

**K-12 Basic Education Compensation Advisory Committee
December 16, 2021 (Zoom)
Meeting Summary**

Committee members present: Brandy Strait, Cindy Kelly, Denise Reddinger, Kayalyn Stewart, Keri Hutchins, Lyn Nakashima, Michelle Scott, Naila Prieto-Duval, Nancy Chamberlain, Shawn Lewis (Committee Chair), Tom Seigel

Time	Agenda Item	Summary
4 pm	Land Acknowledgement, Welcome and Introductions	<p>Committee Chair, Shawn Lewis led the land acknowledgement, welcome and introductions for Committee members.</p> <p>Objectives of the Committee review (PPT).</p>
4:20	School Model and Funding Formula Overview	<p>Michelle Matakas presented to the Committee on school model and funding formula (PPT).</p> <p>Questions and comments from the Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different types of staff—what are the different types of staff and how does that work into the formula? (A different staff type is based on certificated or classified). • Would a plumber or electrician that has that extra education be considered a classified staff or a certificated staff? Those employees need those certs to perform their job. Are the different staff types based solely on college degrees? • What makes a classified employee and a certified employee? There is a vast difference in compensation amount. (In prototypical funding formular we would not have that many distinctions). • This could be a reason why we are having a hard time filling these positions. • Classified also means classified administrators as well, it's all classified employees including aids • What is the difference between a classified administrator and a certificated administrator? How are those funding sources separated? (Based on the amount they are allocated for. At

		<p>a school they are separate based on position. Each school district identifies the positions that are required for certification—some school districts, all principals are certified, and some superintendents are soon to be certificated. Generally certified superintendents have certified staff. It is assumed a certain percent of staff are classified and a certain percent or certificated).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On slide 11—Does this include benefits? (This does not include benefits. This is a statewide average). • Why distinct between elementary and secondary teacher pay? It's usually just certificated teacher in general. (There is a distinction in the data base that we collect. We have to determine the K-3 compliance. The only exception is K-3 class size. There is not a difference between elementary and secondary teachers). • Secondary teachers have more experience. • Elementary teachers have more turnover. • There are higher paid stipends at the secondary level, including additional days. There aren't those options given to elementary teachers. (We do not have stipend data without going directly to the district). • Action item for OSPI: I would like to see the average teacher pay separated from the extra things such as extracurricular or working through their planning period. Can we go to the main 1.0 FTE contract for teachers and then see if a stipend is something extra they have to sign? (OSPI will look at this—typically the stipends are coded differently so it should be able to be broken out, however it would take a bit more analysis). • Could it also be related to a few smaller, rural districts which do not have secondary schools? • Some secondary teachers teach for longer hours per day so get more salary from the districts based on that. • There are Teaching certificates and administrative certificates—hence them both being certificated. Counseling certificates as well, and they are under the CIS staff type.
4:45	Review of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educator Growth Data 	Shawn led the Committee through a review of data on educator growth, inflationary factors, and Washington state wage trends (PPT).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inflationary Factors • Washington State Wage Trends 	<p>Questions and comments from the Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why are we struggling to find people to fill these positions? (bus drivers and paraeducators) • Bus drivers could find other work that paid more. • It seems to me that the minimum wage inflation is based upon the CPI-W (Consumer Price Index for Urban Wage) earners. Do you know more about those increases? • Regarding inflation factors, the allocation model is built into the law essentially for school workers, but it treats school system workers as state employees. What inflation factors are used for other state employees? Is it in law or negotiated? (There is no requirement that salaries are increased by a certain inflation factor, they have not used inflation factors for state workers). • Bus drivers and paraeducators may be looking for other work but made a choice to work 180 days a year. It would be nice to see salaries fit what they actually do. (These numbers assume 280 hours, 260 days, full time employees). • The jobs that we do now are different than they were 5 years ago. As a bus driver, 5 years ago I could work a second job. Now I am working 8 hours a day even though I am a part time employee but doing the same job. • Job perimeter is different than it was 5 years ago. • The average non-farm wage would include CEOs and other high-salary workers. Do we have the median wage? • As we look at issues with the inflationary models, we are not allocated for all of our positions, especially true in the classified areas which is significantly lacking. How much of our funding is coming from other sources other than what the state is providing? Districts simply can't afford what is happening right now as the state doesn't allocate enough for positions. • Before we get into the workload model we need to recognize that that is a component. The prototypical model is so far out of staffing needs, we need to look at it from how do we support students and how do we work with students to make them successful. • What is in the scope of what we can recommend? We didn't see the prototypical model today, but the staffing on non-classroom teacher staff is so much lower than the reality of what school districts are funding out of levy dollars. Could we see the actuals from school
--	--	--

		<p>districts, and can we make recommendations to change the prototypical school model, as part of our charge? (Yes, we could include this as part of our recommendation(s) but not the whole thing).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One argument is that our IPD did not flow through to everyone because they only provide funding for a certain amount of employees (so no raise for classified employees). The state provides no funding for IPD for local school districts so that has to come out of other resources. • Action item for OSPI: Pull data to show how many student FTEs are needed to generate per student. OSPI will reach out to the EDRS and bring back to the January or February meeting. • Action item for OSPI: Pull data to show allocations in prototypical model vs. what has been recommended in the past and compare to what has actually been hired. <p>Regionalization portion of PPT—questions and comments from the Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative solution. • This does have an impact in ability to retract and retain. • 4th year of regionalization work at 6 million plus, which is money less we have to spend on personnel. All have at least 6% more pay allocation in the surrounding districts of Bethel. We all draw from the same labor pool. We have to spend that money to be competitive with other school districts to retain staff but don't get the additional allocation. • Counties that border other areas that have higher cost of living should be taken into consideration with regionalization. It does affect those salaries we are offering. Staff will go to where the higher wage is. • Housing values are diff between counties that are near each other (Lewis and Thurston for example). • Action item for OSPI: Find a map by county of what labor industries or markets are special to those counties, such as multicultural and multi-lingual families—where are we going to attract them from? Yakima county for example, is very agricultural which is different than the west side of the state. OSPI will reach out to EDRS and bring back to January or February meeting.
--	--	---

5:45	Break	
6	Call for Proposals from Stakeholders Discussion	<p>Shawn led the Committee through a draft one-pager flyer to distribute via email, GovDelivery, and posting to the OSPI website to gain stakeholder proposals, thoughts, and ideas.</p> <p>Committee member proposed organizations to reach out to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSSDA • Tribal Leaders Congress • ESDs • Share flyer at cultural events • SBE • OneAmerica • 29 federally recognized Tribes • WASA • WASBO • WEA • El Centro del la Raza • Nonprofit organizations that help people get their citizenship or find jobs such as the Unemployment Security Department • Governor’s Office of Indian Affairs • WEA’s ESA subcommittee • Longitudinal Data and Educational Research (Keri Hutchins) • PESB • Washington Association of Pupil Transportation • LULAC • OSPI newsletter, Twitter, and Facebook pages • National groups that have done any studies such as ASBO and ASPA • American Association of School Administrators’ • NASBA • Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians • Healing Lodge of the Seven Nations • National Indian Child Welfare Association

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Washington State Indian Education Association • Western Washington Native American Education Consortium • Peace & Justice Action League of Spokane (PJALS) <p>OSPI to send out flyer and survey link to gather proposals in early January. This information will be sent to the Committee again for final review and approval.</p> <p>Questions and comments from Committee members on the survey link shared by Carrie:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is going to be very hard without specifics to be able to formulate useful concrete information. • We will just get abstract ideas if we do not identify some specific areas we want them to address. • They should not have to provide a response on ALL topic areas. All fields in the survey should not be required. • Organization should be an optional field. • Perhaps add a new question—In what way(s) is (are) your thought(s), proposal(s) related to the work of this committee? Then, list our Committee tasks with check boxes.
6:30	Discuss January 13 Meeting	<p>By the next meeting, we hope to have sent out the call for proposals communications.</p> <p>Carrie will send the Committee the final documents and survey link for review and feedback with an anticipated date to send out the final by January 13.</p> <p>Possible Agenda Items for January and/or February meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment Security Department and/or Education Data Research Center (EDRC) to share data on hard to fill positions, by county, by school district, and high turn-over positions as well as other items noted above in the meeting summary. • Presentation by AWSP on educator compensation. • OSPI to present on prototypical model in terms of staffing units data.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data on exceptions from basic funding model such as access to some of those other forms of models and how compensation is allocated. Look at bus drivers, special education, and food service who run on a different model.
6:45	Stakeholder Comment Period	No questions or comments were received.
No later than 6 pm	Next meeting: January 13, 4-7 pm via Zoom	<p>The next meeting is January 13, 4-7 pm via Zoom.</p> <p>If you have any agenda items, please send them to Shawn Lewis or Carrie Hert.</p> <p>If you wish to share a picture of yourself, please send it to Carrie Hert. Carrie will add it to the member roster and share with the Committee.</p>