

# Salary Grid Workgroup

Puget Sound ESD  
800 Oakesdale Avenue SW  
Renton, WA 98057  
October 30, 2017  
1-4pm

Workgroup Facilitator: Maria Flores, Director of Title II, Part A & Special Programs at OSPI

Members Present: Cindy Rockholt, Cory Plager, Donna Franklin, Henry Strom, Jared Kink, Julie Salvi, Kelley Boyd, Lisa Dawn-Fisher, Marci Larsen, Melissa Beard, Sheryl Moore, T.J. Kelly, Tennille Jeffries-Simmons, Tim Yeomans

Members on Zoom: Brian Mathieson, Jim Kowalkoski, Marianne Costello

Audience Present: Angela Marek, Bill Klein, Brianne King, Chris Reykdal, Corine Pennington, Cynthia Hollimon, D. Franklin, Dan Steele, Jessica Vavrus, Jolynn Berge, Kathleen Lawrence, Lynnette Ondea, Marie Canas, Nicole Klein

Minutes Taken By: Heather Rees

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action/Who/Deadline
Introductions, agenda and plan overview, norms and decision making protocol	Maria Flores called meeting to order at 1:02 pm  Chris Reykdal gave welcome introduction. OSPI staff in attendance are non-voting members. Current salary grid goes away next year. The default is separate salary schedules for each district. The goal is to create a framework that districts can choose to use. This is due to the legislature December 1 <sup>st</sup> . Have 6 hours of required work in two meetings. Can keep the conversation going after if desired.	

	<p>Maria-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introductions of members</li> <li>• Went over scope and objectives, accepted norms, decision making</li> <li>• Votes must be 50% +1 to pass, so 7 for majority</li> </ul>	
<p>Review salary grid workgroup purpose in ESSB 2242 and previous compensation policy recommendations -Maria Flores</p>	<p>Review of House bill 2242 Section 107 1 and 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To develop a model salary grid as a resource and guidance</li> <li>• Districts are not required to use this grid</li> <li>• Due Dec 1<sup>st</sup></li> <li>• Posted on OSPI website</li> </ul> <p>Overview of past recommendations:</p> <p>2006 WA Learns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PESB set performance standards and implement teaching level assessment</li> <li>• Educational experience - requirements for college programs</li> <li>• Novice teacher assistance</li> <li>• Future teachers scholarships and loan repayment programs</li> <li>• Pay for performance, knowledge, and skills</li> <li>• Professional development delivery system</li> <li>• What came out of it, Picus and Odden grid with levels by experience and education</li> </ul> <p>2007 Washington Adequacy Funding Study (Conley)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determined per student spending</li> <li>• Wage indexing: cost of living, competitive and hedonic</li> </ul> <p>2008 Full Funding Coalition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase salaries beyond COLA</li> <li>• Improve classified allocations</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Address adequacy of base salaries with wage analysis</li> </ul> <p>2009 Basic Education Finance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Years of service- career ladder</li> <li>• Levels of certification- residency, professional, master</li> <li>• Educational experience- replace with career ladder</li> <li>• Levels of responsibility- peer review system and mentorship</li> <li>• Hard to staff subjects and schools- bonus for high poverty schools and regional labor market adjustments</li> <li>• Individual and school level performance- student performance awards</li> <li>• Needs based professional development- 10 Learning Improvement Days, support new teachers</li> <li>• Sample salary schedule- based on career ladder</li> </ul> <p>2010 Quality Education Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Levels of responsibility- professional development and mentorship</li> <li>• Needs-based professional development- cultural competency and language acquisition</li> </ul> <p>2012 Compensation Technical Working Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Labor market analysis- increase starting salary</li> <li>• Fair-market based allocations</li> <li>• Maintain with COLA and periodic wage analysis</li> <li>• Align to career continuum</li> <li>• 10 days of Professional Development time</li> <li>• Allocate mentors</li> <li>• Appropriate staffing levels</li> <li>• Limit locally funded salary enhancement to no more than 10% of the state allocation</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure districts receive the same or higher state salary allocation per employee</li> </ul> <p>Most recommendations not adopted except: PESB tiers of certification, National Board bonus, and high poverty bonus</p> <p>Reaction from legislature: Sheryl- because of political climate it was dead on arrival, price tag too high.</p> <p>Some of the language caught on and elements have continued.</p> <p>Jim- economy wasn't great at the time, concern about PD- teachers only work 9 months, concerned about underperforming teachers and difficulty of dismissing teachers</p> <p>TPEP took off but compensation discussion dropped off.</p>	
<p>Review salary grid survey results -Maria Flores</p>	<p>Maria went over results from salary grid survey of members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8 answered</li> <li>• Poll of workgroup members, non-OSPI voting members</li> <li>• Years of experience- favored</li> <li>• Academic degrees- favored</li> <li>• Specific content area degrees- split</li> <li>• Instructional leadership- split</li> <li>• Additional leadership role- split</li> <li>• Mentor- split</li> <li>• Instructional coach- split</li> <li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> tier licensure- favored</li> <li>• National board cert- favored</li> <li>• Hard to fill- split</li> <li>• Low performing school- more opposed</li> <li>• Credits- favored</li> </ul>	

- TPEP score- opposed
- Student achievement- opposed
- School wide achievement- opposed

Top five:

1. Years of teaching
2. National Board certification
3. Academic degrees
4. Content area degree
5. 2<sup>nd</sup> tier licensure

Bottom five:

1. TPEP
2. Low performing school
3. Leadership role
4. Instructional coach
5. Hard to fill/shortage

Discussion:

- Looking for a grid that would work over time, not fluctuating. Some elements might be more appropriate for another pay method, not salary schedule.
- Starting place should be compensation workgroup.
- Our top preferences from survey align with most recent recommendations
- We want to encourage growth. This is reflected in top 5. Stipend rewards for other things.
- Bottom five represent system issues that can be addressed by local controls.
- Seems like everyone supports years of service.
- Smalls schools struggle with content area and mentorship incentives.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On student gains- There are other variables, don't want to discourage teachers from working with struggling kids.</li> <li>• For other staff types, years of experience aren't accounted for nurses', counselors'- experience in other settings.</li> </ul> <p>Conclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, one salary grid</li> <li>• No separate grid for other staff types</li> <li>• Have common areas. Are closer together than would have thought</li> <li>• Can we fit it into the math?</li> </ul> <p>At 2:36 took 10 min break</p>	
<p>Basic mathematical salary grid -T.J. Kelley and Lisa Dawn-Fisher</p>	<p>T.J. Kelley (OSPI) gave presentation of purely mathematical grid</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 40 was bottom, it goes up to 75</li> <li>• Can we reverse engineer from 90 down?</li> <li>• Can we reverse engineer? Take 40 and 90 force into grid. What is average?</li> <li>• What year are we starting at? What happens during transition?</li> <li>• What is the gross statewide cost of this model?</li> </ul>	
<p>Salary grid options proposed by members and discussion -Maria Flores</p>	<p>Maria Flores led discussion of salary grid options and next steps.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Model needs to be scalable to size and funding. How can we make this work across the state? Some want to negotiate regionally and some don't.</li> <li>• <b>Mathematical model presented is an illustration, not proposal.</b></li> <li>• Options are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Computing SAM with inflation</li> <li>2. Basic mathematical model</li> <li>3. Hybrid- math numbers distilled into SAM-like model</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<p>OSPI run other mathematical options and bring them back to the group next meeting.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Set the structure not the values. The money is determined by locality.</li> <li>• Keep in mind phase in-transition.</li> <li>• We need to understand how it's going to work district-by-district, try to find out where it works and where it doesn't.</li> <li>• Should take a look at Governor's proposal condensed grid.</li> <li>• Maria asked "Is the condensed model something you conceptually agree with?" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Took informal vote- yes majority agree</li> </ul> </li> <li>• We don't want to incentivize hiring inexpensive teachers</li> <li>• Is this based on 180-day calendar? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Vote on 180-day- passed with majority of 12</li> </ul> </li> <li>• For new teachers, is there a professional certification? vs. renewal?</li> <li>• Teachers can stay where they are at or move on to professional certification. 18% get National Certification</li> <li>• Need to create a middle option.</li> <li>• Need additional step for teachers hitting 5 years- 10%</li> </ul> <p>Next steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSPI needs to define work details</li> <li>• Send out survey -technical check</li> </ul> <p>Next meeting: Nov. 16<sup>th</sup> at OSPI 1-4 Have a room for 27<sup>th</sup> if we need a bit more time not required</p>	
Final announcements and closing	Next meeting during WSSDA conference- conference call in Meeting ended at 4:00pm	