

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Senator Dwayne Umbarger at 1:37 p.m. on March 6, 2001 in Room 123-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except: Senator Downey (excused)

Committee staff present: Avis Swartzman, Revisor of Statutes
Ben Barrett, Legislative Research Department
Carolyn Rampey, Legislative Research Department
Judy Steinlicht, Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee: Mark Tallman, KASB
Craig Grant, KNEA
Dr. Milton Pippenger, Superintendent, Garden City
Kevin Burr, Principal, Garden City High School
Richard Erickson, Superintendent, Tonganoxie
Steve Woolf, Middle School Principal, Tonganoxie
Gary George, Asst. Superintendent, Olathe
Gene Neeley, President, KNEA
Brilla Highfill Scott, USA
Shelby Smith, USD 501 Lobbyist
Dr. Robert McFrazier, Superintendent, USD 501
Joe Zima, USD 501 Attorney

Others attending: See Attached List

SB188--Kansas exemplary school recognition program

Mark Tallman, KASB, offered testimony in support of **SB188**. (Attachment 1) He stated that he supports the bill in concept, but has reservations about priorities. Senator Vratil reported that the Governor's Task Force struggled with the question of rewarding schools in low-income areas as opposed to rewarding schools in high-income areas. Although that is a difficult problem to resolve, the task force's effort to do that is reflected by the recommendation for grants for significant and continuous progress towards attainment by pupils in school's levels of performance. The task force wanted to make sure that all schools, regardless of their poverty level, have an equal opportunity to receive these achievement grants. This is one of the very few accountability provisions that we have at our disposal and the task force felt strongly that it was important to have some accountability aspects in the school finance formula.

Craig Grant, KNEA, gave testimony in support of **SB188**. (Attachment 2) Craig said he also supports the concept of the bill and is happy that the award can be given to those who have attained standards of excellence, but also to those that are making progress toward attainment of those standards.

SB191--School districts, state grants to study teacher compensation plans for development of alternative compensation plans

Dr. Milton L. Pippenger, Superintendent, Garden City, gave testimony in support of **SB191**. (Attachment 3) Dr. Pippenger stated that passage of this bill would be of great benefit to their district for development of their plan for an alternative compensation plan for teachers.

Dr. Pippenger introduced Kevin E. Burr, Principal, Garden City High School, to talk about the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) which includes five key principles - Multiple Career Paths, Market-Driven Compensation, Performance-Based Accountability, Ongoing, Applied Professional Growth and Expanding the Supply of High Quality Teachers. (Attachment 4)

CONTINUATION SHEET

March 6, 2001

This bill is another recommendation of the Governor's Task Force. This bill would provide a grant for the sole purpose of developing and implementing an alternative teacher compensation plan. There is a companion bill to finance the end result of the alternative compensation plan. It envisions in each school district, the administration and boards working with the teachers to come up with a voluntary plan. There is no mandated plan imposed upon teachers.

Richard Erickson, Superintendent, Tonganoxie, spoke briefly about the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) and introduced several teachers and administrators from the Tonganoxie district who have worked to establish the program. He introduced Steve Woolf who spoke of the TAP program. (Attachment 5) He believes that the program has to be driven by the teachers to be successful. The program is outlined in his testimony and a notebook was handed to Committee members showing where the district is now with the program.

Gary George, Assistant Superintendent, Olathe School, gave testimony in support of **SB191**. (Attachment 6) Mr. George asked that an amendment be considered to allow school districts to be permitted to contribute to deferred compensation and tax sheltered investment plans on behalf of employees. This would be a voluntary program.

Brilla Highfill Scott, Executive Director, United School Administrators of Kansas, offered her testimony as written since the Committee has a full schedule today. (Attachment 7) She just stated that they are supportive of **SB191**.

Mark Tallman, Kansas Association of School Boards, gave testimony in support of **SB191**. (Attachment 8) KASB supports the bill but does not believe that this compensation plan will be very popular with teachers who would not benefit, which could be a majority. He believes greater financial incentives are needed to help support the plan. Senator Vratil reported that the task force very strongly believes that the program must be voluntary and that it would never be successful if forced on the teachers. The task force is very optimistic of the program.

Gene Neely, President, KNEA, gave testimony in support of **SB191**. (Attachment 9) He stated that the parts of the program that he feels are on target is that the program is voluntary and that it provides the time and resources for school districts and local associations to review alternative compensations. He believes that now is the time to explore ways to reward enhanced teacher quality, improve student achievement, and provide recruitment and retention incentives for the best and the brightest of teachers.

SB313--School districts, school days and school hours additional to school days and school hours scheduled for the regular school term

Shelby Smith, representing USD 501 Topeka, introduced Dr. Robert McFrazier, Superintendent USD 501 who spoke in favor of **SB313**. (Attachment 10) Joe Zima, USD 501 attorney stood for questions. An editorial "Mandatory Summer School," was distributed. (Attachment 11)

Mark Tallman, KASB, gave brief supportive testimony on **SB313**. (Attachment 12) KASB believes that local school boards should be able to require a longer school term for individual students if additional time is required to meet learning standards.

Craig Grant, KNEA offered his support of **SB313**. (Attachment 13) Craig stated that they were more interested in the remedial programs than the disciplinary ones. They believe summer school, Saturday classes, before and after school programs are all worthwhile and should be explored.

Brilla Highfill Scott offered her testimony in support of **SB313**. (Attachment 14) She just briefly stated that USA supports the bill. They are encouraged that it allows the local district to further help with remedial needs of the students and provides the flexibility that they need.

Senator Vratil moved that the Committee recommend favorably **SB313**. Seconded by Senator Lee. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned. The next meeting is scheduled for March 7, 2001.

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE GUEST LIST

DATE - 3/6/01

<u>NAME</u>	<u>REPRESENTING</u>
William R. Truck	Shawnee Mission Schools
Steve Wolf	Tonganoxie Schools
Gene Burf	Garden City USD #457
Mitt Pappayan	" " " "
Richard Erickson	Tonganoxie USD #464
Mary Dawson	Tonganoxie USD #464
Brenda Shaw	Tonganoxie USD #464
Diane Gjerstad	Wichita Public Schools
Carla Smith	Wichita Public Schools
Gene Neely	Kansas NEA
Holly Finney	Topeka Public Schools
James Cole	Sen. Sporn's Office
Abraham Peor	Ct.
John PROVORSE	myself.
Don Knowles	USA.
Robert McRAZIE	USD 501 (SB 313)
Joseph W. Zima	USD 501
SHELBY Smith	USD 501
Stacy Farmer	KASB
Robert DeHoff	Tonganoxie USD 464
Julie Stasheff	Student Ambassador
Marilyn Layman	USA 232, Sept.
Sharon Zellner	USD 232 Deputy Supt.
Denise Ayt	USA - USW. 500.
Bob Vahman	USD 229 Blue Valley



TO: Senate Committee on Education
FROM: Mark Tallman, Assistant Executive Director for Advocacy
DATE: March 6, 2001

RE: Testimony on S.B. 188 – Exemplary Schools Recognition Program

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

This bill would create a new “Exemplary School Recognition Award” to be given by the State Board of Education. The award would be given to school buildings that have met the building standard of excellence established by the State Board for state assessment results, or for “significant and continuous progress toward attainment by pupils in attendance at the school of levels of performance categorized as advanced or proficient.” The award would be financial, and the money received by a local district would be spent according to the wishes of that “exemplary” school’s site council, and would be additional budget authority.

KASB’s Delegate Assembly has adopted the following policy supporting the concept of financial incentives: “Financial incentives should be used to encourage districts to attain objectives and develop programs that are of sufficient importance to be a matter of state policy.” Therefore, we do not have a philosophical objection to this bill, but we do question the priority that should be attached to this goal.

Any school recognition program must take into account the fact that school performance is strongly influenced by the student population the building serves. I have reviewed the results of the state mathematics assessments given last year. Approximately 1400 public school buildings participated in the math assessments at the fourth, seventh and tenth grade levels, and 91 of the these building had scores that met the “Standard of Excellence” for math.

Of those 1,400 schools, about 10% had less than 10% of their students eligible for free or reduced price lunch. However, about 40% of buildings meeting the Standard of Excellence had less than 10% of students eligible for meal support. Approximately 42% of schools had less than 30% of students eligible for meal support, but 70% of the schools meeting the Standard of Excellence did.

These results do not mean that high-performing schools with low rates of student poverty should not be recognized. After all, many schools with similar populations did not reach the standard. But it certainly suggests that it is much easier to reach high achievement levels if most students in a school do not face the problems of associated with poverty. Although the bill would also provide awards to school demonstrating improvements in student performance, we do not know who many schools might be included because the State Board would have to define the standard of improvement. Even recognizing change over time can also raise issues because some schools face tremendous turn-over in the student body each year due to family mobility.

*Senate Education
3-6-01
Attachment 1*

The real question is this: should state funds be used to reward schools that have already demonstrated success, or should those funds be used to help schools do more for students who are not succeeding? While this bill would be subject to appropriation, the Governor's Task Force recommended \$7.5 million for such awards. We would note that \$7.5 million would fund the State Board of Education's request to provide preschool programs for all at-risk children not currently served by the program or by Head Start. Alternatively, those funds could be used to broaden the definition of the at-risk weighting factor to include children with attendance problems or those behind schedule to graduate. That step would cost just \$4 million. A third option would be to use those funds to raise the at-risk weighting beyond the Governor's recommendation, which increases that weighting from 0.09 to 0.1. Each 1% step costs \$4 million.

We suggest that these options may have a more significant impact on student achievement than the financial recognition proposed in this bill. The State Board can certainly be encouraged to provide additional public recognition for high performing or improving schools without attaching dollars.

Thank you for your consideration.



KANSAS NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION / 715 SW 10TH AVENUE / TOPEKA, KANSAS 66612-1686

Craig Grant Testimony
Senate Education Committee
Tuesday, March 6, 2001

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am Craig Grant and I represent Kansas NEA. I appreciate this chance to speak to the Senate Education Committee about Senate Bill 188.

Kansas NEA supports the concept of building-based awards that recognize excellence and achievement in our schools. We do believe that this is the proper way to reward such outstanding contributions. We are happy to see that the award will be awarded not only to those buildings that have attained the standards of excellence but also to those building that are making progress toward attainment of the standards. This will encourage buildings to continue to improve student performance.

We have to admit that we wonder where the funds will come from to fund this proposal. We hope that we will not take funding from other needed programs to pay for this plan. We have so many needs in our schools that must be met before, we believe, we can afford this and other plans of action. We hope to find the funding to assist all our schools plus find the funding to reward our schools for excellent performance.

Kansas NEA supports SB 188, but hopes that we fund our basic needs first and then reward our excellent schools for performance. Thank you for listening to our concerns.

Senate Education
3-6-01
Attachment 2
Web Page: www.knea.org

**TESTIMONY ON SENATE BILL 191
ALTERNATE TEACHER COMPENSATION
Milton L. Pippenger, Superintendent
USD 457 Garden City, Kansas
March 6, 2001**

Background

- Garden City Public Schools have experienced an average of 14% turnover in certified staff over the past 19 years. This year we started school with nearly 30 open positions, in math, special education, language arts, instrumental music, bilingual, business, and family and consumer science (home economics), to name a few.
- We have given raises of 4% or more over the past three years. Presently our beginning salary is \$29,270 with full single health insurance. A teacher can earn up to \$44,983 at the top of the master's scale, including health insurance. We have a doctorate scale, but it is almost impossible for a teacher to obtain a degree of this level, given our location in Southwest Kansas. Our salary range is about average for the state. However, average for southwest Kansas is not good enough, given our location.
- We have no way to reward teacher leaders under our present system. We do pay them for additional work, including sponsoring activities, curriculum writing, working in after school programs, and serving as curriculum specialists, for which they receive a stipend of up to \$2,000 per year. These teachers teach full time.
- We are most fortunate to have developed some excellent teacher leaders, but they can only advance by going into administration or leaving the profession for the business world. Last year we lost one to Sprint and another to Cisco. In the past we have lost many teachers to the insurance industry, technology companies, investment firms, etc. The majority of our teacher leaders would prefer to stay in the classroom and work with students, but do not believe they can support their families on this salary.
- Many of our teachers have taken second and third jobs at Wal-Mart and other retail establishments, in banks or other businesses to support their families.

Interventions to Date

- We provide an above average inservice program for staff. We have been aggressive about getting grants that have allowed us to provide expanded staff training. At a recent budget presentation one teacher new to the district stated that this is one reason she wanted to stay with the district.
- We have proposed a plan to contract with 10 potential teachers, including seniors (or recent graduates) from Garden City High School, employees, or others in the community, to earn their teaching credentials. Upon completion of their degree, these individuals would return to the district to teach for three years.
- We are expanding our mentoring program for new teachers.
- We have a "grow your own" program for bilingual graduates of Garden City High school and for teachers who obtain English as a Second Language and Special Education certification.
- We pay an additional stipend of approximately \$1,000 for bilingual teachers.

Needs

- We need to develop an alternative compensation plan that will provide a career path for teachers who wish to remain in the classroom and/or support and mentor other teachers.
- We need to devise a plan that will reward teachers who are successful with student achievement.

One Solution

It is the intent of USD 457 to explore the possibility of developing an alternative compensation plan. This program would provide a career path for teachers, rewarding those who choose to remain in the district as classroom teachers and instructional leaders, without severely penalizing those do not wish to pursue administrative careers.

- At the invitation of the Milken Family Foundation, two of our administrators and one board member attended a conference describing their Teacher Advancement Program (TAP).
- Administrators and board members have been spent a considerable amount of time discussing the information that we received from participants at the conference. There has been universal support for pursuing it. Our teachers' association also expressed interest in looking at the program's possibilities.

*Senate Education
3-6-01
Attachment 3*

MAP (or other similar program) has been placed on the negotiations table for this school year. If successfully negotiated, a pilot program would begin in the 2002-2003 school year.

Potential Plan

- A career ladder will be established with three basic levels.
 - a) Master teacher, who would work ten or eleven months per year, teach one or two classes per day, mentor other teachers, and be a curriculum leader.
 - b) Mentor teacher, who would work ten months per year, be released one or two periods per day and mentor two to three teachers.
 - c) The third level would be the regular classroom teacher.
- The master teacher would be compensated about the same as one of our curriculum coordinators. The mentor teachers' salary would be significantly above that of a regular teacher plus compensation for additional days. The classroom teachers would be on a regular teacher's contract.
- All staff members would be eligible for to receive additional income for meeting student achievement targets, both individually and as a team.
- Retired teachers and individuals with special expertise would be employed to cover the released time of the master and mentor teachers.

Cost

- The anticipated cost for implementing this plan would be an increase of 10% to 15% percent per building for increased salaries.
- To pay for this we will have to increase our local option budget.

Senate Bill 191

The passage of SB 191 would be of great benefit to Garden City USD 457 in our development of an alternative compensation plan for teachers. As a district, we believe this is a necessity, both for Garden City and for the rest of the state. Unless we take positive, proactive steps soon, the education profession will not be able to attract and retain the high quality teaching staff we need to reach the high standards we have set for student achievement.

The Milken Family Foundation's Teacher Advancement Program (TAP)

Kevin E. Burr, Principal
Garden City High School
March 6, 2001

The Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) is a comprehensive and systemic strategy. It addresses recruitment, training, induction, professional development, compensation, performance evaluation and career advancement — within a conceptual framework that includes five key principles. These principles are:

- Multiple Career Paths
- Market-Driven Compensation
- Performance-Based Accountability
- Ongoing, Applied Professional Growth
- Expanding the Supply of High Quality Teachers

The Teacher Advancement Program provides teachers **with multiple career paths** ranging from inductee to master teacher. TAP offers all teachers the opportunity to advance in the profession without having to leave the classroom. Teachers are able to move along a continuum where increased responsibilities, qualifications, professional development and performance-based accountability requirements are commensurate with compensation.

The second principle is **market-driven compensation**, which replaces lock-step salary structures and provides flexibility to establish salaries. Pay differentiation is based on demand (more to those in hard to staff fields and schools), demonstrated teacher knowledge and skills, actual teacher performance, increased responsibilities and student performance. This system provides increased pay for those who do more work and are judged to be the best.

Performance-based accountability is rigorous, tied to compensation, and includes differentiated requirements based on the teacher's position. Teachers are assessed against high standards that measure their performance in content knowledge, planning, instruction, assessment, and in producing student learning gains. Hiring, advancement, and pay increases are based on performance reviews conducted by the principal and peer experts from both within and outside of the school. In the short term, tenure reviews will be more thorough, and tenure will be awarded after a longer period of time in the classroom. Initial and continuing certification will become primarily performance based.

The fourth principle is **ongoing, applied professional growth**, which requires a school-wide commitment and includes all teachers. Outcomes are tied to state teaching and learning standards, school improvement efforts, and a data-driven analysis of student learning outcomes. A mandated salaried, mentored induction year gives new teachers classroom responsibility with intensive support.

The fifth principle of TAP is **expanding the supply of high quality teachers**. This is achieved by making the initial academic degree and teaching certification attainable in four years; providing alternative certification to give beginning teachers as well as mid-career professionals the ability to enter teaching as adjuncts or full-time through assessments and classroom demonstration; and allowing outstanding retired teachers to continue working on a part-time basis as faculty fellows.

Senate Education
3-6-01
Attachment 4

Teacher Advancement Program or Blinding Flashes of the Obvious

The Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) is a program dedicated to ensure that our teachers are prepared and motivated to provide the quality teaching that research shows is the basic building block and essential ingredient of student success and achievement. While there is no shortage of ideas for improving the quality of American teachers, none of the proposals out there are making the kind of fundamental changes that are equal to the challenge - the challenge of attracting, motivating, and retaining high-caliber talent to the American teaching profession.

Our teaching structure, in its current form, fails to attract and keep top talent in three critical ways:

- 1) **It does not offer teachers sustained opportunities for professional growth and advancement.**
- 2) **It does not provide competitive compensation, and in part, consequently,**
- 3) **It does not command the respect of the society it upholds - or the people it serves.**

It is more than a personal or educational issue. A sense of urgency exists because it is an economic issue. Human capital, which is propelled by the education, training, and skills that give people command over knowledge, is the engine of today's economy. There is a limited supply of this human capital and the fierce competition for highly skilled workers in virtually every industry, and companies offering ever-larger compensation packages to attract the best and brightest is impacting the quality of the human capital that is available to educate our children. At a time when the entire economy is competing for a limited pool of high quality human capital, how can the American education profession - which already faces an unprecedented teaching shortage - possibly attract, retain, and motivate the high-caliber practitioners it needs?

The answer is obvious to all - it can't. Compensation is a major concern. With teachers' average starting salaries being lower than those of other college graduates, it is more difficult to attract talented young undergraduates to teach. This is evident in the fact that the young people who are attracted to teaching, compared to students considering careers in other fields, are those who largely score near the bottom of high-stakes exams. This pattern is reinforced by hiring practices which tend to undervalue important indicators of teacher quality, such as subject matter knowledge, strong academic records, and cognitive ability.

In the current form, it will do little good to recruit talented young people to the teaching profession if we cannot retain and motivate them. It is our responsibility to create an environment where our teachers and students can thrive. Under the current system, 20% will leave the profession within 3 years in our nation (more in Kansas) and most of them will be those with stronger academic backgrounds. Part of the reason, again, is compensation. Those in other professions with similar education and experience levels earn on average 75% more than teachers. The minimal pay raises that do occur are based almost exclusively on years service or seat time, not on performance or additional responsibility. Because of the very few opportunities for career advancement for those teachers who want more salary and responsibility, the current K - 12 system is a one-way career path out of the classroom and into administration.

The Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) offers a solution that is based on five principles. They are as follows: **First, establish multiple career paths.** Under our current system, a teacher who is trained to be a 6th grade teacher is stuck being a 6th grade teacher with no chance of advancement unless they leave the classroom to administration. TAP provides all teachers with multiple career paths and opportunities to advance in the profession without leaving the classroom. Teachers are able to progress along a continuum where increased responsibilities, qualifications, professional development and performance requirements are commensurate with compensation. Multiple career paths provide expanded roles for talented teachers as leaders, decision-makers and mentors, and give them opportunities to work in the broader community.

Second, establish a system of broad market-driven compensation. TAP provides market driven compensation, which replaces lock-step salary structures and provides flexibility to establish salaries. This system provides increased pay for those who do more work and are judged to be the most effective.

Third, establish a system of performance-based accountability. TAP maintains high standards by means of performance-based accountability, which systematically measures teacher competence in content knowledge, instruction, assessment, and student learning gains. Hiring, advancement, and pay decisions are based on performance reviews conducted by peer experts from both inside and outside the school and the principal. The tenure process would have more meaning when earned.

Fourth, establish the means of ongoing, applied professional growth. TAP provides for a site based professional growth opportunity that continues throughout the year in order to improve teacher skills in the classroom. Professional Growth Blocks would be developed that would provide frequent opportunities for teachers and administrators to learn, plan, and grow collaboratively. A mandated induction year with salary and mentoring gives new teachers classroom responsibility with intensive support.

Fifth, expand the supply of high quality teachers. TAP expands the supply of high quality teachers by encouraging ways to give beginning teachers as well as mid-career professionals the ability to enter teaching, and by allowing outstanding retired teachers to continue to work part-time.

To make this bold move brings much more respectability, opportunity, and compensation to the profession that defines all others. The decision to step back and do nothing now after seeing the possibility of the future for, not only us, but our children and our children's children will determine the quality of teachers we choose to have in the Great State of Kansas for years to come. That will be too late for thousands of students.

Senate Education
3-6-01
A Hachment 5

Olathe District School USD 233
Gary George

Testimony on the Senate Bill 191
March 6, 2001

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for allowing me to appear before you today. We would like to propose that school districts be permitted to contribute to deferred compensation and tax sheltered investment plans on behalf of employees. State staff has advised us that legislation is needed to authorize this concept. We believe that Senate Bill 191 could be so amended or K.S.A. 72-8603 could be amended to accomplish this.

Currently, 26% of Olathe School District employees participate in a tax-sheltered plan. We believe the number of participating employees could be much higher if the district were allowed to contribute to these plans. We are asking for legislation that would allow the district to provide a match to employee contributions. In our case, the contribution would be a partial match with a cap on our participation to make it affordable. We see several advantages for the employees and the school district.

1. There are tax advantages to the employee.

Senate Education
3-6-01
Attachment 6

2. More employees would participate in tax sheltered plans thereby helping employees be more prepared for retirement.
3. With the shortage of teachers and administrators, this arrangement would give us another benefit to attract new employees and retain existing staff.

This arrangement is common in the private sector and would allow school districts to be more competitive with the business world. We are seeking authority to move forward in this area. We are asking that you consider this concept and are hopeful that legislation can be enacted that creates this benefit for employees.

Full Text of Bills

Kansas Legislative Services



brought to you by the
Information Network of Kansas

[INK Home](#) > [Government](#) > [Legislative](#) > [Full Text of Bills](#) > House Bill No. 2874

Session of 2000

HOUSE BILL No. 2874

By Joint Committee on Pensions, Investments and Benefits

2-7

10 AN ACT concerning retirement; relating to tax sheltered annuities; com-
11 munity college and school employment; amending K.S.A. 72-8603 and
12 repealing the existing section.

13 *Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas:*

14 Section 1. K.S.A. 72-8603 is hereby amended to read as follows: 72-
15 8603. (a) The board of education of any school district or the board of
16 trustees of any community junior college shall contract with any of its
17 employees ~~so requesting, who request~~ for reductions in compensation and
18 the contribution thereof for tax sheltered annuities as permitted under
19 the United States internal revenue code, for the benefit of such employ-
20 ees. Any employee desiring to contract under the provisions of this section
21 shall ~~express his or her wishes in writing to his or her~~ send written notice
22 of such employee's desire to contract under the provisions of this act to
23 such employee's employer within semiannual thirty-day periods in ac-
24 cordance with rules and regulations of such employer.

25 (b) The board of education of any school district and the board of
26 trustees of any community college may contribute to such employee's tax
27 sheltered annuity an amount to match the employee's contribution as pro-
28 vided in subsection (a).

29 Sec. 2. K.S.A. 72-8603 is hereby repealed.

30 Sec. 3. This act shall take effect and be in force from and after its
31 publication in the statute book.
32

Brilla Highfill Scott
Executive Director
bhsusa02@ink.org

M. Katharine Weickert
Director of
Administrator Services
usak01@ink.org

Don Knowles
Professional Development
Coordinator

SB 191: Grants to Study Teacher Compensation Plans

Testimony presented before the Senate Education Committee

by

**Brilla Highfill Scott, Executive Director
United School Administrators of Kansas**

March 6, 2001

**Mister Chairman and
Members of the Senate Education Committee:**

United School Administrators of Kansas is supportive of SB 191 which would provide grants to study teacher compensation plans for the purpose of developing alternative plans.

During this legislative session our association has expressed concern about the growing shortage of teachers across our state, and the need to adequately compensate educators so that we will be able to recruit quality young people and retain experienced staff members.

Our association looks forward to increased funding for teachers' salaries. The logical next step is incentives that encourage alternate teacher compensation packages and promote teacher excellence.

United School Administrators of Kansas asks you to favorably report SB 191.



Kansas Association of
Elementary
School Principals
(KAESP)

Kansas Association of
Middle School
Administrators
(KAMSA)

Kansas Association of
School Administrators
(KASA)

Kansas Association of
School Business
Officials
(KASBO)

Kansas Association for
Supervision and
Curriculum Development
(KASCD)

Kansas Association of
Special Education
Administrators
(KASEA)

Kansas Association of
Secondary School
Principals
(KASSP)

Kansas Council of
Vocational
Administrators
(KCVA)

Kansas School
Public Relations
Association
(KanSPRA)

*Senate Education
3-6-01
Attachment 7*



TO: Senate Committee on Education
FROM: Mark Tallman, Assistant Executive Director for Advocacy
DATE: March 6, 2001

RE: Testimony on S.B. 191 – Alternative Teacher Compensation Plans

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

Our association has adopted the following position on employee compensation plans:

Performance Criteria for Teacher Compensation: Boards of education should have authority to deal with issues such as merit pay and differentiated staffing outside the professional negotiations process.

KASB, through our participation in the School Finance Coalition, has made very clear our belief that compensation for teachers, as well as other school district employees, needs to be increased across the board if the quality of education is going to be maintained in Kansas. At the same time, we believe that school districts will need to develop compensation plans which have more flexibility to recognize differences in performance, duties and need.

S.B. 191 could be a first step in this direction. It would authorize the State Board to make grants to assist school districts in studying the development of “alternative teacher compensation plans.” However, we have several concerns about the provision of this bill.

First, the bill defines an “alternative teacher compensation plan” to *require* components of peer mentoring and peer evaluation. While these components may have merit, it seems to us they should be based on the results of the study the bill would authorize and fund, not required before study even begins. In addition, the bill does not specify how these components would match current statutes on teacher mentoring, evaluation and due process procedures.

Second, the bill does not authorize the local school board to implement an alternative teacher compensation plan without going through the professional negotiations process. In other words, a plan could be developed with the peer mentoring and peer evaluation components required under this bill, meet criteria established by the State Board, and have the support of the local school board, community and whatever group studied and developed the plan. Yet it could still be, for all practical purposes, blocked by the local teacher’s association.

New members of the committee may not be familiar with the professional negotiations act. Under state law, local school boards are required to bargain with local teachers associations over terms and conditions of employment, including compensation. A board cannot unilaterally adopt changes in compensation. There is a statutory process for negotiations, mediation and fact-finding. Only after this process is exhausted can boards adopt a “unilateral contract.”

Senate Education
3-6-01
Attachment 8

History has shown that adopting unilateral contracts is an extremely controversial and divisive step. Even if a board does adopt a unilateral contract, individual teachers may elect to continual working under the previous contract. The reality is that it would be virtually impossible in most districts for a school board to adopt an alternative compensation plan under current law without agreement by the teachers' association. There are reason to believe that would very difficult to achieve.

The very definition of alternative teacher compensation plan contained in section 1 (a) (2) of this bill strongly suggests that some teachers will make more than others based compared to the traditional teacher compensation plans defined in section 1 (a) (1). No matter how much money is available for teacher salaries in a school district, it will always be finite.

For this bill to have a real impact, a majority of teachers will have to agree through the collective bargaining process to an alternative compensation plan that would likely offer greater benefits to a minority of teachers. There are a number of compelling reasons to do this, but these reasons have historically not been very popular with the teachers who would not benefit – which may well be a majority.

Therefore, if this committee is serious about encouraging the development compensation plans that based pay rates and increases on “demonstration of excellence or significant improvement in skills, knowledge and performance,” S.B. 191 is a very limited step in that direction. At least two additional elements are necessary. First, you must make it easy to adopt such plans outside of the professional negotiations act. Second, you must consider greater financial incentives help support the implementation of such plans, not just their development.

Thank you for your consideration.



KANSAS NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION / 715 SW 10TH AVENUE / TOPEKA, KANSAS 66612-1686

Gene Neely
Senate Education Committee
March 6, 2001

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am Gene Neely, a high school social studies teacher from Coffeyville who is on leave to serve as President of the Kansas National Education Association. I appreciate the opportunity today to discuss with you the topic of alternative compensation and Senate Bill 191 in particular.

I was invited last summer to testify before the Governor's school finance task force specifically about this issue. I no doubt surprised some members of the panel by indicating that my organization was supportive of investigating alternatives to the single salary schedule. SB 191 offers a thoughtful approach to the time and study necessary for considering changes in the compensation system long used by nearly every Kansas school district.

I must add, however, some caveats to this support: 1) we believe that ALL teachers should be paid higher salaries with alternative compensation approaches used to provide additional salary enhancement; 2) our view of alternative compensation is that it does not supplant current salary schedules, but rather combines them with additional dimensions. The use of experience and educational units as factors in determining base salary is appropriate and justifiable; and 3) without the local teachers association participation from the beginning of the planning process and ultimate support of the final product, any alternative system is doomed to fail.

KNEA currently has an Alternative Compensation Committee working on this somewhat sensitive issue. A roster of the committee members is included with this testimony. Since last August, this blue ribbon panel has been studying this very issue. By the end of school, the committee will issue its recommendations to the KNEA Board of Directors and ultimately our members. The committee is looking at various alternatives such as school based rewards and individual based rewards for performance, knowledge, and skill. I believe the work of this group will allow KNEA to provide technical advice and assistance to districts and local associations wishing to take advantage of the opportunities embedded in SB 191.

We may all be walking down a tenuous path with this proposal and we don't have many models to examine. We believe the time has come, however, to loosen the restrictions of our current thinking and current practices to encourage local districts and local associations to explore ways to reward enhanced teacher quality, improved student achievement, and provide recruitment and retention incentives for the best and brightest of us to teach.

Senate Education
3-6-01
A. Hachment 9
Web Page: www.knea.org

KNEA Alternative Compensation Committee

Dr. Blake West, Chair
KNEA Secretary-Treasurer
Blue Valley NEA

Jim Armendariz
NEA Manhattan/Ogden

Terry Boyd, NBCT
President, Great Bend NEA

Tom Brungardt
Chair, Kansas Professional Standards Board
Junction City Education Association

Joy Carroll
NEA Kansas City

Melanie DeMoss
Olathe NEA, administrator

Kathi Flexman
Kansas Teacher of the Year finalist, 1999
Blue Valley NEA

Alvin Peters, NBCT
North Anderson County Teachers Association

Sue Rippe
Kansas Teacher of the Year, 2000
United Teachers of Wichita

Dana Sprinkle
Kansas Teacher of the Year finalist, 1998
Ell-Saline NEA

Frank Strada
Vice President, NEA Shawnee Mission

Kathy Wagoner, NBCT
Hays NEA

**USD 501-TOPEKA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
REQUIRED SUMMER CAMP
JULY 9-AUGUST 3, 2001**

The mission of Topeka Public Schools is “. . . to develop lifelong learners who possess the necessary knowledge and skills to be responsible, contributing members of the community and of a dynamic society;” and to this end, the number one instructional priority for Topeka Public Schools shall be the development of reading skills; 2) the district shall allocate resources to assure that students have basic reading skills by the end of the second grade; 3) the district shall promote only students whose reading performance meets district standards; 4) the district shall only graduate students whose reading skills meet district graduation standards; 5) the district shall identify effective instructional practices for reading and shall assure its use at every district school.

In order to provide remediation for students not meeting district standards at K-2 levels, we will be initiating a required summer school. To further lend motivation for students to attend this program, we are requesting consideration for legislative action to extend the truancy law to include this program.

*Senate Education
3-6-01
Attachment 10*

Projected Costs for FY 01 Summer Reading Program K-2

10-2

Estimated Teaching Staff Costs							
	# of Teachers	Hours Per Day	# of Days	Salary Per Hour	Total Salaries	Benefits 8.40%	Total Salaries & Benefits
Instruction	81	5	20	\$ 15.00	\$121,500.00	\$ 10,206.00	\$ 131,706.00
Instruction - (1 wk. for makeups)	9	5	5	\$ 15.00	\$ 3,375.00	\$ 283.50	\$ 3,658.50
Curriculum Planning Development	81	7	2.5	\$ 12.50	\$ 17,718.75	\$ 1,488.38	\$ 19,207.13

Estimated Support Staff Costs							
Type of Support Staff	# of Support Staff	Hours Per Day	# of Days	Salary Per Hour	Total Salaries	Benefits 8.40%	Total Salaries & Benefits
Facilitators-Instr.	2	5	26	\$ 15.00	\$ 3,900.00	\$ 327.60	\$ 4,227.60
Facilitators-Plan	2	7	2.5	\$ 12.50	\$ 437.50	\$ 36.75	\$ 474.25
Paraprofessional	4	5	20	\$ 8.00	\$ 3,200.00	\$ 268.80	\$ 3,468.80
Paraprofessional - (1 wk. for makeups)	1	5	5	\$ 8.00	\$ 200.00	\$ 16.80	\$ 216.80

Estimated Transportation Costs			
# of Buses	Cost per Bus per day	# of Days per day	Total Cost
20	\$152.00	20	\$60,800.00
4 - (1 wk. for makeups)	\$152.00	5	\$3,040.00

Other Estimated Costs					
Incentives \$50 worth of materials per teacher	Indistrict Travel for Facilitators	Postage	Snacks	Supplies & Materials	Total
\$ 4,500.00	\$ 500.00	1,500.00	\$ 7,150.00	\$ 28,000.00	\$ 41,650.00

Estimated Revenue	
Title I	\$ 75,000.00
Title VI	\$ 62,554.00
Migrant	\$ 6,500.00
Topeka School Foundation	\$ 1,000.00
Total	\$ 145,054.00

Estimated Expenditures	
Salaries & Benefits	\$ 162,959.08
Transportation Cost	\$ 63,840.00
Other Costs:	\$ 41,650.00
Incentives	4,500.00
Indistrict Travel	500.00
Postage	1,500.00
Snacks	7,150.00
Materials	28,000.00
Total	\$ 268,449.08

Revenue	\$ 145,054.00
Expenditures	\$ 268,449.08
Total	\$(123,395.08)

Cost per student (based on 600 students) \$ 447.42
 Cost per Site (based on 4 sites) \$ 67,112.27

prepared by Dr. Glennie Buckley and Nancy Hedstrom
 Topeka Public Schools
 3/5/01

10-2

EDITORIALS

■ Mandatory summer school

Writing is on the wall

It's a fascinating and delightful irony: Because Topeka public schools are now air-conditioned, Dr. Robert McFrazier can now turn up the heat.

He's doing just that. The Unified School District 501 superintendent says he is determined that students in kindergarten, first and second grades will be reading at their grade level by the time school lets out in May — or they will be required to attend summer school. Period.

Those around him support McFrazier in this effort, as they should — though some wonder if he's on sound legal footing.

"No one is quite sure we can do this," he says.

Well, he's planning to ask the Shawnee County legislative delegation to support a bill giving public schools express authority for mandatory summer school. And he should get it.

Even if he doesn't, McFrazier holds an ace up his sleeve: Those reading-deficient students who don't attend the special morning-only summer school from July 9 to Aug. 3 will not be promoted to the next grade.

Now, that's some old-fashioned tough love — the kind of gentle insistence on performance that fell out of favor in the public schools years ago, but shouldn't have. Why should students be moved along to the next grade level if they are already falling behind in the one they're in?

Far from being kind to the students, it's cruel. It's selling them short and setting them up for failure now and later in life.

McFrazier wants to make sure that doesn't happen to the more than 1,000 K-2 students currently identified as needing the remedial reading help in USD 501 — many of whom are minority students, he notes.

Good for him.

Still, remarkably, it would be out of character for this country if some of the parents didn't object, even in court. Fine, McFrazier says. Bring it on.

He's right. No judge or jury of sound mind would condemn McFrazier and his cohorts from insisting that USD 501 students be able to read and write. Why we haven't insisted on it before is the

■ **Dr. McFrazier is right: Promoting kids who can't read is only promoting failure. Parents, take note.**

real question.

One reason why is money. Indeed, it's a wonder where McFrazier will find the estimated \$200,000 necessary to run the program this summer, especially considering that the district has been slapped with about \$1.2 million more in utility costs this winter than planned.

If the district can absorb all those cost overruns and still pay for summer school, you have to wonder whether the district's budget was austere enough.

But give McFrazier credit for determining to do it, and do it right. There will be free transportation, free meals — the district will even "wipe noses," he says. There can be no excuses.

A student need not be behind in school to attend the summer school sessions, which will be at various elementary schools around town. On a space available basis, any K-2 student can attend for free.

Whether it can be read or not, the writing is on the wall. Kids simply have to learn how to read. Parents ought to be the first to insist on it, and take pleasure in it. Yet, that's not happening. Consider this: Last year, in its second year, the summer reading program was voluntary — and only about 100 of the 700 eligible students were sent.

How sad, especially when you hear McFrazier and associate superintendent Dr. Susan Rogers say what a measurable difference the summer reading program makes in kids' lives, with its student-to-teacher ratio of as little as 6 to 1.

Moreover, McFrazier and his board of education are on the cutting edge of a national trend, both in terms of eliminating "social promotion" of students and in lengthening the school year, which needs to happen.

Fact is, mandatory summer school shouldn't just be for K-2 students. Somehow we need to find the money in the future to require any student who isn't ready for the next grade level to get ready over the summer.

Now that the schools are cool, it's time to turn up the heat.

Senate Education Committee
Date: 3-6-01

Attachment # 11

KANSAS
ASSOCIATION



OF
SCHOOL
BOARDS



1420 SW Arrowhead Road • Topeka, Kansas 66604-4024
785-273-3600

TO: Senate Committee on Education
FROM: Mark Tallman, Assistant Executive Director for Advocacy
DATE: March 6, 2001

RE: Testimony on S.B. 313

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

KASB appears in strong support for S.B. 313. This bill would allow local school boards to adopt policies that would require additional hours or days for “pupils who are in need of remedial education or who are subject to disciplinary measures imposed under the district’s disciplinary policy.” If such students fail to attend these additional hours or days, they would violate the state’s compulsory attendance law and be considered truant.

KASB’s Delegate Assembly has adopted the following policy statement:

KASB believes that local school boards should be able to require a longer school term for individual students if additional time is required to meet learning standards.

S.B. 313 is certainly consistent with this position. It is clear that some students require additional time to meet learning objectives. The state certainly has a compelling interest in an educated population. This is why we have public schools in the first place, and why we have compulsory attendance laws. What we have learned is that students progress academically at different rates. If the goal of the state is that all students reach certain standards, we should not expect that a single measure of time, such as 186 days, will be adequate or appropriate for all students. S.B. 313 gives local boards the ability to require more learning time if more learning time is needed.

It is important to realize that extended learning time requires additional resources. We commend the State Board of Education for proposing in its budget request funding for extended learning time. The school finance plan proposed by Senators Umbarger, Vratil, Downey and Oleen would provide funding for extended learning in grades K-3. We believe the concept of S.B. 313 must be linked to additional funding, and additional funding must be linked to this bill. Without resources, schools will not be able to provide programs such as summer school, weekend programs and after school assistance. Without the ability to require attendance, many students will not take advantage of these programs.

Thank you for your consideration.

*Senate Education
3-6-01
Attachment 12*



KANSAS NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION / 715 SW 10TH AVENUE / TOPEKA, KANSAS 66612-1686

Craig Grant Testimony
Senate Education Committee
Tuesday, March 6, 2001

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am Craig Grant and I represent Kansas NEA. I appreciate this opportunity to visit briefly with the Senate Education Committee about Senate Bill 313.

Teachers and other educators are frustrated about the topic of extra time for students for both disciplinary and remedial reasons. We are probably more worried about the remedial programs than the disciplinary ones. Teachers who identify students who need more time-on-task to attain skills do not always know if or when that time will be provided. We have talked about summer school, Saturday classes, before and after school programs. All are worthwhile and should be explored.

However, how can we force a student to comply with summer or Saturday programs? What do we have to show parents when we talk about extra time? School districts and educators will not be unreasonable as far as excessive time when other family situations would conflict. Excused absences will be given. We assume that if a district busses children to school the district will probably have to provide transportation for Saturday and summer classes, if needed. This explains one of the cost items possible for extended time programs. We want some ability to require students who are behind to get the extra help needed to get them up to standards. SB 313 would give us that ability.

Kansas NEA supports SB 313 and the ability to set policies for school hours and days outside the regular school term. Thank you for listening to our concerns.

Brilla Highfill Scott
Executive Director
bhsusa02@ink.org

M. Katharine Weickert
Director of
Administrator Services
usak01@ink.org

Don Knowles
Professional Development
Coordinator

SB 313: Additional School Days and School Hours
Testimony presented before the Senate Education Committee

by

**Brilla Highfill Scott, Executive Director
United School Administrators of Kansas**

March 6, 2001

**Mister Chairman and
Members of the Senate Education Committee:**

United School Administrators of Kansas supports SB 313 which amends the school term statute to allow school districts to schedule additional days or hours of student instruction for remedial or disciplinary reasons.

The additional hours could be scheduled on weekends before or after school or during the summer. Attendance would be subject to compulsory attendance rules.

We believe that this change would encourage further local involvement in determining student needs and provide additional flexibility for local Boards of Education.

United School Administrators of Kansas asks that you favorably report SB 313.



Kansas Association of
Elementary
School Principals
(KAESP)

Kansas Association of
Middle School
Administrators
(KAMSA)

Kansas Association of
School Administrators
(KASA)

Kansas Association of
School Business
Officials
(KASBO)

Kansas Association for
Supervision and
Curriculum Development
(KASCD)

Kansas Association of
Special Education
Administrators
(KASEA)

Kansas Association of
Secondary School
Principals
(KASSP)

Kansas Council of
Vocational
Administrators
(KCVA)

Kansas School
Public Relations
Association
(KanSPRA)

*Senate Education
3-6-01
Attachment 14*