

Salary Grid Workgroup

OSPI-Brouillet Conference Room
600 Washington St. S.E.
Olympia, WA 98504

November 27, 2017
10am-2pm

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

Members Present: Cindy Rockholt, Cory Plager, Henry Strom, Jamila Thomas, Julie Salvi, Melissa Beard, Michelle Matakas, Sheryl Anderson Moore, T.J. Kelly, Tennille Jeffries-Simmons, Tim Yeomans

Members on Zoom: Donna Franklin, Jared Kink, Jim Kowalkowski, Kelley Boyd, Lisa Dawn-Fisher, Marianne Costello

Audience Present: Lorrell Noahr, Lynnette Ondeck, Nicole Klein, Angie Merek, Vicky Dyer, Dan Steele

Audience on Zoom: Jessica Vavrus, Trisha Schock

Minutes Taken By: Heather Rees

Agenda Item	Discussion
Agenda Overview	Maria Flores called meeting to order at 10:08 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Introduction of members• Agenda and goals• Timeline of work• Technical edits only on draft. Any other comments should be offered to the group today.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members expressed feeling rushed, concern for the timeline. • OSPI emphasized that the goal is not to force a consensus • Need details of workgroup’s opinions- pros and cons on models.
Review of materials	Time for individuals to look over materials
Review of models and costing summary -Michelle Matakas	<p>Michelle Matakas reviewed the models that the workgroup requested and the costing for the models, statewide and by district.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Model #3: 40 to 90, two tiers in the middle, average \$62k. • Model #4: adjusted for average closer to \$64k. • Model #5: based on Cory’s and on current LEAP, added 10% bump required after 5 years and added grids to get to \$90k, average \$64k. 0 to 25 years. • Model #6: condensed LEAP, no tie to staff mix. Average salary \$70k. 1 to 16+ years. • Salary Grid Comparison Costing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Based on 2016-17 S275 ○ Column H: individual hold harmless- current salary vs salary on grid, includes regionalization. ○ Actual salary higher than allocation, calculated by total number of staff not allocated state funding. ○ Column I: all current district units (G allocated by model) + hold harmless cost compared to S275 inflated salary. Estimated cost of current staff with inflation. ○ Column J: all current district units (G allocated by model) + hold harmless cost compared to current law under 2242 applied to current staffing units.
Small group discussion	Broke out into small groups for discussion of presented salary models at 11:00am
Discussion -Maria Flores	<p>Reconvened around 11:30am</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Column G: Total number of certificated staff x statewide average salary x regionalization = total allocation G • Some members feel that no grid isn’t going to hurt someone. • Issue of portability. Doesn’t happen in other states. We want to recommend that portability is maintained. • Importance of capacity for grandfathering in.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue of equitability in hiring capacity. School districts with more money will get more credentialed staff. • Tennille’s proposal: start at current compensation, recommend to move to models 3 or 4 if you can. If not, provide considerations for transition plan. • For 18-19, total compensation can’t increase more than inflation but individual salaries can. <p>Members poll:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not one grid is not going to work for all districts – most agree, some feel not binary choice, need a starting point. • Issue of equity- everyone agrees. • There will be winners and losers among teachers unless there is a hold harmless- everyone agrees.
	Break for lunch 12:08 back 12:35
Discussion: Models -Maria Flores	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Come up with something that is a resource for districts and continue the conversation • Show our work, the situation that leg has put us in, what they have created <p>*See table below for pros and cons by model</p>
Discussion: Process -Maria Flores	<p>Transition Process for 18-19 or 19-20?</p> <p>Staff mix:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend that legislature fund a staff mix • Equity definition- in the state as a whole you can hire the best teacher available whether that is older or younger teachers. • Legislature thought staff mix took money from districts with high poverty. • We need to address the issue of hiring in rural small districts, hard to fill, student access to high performing teachers. • Opportunity to use data to highlight which districts have a hard time with going to an average. • Examples of local markets. • Rename staff mix- use a different term, has too much baggage • “Equity funding factor”

	<p>Process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide models 5 or 6 as transition models. Explain, pros and cons winners and losers • Provide staff mix and salaries for 5 and 6. • 6 isn't affordable. • Use 6 to show that it isn't possible, to fit requirements into an affordable model- to educate the legislature. • Clarify what 2242 does- timeline funding years • Questions for districts to consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How are you going to give ESAs credit for years? ○ How are you going to value ProCert? • Provide context/considerations • Identify your school districts values to compensate teachers/ qualifications, student and SD needs <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Transition models 2. Clarify the law 3. Opportunities/flexibility 4. Identify your SD values
<p>Presentation of Narrative Format -T.J. Kelly</p>	<p>Draft Narrative Overview by T.J. Kelly</p> <p>Outline:</p> <p>Tasks, process</p> <p>Pathways to salary advancement- survey (remove)</p> <p>Notes about second tier</p> <p>Financial viability</p> <p>Financial assumptions</p> <p>Need:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background work • Take out reference to survey, just mention issue of 2nd tier • Talk about what we want to do in the future, what we need to do that.

<p>Discussion Future work and Wrap-up</p>	<p>Future work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jan until? How long do we need? • What is the goals of future work? • Scope of work/what we want to work on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Waiting for PESB and status of 2nd tier licensure ○ Look at ESAs, separate or not ○ Portability ○ Hard to fill ○ Low performing schools <p>Process for edits: Tuesday- OSPI sends out report Wednesday- Look over and edit Thursday morning- Edits due from workgroup Friday- OSPI finished report</p> <p>Ended at 1:57</p>
---	--

Model #5	
What Works	What Doesn't
Recognizable transition model	Winners and losers in terms of funding
Fits in allocated money	Expanded further from compressed model, longer to the max
No individual hold harmless problems	
Model #6	
What Works	What Doesn't
Recognizable transition model	Doesn't fit the allocated money
40 to 90 in shorter amount of time	Winners and losers in terms of funding
No individual hold harmless problems	*look at staff mix, get into backwards show mathematically
Valuable to show legislature that the money doesn't fit	