

Effective Teachers & Leaders / Fiscal Stability

Meeting Notes August 2, 2013

Members Present: Linda Clark, Wayne Freedman, Bert Marley (proxy for Penni Cyr), Brian Smith, Janie Ward-Engelking.

Joining by phone: Mary Ann Ranells

Others present: Jason Hancock, Christina Linder, Allison McClintick, Marilyn Whitney

Dr. Clark mentioned that she received a call from the Governor's budget office regarding the cost of some of the proposals. Dr. Clark proposed that the group look at the recommendations and ensure they are realistic and have a chance to succeed.

The group discussed differentiated pay and how elements of performance pay are part of the career ladder mode.

The group agreed that it may be possible to use one-time money for specific professional development needs, setting up a mentor program, and perhaps others.

They group discussed that there are three different kinds of money: – one-time, new money, and restoration money.

Jason Hancock walked the group through the career ladder model as modified after the meeting on July 12 and described phase-in scenarios and their likely fiscal impact.

The group discussed whether the recommendation should be to move to one-year contracts. It may not be necessary for the group to include that in the recommendation. There would likely need to be compromise and negotiation around any legislation going forward.

Christina Linder explained that there would not initially be a master teacher category at the beginning of the phase in if it's tied to licensure. There could be a year to apply for licensure. This move might need to happen when their certificate expires.

The group discussed that one way to phase in the career ladder could be that masters level teachers phase in as their certificates renew. The downside is that there is no training available until there is money in the pool to do the training. You could still reward the teachers in the pool if there is money set aside. It's generated at the professional level at \$1,000 per teacher. This would take this phase-in out several years. That could create a problem in timing for a teacher who had just re-certified and didn't have an opportunity and might have to wait 5 years to move to master teacher level. This is not going to be fair to everyone.

One thing that will need to be delineated is what a current teacher has to do to move to a new system of licensure. It would be helpful to run a model to see if all current teachers in Idaho have a professional designation.

There are two types of licensure for the novice teacher. After three years those teachers would have to be performing at proficient level or above. There could be a 4th year extension of

intensive training and work. If they still weren't proficient, they would need to go back to a preparation program. This might be the case for some of the alternate route teachers.

Rep. Ward-Engleking commented that this will be a selling point with the legislature. Teachers who don't perform will not be rewarded and they will be gone if the intensive training doesn't bring them to proficiency.

There may be a few teachers who have to bump down and get some intensive training to move back up.

Dr. Clark reminded the group that this committee was charged with identifying the reasons for current fiscal instability. The current steps and lanes model and the differential were identified. The career ladder would address this issue. Some districts are not able to pay the differential.

Brian Smith asked how much of this will be a statewide effort.

The group discussed that the state doesn't have the bandwidth to move everyone at once. There will need to be a phase in for master teachers. This could potentially be a local level decision. There would be no master teachers in year one of the phase in.

Jason Hancock mentioned that the model the group is considering is not valid without the renewable contract feature. He will need to be redesigned if the group doesn't want to build that in.

Wayne Freedman asked if this would lessen the likelihood of districts passing supplemental levies.

Before the shift, the total of supplemental levies was \$79 million. Last year it was \$179 million.

Dr. Clark asked what the next steps are. Jason Hancock will need to rework the model so that it does not factor in eliminating the ongoing contracts.

Brian Smith commented that you need to remove the barrier to implementing the model.

Mr. Marley suggested that the model could phase in a percentage, maybe 25%, each year. Would you do it by lottery or top 25%?

Dr. Clark suggested using a cap of \$40 million each year. No masters for 2 years and then 20% each year. The question is what's the starting point? New teachers have no choice, but the starting salary still needs to be increased.

Brian Smith asked if districts couldn't get the money and then distribute it based on the current system until they can transition.

Dr. Clark commented that the legislature won't accept that.

Rep. Ward-Engleking commented that whatever the decision, it needs to ensure that beginning teachers are not making more than teachers with 3-4 years' experience. Movement needs to be tied to the evaluation. She commended that she was happy to see that teachers can be bumped down. She also commented that she doesn't think the model needs to be tied to continuing contracts.

Brian Smith commented that when teachers hear non continuing contracts they think they can be fired “at will.”

The group discussed that all a renewable contract does is to say that if teachers are doing a good job their contract is renewed. It's based on performance and other criteria.

The group agreed to meet again at 11:30 on the 12th for the subcommittee before the full group meets at 1:00.