

Q Comp Annual Report

This template, which may be changed as needed, is designed to help formulate the Quality Compensation (Q Comp) Annual Report. Per [Minnesota Statutes, section 122A.414, subdivision 3\(a\)](#) the report must be submitted to the school board by June 15 of each year and include findings and recommendations for the program. We also recommend that the report include a summary of what was implemented for the year, to help provide context for the findings and recommendations.

Please address the following questions for each program component describing the implementation of the approved plan, the impact of implementation, findings from the program review and recommendations to improve program effectiveness. **All information reported should be based on the current school year.** We recommend that each question be addressed with a brief summary of 3-7 sentences.

Core Component: Career Advancement Options

Implementation

Are the teacher leader positions that were implemented this year the same as those outlined in the approved plan (approval letter and subsequent plan change approval letters)? [Yes](#)

If no, please explain what changes have occurred and why?

Impact

How did the work of teacher leaders through coaching, observing, mentoring, facilitating learning teams and performing other responsibilities impact classroom instruction?

[During this annual program review, we focused on the Continuous Improvement Coach \(CIC\) teacher leadership position.](#)

[When asked about a variety of supports provided by their Continuous Improvement Coaches \(CICs\), first-year probationary staff felt the following were most impactful \(in order of highest impact\): learning walks, check-ins, informal observations and feedback, providing resources, and support with goal writing.](#)

[CICs are in their second year of leading learning walks to support first-year probationary instructional staff. 97.5% of staff who participated in a learning walk reported that the learning walk process supported their professional development and helped them reflect on and improve their practice or instruction. 72.2% of these same staff reported that it led to a direct impact on their instruction or practice. Teachers applied their learning by adopting AVID strategies, adjusting pacing, and including more collaborative hands-on activities. They expanded the use of visuals and technology to clarify expectations and support learning. Classroom management and organization improved through changes to layouts, clearer routines, and practical tools like simplified instruction steps and visual systems.](#)

82.3% of administrators reported a high or moderate impact of probationary staff implementing new learning from their learning walk experience (an increase from 57.1% during the 24-25 school year). 100% of reporting administrators place moderate-to-high value on the learning walk experience as a support for probationary staff (with 87.5% highly valuing it and 12.5% moderately valuing it).

78.8% of probationary staff reported that the informal CIC coaching, feedback and observation process had a moderate to high impact on instruction and/or practice. This was a newly added support provided by CICs for instructional probationary staff.

97.4% of tenured teachers indicated that the observation process with their CIC had a moderate to high impact on their reflection and instructional practice.

How did the work of teacher leaders impact student achievement?

82.3% of tenured teachers reported that the observation process, including coaching, had a moderate to high impact on student achievement.

92.3% of first-year probationary staff who participated in a learning walk with their CIC and self-reported that they implemented a change into their practice felt that it had a moderate to high impact on student learning.

How did the training teacher leaders received impact their ability to fulfill the responsibilities of the position and meet the needs of the licensed staff members?

Cognitive Coaching continues to be the training for new CICs that builds the foundation for their coaching conversations with tenured staff. With the move to increasing support to probationary staff, the CIC team has self-studied more direct styles of coaching that are more appropriate for staff new in their instructional practice.

The Danielson Group has released new training modules aligned to the updated 2022 version of the framework. We will continue reviewing available training options to determine which best supports a deep understanding of the Danielson Framework and strengthens coaches' ability to collect objective, unbiased evidence to inform coaching and feedback.

Review Findings

What do the collected data and evidence reveal about the impact and effectiveness of this core component, and what additional findings or contextual information should be considered?

Feedback from probationary staff indicates that onboarding and support structures for new-to-district employees could be further refined. In particular, additional differentiation is needed for (1) highly experienced educators who are new to the district and require orientation to district systems rather than foundational instructional support, and (2) staff in unique or "singleton" roles whose instructional contexts and professional needs differ from those of larger content or grade-level teams.

Recommendations

How will the district use the review findings to improve the effectiveness of teacher leadership?

- Select and implement the most effective The Danielson Group training course—based on pilots conducted over the past two years—as the required learning module for all new coaches and evaluators beginning in the 2026–27 school year.
- Continued implementation of learning walks with probationary instructional staff to ensure shared instructional understanding of effective teaching and high-impact practices.
- Cross-department collaboration to refine probationary support systems for new-to-district employees to meet needs of staff entering with varying levels of experience and serving in diverse or specialized roles.

Core Component: Job-embedded Professional Development

Implementation

Are learning teams configured and meeting as outlined in the approved plan (approval letter and subsequent plan change approval letters)? [Yes](#)

If no, please explain the changes that have occurred and why?

Impact

How did teacher learning from learning teams and other job-embedded professional development activities impact classroom instruction?

[93.1% of teams agreed or strongly agreed that their learning from CT participation impacted their practice/instruction.](#)

Based on forced ranking, teams spent the majority of their time on the following:

- Collaborate on effective instructional practices and engagement strategies
- Clarify standards and learning targets of focus.
- Discuss interventions to respond to students who have not yet mastered the standards of focus
- Determine proficiency indicators that include how they will know if students have mastered the standards of focus.

[Teachers report that these activities impact classroom instruction by using data-driven and differentiated instruction, aligning standards and rigor, and refining instruction as needed \(interventions, reteaching, etc\)](#)

How did teacher learning from learning teams and other job-embedded professional development impact student achievement?

Collaborative Teams (CTs)

[90% of teams agreed or strongly agreed that their learning from CT participation impacts student achievement.](#)

[CTs report that their work has had a clear impact on student achievement by promoting data-driven instruction, targeted interventions, and consistent learning experiences across classrooms. Teachers report that CT time enables them to collaborate on Tier 1 strategies and resources while creating an aligned curriculum that ensures](#)

all students have access to grade-level standards and learning objectives. This collaboration fosters greater student engagement while also strengthening consistency across classrooms and allowing for more effective problem-solving among educators.

Collegial Conversation Choices

Tenured staff have the option to choose a collegial conversation choice in place of one of their traditional observations with their CIC. Collegial conversations embeds professional learning through either a literature review, collegial co-observation, data review, or creation of a self-directed plan. All choices involve staff implementing something they have learned into their practice (action plan) and reflecting on its impact. 96.7% of staff report that this observation choice (up from 92.9% last year), if elected, has a moderate to high impact on their practice with the highest impact choice reported being a collegial co-observation.

How did the sites or learning teams identify needs and instructional strategies to increase student achievement?

Learning teams identify student needs and instructional strategies by analyzing multiple data sources, including FastBridge, Heggerty, Morphology, PreLAS (Pre Language Assessment Scales), Teaching Strategies Gold (TSG), and classroom assessments such as unit tests, student work, and progress monitoring. Through collaborative discussions, teachers share observations about student performance, learning challenges, and instructional barriers, allowing them to reflect on what is and is not effective. Teams then use this information to adjust instruction, develop targeted interventions such as What I Need (WIN) groups, and align strategies with curriculum standards and best practices. In addition to academic data, teams consider holistic factors such as behavior, social-emotional needs, attendance, and communication, ensuring a comprehensive approach to improving student achievement.

How did learning teams use data and implement the selected instructional strategies and follow-up on implementation?

74% of teams agreed or strongly agreed that they frequently reviewed data and implemented instructional or professional strategies based on data. Learning teams use data from formative and summative assessments, FastBridge, and other progress-monitoring tools to adjust instruction by reteaching key skills, modifying lessons, and adjusting pacing based on student needs. They implement targeted strategies through flexible grouping, such as WIN groups and small-group instruction, and adjust interventions or services as needed. Ongoing data tracking allows teams to monitor progress, identify trends, and follow up on the effectiveness of instructional strategies, making continuous adjustments to improve student outcomes.

Review Findings

What do the collected data and evidence reveal about the impact and effectiveness of this core component, and what additional findings or contextual information should be considered?

The data suggests an opportunity to increase attention to enrichment for students who have already mastered standards as well as additional ways to reteach core concepts when not mastered by a majority of the students the first time.

Additional Findings

The majority of administrators (85.7%) who attended the PLC at Work® Institute in June 2025, report that it had a high or moderate impact on their ability to effectively lead CTs at their site.

Recommendations

How will the district use the review findings to improve the effectiveness of job-embedded professional development?

- Increase the number of admin and BLT members who participate at the PLC at Work® Institute.
- Prioritize professional development on effective reteaching strategies for students who are not yet mastering grade level guarantees and meaningful enrichment for those who have already mastered them.
- Support teams in developing or implementing curricular common formative and summative assessments, aligning on proficiency expectations, and using data to guide instruction.
- Protect collaborative team time and ensure access to resources and specialists so teams can effectively implement both interventions and extensions.

Core Component: Teacher Evaluation

Implementation

Are licensed staff members observed/evaluated as outlined in the approved plan (approval letter and subsequent plan change approval letters)? **Yes**

If no, please explain the changes that have occurred and why?

Impact

What impact did the observation/evaluation process, including coaching, have on classroom instruction?

Tenured staff receive coaching, feedback, and observations from multiple sources. Staff reporting a moderate-to-high impact on their instruction and/or practice include:

- 86.4% from the administrative coaching and observation cycle
- 97.4% from the CIC coaching and observation cycle
- 84.6% from the other trained observer coaching and observation cycle

76.8% of probationary staff report that the coaching and feedback in their evaluative observation process has a moderate to high impact on their instruction and/or practice.

What impact did the observation/evaluation process, including coaching, have on student achievement?

82.3% of responding tenured staff indicated that the observation process had a moderate to high impact on student achievement.

74.1% of probationary staff indicated that the administration observation process had a moderate to high impact on student achievement.

How did the feedback teachers received from each observation/evaluation assist in self-reflection and improved instructional practice?

Teachers report that the CIC observations and feedback were supportive and valuable for professional growth. The streamlined, two-observation process using Danielson's framework facilitated meaningful reflection on their practice. Many teachers noted that this feedback directly led to implementing instructional strategies that positively impacted classroom management, student engagement, and overall teaching effectiveness.

Additionally, staff suggested potential improvements such as being observed by someone within their subject-matter discipline and experiencing more consistent, substantive feedback from administrators throughout the evaluation cycle, not just during the observation.

Summary of Probationary staff comments 2025-26 (grouped by like themes by Magic School AI)

- **Feedback and Growth:** Many probationary staff found the process helpful for professional growth, valuing the opportunity to reflect on teaching practices, set goals, and receive constructive suggestions. Mentoring and coaching from the CIC team was mentioned as supportive while providing actionable feedback.
- **Administrative Communication & Tone:** Feedback and comments were often delivered professionally and with a positive tone, and administrators were frequently described as supportive, helpful, and accommodating. However, several respondents noted issues with efficiency, including long wait times between observations and post-observation meetings, and a lack of timely written feedback in ProTraxx.
- **Challenges in Early Childhood (EC) Observations:** Both staff and administrators in Early Childhood programs expressed concerns that the current observation tool, the Danielson instructional rubric, were not suitable for the EC context, making it difficult to achieve what was being asked. This perceived misalignment, along with the evaluative observations, created anxiety and the sense that EC teachers were less valued.

How did the training observers/evaluators received throughout the year impact inter-rater reliability and their ability to provide constructive and meaningful feedback to all licensed staff members?

This year, we piloted two rubrics adapted from the Danielson Instructional Framework for licensed professional and system specialist staff. Since a majority of staff that aren't on the instructional rubric are on the licensed professional rubric, we reviewed that rubric in our program review this year.

Rubric findings:

- 68.8% of administrators evaluated staff on the licensed professional rubric. 81.8% of those agreed or strongly agreed that the rubric helped them give feedback about the staff member’s professional practice.
- Among staff who were coached or evaluated using the rubric, participants were asked to rate the relevance of the identified “best practices” within each domain to their current professional context using a five-point scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. The percentage of staff who selected *agree* or *strongly agree* is summarized below:
 - Domain 1 = 69.5%
 - Domain 2= 80.6%
 - Domain 3= 80.5%
 - Domain 4= 75%
- About 70% of special education teachers who responded indicated that the Licensed Professional Staff rubric descriptions best fit their role, however, 72% of administrators indicated that the instructional rubric was better suited for evaluating special education staff.

Review Findings

What do the collected data and evidence reveal about the impact and effectiveness of this core component, and what additional findings or contextual information should be considered?

Administrators reported that coaching and feedback during observations have led to more intentional, student-centered instruction, including clearer learning targets, stronger use of data, increased collaboration structures, and improved formative assessment practices. When given feedback, they observe teachers implementing new strategies more consistently, resulting in higher engagement, stronger classroom management, and better alignment to standards.

Initial rubric review results indicate generally strong alignment between the rubric’s identified best practices and staff members’ professional contexts, with the highest perceived relevance in Domains 2 and 3 which are the two observable domains.

Recommendations

How will the district use the review findings to improve the effectiveness of teacher evaluation?

- Revisit the potential adaptation of the instructional rubric to better reflect the instructional practices and developmental context of Early Childhood staff.
- Provide additional professional learning to clarify distinctions between the Instructional rubric and the Licensed Professional Staff rubric, including guidance on appropriate observation opportunities for specialized roles.
- Review and consider revisions to Domains 1 of the Licensed Professional Staff rubric to ensure clarity, relevance, and alignment with current professional practice.

Core Component: Performance Pay and Alternative Salary Schedule

Implementation

Are the performance pay amounts and standards the same as outlined in the approved plan (approval letter and subsequent plan change approval letters)? [Yes](#)

If no, please explain the changes that have occurred and why?

Is salary schedule movement or base salary increase based on the same measure of performance as outlined in the approved plan (approval letter and subsequent plan change approval letters)? [Yes](#)

If no, please explain the changes that have occurred and why?

Is performance pay awarded for another area (besides school wide goals, measures of student achievement and observation/evaluation results)? [Yes, CT goals and professional learning plans.](#)

Impact

[The majority of staff compensation is tied to participation in observations, collaborative team work, and the completion of annual professional learning plans. The only compensation directly linked to student outcomes is connected to the achievement of established building goals.](#)

[A review of historical payout data suggests that sites using curriculum-embedded proximal assessments, rather than standardized or norm-referenced assessments, tend to meet their goals more consistently. In addition, programs serving younger learners demonstrate higher rates of goal attainment compared to those serving older students.](#)

Review Findings

What do the collected data and evidence reveal about the impact and effectiveness of this core component, and what additional findings or contextual information should be considered?

[Building leaders that are involved in writing school-wide goals and plans have expressed needing support in understanding normed assessments and in writing goals that are achievable at the building level while being rigorous.](#)

Recommendations

How will the district use the data to improve the effectiveness of this core component?

- [Recognizing the complexity of measuring student learning, we recommend deeper analysis of examining whether the current building goal payout structure adequately reflects and rewards instructional effectiveness.](#)

- Additional professional development on our assessment systems as well as data literacy on goal writing.

General Program Impact and Recommendations

What overall impact on instruction and student achievement has the district or charter school seen as a result of implementing the Q Comp program?

Based on recommendations from the previous year, two updated and consolidated evaluation and coaching rubrics were implemented for staff in specialized roles. These updates streamlined evaluation processes and improved consistency and usability within the ProTraxx platform, which supports the Teacher Development and Evaluation (TDE) system for probationary and summative evaluations.

Student achievement outcomes also reflect positive impact. During the 2024–25 school year, 10 sites/programs met their Building Goal—the highest number since the 2014–15 school year. Over the past 11 years, an average of 7.2 sites have met their goals annually, with results ranging from 4 to 11 sites. Because Building Goals are tied to measurable student outcomes, this increase suggests stronger alignment between instructional improvement efforts and student learning results.

As Q Comp funds support implementation of the Teacher Development and Evaluation Plan, last comprehensively updated in 2014–15, it is recommended to revisit components of the plan that are not regularly addressed through the Q Comp Memorandum of Understanding. Updating these elements will ensure that evaluation guidance, expectations, and processes remain current and continue to effectively support both evaluators and educators.

How will the district use the review findings to improve the overall effectiveness of the program?

- Q Comp Coaches continue to conduct probationary learning walks to support our newest staff's growth.
- Establish a cross-functional team to explore adaptations to the Danielson instructional rubric that better reflect the developmental needs of our youngest learners.
- Continue streamlining evaluative observation and feedback processes through collaboration with ProTraxx and Human Resources, including enhanced evaluator training and onboarding supports, as well as system-based reminder tools to improve the timeliness and consistency of written feedback.