

**Appendix A**  
**Texas Educator Excellence Grant (TEEG), Cycle 2 Glossary of Terms**

- A. Accountability ratings** – Districts and campuses assigned state accountability ratings based on performance on the TAKS, State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II), and completion and annual dropout rates. Possible ratings include:
- *Exemplary;*
  - *Recognized;*
  - *Academically Acceptable;*
  - *Academically Unacceptable;*
  - *Not Rated: Other;* and
  - *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues.*
- These ratings apply to districts (including charter operators) and schools rated under the standard accountability procedures.
- B. AEA campus** – An Alternative Education Campus (AEC) registered to be evaluated under Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) procedures.
- C. AEC campus** – An Alternative Education Campus (AEC) of Choice provides accelerated instructional services to students at risk of dropping out of school.
- D. AEA rating** – Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) ratings issued to campuses and charters registered to be evaluated under AEA procedure. Possible ratings include:
- *Academically Acceptable;*
  - *Academically Unacceptable;* and
  - *Not Rated - Other.*
- E. Award Amount** –
- **Total campus grant** – Total amount of award money allocated to the school. This amount represents 100 percent of the total TEEG award given to the school.
  - **Maximum amount for teachers** – The maximum amount of award money that an individual teacher could possibly earn from Part I funds.
  - **Minimum amount for teachers** – The minimum amount of award money that an individual teacher could possibly earn from Part I funds.
- F. Campus-level planning committee** – Campus committees determine and approve incentive plans and the distribution of incentive funds. The campus level committee should be composed of individuals representing a diverse and broad mix of teachers, including representation from different grade levels and subject areas.
- G. Campus-wide vote** – A campus held vote is required among all teachers to approve, by at least a simple majority, the proposed incentive plan.
- H. Classroom teacher** – “An educator who is employed by a school district and who, not less than an average of four hours each day, teaches in an academic instructional setting or a career and technology instructional setting. The term does not include a teacher’s aide or a full-time administrator” TEC 5.001.
- I. Comparable Improvement Rating** – Comparable Improvement (CI) is a measure used to calculate student performance change (or growth) on the TAKS mathematics and reading/English language arts tests from one year to the next. The change is compared to 40

schools demographically most similar to the target school. CI is calculated separately for reading/ELA and mathematics. Schools that fall into the first quartile (i.e. top 10 schools of the 40 in their campus group) of performance receive *Gold Performance Acknowledgment* for CI.

- J. Criterion one** – One of the two required criteria used to determine incentive awards to teachers: Teacher has a record of improving student performance using objective, quantifiable measures.
- K. Criterion two** – The second of two required criteria used to determine incentive awards to teachers: Teacher has a record of collaboration with faculty and staff that contributed to improving overall campus student achievement.
- L. Criterion three** – One of the two optional criteria used to determine incentive awards to teachers: Teacher demonstrated ongoing initiative, commitment, professionalism, personalization, and involvement in other activities that directly result in improved student performance. Teachers can only receive monetary awards when criteria one and two are met.
- M. Criterion four** – The second of two optional criteria used to determine incentive award to teachers: Teacher works in subject that is experiencing a critical shortage of teachers or has had high turnover. Teachers can only receive monetary awards when criteria one and two are met.
- N. Cycle I** – Campuses eligible for the TEEG based on 2004-2005 performance. Awards to teachers are based on 2006-2007 student achievement data.
- O. Cycle II** – Campuses eligible for the TEEG based on 2005-2006 performance. Awards to teachers are based on 2007-2008 student achievement data.
- P. Cycle III** – Campuses eligible for the TEEG based on 2006-2007 performance. Awards to teachers are based on 2008-2009 student achievement data.
- Q. District-level decision-making committee** – Campus incentive plans must be approved by a district-level committee, such as a district-level planning and decision-making committee.
- R. Economically disadvantaged students** – Students who qualify for free or reduced-price lunch or other public assistance.
- S. Eligible campus** – Campuses that meet TEEG eligibility criteria and qualify to apply for an award.
- T. Eligibility list** – List of campuses that meet TEEG program eligibility criteria: campuses in the top half of Texas elementary, middle, junior high, high, and all grade schools enrolling high percentages of educationally disadvantaged students and either is rated exemplary or recognized, or ranked in the top-quartile of campuses in Comparable Improvement in mathematics, reading/English Language Arts, or both.
- U. Evidence of participation** – Evidence demonstrating teacher participation in the incentive plan's development. Evidence can include minutes from campus committee meetings, attendance records (listing subject area and grade level of each teacher present), and meeting minutes from all planning meetings.
- V. Exemplary rating** – At least 90% of tested students pass all tested subject area assessments.

- W. High-need subject area** – Subjects identified, either locally or by the state, to be experiencing a shortage of qualified staff.
- X. Incentive** – A financial award provided to schools or districts that demonstrate high levels of sustained success or great improvement in achieving education goals.
- Y. Letter of support** – Letters authored by teachers outlining their involvement in the incentive plan process and their support for the program.
- Z. Mandatory Notice of intent to apply** – Formal notification (provided to TEA) of a prospective applicant's intent to apply for a grant program. Districts may submit one notice on behalf of all eligible campuses within the district. Applications are not eligible for funding without proper submission of a Mandatory Notice of Intent to Apply by the date requested.
- AA. Objective quantifiable measure** – Measures including local benchmarking systems, portfolio assessment, end-of-course testing, and value-added assessment.
- BB. Part I funds** – Make up 75 percent of the campus award. Incentives awarded under this part may only be used for classroom teachers who meet criteria one and two in addition to any other criteria.
- CC. Part II funds** – Make up 25 percent of the campus award. Funds must be used to provide incentives or activities not previously funded with state, local or federal funds. Part II funds can be spent on other school personnel, feeder campuses, professional development, signing bonuses, activities to support teacher-mentoring and new teacher induction programs, activities to support common planning time and curriculum development, stipends for teachers who participate in after-school or Saturday programs, hold a Standard Teaching certificate or a Lifetime Provisional certificate, or hold a postgraduate degree that will improve their instructional abilities (excluding education administration, mid-management certification, and superintendency certification), and other programs proven to directly contribute to improved student achievement.
- DD. Performance Levels** – The degree of student, teacher, and/or staff performance that must be met in order for a teacher or group of teachers to qualify for an award.
- **Structure** – The way in which performance levels are organized. A school might establish one level that a teacher or group of teachers must meet or exceed in order to qualify for the award. Others might establish tiered levels whereby teachers earn more money as they advance from a lower level to a higher one.
  - **Distribution strategy** – A school's approach for distributing awards to eligible teachers. This approach can be described by unit and method of distribution.
    - **Unit of distribution** – The unit by which award distribution is determined. Some schools distribute awards to teachers based upon the performance of an "individual teacher," while others distribute awards based on the performance of a "team" of teachers (i.e., grade-level, subject department). A third approach is distributing awards based on "campus-wide" performance.
    - **Method** – The way in which award distribution is related to performance on a given criterion.
      - **Tiered** – This method is used to assign differential importance to criteria/measures required to earn performance incentives. Some criteria could be associated with higher pay amounts. This method can be associated with a tiered performance level structure. Common strategies include:

- (1)**Qualitative** – Base award is assigned for achieving the performance criterion measure, and supplemental awards are assigned based upon meeting some other additional measures or classification.
  - (2)**Points** – Points are assigned in an increasing fashion to performance criterion measures.
  - (3)**Percentages** – Percentages are assigned in an increasing fashion to performance criterion measures; therefore, highly weighted measures are assigned to a higher percentage of the total award amount associated with that criterion.
- **Flat amount** – A school does not use a tiered approach to distribute awards; instead it allocates awards at one flat amount based on the required performance level for given criterion/criteria. This method is often associated with a one-level performance level benchmark structure.

- EE. Recognized rating** – At least 70% of tested students pass all tested subject area assessments.
- FF. Student performance measure** – An objective, quantifiable measure, such as local benchmarking systems, portfolio assessments, end-of-course testing, and value-added assessments.
- GG. TAKS** – The Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) is a comprehensive testing program for Texas public school students in grades 3-11 designed to measure students’ ability to learn, understand, and apply important concepts and skills expected in each tested grade. The grades and subjects tested include:

Grade	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Social Studies
3	X	X			
4	X	X	X		
5	X	X		X	
6	X	X			
7	X	X	X		
8	X	X		X	X
9	X	X			
10	X	X		X	X
11	X	X		X	X

- HH. TEEG** – Texas Educator Excellence Grant – The Governor’s Educator Excellence Award Program-Texas Educator Excellence Grant is authorized by House Bill 1, enacted in the third called session of the 79th legislative session, subchapter N, Awards for Student Achievement. The purpose of the Governor’s Educator Excellence Award Program-Texas Educator Excellence Grant is to provide a system of financial incentives to award educators who demonstrate the ability to achieve higher levels of student academic performance. Grants will be awarded based on the percentage of educationally disadvantaged students and high levels of achievement or growth in student achievement. The goals of the program are to create a financial incentives system for educators and to increase student academic achievement. Funds will be distributed in two parts: Part I-Teacher Incentives (not less than 75% of the award) and Part II-Additional Incentives (not more than 25% of the award).

- II. **Value-added** – Value-added assessments divide the annual academic growth of students into two parts. Growth that can be attributed to the student based on the expected academic growth a student should make from year to year and growth that exceeds the expected academic growth and can be attributed to a teacher, school, and/or district. The latter is considered value-added.