and provide state funds for a continuing curriculum study.

APPENDIX A

RESOLUTION NO. 80—A JOINT RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF A COMMISSION TO REPORT UPON THE PAY OF PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS BASED UPON THE ABILITY OF THE INDIVIDUAL TEACHER, AND TO STUDY AND REPORT MEANS OF IMPLEMENTING CURRICULUM STUDIES IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

WHEREAS, the present salary schedule for teachers in the public schools of North Carolina does not take into account the individual ability and the value of the services rendered by the individual teacher and the work done by the individual teacher in the public schools of the State; and

WHEREAS, it is desirable to have an incentive for teachers to excel in their profession and encourage the best endeavors of the teacher to improve their teaching capacity; and

WHEREAS, it is in the interest of the public schools of the State that the merit of an individual teacher be recognized and awarded by salaries based upon individual teaching ability in addition to minimum standard salary; and

WHEREAS, intensive curriculum studies are now being made, the findings of which will need implementation in order that the school children of North Carolina may benefit from the findings and receive maximum education; and

WHEREAS, there is widespread disagreement among educators, legislators and taxpayers as to the feasibility and needs of a merit system for teachers, and a change in the public school curriculum, the elimination of which would improve public relations; and

WHEREAS, the rapid increase in school population and demand for additional revenue makes it necessary that we derive the maximum benefit from our teaching effort and financial expenditures; and

WHEREAS, the continuing better education of our youth is a fundamental and continuing necessity for the welfare of our citizens;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate, the House of Representatives concurring:

Section 1. The Governor is hereby authorized and empowered to appoint a commission to be known as the North Carolina Commission for the Study of Teacher Merit Pay and

Implementation of a Revised Public School Curriculum to consist of not more than seventeen members including the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Chairman of the North Carolina Board of Education, five members representing the North Carolina General Assembly, five members representing the school profession and five members representing the public, The Governor shall designate one of the members as Chairman.

Section 2. It shall be the duty of the Commission to study any and all problems involved in teacher merit pay, and the implementation of a revised public school curriculum, to the end that our public school system may be strengthened and the public relations improved. The Commission shall fully investigate and report their findings as to the methods by which the compensation of teachers in the public schools of the State may be based upon merit and the individual capacity and ability of the respective teachers, to the end that such capacity and ability may be recognized, and compensation provided therefor in addition to the minimum standard salaries.

Section 3. The Commission shall work with and in consultation with the State Board of Education, or its representatives, in conducting its studies.

Section 4. The Commission shall be authorized to employ an executive secretary and such other assistants as it, from time to time, with the approval of the Governor, finds necessary. The salaries of the executive secretary and all other assistants employed by the Commission shall be fixed by the Commission with the approval of the Governor and shall be paid, together with all other necessary and proper expenses of the Commission, from the Contingency and Emergency Fund.

Section 5. The Commission shall make its report to the Governor of North Carolina on or before December 1, 1960, and the Governor shall transmit said report to the 1961 North Carolina General Assembly. Members of the Commission shall receive the same per diem and travel allowances as the allowed officers and employees of the State while in the performance of their duties, said pay and expenses to be paid from the Contingency and Emergency Fund.

Section 6. This Resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its adoption.

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE PLAN FOR MERIT EXPERIMENTATION¹

1. Teacher teaches a minimum of years; i.e. A 12 or G 13, and holds not less than A Certificate based upon degree from 4-year college (i. e. A or G teacher only).
2. Teacher makes application to be considered by beginning of sixth month of first year of study and thereafter by fifth month of each year.
3. Principal makes a minimum of ten hours observation on three separate days, recording observation on form (to be developed). He recommends, defers, or denies application. (At this point teacher may appeal to Board of Education or its representative for reconsideration of application.)
4. (a) If application is approved, unit merit supervisor and at least two additional members of the review board spend not less than six hours each in classroom, observing and evaluating applicant, using standard instrument.
(b) At the end of this evaluation the teacher is rated superior, excellent, or good. Superior teacher entitled to additional pay following year; excellent entitled to review using step 4 (a) following year; good may re-apply after one year for consideration.
5. Superior teacher receives an additional increment of _____
Permanent plan should include following:
6. At the end of _____ years the teacher rated superior may apply for a second merit increment.
7. Teachers rated superior will be reviewed every _____ years to determine if competency level is being maintained.

¹ Commission believes plan should include but not be limited to items listed.

APPENDIX C

SAMPLE INSTRUMENT FOR THE EVALUATION AND MEASURE OF THE TOTAL SERVICE OF THE TEACHER

DESCRIPTION OF CRITERIA FOR EACH LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENT

A five-point rating scale will be used in evaluating teaching services.

A rating of "1" in areas I, II, and III shall be necessary in order for promotion to the level of the salary schedule. Areas IV and V shall be used for additional information in arriving at the total evaluation of the teacher.

DIRECT SERVICE TO PUPILS

- I. Teaching Ability
- II. Classroom Management
- III. Contribution to the Total School Program

TEACHER QUALITIES AND GROWTH

- IV. Personal Qualities
- V. Professional Growth

Teachers rating "1" may be defined as those who possess the following characteristics:

- A. A strong and pleasant personality
- B. A genuine respect for the profession and the members thereof
- C. Good health
- D. An ethical point of view
- E. An understanding of human nature and individual differences
- F. Have excellent command of the subject matter in their field both in range and depth
- G. Have ability to instruct clearly, to manage classroom efficiently, and to control easily without undue dominance
- H. Have a genuine interest in boys and girls, a knowledge of the physical and emotional characteristics of age group, and a desire to provide a happy, meaningful classroom environment for learning experiences appropriate to the age level.

- I. Have ability to evaluate and utilize discriminately current professional theories and practices
- J. Have ability to plan a diversified program which provides for maximum enrichment of learning experiences through the use of all available and appropriate teaching materials, (audio-visual materials, natural and community resources, field trips, libraries, etc.) and provides for a variety of media for expression of ideas: dramatization, creative writing, folk songs, poetry and literature
- K. Have ability to take initiative and to help plan and to carry out school programs within their own school and for the school system
- L. Willingly cooperate in aiding and enriching the teaching experience of other teachers
- M. Contribute to the growth of the profession through writing, speaking, and committee membership when afforded the opportunity
- N. Accept the responsibility for their own professional growth through advanced study, professional reading, and affiliation with in-service groups.

A rating of "2" in areas I, II, and III shall be necessary in order for promotion to the top level of the regular salary schedule. Areas IV and V shall be used for additional information in arriving at the total evaluation of the teacher.

Teachers rating "2" must possess, at least, the first eight characteristics outlined for a "1" rating: A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H.

A rating of "3" in all areas shall be necessary for promotion to the continuous service staff.

A "4" rating indicates that the teacher does not possess the characteristics listed for rating "1" or "2" in a sufficiently high degree necessary for successful teaching. A teacher who cannot rise above this rating will not be promoted to the continuous service staff.

A "5" rating indicates that a serious question is raised concerning the teacher's work and that he should not be recommended for reappointment.

It is not expected that all sub-items under each major area shall be checked, but all applicable items should be marked.

DIRECT SERVICE TO PUPILS

I. TEACHING ABILITY	5	4	3	2	1
A. Evaluation of subject matter and functional application					
B. Knowledge of subject matter					
C. Organization of the work					
D. Definiteness and clearness of aim					
E. Preparation of lessons					
F. Presentation of work					
G. Effectiveness in pupil participation					
H. Effective use of questions					
I. Knowledge, use, and interpretation of tests and testing techniques					
J. Skill in making assignments					
K. Skill in development of study habits					
L. Skill in awakening interest and effort					
M. Attention to individual abilities and needs					
N. Aptness in using references and illustrative materials					
O. Development of critical thinking					
P. Development of habits, attitudes and appreciations					
Q. Provision for opportunities to develop self-discipline					
R. Voice and speech					
	5	4	3	2	1
Evaluation—Teaching Ability					
II. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	5	4	3	2	1
A. Physical well-being of pupils					
B. Emotional well-being of pupils					
C. Teacher-pupil rapport					
D. Organization of routine					
E. Appearance of the classroom					
F. Evidence of worthwhile activities					
G. Care of school materials					
H. Effective use of school materials					
I. Social control					
	5	4	3	2	1
Evaluation—Classroom Management					

III. CONTRIBUTION OF THE TEACHER TO THE TOTAL SCHOOL PROGRAM	5	4	3	2	1
A. Participation in faculty meetings					
B. Faculty committees					
C. Assembly and other programs					
D. Playground					
E. Noon hour, bus duty, etc.					
F. Evening meetings and P. T. A.					
G. Cooperation with cadet program					
H. Outside help to students and teachers					
I. Club programs and intramural sports					
J. Homerooms					
K. Student organizations					
L. Excursions, field trips					
M. Observations by other teachers					
N. Promptness and accuracy with reports					
Evaluation—Contribution of the Teacher to the Total School Program	5	4	3	2	1

TEACHER QUALITIES AND GROWTH

IV. PERSONAL QUALITIES OF THE TEACHER	5	4	3	2	1
A. Professional attitude					
1. Ethical conduct					
2. Respect for the teaching profession					
3. Acceptance and use of suggestions					
B. Traits of character					
1. Cheerfulness					
2. Loyalty					
3. Sense of humor					
4. Sincerity					
5. Courage					
6. Tact					
7. Judgment: fairness and sense of proportion					
8. Sympathy and understanding					
9. Responsibility					
10. Resourcefulness					
C. Personal appearance					
Evaluation—Personal Qualities of the Teacher	5	4	3	2	1

V. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH OF THE TEACHER	COMMENTS
---------------------------------------	----------

- A. Education
 - 1. Initial training _____
 - 2. In-service training _____
 - 3. Attendance at conferences and workshops _____
- B. Cooperation with educational research projects _____
- C. Professional leadership _____
- D. Community service _____
- E. Professional reading _____
- F. Travel _____
- G. Work experience _____
- H. Membership in professional organizations _____
- I. Other _____

Evaluation—Professional Growth of the Teacher	5	4	3	2	1
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

TOTAL EVALUATION OF THE TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE TEACHER

Check the appropriate rating	5	4	3	2	1
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Comments: _____

APPENDIX D

EXAMPLE OF MERIT SALARY PLAN

This merit salary schedule incorporates two features: (a) merit advancement to teachers who have not reached the maximum, and (b) "career" awards to superior teachers who have reached the normal maximum and render outstanding service to the schools and community.

- (a) **Merit advancement.** The salary schedule is not automatic. Normally a teacher is advanced one step each year, but double increments may be given for superior work, thereby accelerating him on the salary schedule. Annual increments may be, and occasionally are, withheld from those whose work is not satisfactory.
- (b) **"Career" classification.** In recognition of unusual teaching ability and service to the schools and community, the Board of Education may grant the teacher who has reached the maximum an additional \$500 per year. At the end of three years, he is eligible for another \$500 and at the end of three more years, a third \$500, making a total of \$1500 above the normal maximum. The award, once given, is continued from year to year.

Selection of "Career" Teachers

Nomination may be made by the teacher's principal or any group of three or more teachers. If a teacher is not recommended by his principal or colleagues, he may apply. In all cases, the teacher's consent is necessary if he is to be considered for the "career" award.

Nomination is based on established criteria, which include skill in teaching, pupil-teacher relations, staff relations, professional activities and community relations. Supporting evidence is submitted to a central administrative committee, composed of the Director of Elementary Education, one elementary principal, a junior high principal, and a senior high principal, and the Assistant Superintendent of Schools. Membership of principals is rotated, with one new member each year.

This committee reviews records, interviews the principals, visits the schools over an extended period of time. Final recom-

mendations of the committee are submitted to the Superintendent and approved by the Board of Education. Announcement of teachers appointed to the "career" classification is made through the staff bulletin and the press. No attempt is made to keep the names secret. Teachers not selected may have their evaluations reviewed by the Superintendent or Board of Education.