

LECTF - September 26, 2016

In Attendance: Vicki, Janice, Kim, Amanda, Jessica, Katherine, Melissa, Anthony, Matt, Jennifer

Janice welcomed the committee. Introductions were made for Kim, since it is her first time at the meeting.

Motion to approve the minutes from September 12, 2016. Approved

- The co-chairs signed the copy of the minutes.

Survey-

Discussion about the survey questions. Prior to the meeting, the committee members took the survey as a test. Jennifer expressed concern about the question regarding extra duties not reflecting all the extra responsibilities required by classroom teachers that are not outside of regular duties. The committee brainstormed how to better word the question, including dual-language immersion as an example. Another change to the survey was the breaking out of answers instead of stars for a satisfaction rating. A demographic question was added about the home school location (elementary, middle, high, and special). It was noted that the status bar on the survey was helpful.

It was suggested that the survey be sent to employees after the principals are informed about it so that the principals can encourage teachers to look for it and take the survey. Since there is not a principals' meeting scheduled before the survey will be distributed, the information will be shared with principals electronically. Anthony suggested sending it on the day of our next meeting (October 10). It will be open for a week and will be sent to anyone on the licensed employees list. Anthony will bring the data at the following meeting for discussion.

Job Description Discussion-

The Joint Relations Committee will be discussing the document and Melissa will return to LECTF with a report.

Budget Presentation-

Janice said that one of the reasons that the school board is part of this committee is because they want to pay teachers more but they also want to encourage teachers to improve their practice. The School board as a group, have agreed that their primary goal is to pay teachers more. They want to put money where their mouth is.

Matt presented alternate sources of revenue. He reiterated that there has been a paradigm shift for the top of the school district. There are more viewpoints that

are being interjected and looked at than there were even 5 years ago. The 5 sources of revenue are:

1. Federal Money- Little local control

2. State Money- Little local control but lobbying control

3. Cost Savings- Moderate to Significant local control. The board is looking at long term savings, perhaps a shifting of items in the budget. Matt would like to see the goal of the board to be to increase the number of dollars that are going directly to instruction.

4. Fund Balances- Significant local control. What comes in vs. what is expensed = something left over. In a school district, the extra money goes into the Fund Balances. It is not significantly invested because of risk tolerance. The "Rainy Day Fund" (Contingency Fund) is one of the Fund Balances. Credit agencies like entities to have large Fund Balances for credit ratings. JSD needs to keep the Fund Balances at a high enough balance not to risk the credit rating. The school board would like to look at the Fund Balances as a way to fund suggestions from LECTF. Currently there is \$50,000,000 in the restricted fund. There is about \$16,000,000 in the Contingency Fund. There is another fund that is Unassigned with a balance of \$23,000,000. JSD shouldn't fund ongoing projects from Fund Balances but can use some of the Fund Balances, particularly the Unassigned, to gradually implement some of these programs to use as part of an ongoing project. This is not the catch all to fund ongoing, but can be used as part of an ongoing plan.

5. Local Property Taxes

a) Natural Growth of Tax Base- The ways that the laws are set up, JSD does not benefit from the rising property values, the inflation of property values. JSD does benefit from the new property construction that comes into the tax base.

b) Tax Rate- Adjusted to stay revenue neutral. The board can raise the tax rate through a Truth in Taxation meeting (TNT). It has been 7 budget years since the last raise in property tax (2009). Timing wise, it is not a great year to ask for a TNT because of the bond. Next year isn't a great time either coming right after the bond. But there is a time in the future that it could happen. Once other options are used, the board could do a TNT for more money for teachers.

Matt can't speak for any other individual board members but can speak for the other board members on the committee. They are interested in using all of the options available to them to get this right, to come up with a plan to reward high quality teaching. He feels that the board better understands the financial options better than they have in the past.

Side Note: The fiscal year ends June 30. The last financial report is from 2015 which the board is currently assessing.

It was discussed that there is an importance of having new money from the legislature put on the WPU. By doing this it allows for local control of the money. Janice also shared that there is a possible equalization funding bill from Senator Fillmore that will be presented in the next legislative session.

Janice reminded the committee that something to consider is that when JSD and CSD split, JSD was \$20 million in the hole. That is part of the reason why this (LECTF and an effort to increase salaries) hasn't been done in the past. To make up that money initially, a lot of jobs were cut, especially classified. She hopes that JSD is coming out of that.

As a school board, Janice said they don't want to damage anyone. She personally would like to bump up everyone's salary. She expressed concern about Jordan's standing when compared with salaries from other districts.

What is a quality teacher?

Janice provide articles. There was a brief discussion about each one.

1. Examining Merit Pay by Josh Rosales (nea.org)
2. The Five Core Propositions from NBCT

Janice wants to address base salary and recognizing people that are doing a good job.

Matt asked about winners and losers in a transition from the current salary schedule to a new one. Vicki shared her experiences in elementary schools. Teachers are concerned about having to do a dog and pony show to prove their are doing a good job. They also worry about what more they will have to do. Teachers just want everyone to be paid more, not compete against their colleagues through merit pay.

Kim shared a concern about the evaluation of the process. She wants to know who is making the determination that a teacher is quality or not. Janice doesn't want principals to make the decision.

Melissa voiced concerns from her colleagues about being asked to do more work for money. Matt identified that there are simple metrics that can help determine if a teacher is doing what makes a good effective teacher. He doesn't see a system with scores.

Kim shared that when she was principal, she paid teachers from Trust Lands money, to write curriculum and plan in the summer. This supports the option for

an extended contract. Jennifer mentioned an extended contract might not work for year round schools because teachers don't have a classroom when they are off track.

"Do no harm." - Matt. First let's pay teachers more money across the board. Bump it to some degree so that everyone's basic needs are taken. Once we settled and satisfied with that, then let's discuss how we can pay people more who are interested in improving their practice (phase 2). A third phase might be elevating some more defined, extended type roles. Basically a three prong approach to getting through this process.

Katherine said that from a SPED perspective the phase 2 might be overwhelming. Matt clarified that it would be important to help people without harming people.

If we move forward with Phase 1, we can use the survey data to discuss Phase 2.

Steps and Lanes-

There is data about the number of teachers who were frozen since the district split. The cost is estimated to be about \$40 million to restore all steps. Vicki suggested that one frozen step be returned at a time. Kim advocated for the teachers that have stayed in the district to receive a frozen step returned to them. Anthony will bring the data about frozen steps to our next meeting.

Matt would like to discuss why the district in the past has felt that there needed to be frozen steps and lanes. Vicki and Melissa shared that it was because there wasn't money to fund them. Matt wanted to reevaluate that. Kim suggested that it be important to look forward and not backwards. Matt thought that if the step increases were smaller, it would be more likely to be funded. Melissa shared that a previous salary schedule included 25 steps. Last year 856 teachers did not receive a step increase because they plateaued somewhere in the process.

Matt thinks it is sad that a main conversation in negotiations is whether or not teachers will get a step and lane. He wants to explore taking that off the table and make sure it is a given. Prior to the district split, it was always a given. Since the split, it was blamed on a lack of money for steps and lanes.

Matt said that all he knows is that the size of the step increases is what prevented previous people from funding steps and lanes. Amanda mentioned that it is a morale killer when you don't get a step and then add an insurance increase and you make less money. Melissa shared negotiations information about steps and lanes prior to the split vs. after the split.

Matt said to entrench that, the size of the steps is what created that concern. So if we stretch that out, frozen steps and lanes would become a non-issue. If we stretched it out, it would be a given that people would be doing better than they are today. He would like to explore more steps with smaller gains between.

Melissa mentioned the confusion that occurred when the current salary schedule was implemented and expressed a desire to prevent that from occurring if a new schedule was implemented.

Looking Forward-

Anthony will send the survey results to committee members so they can review them between October 10 and November 7.

At the next meeting we will discuss Phase 1 as well as the frozen step data. Melissa will bring old JSD salary schedules. Jessica will gather information from other districts about the restoration of frozen steps.

Next Meeting:

October 10 (Anthony)

November 7 (Jessica)