

To: K-12 Advisory Committee to Washington Learns

From: Compensation Subgroup Members
Kevin Teeley, Chair
Rep. Ross Hunter
Rep. Skip Priest
Paul Rosier

Date: May 23, 2006

Subject: Compensation Subgroup Recommendations

Certificated Instructional Staff

At this time, we believe that there is not enough empirical evidence to recommend a specific new statewide compensation structure. Therefore, we recommend that state-funded competitive grants be made available for **alternative compensation pilot projects**. The purpose of the pilots would be to provide opportunities to determine which compensation strategies have the greatest impact on teacher quality and student achievement so as to inform future statewide compensation policy decisions. Districts and employees would bargain over the components of proposed pilots and submit the proposals to the state. The pilots could include such features as multi-tier licensure systems, school-based performance pay, and various wage premiums.

In the meantime, the statewide **base salary structure** should be retained. The schedule should provide incentives for continued, quality professional development, including relevant degrees and relevant additional education credits. To that end, the policies and procedures governing movement on the schedule should be strengthened to ensure that only relevant credits are recognized. Changes to qualifications for movement on the salary schedule should be made in such a way that no current teacher receives a reduction in salary as a result of the changes.

Teacher preparation programs, licensure programs, and ongoing professional development should be restructured and reformed so as to strengthen the connection between educational credits/advanced degrees and quality teaching and student achievement. Masters in education programs should receive particular scrutiny to ensure that they result in increased teacher quality and increased student achievement. A consolidated state-administered licensure system would promote uniformity of assessment and greater quality control, and separate instruction from assessment.

Additional changes that should be made to the current statewide compensation system:

1. **Salary grandfathering** should be eliminated.
2. Beginning, average and high-end salaries should be **competitive** so as to attract and retain high quality teachers. Potential comparables include:
 - a. Teacher pay in other states
 - b. Comparable professions
3. State salary allocations should include **regional cost adjustments**. Potential ways of doing this include:
 - a. Comparable wage index
 - b. Regional cost-of-housing index
 - c. Other methodology
4. Achieving **professional certification** should be acknowledged on the salary schedule. Options to consider:
 - a. Additional percentage of base pay
 - b. Additional flat amount
 - c. Moving to a particular lane on the salary schedule
 - d. Other
5. **National Board Certification** should be recognized in statute with additional pay. The bonus should be included in the calculation of wages for purposes of determining pensions. Options discussed regarding the bonus:
 - a. Keep the current bonus of \$3,500 for 10-year life of the certificate.
 - b. Increase the bonus to a higher flat amount.
 - c. Change to a percentage of base pay.
 - d. Board certified teachers move to the highest lane on the state salary schedule. Those already in the highest lane would receive x% bonus.
 - e. Provide additional compensation to board certified teachers who mentor and/or teach in hard-to staff schools.
6. **Wage premiums** should be provided for the following:
 - a. To attract high quality teachers to hard-to-staff schools;
 - b. To recognize additional responsibilities of mentoring. A strong, statewide mentoring program should be developed and adopted.

The wage premiums could be in the form of a flat bonus or an additional percentage of base pay.

7. Prior relevant experience of educational staff associates (e.g., nurses, psychologists, counselors) as well as career and technical educators should be recognized on the salary schedule.

Classified Staff Salary Allocations

The state allocations provided for classified staff salaries are based on each districts' actual average salary at some point in the 1980s, adjusted by any across-the-board increases provided by the state from that point forward. The amount allocated for each state-funded classified staff ranges from \$21,737 to Damman School District in Kittitas County to \$32,885 to Seattle School District. The statewide average salary allocation is \$28,458 while the statewide actual average classified staff salary is \$33,843.

State classified salary allocations to each district should be increased to the current actual average allocation and a regional cost adjustment should be applied to these base salary allocations.

The subgroup recognizes that a restructuring of classified salary allocations needs to be considered by the funding subgroup. One way of accomplishing this could be by convening a task force after the Steering Committee has made its recommendations.

Certificated Administrator Salaries

The state allocations provided for certificated administrative staff salaries are based on each districts' actual average salary at some point in the 1980s, adjusted in subsequent years by across-the-board salary increases as well as reductions made in the early 1990s. Beginning with the 2005-06 school year, the minimum allocation for administrative salaries was increased to \$45,000 (increased each year by the across-the-board salary increases); this impacted 23 districts. The highest allocation of \$75,435 is received by Skykomish, Harrington (Lincoln County), Columbia (Stevens County) and St. John (Whitman County). The average allocation is \$53,000 and the actual average salary is \$89,000.

This subgroup recommends to the funding subgroup that a administrator compensation system be created that reflects the actual needs of the districts, including achieving state and federal mandates.

As with teacher compensation, we believe that there is not enough empirical evidence to recommend a specific new statewide compensation structure for administrators at this time. Therefore, we recommend that school-based administrators and superintendents be included in the state-funded competitive grant pilot projects discussed above. The purpose of the pilots would be to provide opportunities to determine which compensation strategies have the greatest impact on student achievement so as to inform future statewide compensation policy decisions.