

MICHIGAN SCHOOL BUSINESS OFFICIALS

PERFORMANCE BASED COMPENSATION

April 29, 2015

Agenda

1. Introduction
 - Project on Incentives in Teaching
 - D.A.T.E. Program Evaluation
 - Importance of Non-Compensation Factors
2. Teacher Pay Criteria
3. Teacher Performance Criteria
4. Knowledge and Skills Based Pay
5. Teacher Career Ladder
6. Performance-Based Pay Options

Agenda

7. A Base Salary Merit Pay Approach – Step System
8. A Base Salary Merit Pay Approach – Open Ranges
9. Incentive Pay
10. Cleveland Differentiated Compensation System
11. Pro Comp Pay System
12. IMPACTplus Pay System
13. Center for Teaching Quality – Professional Compensation Framework
14. TAP – The System for Teacher and Student Advancement

Agenda

15. Observations of Current Performance-Based Compensation Plans
16. Keys to Successful Performance-Based Compensation Plans

17. Center for Teaching Quality – Set of Perspectives
18. Center for Educator Compensation Reform – Lessons Learned
19. Center for Public Education – What School Boards Should Consider When Designing a Pay-For-Performance Plan

Agenda

- 20. American Federation of Teachers
- 21. National Education Association
- 22. AASA Survey
- 23. Websites

Project on Incentives in Teaching (POINT)

- National Center on Performance Incentives, Vanderbilt University, Peabody College
- Nashville Public Schools, 300 Middle School Math Teachers, 3 Years
- 2 Groups – Treatment (Bonus), Control (No Bonus) for Student Achievement
- Bonus opportunities - \$15,000 (95th percentile), \$10,000 (85th percentile), \$5,000 (80th percentile) – test score growth prior 2 years

Project on Incentives in Teaching (POINT)

- Students of teachers in Treatment Group did not outperform students of teachers in Control Group
- Bonuses got their attention, but teachers did not alter their instructional practices or effort
- Pressures to avoid NCLB sanctions (State takeover) appeared to have accomplished considerably more than the bonus opportunities

D.A.T.E. Program Evaluation

- Texas – District Awards for Teacher Excellence (State Funded)
- National Center for Performance Incentives, Vanderbilt University, Peabody College
- Comparison of D.A.T.E. districts to other districts with similar percentages of economically disadvantaged students
- Students in D.A.T.E. schools had greater TAKS (Texas Assessment of Knowledge & Skills) gains than non-D.A.T.E. schools

D.A.T.E. Program Evaluation

- Teacher turnover decreased for D.A.T.E. schools and increased for non-D.A.T.E. schools
- Overall, teachers in D.A.T.E. schools believed incentive pay plans were fair, goals were worthy, and correct teachers received awards

Importance of Non-Compensation Factors

1. Principals who cultivate and embrace teacher leadership.
2. Time and tools for teachers to learn from each other.
3. Specialized preparation and resources for the highest needs schools, subjects, and students.
4. The elimination of out-of-field teaching assignments.
5. Teaching loads that are differentiated based on the diversity and mobility of students taught.

Importance of Non-Compensation Factors

6. Opportunities to take risks.
7. Integration of academic, social, and health support services for students.
8. Safe and well-maintained school buildings.

Teacher Pay Criteria

- Education Level
- Length of Service
- Additional Responsibilities (Lead Teachers)
- Hard to Staff – High Need Fields
- Hard to Staff – Low Performing Schools
- Knowledge and Skills (National Board Certified, Career Ladders)
- Performance

Teacher Performance Criteria

- Professional Evaluation
- Professional Development
- Student Academic Achievement
- Student Retention
- Student Attendance
- School Participation
- Parent interaction, participation, involvement

Teacher Performance Criteria, continued

- Staff Input
- Student Input
- Disciplinary Referrals
- Teacher's Personal Attendance

Knowledge and Skills Based Pay

- Link pay to desired knowledge and skills
- Base salary increases and/or lump sum awards
- Supplement or replace current salary schedule
- Most appropriate for teachers versus other district personnel
- Involves determining what knowledge and skills to reward, methods of assessment and level of awards
- Costs – added costs of awards and costs to administer (particularly the resources required for assessments)

Teacher Career Ladder

Apprentice *	Professional *	Expert *	Distinguished *
\$38,000			
\$40,000			
\$42,000			
\$44,000			
	\$48,000		
	\$52,000		
	\$56,000		
	\$60,000		
		\$64,000	
		\$68,000	
		\$72,000	
		\$76,000	
			\$80,000
			\$84,000
			\$88,000
			\$92,000

* Based upon competencies and roles (may also reflect performance)

Performance-Based Pay Options

- Base Salary
- Incentive Award (Lump Sum Payment not Folded into Base Salary)
 - Individual and/or Group

A Base Salary Merit Pay Approach – Step System

- Develop performance management system and tie evaluations to base salary / step progression
- “Meets Expectations” required to move to the next step (Go / No Go)
- Alternately, provide 4 options:
 - Accomplished– 1 ½ steps
 - Skilled– 1 step
 - Developing– ½ step up to a specified step level
 - Ineffective– no step

A Base Salary Merit Pay Approach – Open Ranges

Overall Performance Rating	Base Salary Increase
Accomplished	1.5 x Target
Skilled	Target
Developing	Target (up to Salary Range Midpoint)
Ineffective	- 0 -

Notes:

1. "Target" is determined each year as the desired salary increase to provide to employees with "Skilled" performance ratings and is based upon the District's ability to pay (financial resources), internal equity considerations (salary increases given to other District employee groups) and the "market" (salary increase in other targeted school districts or broader employer market).
2. Any portion of the base salary increase, which would result in the new base salary level exceeding the salary range maximum for the position, will be paid in a lump sum and not folded into the base salary.

A Base Salary Merit Pay Approach – Open Ranges

Overall Performance Rating	Position in Salary Range	
	Below Midpoint	Above Midpoint
Accomplished	2.0 x Target	1.5 x Target
Skilled	1.5 x Target	Target
Developing	Target	- 0 -
Ineffective	- 0 -	- 0 -

Notes:

1. "Target" is determined each year based upon the District's ability to pay (financial resources), internal equity considerations (salary increases given to other District employee groups) and the "market" (salary increase in other targeted school districts or broader employer market).
2. Any portion of the base salary increase, which would result in the new base salary level exceeding the salary range maximum for the position, will be paid in a lump sum and not folded into the base salary.

A Base Salary Merit Pay Approach – Open Ranges

Performance Evaluation	POSITION IN SALARY RANGE			
	1st Quartile	2nd Quartile	3rd Quartile	4th Quartile
<i>Accomplished</i>	6%	5%	4%	3%
<i>Skilled</i>	4%	3%	2%	1%
<i>Developing</i>	2%	1%	0%	0%
<i>Ineffective</i>	0%	0%	0%	0%

Incentive Pay

- Provide incentive amounts based upon achievement of defined goals and/or performance
- Incentive awards can be structured on an individual, team (e.g., grade level), school or even district-wide basis
- Classroom/School Goals
 - Growth in student achievement
 - Student retention
 - Student attendance
 - Parent satisfaction
 - State ratings

Incentive Pay

- District Goals
 - Growth in student achievement
 - Student retention, attendance
 - Budget
 - Cost containment
 - Strategic plan
 - Parent/community satisfaction
 - State ratings

Incentive Pay Example

Team Success Compensation Program Objectives

- Share with staff in the collective success of the District
- Encourage performance consistent with the mission, goals and strategic direction of the District

Award Eligibility

All staff employed for at least one school year with the District, employed at time of award payout, and assessed to be performing competently (i.e., skilled) will be eligible for incentive award consideration

Award Threshold Requirement

The District must achieve targeted financial goals (e.g., minimum fund balance level) for any award to be granted.

Incentive Pay Example

Award Goal

Award goals, expressed as a percentage of base salary will be established for each position.

Award Payout

Awards will be determined and paid at the completion of the fiscal year. The awards will be lump sum payments not added to base salaries.

Award Determination

Staff awards will be calculated as follows:

$$\text{Base Salary} \times \text{Award Goal} \times \frac{\text{Success Points Earned}}{100 \text{ Points}}$$

Incentive Pay Example

Success Points

Staff will earn success points based upon achievement of organization-wide performance goals

Total Awards Limit

Total awards cannot exceed “X%” of a specific financial measure (revenues, fund balance). If necessary, awards will be reduced on a pro-rated basis to not exceed the total awards limit.

Incentive Pay Example

Basis for Success Points – Example A

Performance Goal Area	Weighting	Performance Level	Award Points
High Quality Education	40%	Achieves Goal	40
		Achieves X% of Goal	20
High Quality Faculty & Staff	15%	Achieves Goal	15
		Achieves X% of Goal	7.5
Engaged Parents	15%	Achieves Goal	15
		Achieves X% of Goal	7.5
Community Collaborations & Partnerships	15%	Achieves Goal	15
		Achieves X% of Goal	7.5
Fiscal Responsibility & Accountability	15%	Achieves Goal	15
		Achieves X% of Goal	7.5

Incentive Pay Example

Basis for Success Points – Example B

Performance Goal Area	Weighting	Performance Level	Award Points
ODE Evaluation (Performance Rating)	50%	A	60
		B	50
Community Satisfaction (Overall Rating)	25%	Very Satisfied	30
		Satisfied	25
Individual Administrator Performance (Final Summative Performance Rating)	25%	Accomplished	30
		Skilled	25
		Developing	20

Cleveland Differentiated Compensation System

- Base Salary Progression Tied to Performance Ratings (Achievement Credits)
- Supplemental Stipends
 - Meeting or Exceeding Building Goals
 - Improvement on District Selected Items on Conditions for Learning Survey
 - Individual Teacher Attendance At or Above 95%
 - Teaching in Hard-to-Staff Grade Level, Subject Matter or School
 - Eligible College Coursework
 - Educator Licensure Status – Senior Professional, Lead Professional, Master Teacher

Cleveland Differentiated Compensation System

- Similar System for Building Leaders
 - Base Salary Progression Tied to Performance
 - Stipends for Performance Index, On Track Students, Conditions for Learning Survey

ProComp Pay System

Area of focus	Incentive	You earn . . .	Amount *
Student Growth: Helping Your Students and Your School	Top Performing Schools	A bonus for working in a Top Performing school, based on overall points earned on the School Performance Framework (SPF)	\$2,439.55
	High Growth Schools	A bonus for working in a High Growth school, based on the SPF.	\$2,439.55
	Exceeds Expectations	A bonus if at least 50% of your students (grades 4-10) are in the 55 th percentile or higher for statewide student growth in Math and Language Arts on the state assessment	\$2,439.55
	Student Growth Objectives (SGOs)	A salary increase if you meet two approved SGOs. A bonus if you meet one of the approved SGOs.	\$381.18
Market Incentives: Teach Where You're Needed Most	Hard to Staff Assignment	A bonus for working in a Hard to Staff assignment based on local and national data.	\$2,439.55 per assignment
	High Needs School	A bonus for working in a High Needs school.	\$2,439.55

* Incentives are determined based on a percentage of an index, currently set at \$38,118

ProComp Pay System

Area of focus	Incentive	You earn . . .	Amount *
Knowledge and Skills: Develop in Your Profession	Professional Development Units (PDUs)	A salary increase for completion of approved PDUs, if you have 14 or fewer years of credited services. A bonus for completion if you have 15 or more years of credited service.	\$762.36
	Tuition and Student Loan Reimbursement	Reimbursement for satisfactory completion of approved coursework or outstanding student load.	Up to \$1,000 per year/\$4,000 per lifetime
	Advanced Degrees, Licensures and Certificates	A salary increase for earning a new advanced degree, license or certificate.	\$3,430.62 increase, payable once every 3 years
Comprehensive Professional Evaluation: Aim for Effectiveness	Comprehensive Professional Evaluation (CPE)	A salary increase if you have 14 or fewer years of credited service and receive a satisfactory evaluation.	Probationary Teachers \$381.18
			Non-Probationary Teachers ** \$1,144.00 payable once every 3 years

* Incentives are determined based on a percentage of an index, currently set at \$38,118

** Certain non-probationary teachers evaluated annually may receive a \$381.18 salary increase for a satisfactory evaluation each year.

IMPACTplus Pay System

- District of Columbia Public Schools
- Bonus – Requires Highly Effective Performance Rating
 - Factors Include Free and Reduced Lunch Rate (\$2,000 - \$10,000), % of Performance Assessment Tied to Student Achievement Data (\$1,000 - \$5,000), Lowest-Performing Schools (\$10,000)
- Base Salary Increase – Requires Effective or Highly Effective Performance Rating
 - Factors Include Free and Reduced Lunch Rate, Career Stage
- Potential Total Cash Compensation - \$130,000 +

Center for Teaching Quality- Professional Compensation Framework

Base Salary Range Negotiable based on credentials, experience, performance		Career Salary Supplements				
		Student Learning	Knowledge and Skills	Market Needs	Leadership	Base and Career Pay
Novice (year 1-4)	\$30,000 – \$45,000	Up to 5%: Individual with evidence of impact	Up to 5%: Research-based professional development based on induction-program improvements in teaching and assessment	Up to \$5,000 for teaching in high-needs schools, subjects, and assignments (Teachers need to demonstrate potential in specific context)	Not ready for role and reward	Can earn up to \$55,000

Center for Teaching Quality- Professional Compensation Framework

Base Salary Range Negotiable based on credentials, experience, performance		Career Salary Supplements				
		Student Learning	Knowledge and Skills	Market Needs	Leadership	Base and Career Pay
Advanced (years 5-10)	\$46,000 – \$55,000	Up to 10%: With evidence of impact beyond own classroom; plus \$2,000-\$3,500 bonus for building and using new assessments	Up to 10%: National Board Certification can earn stipend; research-based professional development; mentoring new teachers; plus demonstrations of how professional development improves student learning	Up to \$10,000 for teaching in high-needs schools, subjects, etc. (Teachers need to demonstrate potential and effectiveness in specific context)	Up to 10% for coaching and mentoring; supporting community development	Can earn up to \$85,000

Center for Teaching Quality- Professional Compensation Framework

Base Salary Range Negotiable based on credentials, experience, performance		Career Salary Supplements				
		Student Learning	Knowledge and Skills	Market Needs	Leadership	Base and Career Pay
Expert (year 10+)	\$56,000- \$70,000	Up to 15%: With higher rewards for using test scores and other measures of improved student learning beyond own classroom and demonstrate how own skills help other teachers enhance student learning; plus \$2,000-\$3,500 bonus for building and using new assessments	Up to 15%: Same as advanced teacher but 5% more when evidence of knowledge and skills spread though district and state	Up to \$15,000 for teaching in high-needs schools, subjects, etc. (Teachers need to demonstrate potential and effectiveness in specific context)	Up to 15% for coaching and community development; plus \$10,000 for state and national leadership in developing new products and informing new policies	Can earn up to \$130,000

TAP – The System for Teacher and Student Advancement

- Milken Foundation
- National Institute for Excellence in Teaching
- Four Components
 1. Multiple Career Paths – Career, Mentor, Master Teacher
 2. Ongoing Applied Professional Growth
 3. Institutionally Focused Accountability
 - Teaching Skills, Knowledge and Responsibilities, Performance Standards
 - Academic Growth of Students

TAP – The System for Teacher and Student Advancement

4. Performance Based Compensation

- Salary Augmentations for Master and Mentor Teachers
- Financial Awards Based Upon Evaluations of Classroom Teacher (50%), Classroom Student Achievement Growth (30%), and School Student Achievement Growth (20%)
- Additional Compensation for “Hard to Staff” Subjects and Schools

Observations of Current Performance-Based Compensation Plans

- Multiple Components
- Student Achievement (Growth) is the Key Metric – Team and Individual Awards
- Emphasis on High Needs Schools
- Absolute and Relative Measures are Utilized

Keys to Successful Performance-Based Compensation Plans

- Staff Involvement in Developing and Implementing the Performance-Based Pay Plan (Buy-In)
- Staff Support – Professional Development and School Improvement Initiatives
- Robust Data Systems
- Trust
- Sustained Funding
- Ongoing Monitoring
- Communication

Center for Teaching Quality – Set of Perspectives

A Performance-Pay Plan That's Fair, Strategic and Likely to Win Teacher Support . . .

1. Get the base-pay system right
2. Supplement the base-pay system with performance-pay system that is open to all teachers
3. Reward teachers who help their students make significant academic gains
4. Provide additional pay for additional degrees and professional development, but only if the training is relevant
5. Allow local flexibility

Center for Teaching Quality – Set of Perspectives

A Performance-Pay Plan That's Fair, Strategic and Likely to Win Teacher Support . . .

6. Encourage collaboration
7. Offer incentives to teachers who want to teach in high-needs, low-performing schools, but only if they're qualified
8. Reward leadership, not seniority
9. Be brave, be bold
10. Finally, make sure to include accomplished teachers in any efforts to overhaul your teacher compensation plans

Center for Teaching Quality – Set of Perspectives

We believe performance-pay systems should reward teachers who . . .

- Help their students make significant academic gains
- Effectively assess student progress and use data to tailor instruction to individual student needs
- Work in teams – especially small ones – to accelerate student achievement
- Increase their knowledge and skills to meet the specific, identified needs of the students they currently serve
- Document and share the impact that new knowledge and skills have on student learning

Center for Teaching Quality – Set of Perspectives

We believe performance-pay systems should reward teachers who . . .

- Acquire new knowledge and skills that meet the needs and strategic goals of local schools
- Agree to teach in high-needs schools, when they have demonstrated the necessary qualities and skills to be successful
- Have the qualifications and experience to fulfill high-demand positions in the local labor market – including but not limited to specific subjects, grade levels and specialty areas
- Improve instruction by providing guidance and support to their colleagues through mentoring and coaching

Center for Teaching Quality – Set of Perspectives

We believe performance-pay systems should reward teachers who . . .

- Lead innovations in teaching and learning at the school and district level
- Work with parents, community members and colleagues to bridge the gap between home and school
- Provide leadership and guidance on educational policy at all levels

Center for Teaching Quality – Set of Perspectives

What NOT To Do . . .

- Don't place an artificial cap on the number or percentage of teachers who are eligible for performance incentives or rewards
- Don't limit rewards only to teachers who teach tested subjects, such as reading and math
- Don't tie rewards only to gains in student test scores
- Don't provide additional pay for just any kind of professional development
- Don't make a blanket offer of extra pay only to teachers of math, science and special education

Center for Teaching Quality – Set of Perspectives

What NOT To Do . . .

- Don't use test scores in ways that produce unintended consequences
- Don't focus on performance incentives and bonuses at the expense of improving your base-pay system
- Don't offer incentives to just any teacher who wants to teach in a high-needs, low-performing school
- Don't create a one-size-fits-all performance-pay system
- Finally, don't try to overhaul your own teacher compensation plan without the expert assistance of those who know best what will work and what won't – your teachers

Center for Educator Compensation Reform

Lessons Learned

Communication

- Creating a Communication Plan
- Promote Clarity & Transparency

Buy-In

- Identify Stakeholders and Tailor Communication Strategies to Them
- Work Collaboratively with Unions and Associations

Center for Educator Compensation Reform Lessons Learned

Fairness

- Commit Adequate Funding
- Find Ways to Reward All Who Deserve It

Comprehensiveness

- Use Multiple Measures of Assessment
- Evaluate Growth and Progress

Center for Public Education – What School Boards Should Consider When Designing a Pay-for-Performance Plan

- **Guarantee stable and adequate funding.** If teachers think funds will dry up, they have little incentive to change.
- **Provide competitive compensation.** Determine how large awards need to be to create a true incentive to teachers to changes their practice, or to attract new teachers to a district.
- **Build strong measurement systems.** Value-added measures offer promise as fair ways to assess student growth, since they measure the gains students have made since the previous year rather than overall achievement. These systems should be used to monitor the plan's effectiveness.

Center for Public Education – What School Boards Should Consider When Designing a Pay-for-Performance Plan

- **Include principals, administrators, and teachers in the design process.** Getting ideas and agreement from those most directly affected will smooth implementation.

American Federation of Teachers

Differentiated Pay Plans

- Labor-management collaboration
- Adequate base compensation for all teachers
- Credible, agreed-upon standards of practice
- Support for professional development
- Incentives that are available to all teachers
- Easily understood standards for rewards
- Sufficient and stable funding
- Necessary support systems, such as data and accounting systems

American Federation of Teachers

Reasons for Awarding Additional Compensation

- Advanced degree, such as a master's or PhD 87%
- Assuming additional responsibilities 85%
- Length of his or her teaching experience 82%
- High evaluations by principal and other administrators 58%
- High evaluations by other teachers 58%
- Gains in student academic achievement as measured by portfolios, projects, etc. 53%
- Gains in student academic achievement as measured by standardized test results 21%

American Federation of Teachers

Biggest concerns about plans that take into account gains in student achievement

- System would be unfair to teachers with the most difficult students to teach 49%
- Tying salaries to test scores will mean more teaching to the test, instead of teaching children 36%
- Inappropriate to base teacher's pay on student achievement 25%
- No fair way to measure student achievement gains 16%

National Education Association

- Pay Raises Tied to Test Scores
 - ✓ Can Pit Employee Against Employee
 - ✓ How to Reward Teachers Who Do Not Teach Tested Subjects
 - ✓ Only Measuring a Narrow Piece of the Teacher's Work

National Education Association

- What Makes a Quality Pay System
 - ✓ Professional Level Starting Pay
 - ✓ No More than Ten Steps
 - ✓ Move Through System Based Upon Experience, Knowledge & Skills
 - ✓ Grant Extra Pay for Other Assignments (Peer Coaching, Mentoring), Advanced Degrees, Hard-to-Staff Schools

National Education Association

Potential Problems with Alternative Compensation Systems

- Is there adequate funding for the new pay system and is it sustainable?
- Is it easily understood and transparent?
- Are evaluations subjective or objective?
- Have administrative and implementation costs been considered?
- Are the sizes of the incentives large enough to change behavior?

Support Pay Systems that Create Career Paths and Include Teachers in Any Compensation Reform Effort

AASA Survey

1. PLEASE RATE YOUR DISTRICT'S LEVEL OF INTEREST IN A PAY-FOR-PERFORMANCE PROGRAM	
	SCALE 1 – 10 1 = No Interest; 10 = Already Pursuing
At the individual teacher level (individual teachers are rewarded)	4.39
At an intermediary level (teams/groups of teachers are rewarded)	4.49
At the system level (all teachers in the system are rewarded)	4.42

AASA Survey

2. IF YOUR DISTRICT WERE TO IMPLEMENT A PAY FOR PERFORMANCE PLAN, PLEASE INDICATE THE LEVELS WHERE YOU THINK PERFORMANCE PAY SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE EVALUATIONS:

Teacher	101	20%
Principal	94	18%
Administrator	60	12%
All three levels	423	82%

AASA Survey

3. OF THE SYSTEM AND INDIVIDUAL INDICATORS LISTED BELOW, PLEASE MARK THOSE YOU WOULD CONSIDER IN A PAY-FOR-PERFORMANCE MODEL:		
Student attendance	195	37%
Graduation rates	285	54%
Student behavioral figures (suspensions, expulsions, etc.)	181	35%
Teacher retention	117	22%
Teacher attendance	281	54%
Teacher grievances	31	6%
Fiscal management	204	39%
Teacher evaluations	357	68%
Student achievement	467	89%
Other	92	18%

AASA Survey

4. WHAT WOULD MOTIVATE YOUR DECISION TO IMPLEMENT A PAY-FOR-PERFORMANCE PROGRAM?:		
Desire to improved student achievement	405	77%
Motivational tool for teachers	258	49%
Tool for improving teacher effectiveness	336	64%
Community pressure	46	9%
Improving teacher recruitment/retention	164	31%
An existing "crisis mentality"	9	2%
State/Federal legislative mandate	180	34%
Inclusion with labor agreement	134	25%
Other	49	9%

AASA Survey

5. WHAT OBSTACLES DO YOU EXPECT/HAVE YOU EXPERIENCED IN IMPLEMENTING A PAY-FOR-PERFORMANCE PROGRAM?		
Teacher union resistance	392	75%
Costs	263	50%
School board resistance	64	12%
Lack of community support	45	9%
Capacity to link teacher evaluation and/or student achievement to evaluations	347	66%
School-system support	105	20%
Legal tests/restrictions	156	30%
Accuracy of performance measures	341	65%
Other, please specify	42	8%

Websites

- Center for American Progress
www.AmericanProgress.org
- Center for Teaching Quality
www.TeachingQuality.org
- The New Teacher Project
www.tntp.org
- Center for Public Education
www.CenterforPublicEducation.org
- National Center on Performance Incentives
www.PerformanceIncentives.org
- Center for Educator Compensation Reform
www.cecr.ed.gov
- National Institute for Excellence in Teaching
www.niet.org



For more information contact:

Jeff Rahmberg
Rahmberg, Stover & Associates, LLC
(248) 203-7710
Jeff.Rahmberg@rahmbergstover.com

Dawn Mullaly
Rahmberg, Stover & Associates, LLC
(734) 680-6300
Dawn.Mullaly@rahmbergstover.com

rahmbergstover.com