



**Arlington
Public
Schools**

AGENDA

Budget Work Session #2, Employee Concerns

March 2, 2016

5:00 PM

Rooms 101 A/B
Education Center

Employee Concerns:

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| 5:00 – 5:10 p.m. | Summary – Processes for Employee Advisory Committee (EAC) and Collaborative Professional Strategies Team (CPST) |
| 5:10 – 5:30 p.m. | Employee Advisory Committee (A, C, D, E, G, M, X-scales) |
| 5:30 – 5:50 p.m. | Collaborative Professional Strategies Team (T-scale) |
| 5:50 – 6:10 p.m. | Arlington School Administrators (P-scale) |



**ARLINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
HUMAN RESOURCES**

MEMORANDUM

February 26, 2016

TO: School Board Members

FROM: Patrick K. Murphy

SUBJECT: 2015-16 Budget and Non-Budget Employee Related Concerns

Policy Implementation Procedure (PIP) 35-4.2 Employee-Employer Communications specifies the procedure that A, C, D, E, G, M, P, T and X-scale advisory groups follow when submitting employee budget and non-budget related concerns. Below are the employee groups represented by each scale.

Scale	Employee Group
A	Assistants
C	Cafeteria
D	Drivers and Bus Attendants
E	Exempt from FLSA
G	Clerical
M	Maintenance
P	Administrators
T	Teachers
X	Extended Day

The following employees will present employee budget and non-budget concerns to the School Board at its work session on Wednesday, March 2, 2016.

Employee Advisory Committee (EAC)	<i>Thanh Au</i> – Maintenance Mechanic (Carpenter), Facilities <i>Cristina Berrang</i> – Extended Day Supervisor, Taylor <i>Anne Coia</i> – Montessori Assistant, Carlin Springs <i>Wanda Gant</i> – Personnel Technician, Human Resources <i>Thomas Norton</i> – Safe Routes to School Coordinator, Instruction
Collaborative Professional Strategies Team (CPST)	<i>Judy Apostolico-Buck</i> – Principal, Ashlawn <i>Miles Carey</i> – Teacher, Langston <i>Paul Jamelske</i> – Assistant Principal, Washington-Lee <i>Linda Rothman</i> – Teacher, Randolph
Arlington School Administrators (ASA)	<i>Paul Jamelske</i> – Assistant Principal, Washington-Lee

EMPLOYEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (EAC)

The Employee Advisory Committee (EAC) represents A, C, D, E, G, M and X-scales. In 2015-16, the EAC continued to follow the model of the Collaborative Professional Strategies Team (CPST). Representatives for all scales met as one large group, rather than individually by scale. Areas that the EAC addressed during the 2015-16 school year include, but are not limited to the following:

- Revisions of the following School Board Policies (SBP) and Policy Implementation Procedures (PIP):
 - Policy 35-6.2 Retirement
 - Policy 35-2.2 Staff Reductions
 - PIP 35-5.3 Sick Leave
 - PIP 35-5.7 Workers' Compensation Leave.
 - PIP 35-6.3 Employee Health and Dental Insurance
- A-Scale Responsibilities Expectations
- Compensation Study
- Overtime
- Attendance of APS Employees' Non-Resident Children
- Calendar
- FY 17 Budget Update (ongoing topic at various meetings)
- FY 17 Budget Discussion
- Affordable Care Act
- Changes to 10-month employee VRS Deductions
- Measures of Employee Engagement

The Employee Advisory Committee spent a large portion of its time discussing the FY 2017 budget. FY 2017 budget recommendations included the following:

- Step increase, plus a bonus for any employee who does not receive a monetary increase from a step increase.
- For any support staff step in the pay plan that is only a 3% increase, increase to 4%.
- Add steps to the support staff pay plan lanes.
- Permit employees who work multiple hourly positions with APS to combine them to create a benefits-eligible position.
- Increase HR staffing to allow for systematic, periodic review of classification specifications for all scales.
- Award professional standards stipends to support staff employees who hold masters' degrees related to their job duties and responsibilities.
- Increase 7-hour instructional assistant contract hours to 7.5, to mirror teacher hours.
- Increase Extended Day Assistant Supervisor contract hours from 7 to 7.5, to mirror Extended Day Supervisor contract hours.
- Add HVAC preventive maintenance technicians and contract funding to meet increased demands created by student enrollment growth.

Staff Invited to Meet with the EAC

- Deirdra McLaughlin, Assistant Superintendent, Finance
- Terri Carson, Administrative Officer/Risk Manager
- Leslie Peterson, Budget Director
- Anna Samayoa, Payroll Administrator
- Kristi Murphy, Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources

The Employee Advisory Committee will address and/or re-visit the following topics for discussion:

- Leave in One-Hour Increments
- A-Scale concerns: attending faculty meetings, evaluations, planning time, technology requests, and consistency across school division and being asked to serve as substitute teachers.
- Review the policy of salary setting for internal promotions when the pay ends up being less than someone hired from the outside.
- Review compensation for E-scale employees to ensure equalization for similar job duties and responsibilities; also G-scale.
- Update on cultural competence with regard to when it will “roll out” to remaining schools/departments.
- Review of G-scale duties across the school division with regard to making sure duties are apportioned to the correct level employee, including possible survey of duties.
- Contracts for D-Scale employees
- Hourly employee set up and combining positions for benefits.

COLLABORATIVE PROFESSIONAL STRATEGIES TEAM (CPST)

The CPST addresses concerns in an ongoing manner at each meeting by sharing information and brainstorming solutions. Areas discussed during the 2015-16 school year include, but are not limited to the following:

- Review of CPST Procedures and Processes
- Revisions of the following School Board Policies (SBP) and Policy Implementation Procedures (PIP):
 - Policy 35-6.2 Retirement
 - Policy 35-2.2 Staff Reductions
 - PIP 35-5.3 Sick Leave
 - PIP 35-5.7 Workers’ Compensation Leave.
 - PIP 35-6.3 Employee Health and Dental Insurance
 - PIP 8.1 Payroll – Teacher Pay Setting
 - PIP 35-6.4 Other Benefits
 - PIP 35-8.3 Contracts & Work Schedules
 - PIP 35-3.13 – Employment – Assignment of Teachers and Assistants
- Employee Facilities

- Re-assignment of Staff Members
- Compensation Study
- Recess
- Technology Update
- FY 17 Budget Update (ongoing topic at various meetings)
- FY 17 Budget Discussion
- 2016-17 School Calendar
- Planning Time
- Arts & Music Teacher Schedules, Duties
- Employee Facilities
- Special Education Caseload
- Personal Appliances
- Attendance of APS Employees' Non-Resident Children
- SMART Goals
- ATSS Intervention Blocks and Teacher Schedules
- Copier Paper
- Substitutes

The CPST spent a large portion of its time discussing the FY 2017 budget. FY 2017 budget recommendations included the following:

Discussion: The CPST endorses the School Board's recommendation to address compensation in the FY17 budget for all employees. Specifically, the CPST forwarded the following budget recommendations to the Superintendent.

- Step increase, plus a one-time bonus to staff members who do not benefit financially from the step.
- Increase school-based instructional staff support:
 - 0.5 testing coordinators for elementary schools that do not have them
 - 0.5 ITCs to 1.0 at four elementary schools
 - Additional 1.0 ITC allocation at high school level
- Increase Information Services TSC Technician positions to meet school demands for hardware maintenance from 9 to 18.

Staff Invited to Meet with the CPST

- Dr. Sue Sarber, Supervisor, Professional Development
- Kerri Hirsch, Teacher Evaluation Specialist
- Rajesh Adusumilli, Assistant Superintendent, Information Services
- Terance Proctor, Director, Service Support Center
- Deirdra McLaughlin, Assistant Superintendent, Finance & Management Services
- Dr. Kelly Krug, ATSS Supervisor
- Dr. Donna Snyder, Director, Early Childhood Education

In looking forward, some of the areas the CPST plans to address include:

- Additional compensated time in daily teacher contract hours for planning
- Special education case loads and equitable teacher workloads
- Art & Music schedules
- Planning Time
- Review PIP 35-8.1 Regarding step increase/effective performance
- Clarification of teacher contract hours
- Possible new PIP on employee facilities
- Timely repair of copiers
- Bulb replacements, projectors, overhead, toner, timely provisions
- Clarity on the procedure for notification of platform changes
- Review elementary school scheduling and implementation of PIP 35-8.3 Contract and Work Schedules (Challenges include materials management, instructional time, climate/morale.)
- Budget Item: administration of insulin and other medical procedures by school administrators and teachers – including clarification on what can be required
- Develop a protocol for addressing issues (AEA, Administration, Central Office, School Board, within buildings, etc.)
- Review PIP on reporting student progress to parents

P-SCALE EMPLOYEE CONCERNS

P-Scale Forum representatives presented the following items:

1. Concern: Salary adjustments for administrators

ASA Recommendation: ASA commends the administration for implementing the P/E Scale classification study. We request that ASA be engaged to work collaboratively with the ELT to develop compensation adjustments that respond to the study results and to the concerns put forward by administrators over the years. ASA members express concern that increases in deductions for benefits (such as insurance) result in administrators' salaries and take-home-pay no longer keeping up with the cost of living. This decrease in real income is occurring as expectations and responsibilities are increasing for administrators.

ASA recommends that the Superintendent consider this concern in conjunction with the results of the classification study when recommending salary proposals in the Proposed FY 2017 Budget. ASA recommends that the Superintendent's Proposed FY2017 Budget includes step increases for all employees. ASA suggests that compensation costs be offset by a moratorium on all *new* program initiatives. Further ASA would like to work with you and your staff to develop additional mechanisms that provide compensation for administrators based on knowledge, skills and performance. This could involve a number of methods and procedures including: Pay scale adjustment for a doctorate degree; A program similar to Career Advancement Program (CAP) for teachers; Recertification points and stipends for administrators who mentor new administrators; Assured provision of tuition assistance for pursuit of advanced degrees

Superintendent's Response: When the report from the compensation study becomes available, the

Assistant Superintendents of Administrative Services and Human Resources will work with ASA to discuss the results and solicit feedback that can be shared with the Executive Leadership Team (ELT) as decisions are reviewed. Pursuing a doctorate degree is a personal decision that is fully supported and encouraged to enhance one's career path. At this time, given the current budget forecast tuition assistance for pursuing advanced degrees is not being considered.

2. Concern: The impact on students, teachers and administrators of new initiatives, increases in required committee participation, and other newly required duties.

ASA Recommendation: Members express a sense that there is little appreciation by the administration and School Board of the consequence of multiple new initiatives on the quality of instruction. The requests for information and participation in new initiatives and committees are often distractions and burdensome for school staff. This is a serious problem for educators charged with working directly with students and teachers.

ASA recommends that the ELT and the School Board consider the impact of increasing workloads, new program implementation, and lack of clerical and technical support before adopting initiatives. We support the review/revision of planning factors to provide realistic staffing to continue to meet instructional needs and requirements.

Superintendent's Response: Planning factors are reviewed each budget cycle in connection with planning for instructional purposes and student population growth. The staffing committee and ELT will continue this process and make adjustments as needed. An example of this process is the current proposal to review the planning factor for assistant principals, Instructional Technology Coordinators (ITCs), and other key positions in the school division. ASA members are encouraged to review the state, surrounding jurisdictions and those of comparable student size planning factor recommendations and present a recommendation for revising planning factors.

3. ASA Concern: Current process for movement on longevity steps

ASA Recommendation: When the School Board provides no step increase, an employee on a longevity step (e.g. L-3) remains on the longevity step (L-3) until the next year that the board approves a step increase. It is the same process as moving on any step. For instance, if an employee is on step G and there is no step increase approved the employee stays on G until a step increase is approved at which point the employee advances to step H. The issue is that an employee on a longevity step remains on the longevity step for 8 years instead of 4 years while an employee on a regular step moves up after only 2 years (assuming one year is skipped). ASA recommends that the procedure for moving on longevity steps be changed so that an employee on a longevity step *receives credit for each year served*. We recommend that the year of service count regardless of whether or not the individual gets a formal step.

Last year you responded to this concern: "ASA Executive Board is encouraged to work with the Assistant Superintendents for Administrative Services and Human Resources in preparing a proposal for consideration during the FY 2016 budget development process. Such a proposal will be considered along with other recommendations during this process." ASA selected representatives to work with the ELT to develop a proposal for consideration in the FY2016 Budget. *However, there was no follow up by the ELT. We reiterate our request to work with the administration to address this issue in the Superintendent's Proposed FY2017 Budget.*

ASA Proposal: As stated above, ASA proposes changing the procedure for progression on longevity steps so that an employee currently on a longevity step receives credit for each year served. Currently, an

employee remains on longevity steps (K, L-1, L-2, L-3, L-4) for four years (rather than one year, as is the case for regular steps). Therefore, if an employee is on step L1-Year 1 in a year when the School Board does not authorize a step increase, the employee will remain on step L1-Year 1. As demonstrated in the table below, over the past 9-10 years, employees were held on longevity steps for 8 to 9 years despite the fact that the PIP makes it clear that the intention is that an employee will remain on each longevity step for 4 years.

Employee X	Salary	Grade	Step	Year	Step for FY approved by School Board.
1-Jul-07	\$ 121,589.00	P-15	Step K	4	
1-Jul-08	\$ 127,372.00	P-15	Step L-1	1	Yes
1-Jul-09	\$ 127,372.00	P-15	Step L-1	1	No at beginning of year
1-Jan-10	\$ 127,372.00	P-15	Step L-1	2	Yes, mid year
1-Jul-10	\$ 127,372.00	P-15	Step L-1	2	No
1-Jul-11	\$ 127,372.00	P-15	Step L-1	3	Yes
1-Jul-12	\$ 137,154.00	P-15	Step L-1	3	No
1-Jul-13	\$ 137,154.00	P-15	Step L-1	4	Yes
1-Jul-14	\$ 139,897.00	P-15	Step L-1	4	No

ASA believes that an employee should stay on a Longevity Step for **4 years**, not the number of years between step increases approved by the School Board.

Assuming that longevity steps are a component of the salary scale used in the FY2017 APS Budget, ASA proposes the following remedies: (1) **Change the process for progression on longevity steps so that it is based on the actual number of years an employee has been on the longevity step rather than the current system;** (2) **To compensate for the inequity of this process over the past decade, move every person currently on a longevity step to the next step (i.e. L1 to L2).**

Superintendent's Response: Follow-up was provided on the ASA longevity steps proposal through feedback at Administrative Council on items that would be included in the budget during the FY 2016 budget development process. At the November 5, 2015 meeting, a request was made of ASA to provide a recommendation for addressing the concern. The above proposal will be considered during the FY 2017 budget development process. Please note that the request will be considered on behalf of all employees who have longevity steps associated with the applicable pay scale.

4. ASA Concern: Professional development funding for administrators

ASA Recommendation: In a recent ASA survey, members expressed a number of concerns related to professional development for administrators. Members referenced changing roles and expectations exacerbated by the lack of support to respond. To remain current in best practice and to advance the

Strategic Plan goal to recruit, retain, and develop exemplary staff, ASA encourages support for new and experienced administrators in continuous professional growth and leadership development. Specifically ASA recommends: Formal mentorship to incoming P-Scale employees providing direct and personal training in budgeting, community building and other required “hands on” skills; Reinstatement of professional development funds (the \$20,000 removed beginning in FY2014 Budget) to provide administrators with financial assistance for personally selected, relevant and approved coursework, conferences and seminars.

The loss of professional development funds for administrators continues to be of great concern to ASA. This funding is essential to continuing improvement and to accomplishment of APS strategic goals. We urge the Superintendent and the School Board to make the compensation and professional development of administrators a high budgetary priority. ASA is anxious to work collaboratively with the ELT. We request an outline of next steps and a point of contact from the Superintendent’s staff to construct a proposal for the FY2017 Proposed Budget.

Superintendent’s Response: While the FY14 adopted budget removed professional development funds for administrators, the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendents of Administrative Services and Human Resources worked together to ensure those administrators who requested support with professional development activities were granted the requests. Administrators have been supported in more targeted professional activities such as the Superintendents’ Academies, George Mason University Cohort Scholarships, conference participation and other activities. The proposed FY17 budget includes a proposal to reinstate the professional development funds of \$20,000 that was removed in FY14.

5. ASA Concern: Lack of School Board Response to P-Scale Concerns

ASA Recommendation: PIP 35-4.2 Employee-Employer Communications—Administrative Forum Sec. B-5 states: “The School Board shall respond to the recommendations of the Forum and the Superintendent”. However, ASA has not received a response from the School Board in several years. In accordance with School Board Policy, ASA requests feedback from the School Board regarding the P-Scale concerns put forward annually.

Superintendent’s Response: In the past, the Superintendent’s responses to ASA’s concerns were shared with the School Board, in many instances, in Friday Letter and at the Employee Concerns Meetings which usually occurred in March. This provided opportunities for the School Board to give the Superintendent feedback. Going forward, the Superintendent will share recommendations of the forum and his responses with the School Board before providing written responses to ASA regarding its concerns. The responses provided to ASA from the Superintendent will be forwarded on behalf of the Superintendent and School Board.