

Salary Grid Workgroup

Puget Sound ESD
800 Oakesdale Avenue SW
Renton, WA 98057
November 15, 2017
9 a.m.–12 p.m.

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

Members Present: Cindy Rockholt, Donna Franklin, Jamila Thomas, Jared Kink, Jim Kowalkowski, Julie Salvi, Marci Larsen, Melissa Beard, Michelle Matakas, Sheryl Anderson Moore, T.J. Kelly, Tennille Jeffries-Simmons, Tim Yeomans

Members on Zoom: Brian Mathieson, Cory Plager, Henry Strom, Kelley Boyd, Lisa Dawn-Fisher

Audience Present: Nicole Klein, Jessica Vavrus, Cynthia Hollimon, Brianne King

Audience on Zoom: cbrenengen, Lynnette Ondeck, Scott Westlund, Stephanie Drake, Wandah Messinger

Minutes Taken By: Heather Rees

Agenda Item	Discussion
Agenda Overview	Maria Flores called meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Introduction of members• Goals for today's meeting: call the vote or determine what is needed to vote on 11/27
Status of Educator Licensure -Maria Flores	Presentation on "Washington State Second Tier Licensure" prepared by the Professional Educator Standards Board and given by Maria Flores. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Second tier licensure is currently optional for all educators (exception of CTE teachers) and available for all except principals and program administrators.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ProTeach ends December 2019. Last submission deadline is June 2019. • After 1.5 FTE of experience, teachers must renew residency certification or receive professional certification. Can stay in residency indefinitely.
<p>Debrief Educator Licensure -Maria Flores</p>	<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maria: What is our level of comfort with the middle/second tier of the model? • Stakeholders are working on creating a new professional second tier. • Difficult to choose a model when the current second tier option is going away after December 2019. • Current status is okay, very interested in the next step. • Important element but workgroup cannot come to a solution today. • Concern about third column as well. Is NBCT in the third tier or beyond the 90? • If NBCT gets folded into the grid, might not get the funding for it. • Why would you want to hire a national board certified teacher if it costs so much? • Concern that the second tier of this model will be obsolete by the time this comes out. • Question of incentives for master's degree. About 42,000 have a master's degree. • The reason we have so many with a master's is because that's what we compensated for, encourages what we want. • Can local districts afford higher tiers? Can hire two new staff for cost of one advanced. • This is a huge challenge. We are required to submit a model. The report can look how we want. We can continue the conversation. • Districts are going to define the tiers for themselves. • Maria: options are 1. Define it 2. Leave it broad (it's going to be bargained locally) 3. Hybrid (make suggestions). • We are developing a framework for districts. Funding isn't tied to this. • Is this a tool or an allocation method? • This change is very dramatic. Important to indicate the goal, but has to be phased in. It's going to take time to transition.

<p>Review 4 Salary Allocation Models -Michelle Matakas</p>	<p>Michelle Matakas, Financial Policy and Research Analyst at OSPI, gave presentation of 4 salary allocation models as requested last meeting and staffing grid based on preliminary S275 for school year 2016–17</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Model #1- Starting with entry salary at 40k, up to factor of 1.68. Goes to \$67k, with average salary of \$54,809. • Model #2- Starting with top salary at 90k, bottom salary is 54k, with average salary of \$73,422. • Model #3- With entry at 40k and top salary at 90k, factor goes from 1 to 2.25, with an average salary of \$62,158. • Model #4- Is the same as #3 with percent increases altered to create an average salary of \$64,060 (current average). • Average salaries are based on staffing grid. • Models do not have regionalization.
<p>Discussion of Proposed Models -Maria Flores</p>	<p>Discussion: See table before for pros and cons of each model as discussed. See “Parking Lot” section for issues that still need to be discussed further at a later date.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pay bump at 5 years reflects the law. • There will be winners and losers, but not driving state allocation and is a tool. • OSPI has the district level information for model 4. • The issue is the average salary model does not fit with grid example. • Can you exceed 90k with regionalization? A: Yes • Salary grid is not going to affect regionalization. • Hold harmless will impact the average. • Hold harmless is not on individual salaries. It is applied to total allocation. Need for technical correction to bill for hold harmless. Bill language needs to be changed • Recognition for prior experience for ESAs? What would that cost? • There is some survey data on the average additional experience for ESAs. • Concern that second tier needs to go to 90k if the only way to get to it is NBCT

	<p>Took 5 min break at 10:48</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislature wants certifications that can be tied to student performance. • Do we need a transitional model? • Should take 1-2 years to change the model. We need to do some costing to determine what the goal is in three years. What do the steps between look like, model and plan? • We need: a chance to see how regionalization is going to play out, a real transition not just status quo, something to keep order and equity, no chaos. • Should utilize existing LEAP. Going to need to add years to reach average. • Concern about transitional model. Will be negotiation and districts might not move off of it for 4-5 years. Should be concepts and values. Steps are more important. • Transition model isn't going to fit everyone. • Report should highlight new and different options. • School districts need autonomy for ESAs, end up contracting anyway. • Is it worth it to look at a separate model for ESAs? It is a shortage area. • Transition approach would also be subject to bargaining • Is the average 64k or adjusted for inflation? Closer to 66k for 2019-20. • Want to see how models get written descriptions- draft outline, and costing of 3 and 4 stateside against LEAP adjusted for inflation 2019-20 • Consensus that we all want to work more on this. Key point is advanced certification needs more work. Envision one year grid would include guidelines.
<p>Option-to call the vote or outline needs for 11/27 vote</p>	<p>Outline of tasks for next meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjusted LEAP model • Costing 3 + 4 • Play with factors of adjusted LEAP • LEAP condensed and added years • Written description framing draft outline • Clarity on ProCert in the model

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Morning is better for the 27th <p>Meeting ended at 12:02</p>
--	---

Parking Lot:

- Second tier certification
- Cost for ESAs

Model #1	
Pros	Cons
*Certification tied to educator growth and compensation	Average not high enough
Maximizes earnings faster compress the schedule 1 to 1.6 factor	*Hard to recommend a model during time of uncertainty in educator licensure stages
	Doesn't match the current funding model
	Doesn't get to 90
Model #2	
Pros	Cons
Beginning wages closer to inflation, competitive	SDs can't afford. Not affordable with funding cuts
	Average too expensive in many districts
	If you didn't do NBCT you would max out pretty quickly
	No clear pathway to 3 rd tier, only have NBCT bonus
Model #3	
Pros	Cons
Close to the average	Lengthening not compressing to get to the top
	Below what's funded

Model #4	
Pros	Cons
Fits in state level funding	*Some ESAs don't have recognized certification. No way to move them to the far right
Districts can input their own data	
Good place to start conversation	

*applies to every model