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## Teacher Salary Overview

- Statutory minimum salary schedule:
$>16$ steps for each year of experience from 0 to 15 years
> Minimum: \$29,244 for BA \& 0 yrs. exp.
$>$ Top of schedule: $\$ 41,130$ for MA \&15 yrs. exp.
$>$ Unchanged since the 2008-09 school year
- Average salary used in the 2013 matrix: $\$ 48,356$ plus benefits
- Actual average salary in 2013: \$47,316


## Recap of Proposals

|  | Current | Proposal <br> $\# 1$ | Proposal <br> $\# 2$ | Proposal <br> $\# 3$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Description |  | Increase <br> minimum to <br> $\$ 31,000$ | Increase <br> schedule <br> $1 \%$ | Increase <br> schedule <br> $2 \%$ |
| Minimum BA | $\$ 29,244$ | $\$ 31,000$ | $\$ 29,536$ | $\$ 29,829$ |
| Minimum MA | $\$ 33,630$ | $\$ 35,650$ | $\$ 33,966$ | $\$ 34,303$ |
| Total Cost* |  | $\$ 2.35$ <br> million | $\$ 121,000$ | $\$ 333,000$ |

*Additional cost in 2012-13 if proposed minimums had been in place

## Questions to Consider

- Purpose of the funding? Payment for new requirement or transition funding to what has been funded but not required?
- One- or two-time payment or ongoing?
- Target districts with salary schedules at the statutory minimum or increase funding for all districts?
- Total amount to increase?
- Restrict funding?


## Option A. 1

- Calculates the average salary in each district's schedule and compares it with the average salary in the proposed schedule.
- Difference is multiplied by number of teachers funded in matrix.


## Example A. 1

|  | Proposal | Low-Paying <br> District | High-Paying <br> District |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BA, 0 Years Exp. | $\$ 31,000$ | $\$ 29,244$ | $\$ 44,570$ |
| BA, 15 Years Exp. | $\$ 37,750$ | $\$ 35,994$ | $\$ 54,915$ |
| MA, 0 Years Exp. | $\$ 35,650$ | $\$ 33,630$ | $\$ 47,094$ |
| MA, 15 Years Exp. | $\$ 43,150$ | $\$ 41,130$ | $\$ 57,645$ |
| Average Step Value | $\$ 36,888$ | $\$ 35,000$ | $\$ 51,056$ |

## Schedule Difference

Low-Paying District \$36,888-\$35,000=\$1,888

High-Paying District \$36,888-\$51,056=(\$14,168)

## Option A. 1 Example

|  | Low-Paying District | High-Paying District |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| ADM | 750 | 20,000 |
| Classroom Teachers Funded <br> in Matrix (24.94 per 500 ADM) | 37.41 <br> cludents | students |


|  | Low-Paying District | High-Paying District |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule Difference | $\$ 1,888$ | $-\$ 14,168$ |
| Number of Teachers | 37.41 | 997.6 |
| Payment Amount | $\$ 70,630$ | Negative Value |

## Option A. 1 Example

- Districts already paying above the pay schedule receive $\$ 25$ per classroom teacher in the matrix-the lowest step value difference of any district receiving funding.

|  | High-Paying District |
| :--- | :---: |
| Schedule Difference | $\$ 25$ |
| Number of Teachers | 997.6 |
| Payment Amount | $\$ 24,940$ |

## Option A. 1 Features

- Total cost: \$2.7 million (2012-13)
- Every district receives funding
- Intended to be temporary to ease transition to higher salary schedule


## Option A. 2

- Same method as Option A.1, but uses 33.665 teachers instead of 24.94 classroom teachers
- Total cost: \$3.64 million


## Option B

Like Option A, but based on the difference between a district's actual salary schedule and the median salary schedule.

## Option B Example

|  | Low-Paying <br> District | High-Paying <br> District | Median |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BA, 0 Years Exp. | $\$ 29,244$ | $\$ 44,570$ |  |
| BA, 15 Years Exp. | $\$ 35,994$ | $\$ 54,915$ |  |
| MA, 0 Years Exp. | $\$ 33,630$ | $\$ 47,094$ |  |
| MA, 15 Years Exp. | $\$ 41,130$ | $\$ 57,645$ |  |
| Average Step Value | $\$ 35,000$ | $\$ 51,056$ | $\$ 37,687$ |

Schedule Difference
Low-Paying District
\$37,687-\$35,000=\$2,687
High-Paying District
\$37,687-\$51,056=(\$13,369)

## Option B Example

|  | Low Paying <br> District | High Paying <br> District |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule Difference | $\$ 2,687$ | $-\$ 13,369$ |
| Number of Teachers $(24.94$ <br> per 500 ADM) | 37.41 | 997.6 |
| Payment Amount | $\$ 100,521$ | Negative <br> Value |

## Option B Features

- Total Cost: \$5.29 million
- 119 districts receive funding
- Districts that receive funding receive significantly more than under Option A, but other districts receive no funding
- Because Option B is based on the median salary schedule (rather than one-time salary schedule change), could be used as ongoing distribution method


## Option C.1: Per-Student Funding

- Possible per-student funding amount: \$15, which is the average per-student increase districts would have paid in 2013 if minimum salary had been $\$ 31,000$
- Provides funding at the same rate for highand low-paying districts
- Total cost for $\$ 15$ per-student increase: \$6.86 million


## Option C.2: Per-Student Funding

- \$7 per student for district above 3,000 ADM
- $\$ 15$ per student for districts between 500 and 3,000 ADM
- \$30 per student for districts under 500 ADM
- Total cost: \$5.12 million


## Option C Features

- All districts receive some level of funding
- Option C. 1 could be easily integrated into matrix


## Possible Policies on Restricted Uses

- No restrictions
- Funding can be used only for teacher salaries
- Districts that accept funding could be required to:
- Commit to increase salary schedule by specified amount in subsequent year
- Limit uses of NSL funding (e.g., first 2.5 instructional facilitators must be funded with foundation funding before using NSL funding)


## Option Cost Summary

## Option

Description
2012-13
Cost
Compares with Proposed Salary
A. 1 Schedule; Multiply by \# of Classroom

Teachers
\$2.7
million
Compares with Proposed Salary
A. 2 Schedule; Multiply by \# of All Teachers

B Compares with Median Salary Schedule
C. 1 Per-Student Funding: One Rate
\$3.64 million
$\$ 5.29$ million \$6.86 million
C. 2 Per-Student Funding: Graduated Rates

