



TIF: Human Capital Management System (HCMS) Self-Assessment

July 2014

The Human Capital Management System Self-Assessment was developed by Measurement Incorporated under subcontract to Kratos Learning for the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, under Contract No. ED-ESE-13-C-0068. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) or the U.S. Department of Education, nor does mention or visual representation of trade names, commercial products or organizations imply endorsement by TIF or the federal government. This document is in the public domain and may be used without permission.

TIF Human Capital Management System (HCMS) Self-Assessment

Assessing the Progress and Future Planning of HCMS Reform: A Self-Assessment Tool for Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) Grantees and Local Education Agencies

Background and Description

The *Human Capital Management System (HCMS) Self-Assessment* is a comprehensive, voluntary instrument designed to guide Local Education Agencies (LEAs) in examining their human capital practices with a critical eye toward improvement. The instrument identifies activities, tasks, processes, and collaborations that, when well implemented, can result in a high-quality HCMS leading to an improved workforce and improved student outcomes. A central premise of this self-assessment is that all LEAs have strengths upon which to build and, through ongoing reflection, can identify existing best practices and use them as cornerstones for promoting broad-based HCMS implementation. Another premise is that LEAs can learn from each other by sharing information on what constitutes HCMS quality—both from the standpoint of what currently “works” and what can be done in the future to advance human capital policies and practices.

The HCMS Self-Assessment is structured around *Human Capital Quality Indicators*—a comprehensive framework developed through an in-depth, collaborative process involving an extensive review of the literature on HCMS and related fields and feedback from TIF grantees. Although, the indicators encompass some of the key features of an effective HCMS, they go beyond by capturing what might be considered an ideal or model system of HCMS. Since Human Capital Management refers to managing all the talent in an organization, the term *educator* is used to denote all school staff including teachers, specialists, and administrators.

Altogether, 56 quality indicators are included in the instrument. They address six areas of HCMS functioning: General System Design, Recruitment/Selection/Placement, Induction/Mentoring, Professional Development, Evaluation, and Recognition and Reward. Also included are examples of evidence (i.e., “look-fors”) that local decision-makers can use to determine whether or not the quality indicators are in place.

As with any framework of this type, it is important to remember that the quality indicators are not carved in stone. At the time of development, they were based on the extensive research knowledge, and best thinking of the TIF Center team. Nevertheless, high quality is a moving target, and continuous improvement can only be maintained if practitioners continue to examine what they are doing, explore creative strategies, and share their knowledge and experience.

Purpose

The purpose of the *HCMS Self-Assessment* is to promote continuous improvement. The tool provides administrators and key staff, in collaboration with other stakeholders, the opportunity to use a common set of research-based indicators to assess, plan, design, and execute strategies for ongoing refinement of HCMS practices. In addition, as a *working tool*, the self-assessment instrument offers a structure for conversation/internal dialogue about:

- HCMS strengths and opportunities;
- areas to focus on for future improvements;
- progress that has been made over time;
- strategies that could be considered models of effective practice; and
- areas where further professional development or technical assistance may be needed to improve practice.

The process of the self-assessment also provides intangible value beyond written reports or assessments because it

- builds commitment and ownership on the part of the district-level staff who participate in the process;
- promotes team building and consensus among district leaders;
- increases the capacity for strategic thinking in the field of HCMS; and
- builds an understanding of an ideal model for HCMS implementation.

Directions for Use

To complete the self-assessment, LEAs are asked to review the quality indicators for each of the six HCMS areas and then, based on supporting evidence (i.e., “look-fors”), make an overall determination about the level of implementation using the 5-point rating scale described below.

Rating	Rubric
1 No Implementation	Our LEA is not implementing any (or hardly any) of the indicators for this HCMS area. We need significant support in this area.
2 Minimal Implementation	Our LEA is implementing some of the indicators for this HCMS area, but most of our efforts are in the planning stage. Substantial work is needed to improve our approach.
3 Moderate Implementation	Our LEA is implementing most of the indicators for this HCMS area, but some gaps in implementation exist and improvements could be made.
4 Complete Implementation	Our LEA is implementing most of the indicators for this HCMS area. Our approach is systematic and organized with no major gaps.
5 Exemplary Implementation	Our LEA is implementing all of the indicators for this HCMS area. We have a sound, systematic approach that could serve as a model for other LEAs.

Directions for Use of the Notes Section

Each HCMS area and indicators is accompanied by a section for *Notes*. This section may be used to record other information that can expand upon the LEA’s performance in a given area. For example, an LEA may use the Notes section to

- provide statements about progress, e.g., “our LEA is in the early planning phase, but we have a commitment to move forward”;
- provide more information and greater detail on accomplishments—i.e., going beyond the listed indicators;
- describe strengths, weaknesses, and plans for improvement; and/or
- provide an explanation as to why the LEA is not implementing a specific indicator, e.g., “This indicator is not applicable to our LEA.”

Recommended Steps

The following steps are recommended to conduct the LEA HCMS self-assessment.

1. **Identify and recruit the key stakeholders to complete the self-assessment.** A variety of approaches to conducting this step can prove effective. One possibility is to have a representative team of LEA-level decision-makers complete the self-assessment as a group. Another approach is to have individual stakeholders fill out the tool separately, and then have the individual results compiled for group discussion and self-assessment completion. Yet a third way is to have the instrument completed by one or two people who are most knowledgeable of the HCMS program. Regardless of the approach used, however, it is important to enlist input from key stakeholder groups.
2. **Review supporting evidence and data.** Sources of evidence can include the LEA plans, reports, minutes of meetings, mission/vision statements, policies, written documentation and data gathered through interviews with stakeholders, monitoring tools, the LEA's professional development plan, progress reports, and so forth. We have provided examples of evidence/look-fors that would be appropriate for each HCMS area
3. **Complete the self-assessment.** Carefully read each indicator then place a checkmark (√) in the box provided if you feel that the indicator is in place (and you have evidence to support this). Review the individual assessments and provide a final rating for the HCMS area by circling or highlighting the appropriate number or table cell. Use the Notes section to record any explanatory or expanded information about the LEA's performance. Once you have rated the six major HCMS areas, transfer your ratings to the Summary Form, on page 17.
4. **Reflect on the self-assessment.** Upon completion of the self-assessment, LEAs should engage key HCMS stakeholders in reflection about the current status of the HCMS implementation. Through thoughtful discussion, HCMS stakeholders should then determine which HCMS areas require refinement.

In Conclusion

It is important to remember that *high quality* is a moving target. LEAs should consider completing the HCMS Self-Assessment, along with the summary form, on an ongoing basis to review and document HCMS program improvement efforts.

Table 1. General System

General System Quality Indicators					Check if Implemented
1. The LEA has an explicit vision for instructional improvement and a strategic plan to achieve it.					<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The LEA clearly articulates and measures the knowledge, skills, and competencies educators need to realize the instructional vision.					<input type="checkbox"/>
3. The LEA has an explicit talent strategy to: acquire, develop, train, support, reward, and retain the most effective educators.					<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
4. The LEA has restructured its human resource system to support the implementation of an aligned HCMS (e.g., by revamping HR policies and practices including staffing criteria).					<input type="checkbox"/>
5. The LEA has galvanized support for the aligned HCMS by engaging stakeholders through ongoing and transparent communication.					<input type="checkbox"/>
6. The LEA monitors data and regularly evaluates the results of the HCMS to ensure that components are vertically aligned with the vision and strategy of the district and horizontally aligned with the other components of the HCMS.					<input type="checkbox"/>
7. The LEA provides schools with sufficient operational flexibility to hire educators of their own choosing and to assign roles, responsibilities, and duties in a way that best supports school and student needs.					<input type="checkbox"/>
8. The LEA promotes and supports a culture/work environment characterized by (a) high expectations, (b) shared understanding of effectiveness, (c) collective responsibility for achievement, and d) collaborative professional learning.					<input type="checkbox"/>
9. The LEA and teachers' and principals' organizations have agreed on the principles of the HCMS which includes both a rigorous, transparent and equitable educator evaluation system and a performance-based compensation system.					<input type="checkbox"/>
Final Rating:	1 No Implementation	2 Minimal Implementation	3 Moderate Implementation	4 Complete Implementation	5 Exemplary Implementation
NOTES (evidence of accomplishments, related data/criteria, key stakeholders involved, critical issues, Web site, etc.):					

General System Indicators: Possible Evidence or “Look Fors”

1. Vision statement for instructional improvement including an action plan that depicts the timeline for implementation
2. Records/Documentation identifying the specific strategies used for implementing the vision for improvement (e.g., written communication, website postings, meetings, presentations)
3. Formal process to systematically and regularly seek stakeholder input and for stakeholders to raise questions/concerns
4. Communication/media strategy
5. Educators Standards Manual or other resource identifying the core competencies educators need to meet in order to carry out the instructional improvement strategy
6. Research/Evidence that the core competencies reflect evidence-based standards (e.g., list of sources or frameworks used to develop and/or adapt the standards)
7. Records/Documentation of a benchmark analysis of the current HR system was conducted
8. Evidence that the HR policies and practices have been enhanced or restructured: moving from a strictly support function to being the cornerstone of an integrated talent management system (e.g., guidelines emphasizing alignment of all HR function, new HR staff, extensive re-training of existing staff)
9. Evidence that a decision maker from the HR department is involved in all key decisions at central office (e.g., documents/minutes showing an HR presence during budget planning meetings, curricular meetings, meetings regarding personnel needs)
10. Evidence that the LEA has communicated the importance of and strategies for HCMS to various stakeholder groups including district personnel, parents, and community members (e.g., memos, newsletters, presentations, other communications)
11. Evidence, such as survey results, that stakeholders understand and support the HCMS
12. Data systems/Software enabling the coordination/alignment of all HR functions with the HCMS
13. Monitoring measures—e.g., surveys—that provide feedback on the alignment of HCMS functions
14. Waivers—i.e., from state statute and the collective bargaining agreement—to provide greater operational flexibility in the use of people, money, and time to best drive student achievement

15. Testimonials on school culture/work environment (e.g., results of surveys, focus groups, interviews)
16. Records/Documentation describing LEA efforts to promote more flexible work schedules (part-time work, job sharing, flex-time) and work policies (e.g., business casual dress, safe/secure facilities)
17. Regulations/policies on teacher planning time
18. Monthly school schedule showing periods of common planning time, PLCs, peer review etc. to promote teamwork and collaboration
19. Student discipline policies including regulations regarding bullying, harassment, and weapons
20. Testimonials showing educator satisfaction with working conditions (e.g., results of surveys, focus groups, interviews, and other feedback mechanisms)

Table 2. Recruitment, Selection and Placement

Recruitment, Selection, and Placement Quality Indicators					Check if Implemented
1. The LEA uses meaningful data to detect and forecast personnel needs and develop hiring goals based on identified need.					<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The LEA identifies and actively recruits educators with specific performance competencies necessary to produce high levels of student achievement.					<input type="checkbox"/>
3. The LEA uses a variety of recruitment strategies including advertisements in local newspapers, publications such as Education Week, interviewing at local colleges, regional education newsletters, and websites.					<input type="checkbox"/>
4. The LEA establishes partnerships with reputable universities and/or talent recruitment organizations to obtain top talent.					<input type="checkbox"/>
5. The LEA draws non-traditional candidates into teaching by recruiting from alternative sources.					<input type="checkbox"/>
6. The LEA provides incentives to help attract effective educators (e.g., higher salary, signing bonus, additional benefits, increased compensation for teaching in hard-to-staff subjects and locations, subsidized tuition, or forgivable loans).					<input type="checkbox"/>
7. The LEA uses a rigorous process and a variety of tools to screen and select educators and hire those with the competencies necessary to produce high levels of student achievement.					<input type="checkbox"/>
8. The LEA's hiring and placement timelines enable the early hiring of educators.					<input type="checkbox"/>
9. The LEA's placement policies ensure that effective educators are equitably distributed across schools (including hard-to-staff schools), assigned to teach within their area of licensure, and placed in schools where they can be effective. The LEA should have a clearly defined process for meeting this goal.					<input type="checkbox"/>
10. The LEA's placement policies eliminate forced placements and the practice of seniority dictating placement.					<input type="checkbox"/>
Final Rating:	1 No Implementation	2 Minimal Implementation	3 Moderate Implementation	4 Complete Implementation	5 Exemplary Implementation
NOTES (evidence of accomplishments, related data/criteria, key stakeholders involved, critical issues, Web site, etc.):					

Recruitment, Selection, and Placement Indicators: Possible Evidence or “Look Fors”

1. Records/Documentation showing an explicit link between recruitment/selection practices and (1) requisite educator standards/competencies, and (2) other HCMS functions (e.g., recruitment channels are modified based on educator performance data and the competencies needed by the LEA to realize the instructional vision)
2. Results of a workforce gap analysis to forecast future workforce needs
3. Strategic plan for recruiting, selecting, and placing top talent in schools
4. Evidence of training administrators who are interviewing for teaching positions
5. A hiring manual that includes interview questions that personnel can use to conduct interviews
6. Evidence of a hiring committee at the building level that includes exemplary teachers
7. Partnership agreements with high-quality educator preparation programs and other talent pipelines
8. Records/Documentation identifying the recruitment strategies used to attract top talent (e.g., employment ads, job postings)
9. Records/Documentation describing the incentives available/provided to attract effective educators overall, and in hard-to-staff schools
10. Statistics/Data on number and amount of signing (or other) bonuses given
11. List of screening measures and tools
12. Hiring selection criteria
13. Hiring cycle timeline
14. Statistics/Data on the number of newly hired by recruitment source, and the average time it takes to recruit and hire
15. Placement policies that align to best practices
16. Transfer policies
17. Statistics/Data showing the distribution of educators within schools by licensure area, experience level and skill level
18. Statistics/Data showing the background/qualifications of teachers in STEM-subjects

Table 3. Induction and Mentoring

Induction and Mentoring Quality Indicators					Check if Implemented
1. The LEA provides an intensive, comprehensive, and sequentially delivered induction/mentoring program structured around its vision of instructional improvement.					<input type="checkbox"/>
2. New educators are required to participate in the induction/mentoring program until they meet minimum standards; they are required to exit the program after a set number of years (and be dismissed if they fail to meet minimum standards).					<input type="checkbox"/>
3. The induction/mentoring program uses a collaborative coaching model that is informed by rigorous teaching standards and performance rubrics.					<input type="checkbox"/>
4. The induction/mentoring program trains and supports new educators in both classroom management and instructional skills.					<input type="checkbox"/>
5. The induction/mentoring program includes time for new educators to observe, plan, and collaborate with other educators.					<input type="checkbox"/>
6. The LEA implements a rigorous mentor selection and training process that is grounded in research and best practices. The LEA has structures and timelines to help facilitate the mentor/novice educator relationship including required activities and tasks.					<input type="checkbox"/>
7. The LEA evaluates the effectiveness of individual mentors and the mentoring program based on clearly communicated criteria that are grounded in research and best practice.					<input type="checkbox"/>
Final Rating:	1 No Implementation	2 Minimal Implementation	3 Moderate Implementation	4 Complete Implementation	5 Exemplary Implementation
NOTES (evidence of accomplishments, related data/criteria, key stakeholders involved, critical issues, Web site, etc.):					

Induction and Mentoring Indicators: Possible Evidence or “Look Fors”

1. Records/Documentation showing an explicit link between induction/mentoring programs and (1) requisite educator standards/competencies, and (2) other HCMS functions (e.g., induction/ mentoring outcomes inform the design of subsequent professional development programs—all structured around the vision for instructional improvement)
2. Districtwide plan for coaching and mentoring newly hired educators
3. Resources allocated to support high-quality induction/mentoring programs (e.g., stipends, schedules)
4. Mentor selection criteria aligned to best practices including a rigorous interview
5. Evidence of effective training plans for mentors
6. Mentor training plan
7. Induction/Mentoring evaluation strategy: (e.g., measures, procedures, results, decisions made based on data)
8. Statistics/Data showing the number/percentage of new hires that participated in comprehensive induction/mentoring programs
9. Statistics/Data that tracks the effectiveness of the mentees and links that data to the mentor
10. Testimonials from new hires on the quality and effectiveness of induction and mentoring (e.g., results of surveys, focus groups, interviews)

Table 4. Professional Development

Professional Development Quality Indicators					Check if Implemented
1. The LEA provides sustained, job-embedded, high-quality professional development (PD) to educators that is aligned with its vision of instructional improvement.					<input type="checkbox"/>
2. PD content is designed according to identified needs based on educator evaluation results and student performance.					<input type="checkbox"/>
3. PD progresses developmentally and differentiates by responsibility and levels of expertise/experience; it moves educators along a performance pathway from novice, to tenure, to higher levels of performance and educator leadership roles.					<input type="checkbox"/>
4. PD provides adequate time for educator collaboration, active learning, and reflection.					<input type="checkbox"/>
5. The LEA has developed a system in which PD supports educator leaders by creating opportunities and structures for exemplary educators to take responsibility for instructional leadership and mentoring.					<input type="checkbox"/>
6. The LEA sets goals for professional development and evaluates its effectiveness redirecting resources towards the most effective elements.					<input type="checkbox"/>
7. The district has an intervention program for struggling teachers, with a clearly articulated referral process.					<input type="checkbox"/>
Final Rating:	1 No Implementation	2 Minimal Implementation	3 Moderate Implementation	4 Complete Implementation	5 Exemplary Implementation
NOTES (evidence of accomplishments, related data/criteria, key stakeholders involved, critical issues, Web site, etc.):					

Professional Development Indicators: Possible Evidence or “Look Fors”

1. Records/Documentation showing an explicit link between PD and (1) requisite educator standards/ competencies, and (2) other HCMS functions (e.g., professional development focuses on areas of instructional practice where educators received lower evaluation scores to ensure instructional effectiveness)
2. Districtwide professional development (PD) plan that includes integrated structures and processes both vertically and horizontally
3. Individual PD plans for all new teachers and administrators
4. Partnership agreements with institutions of higher education (IHEs) and other service providers to support the PD needs of educators
5. PD event calendar (e.g., activities, resources, timelines, intended audiences, intended outcomes)
6. Inventory of all PD opportunities/resources available (e.g., electronic resources, PLCs, peer observation, study groups)
7. Resources allocated to support high-quality PD
8. PD needs assessment strategy (e.g., measures, procedures, results, decisions made based on data)
9. PD evaluation strategy (e.g., measures, procedures, results, decisions made based on data)
10. Records/Documentation identifying available opportunities for career advancement
11. Statistics/Data on PD participation rates and hours of participation by educator type
12. Statistics/Data on PD content and the effectiveness of implementation results (test scores—benchmark, and/or high stakes)
13. Testimonials about the quality and effectiveness of PD (e.g., results of surveys, focus groups, interviews)

Table 5. Evaluation

Evaluation Quality Indicators					Check if Implemented
1. The LEA uses an educator evaluation system that is aligned with its vision of instructional improvement and includes the use of a rigorous, research-based rubric to determine levels of educator performance.					<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The LEA evaluates multiple components of educator performance (e.g., instructional expertise, contribution to student learning, and professionalism) using multiple sources of evidence (e.g., portfolios, interviews, supervisor ratings, observation, surveys of relevant stakeholders, self-reflection).					<input type="checkbox"/>
3. The LEA includes evidence of student growth (e.g., value-added, student growth percentiles, etc.) as a significant component of the educator evaluation system.					<input type="checkbox"/>
4. The LEA conducts multiple classroom observations of educator performance throughout the year including some unannounced observations.					<input type="checkbox"/>
5. The LEA makes the evaluation system transparent to educators by ensuring that they understand the evaluation process including student growth measures.					<input type="checkbox"/>
6. The LEA provides rigorous training and monitoring to those conducting educator evaluations to ensure that the evaluations are conducted with fidelity to standardized procedures. Evaluators are certified on an annual basis.					<input type="checkbox"/>
7. The LEA monitors the evaluators for inter-rater reliability and consistency.					<input type="checkbox"/>
8. The LEA uses the evaluation results for formative purposes to provide feedback to educators about their performance and uses data to determine professional development to improve it.					<input type="checkbox"/>
9. The LEA has a process in place to evaluate educators who teach grades and subjects without EOY and EOG assessments.					<input type="checkbox"/>
10. The LEA uses the evaluation results for summative purposes to make personnel decisions around tenure, compensation, promotion, and dismissal.					<input type="checkbox"/>
11. The LEA periodically assesses the quality, utility, and overall effectiveness of the educator evaluation system by gathering feedback from educators and other stakeholders and by comparing evaluation results to student performance.					<input type="checkbox"/>
12. The LEA has a data infrastructure in place to link educators to individual students.					<input type="checkbox"/>
Final Rating:	1 No Implementation	2 Minimal Implementation	3 Moderate Implementation	4 Complete Implementation	5 Exemplary Implementation
NOTES (evidence of accomplishments, related data/criteria, key stakeholders involved, critical issues, Web site, etc.):					

Evaluation Indicators: Possible Evidence or “Look Fors”

1. Records/Documentation showing an explicit link between educator evaluation and (1) requisite educator standards/competencies, and (2) other HCMS functions (e.g., evaluation results inform tenure decisions to reward and retain the most effective educators)
2. Educator evaluation policies/procedures (including guidelines on the design and intent of the evaluation system and use of evaluation results)
3. Records/Documentation identifying the :
 - components of the evaluation system
 - format/methods of evaluation
 - frequency of evaluation
 - type of evaluators/observers and the training required of each
4. Evidence that student growth measures are incorporated into an educator’s final evaluation rating
5. Written guidelines for evaluators; schedule of evaluator training sessions
6. Records/Documentation identifying the strategies used to keep educators informed and ensure their understanding about all aspects of the evaluation system (e.g., written communication, website postings, meetings, presentations)
7. Statistics/Data on the percentage of educators evaluated by type and tenure status, and the percentage falling within each effectiveness level (e.g., HEDI levels)
8. Copies of the evaluation forms, records of observation, analyses of performance ratings, etc.
9. Testimonials about the quality and effectiveness of the evaluation system (e.g., results of surveys, focus groups, interviews, and other feedback mechanisms)

Table 6. Recognition and Reward

Recognition and Reward Quality Indicators					Check if Implemented
1. The LEA has a system/process for recognizing and rewarding educator performance that is transparent and fair.					<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The LEA provides performance-based compensation built on educator effectiveness in (a) meeting student achievement growth targets, and (b) exhibiting the knowledge and skills required for effective job performance (as determined by educator evaluation).					<input type="checkbox"/>
3. The LEA performance pay model differentiates between base pay and variable pay (i.e., one-time bonuses).					<input type="checkbox"/>
4. The LEA provides compensation to educators for assuming leadership responsibilities (e.g., peer coach, mentor, staff development trainer, action researcher).					<input type="checkbox"/>
5. The LEA provides non-monetary incentives for performance including professional growth and advancement opportunities and improved working conditions (workload, autonomy, climate, collaborative planning, involvement in decision-making, etc.).					<input type="checkbox"/>
6. The LEA performance pay structure includes (1) Individual incentives rewarding individual performance and (2) group incentives rewarding all educators in a unit (e.g. school building) for working as a team to achieve group goals.					<input type="checkbox"/>
7. The LEA provides additional incentives for teaching in hard-to-staff positions and high-need schools.					<input type="checkbox"/>
8. All educators, regardless of grade/subject taught, specialist status, or administrator role, are included in the district performance pay system.					<input type="checkbox"/>
9. The LEA extends tenure, if applicable, when an educator’s instructional practice reaches a defined professional level of performance.					<input type="checkbox"/>
10. The LEA identifies and terminates educators who, despite ample support, have failed to meet expectations.					<input type="checkbox"/>
11. The LEA streamlines the dismissal and appeals process to minimize damage caused by underperforming staff.					<input type="checkbox"/>
Final Rating:	1 No Implementation	2 Minimal Implementation	3 Moderate Implementation	4 Complete Implementation	5 Exemplary Implementation
NOTES (evidence of accomplishments, related data/criteria, key stakeholders involved, critical issues, Web site, etc.):					

Recognition and Reward Indicators: Possible Evidence or “Look Fors”

1. Records/Documentation showing an explicit link between the recognition and reward structure—i.e., compensation, incentives, and promotion—and (1) requisite educator standards/competencies, and (2) other HCMS functions (e.g., incentives are results-oriented, realistic, and reflect multiple dimensions of performance aligned with the instructional vision)
2. Salary/Pay structure for educators with evidence showing that salary increases and bonuses are correlated with performance-based evaluation results
3. Records/Documentation describing the incentives operating at the school, classroom, and individual level
4. Written description of career ladders of teacher leader opportunities
5. Statistics/Data on the actual investments in performance-based compensation
6. Statistics/Data on the percentage of educators receiving performance-based compensation and non-monetary incentives
7. Testimonials about the quality and effectiveness of the recognition and reward system (e.g., results of surveys, focus groups, interviews, and other feedback mechanisms)
8. Tenure and termination policies/procedures
9. Statistics/Data on the number of educators granted tenure and reasons for tenure
10. Statistics/Data on the number of educators terminated and reasons for termination
11. Due process/termination timeline
12. Testimonials about the quality and effectiveness of tenure/termination process (e.g., results of surveys, focus groups, interviews, and other feedback mechanisms)

Table 7. Final Rating Summary Form

Program Area / Quality Indicators	Final Rating: Level of Implementation				
1. General System	1 None	2 Minimal	3 Moderate	4 Complete	5 Exemplary
2. Recruitment, Selection, and Placement	1 None	2 Minimal	3 Moderate	4 Complete	5 Exemplary
3. Induction and Mentoring	1 None	2 Minimal	3 Moderate	4 Complete	5 Exemplary
4. Professional Development	1 None	2 Minimal	3 Moderate	4 Complete	5 Exemplary
5. Evaluation	1 None	2 Minimal	3 Moderate	4 Complete	5 Exemplary
6. Recognition and Reward	1 None	2 Minimal	3 Moderate	4 Complete	5 Exemplary