

# Salary Grid Workgroup

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

April 23, 2018  
10am-2pm

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

Members Present: Cindy Rockholt, Jim Kowalkowski, JoLynn Berge, Julie Salvi, Lisa Dawn-Fisher, Marci Larsen, Melissa Beard, Michelle Matakas, Sheryl Anderson Moore, T.J. Kelly, Tennille Jeffries-Simmons, Tim Yeomans

Members on Zoom: Gavin Hottman, Kelley Boyd

Audience Present:

Benjamin Omdol, Bill Keim, Dan Steele, Heather Lewis-Lechner, Kate Davis, Lorrell Noahr, Maren Johnson, Nicole Klein, Patty Doud, Sophia Keskey

Audience on Zoom: Angie, Cindy Blansfield, Clark J., David Ogden, Doug, Glenn Gelbrich, Jolberg, Kelli Wolfe, Lynnette Ondeck, P. Johnson, R. Grant, Rico Lopez, Scott SA, Scott Westlund, T. Dammel, Wallace N.

Minutes Taken By: Heather Rees

| Agenda Item     | Discussion   |
|-----------------|--|
| Agenda Overview | Maria Flores called meeting to order at 10:06 a.m. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Reviewed agenda and goals</li><li>• Introduction of members</li></ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>Review of Correspondence &amp; Debrief Legislative Session - T.J. Kelly and Michelle Matakas, OSPI</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legislative session updates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ full funding of the increased state salary allocations</li> <li>○ added smoothing factor for regionalization in western WA</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Report from this workgroup was submitted last December</li> <li>• OSPI received a letter from legislature which said that the report did not comply with requirement to post a salary grid.</li> <li>• OSPI wrote back and posted a stand-alone grid on the website.</li> <li>• Summary of that grid (Michelle): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Based on 2017 numbers</li> <li>○ Starts at 40 with 10% increase at 5<sup>th</sup> year</li> <li>○ Includes caveat notes</li> <li>○ Using this grid is not required</li> <li>○ It does not fit the money</li> <li>○ Doesn't go to max salary</li> <li>○ Uses current staffing mix</li> <li>○ Some districts would overspend, some under</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are in a no-win situation without staff mix or definition of basic education and enhancement</li> <li>• The only purpose of this grid was to respond to the legislature and to be in compliance</li> <li>• There is no district that is average</li> <li>• The prior work of the group stands. We did not get what we needed to make it work.</li> <li>• <b>This grid is not a product of the workgroup</b> (add to notes section)</li> </ul> |
| <p>Share Public Comments - Maria Flores, OSPI</p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minute to read over</li> </ul> <p>Responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expressed support for “career ladder” type supports, not “time in service”</li> </ul>  |
| <p>PESB Update and Timeline - Maren Johnson, PESB</p>   | <p>Maren Johnson presented on the work of the Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB) Career Continuum Work Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intersecting workgroups: Career Continuum Work Group and coming fall 2018 Clock Hour Policy Review Work Group</li> </ul> <p>Career Continuum Work Group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E2SHB 1341 from last legislative session made second tier licensure optional</li> <li>• National Board certification is not available to all teachers</li> <li>• After June 2019 Pro Teach no longer available</li> </ul>   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leaves void for mid-career educator</li> <li>• Does the work group wish to recommend additional avenues to professional certification for teachers?</li> <li>• Recommendations to strengthen existing systems for continuing education?</li> <li>• ESAs have second-tier professional licensure for every role</li> <li>• Principals and program admin have no professional cert available, must renew indefinitely</li> <li>• Have looked at other states' systems</li> <li>• Will make recommendations to the board in July 2018</li> <li>• Ideas being discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Use a single component of National Board certification</li> <li>○ Cut score on National Board certification</li> <li>○ Portfolio based assessment for other content areas</li> <li>○ Strengthen current systems instead of adding new ones</li> <li>○ Incentives for professional certificate other than National Board certification- clock hours, extended certificate, professional opportunities</li> <li>○ Micro-credentials</li> <li>○ Clock hours for online learning</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Final meetings May 10 and June 7</li> </ul> |
| <p>Debrief Previous Presentations - Maria Flores</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there possible WAC changes? Possibility for legislation? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Depends on recommendations of the workgroup and if they go beyond current WAC</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Changes have been made to WACs that affect ESAs. Evened out cert renewal and interested in looking at other national association standards</li> <li>• The golden "standard certificate" is grandfathered for life</li> <li>• Pro cert, could that come back? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Would need to revisit challenges from before it went away</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Effort to reduce workload by using same pieces of evidence for multiple things</li> <li>• Certification and compensation need to be connected, by compensation elements that reinforce professional development and cert renewal.</li> <li>• End up with gaps that don't connect between the two. Need efficiency and coordination - cuts down costs</li> <li>• Getting stuck at career development recognition in salary grid. It is a barrier to moving forward with the grid</li> </ul>  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Because school districts are negotiating individually, how will the grid then overlay standards later? Will second-tier compensation just add more costs and how will it affect retirement?</li> <li>• There is lots of work to be done and not in time for negotiations. At this point we don't know what anything is going to look like.</li> <li>• The increase in funding is only for one year and will not go up after, as teachers increase credentials it will cost more without allocation for increase</li> <li>• OSPI presented to legislature on staff mix. Informed them as much as possible on what it is and importance. It was a better system to operate under.</li> <li>• Doesn't look like there will be recommendations of major changes from the PESB Career Continuum Work Group. Focusing on what happens to small group of folks that don't have access to second tier option. Would anyone take it if there are not incentives tied to it? Do not foresee any major overhaul.</li> <li>• Experience mix recognizes the impact at least a little</li> <li>• NBCT has always been recognized outside of salary schedule and will continue to be</li> <li>• No one solution for everyone</li> <li>• Would we consider offering districts a model with a "yet to be determined" lane? Would there be a benefit for a placeholder that districts could use for negotiations?</li> <li>• Currently in a time of uncertainty. Will need stability for creative, long-term solutions and changes.</li> </ul> |
| BREAK   | 11:32 to 11:45  |
| Share SAMs  | <p>Jim Kowalkowski shared sample salary grid from Valley School District</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grid uses fixed increments. Educator would land on the grid and then stay there except for cost of living</li> </ul> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most districts currently just doing modeling and looking at their individual staff mix</li> <li>• Smaller districts can't afford proposed grid</li> <li>• Can depend on levies to supplement or recognize masters</li> <li>• Looking at how many staff are above the average state funded allocation</li> </ul>  |
| Discussion and Decision – Future of Salary Grid Workgroup | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal to reconvene a year from now to analyze the results of bargaining, see what comes out of the process. Purpose for this group should be to unpack the results, intended and unintended, to provide some level of analysis to legislature</li> <li>• Proposal to meet in September or October of this year for that purpose</li> <li>• When would data be available?</li> </ul>   |

- Districts won't report until after expenditures are incurred.
- We need staffing numbers and to do comparisons, plus local context with examples of grids that were negotiated
- S275 due before Thanksgiving
- Won't have ongoing data until Nov 2019. Will then have two years' worth to look at.
- Analysis will be a lot of staff work, might need to ask for funding and/or collaboration
- Collecting data and sharing would be value to districts. Are will still in search of a grid?
- Purpose also to inform legislative process
- Potential recommendations based on what happened, not just autopsy
- Election this November could change the conversation
- **Question to members: Anyone opposed to meeting fall 2019? Result: No**
- **Workgroup will not meet in spring or summer. Will reconvene in fall 2019**

Work to be done:

- Use S275 and qualitative survey for analysis
- Compare compensation before and after for funding equity check
- Look at attrition and mobility
- Pick districts to compare- case studies
- Look for innovative salary grid solutions that districts came up with

Meeting concluded 12:31 p.m.