





Career Compensation Comparison





Southeast Wisconsin Suburbs

The Goal

| | | |
|---|--------------|--|
|  | Objective | Raises are based on clear factors like years of experience, NOT on subjective judgements of administrators or invalid, unreliable criteria like student test scores. |
|  | Predictable | The salary path is visible and a teacher can count on it. Not based on unpredictable factors like year-to-year board decisions, evaluations or assignment of extra duties. |
|  | Attainable | Top career salaries are attainable by everyone, not just a select few who are chosen by management. |
|  | Professional | Raises are based on factors that we KNOW are associated with the highest quality professional teaching, especially experience and educational attainment. |

Franklin

Overview:

| | | |
|--|--------------|---|
|  | Objective | Career salary increases are based on subjective judgments and decisions outside of a teacher's control, such as being assigned extra responsibilities or rated "exceptional" |
|  | Predictable | Given the number of factors outside of a teacher's control, there is no way for a person to know what their salary will be in future years. In practice \$50,000 is the maximum. |
|  | Attainable | Only one in twenty teachers will get to the highest pay rate, and only one in ten will get to the second highest pay rate. In practice, even select teachers are not getting big increases. |
|  | Professional | There is no salary credit for achieving a Masters Degree and years of experience only gets the vast majority of people up to \$50,000. |

Franklin

| New Franklin Educator | Professional Educator | Professional School/Program Educator | Professional Systems Educator (Non-represented) |
|---|--|--|---|
| Who? | Who? | Who? | Who? |
| Teachers new to teaching and/or new to FPS | Teachers with experience teaching in FPS | Teachers with experience teaching whom assume leadership for school and/or program development | Teachers with experience teaching whom assume leadership and supervision of teachers for individual development and system development |
| <i>Work Days</i> | <i>Work Days</i> | <i>Work Days</i> | <i>Work Days</i> |
| 190 | 190 | 195 | 195 |
| <i>Minimum Salary</i> | <i>Minimum Salary</i> | <i>Minimum Salary</i> | <i>Minimum Salary</i> |
| 17% \$44,000 Salary for experienced teacher is commensurate with experience and market value | 74% \$50,000 | 5% \$60,000 School/Program Educator annual salary enhancement (\$1500-\$3000) | 4% Salary is commensurate with experience and market value |
| Salary Enhancements | Salary Enhancements | Salary Enhancements | Salary Enhancements |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Board Certification Mentoring Grade level and department liaisons Teaching a Franklin Class "Content or Program Go-To" positions Facilitators Building Team Leaders | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Board Certification Mentoring Teaching a Franklin Class "Content or Program Go-To" positions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Board Certification Teaching a Franklin Class |
| Minimum Requirements <i>*Any minimum requirements may be waived</i> | Minimum Requirements <i>*Any minimum requirements may be waived</i> | Minimum Requirements <i>*Any minimum requirements may be waived</i> | Minimum Requirements <i>*Any minimum requirements may be waived</i> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Hiring Criteria | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative team recommendation 3+ years experience Accumulated a total of 45 hours of PD | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Successful interview and Administrative team recommendation 7+ years experience Accumulated a total of 105 hours of PD Appropriate Masters Degree, certification, and/or National Board Certification | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Successful interview and Administrative team recommendation 10+ years experience Accumulated a total of 150 hours of PD Appropriate Masters Degree, certification, and/or National Board Certification #51 license (principal license) or Teachscape Proficient |

Franklin





*In the 2013-2014 school year, the administration initiated a process to establish a new salary system. The process consisted of a meeting or two with a committee hand picked by management. Teachers participating agree that their views were largely ignored.

* The FEA organized meetings and did a survey on the system to share with the administration and board. Overwhelmingly, educators said they want an objective, predictable, attainable, professional salary system. Overwhelmingly, people said they had almost no input into the system.

*Over a hundred attended the school board meeting at which the salary system was considered. The school board ignored all objections and adopted the system anyway.

Cudahy

Overview:

| | | |
|---|--------------|---|
|  | Objective | There is a visible salary ladder with steps and lanes. Movement is based on 1) maintaining certain overall EE scores (differing by lane); 2) earning Badges (district activities) and/or Microcredentials; 3) Masters degree; 4) years of service. The EE score is said to be minimal expectations. |
|  | Predictable | The ladder progression is visible and predictable. If a person maintains minimal expectations for EE scores and completes badges and microcredentials, they advance each year. |
|  | Attainable | Every teacher should be able to advance to the top if they complete the work and meet the criteria. |
|  | Professional | Advancement is based primarily on experience, professional development and professional contributions to the district. |

Cudahy - How you got there

- * Until the 2017-2018 school year, Cudahy had the “Star Compensation Plan.” For several years, the CEA provided feedback to the district’s board and administration through analyses, member surveys and other means that the system was not supported by teachers and was failing to attract and retain qualified educators.
- * Summer 2017 – Superintendent set up an advisory committee to develop a new system. Key CEA leaders were part of the committee and had substantial input. The CEA especially pushed back on linking raises to EE scores. As finalized, the system maintains the link to EE scores, but scores must be low enough to be placed on a plan of assistance in order to be denied an increase.
- * Fall 2017 – Multiple meetings for employee feedback were held as well as a meeting with the CEA leadership. The new career ladder model was established for implementation in the January, 2018. People were placed on the ladder for next year with an average increase of \$1,500.

Cudahy Career Ladders

Movement to PROFESSIONAL

- 2.5 EE Score
- Obtain DPI Professional Educators License

| Initial Teacher Ladder | |
|------------------------|----------|
| I10 | \$52,000 |
| I09 | \$51,000 |
| I08 | \$50,000 |
| I07 | \$49,000 |
| I06 | \$48,000 |
| I05 | \$47,000 |
| I04 | \$46,000 |
| I03 | \$45,000 |
| I02 | \$44,000 |
| I01 | \$43,000 |
| I00 | \$42,000 |

Movement up INITIAL

- Successful EE Score 2.5
- 5 year max or possible non-renewal

| Professional Teacher Ladder | |
|-----------------------------|----------|
| P20 | \$67,000 |
| P19 | \$66,500 |
| P18 | \$66,000 |
| P17 | \$65,500 |
| P16 | \$65,000 |
| P15 | \$64,500 |
| P14 | \$64,000 |
| P13 | \$63,500 |
| P12 | \$62,000 |
| P11 | \$60,500 |
| P10 | \$59,000 |
| P9 | \$57,500 |
| P8 | \$56,000 |
| P7 | \$54,500 |
| P6 | \$53,000 |
| P5 | \$51,500 |
| P4 | \$50,000 |
| P3 | \$48,500 |
| P2 | \$47,500 |
| P1 | \$46,500 |
| P0 | \$45,500 |

Movement up PROFESSIONAL

- Successful EE Score 2.8
- 4 Micro Creds / Badges

Movement to DISTINGUISHED

- 3.2 EE Score
- 12 Micro Creds/Badges
- 6+ years in District

Movement to MASTER

- 3.0 EE Score
- Obtain Master's Degree

Movement up MASTER

- Successful EE Score 3.0
- 4 Micro Creds / Badges

| | |
|----|----------|
| M9 | \$58,000 |
| M8 | \$56,500 |
| M7 | \$55,000 |
| M6 | \$53,500 |
| M5 | \$52,000 |
| M4 | \$51,000 |
| M3 | \$50,000 |
| M2 | \$49,000 |
| M1 | \$48,000 |
| M0 | \$47,000 |

| Master Teacher Ladder | |
|-----------------------|----------|
| M37 | \$78,000 |
| M36 | \$77,500 |
| M35 | \$77,000 |
| M34 | \$76,500 |
| M33 | \$76,000 |
| M32 | \$75,500 |
| M31 | \$75,000 |
| M30 | \$74,500 |
| M29 | \$74,000 |
| M28 | \$73,500 |
| M27 | \$73,000 |
| M26 | \$72,500 |
| M25 | \$72,000 |
| M24 | \$71,500 |
| M23 | \$71,000 |
| M22 | \$70,500 |
| M21 | \$70,000 |
| M20 | \$69,500 |
| M19 | \$69,000 |
| M18 | \$68,500 |
| M17 | \$68,000 |
| M16 | \$67,500 |
| M15 | \$67,000 |
| M14 | \$66,500 |
| M13 | \$66,000 |
| M12 | \$65,500 |
| M11 | \$65,000 |
| M10 | \$64,500 |

Distinguished Teacher Ladder





| | |
|-----|----------|
| D20 | \$94,000 |
| D19 | \$92,000 |
| D18 | \$90,000 |
| D17 | \$88,000 |
| D16 | \$86,000 |
| D15 | \$84,000 |
| D14 | \$82,000 |
| D13 | \$80,000 |
| D12 | \$78,000 |
| D11 | \$76,000 |
| D10 | \$74,000 |
| D9 | \$72,000 |
| D8 | \$70,000 |
| D7 | \$68,000 |
| D6 | \$66,000 |
| D5 | \$64,000 |
| D4 | \$62,000 |
| D3 | \$60,000 |
| D2 | \$58,000 |
| D1 | \$56,000 |
| D0 | \$54,000 |

Movement up DISTINGUISHED

- Successful EE Score 3.2
- 6 Micro Creds / Badges

Oak Creek

Overview:

| | | |
|--|--------------|---|
|  | Objective | Level placement and raises are based entirely on the subjective judgment of administrators. Multiple cases of unfairness and discriminatory outcomes are evident. |
|  | Predictable | Raises vary wildly from year to year based on school board decisions. People only find out their increase at the beginning of each school year. This year's increase was \$300-\$400. There is no visible salary progression. |
|  | Attainable | People are sorted into three categories. Only one in five will ever be in the highest category and get the biggest raises. |
|  | Professional | Advancement is not based on any known professional indicators, but rather on administrators' subjective judgments (evaluations) and yearly school board decisions. |

Oak Creek

- Level 1 =** Initial Educators
- Level 2 =** Professional or Master Educators new to the district and Professional or Master Educators who demonstrate the descriptors above on an inconsistent or insufficient basis
- Level 3 =** Professional or Master Educators who demonstrate the descriptors above on an effective and consistent basis
- Level 4 =** Professional or Master Educators who demonstrate over a sustained period of time an exemplary level of effectiveness in meeting the descriptors above

Educators on a plan of improvement will receive no pay increase for the year they are working on their plan of improvement.

Any educator making more than the maximum at his or her level will receive a lump sum payment equal to the percent increase for that level.

No teacher will receive a salary cut or decrease, even if they move from a higher level to a lower level, unless they go through a non-renewal process.

| | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Starting | \$45,000 | \$45,000 | \$54,000 | \$57,000 |
| Maximum | \$54,000 | \$64,000 | \$85,000 | \$90,000 |





**Market may also be a factor in determining placement in pay structure.*

Oak Creek

- * Beginning in the 2012-2013 school year, the administration convened a hand picked committee to make changes to compensation. Participants generally agreed that their input was not actually considered.
- * Towards the end of the 2013-2014 school year, the administration introduced its salary system proposal to the school board. Several dozen educators turned out to raise their concerns about the system. Dozens also turned out to bargaining over base wages to raise objections. The system was adopted anyway.
- * The OCEA has repeatedly shown patterns of unfairness and discrimination. The administration drastically reduced the number of people rated in the lowest category, but has otherwise been unwilling to change the system.

Greenfield

Overview:

| | | |
|---|--------------|--|
|  | Objective | There is no documentation that defines how to move from one “lane” to the next, though it is generally stated it takes five years. |
|  | Predictable | The column caps are listed and have been adhered to, but the intermediary years do not have a documented value. |
|  | Attainable | After 16 years, teachers can reach the highest level. However, any salary increase beyond that has been minimal with many teachers receiving less than COLA. |
|  | Professional | Salary increases are based on administration observations and evaluation, but there is no documentation as to how these affect movement from one column to the next. |

Greenfield

| Initial | | Professional | | Advanced | | Senior | |
|---------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|----------|--------|----------|
| I1 | \$40,000 | P1 | \$50,000 | A1 | \$60,000 | S1 | \$70,000 |
| I2 | \$41,500 | P2 | \$51,500 | A2 | \$61,500 | | |
| I3 | \$43,000 | P3 | \$53,000 | A3 | \$63,000 | | |
| I4 | \$44,500 | P4 | \$54,500 | A4 | \$64,500 | | |
| I4 | \$46,000 | P5 | \$56,000 | A5 | \$66,000 | | |

Greenfield

History: After Act 10, GEA Bargaining Team and SDoG developed the model displayed earlier, but it had salary advancements at each level. Since then, the individual advancements have been removed and efforts to increase the salaries at the top of the column have been stonewalled: last meeting was January 2016.

Concerns:

No consideration of inflation causes the entire system to lose value over time, ~\$125,000 worth of value over a career.





Designed to advance new teachers to higher salaries so the district could keep them. Average time a teacher stays at Greenfield is less than 3 years.

No documented advancement allows for favoritism, unfair and unequal salary increases.

Advanced degrees and CE not considered for salary advancement.

Saint Francis

Overview:

| | | |
|---|--------------|---|
|  | Objective | Consistent structure with everyone moving the same with same criteria |
|  | Predictable | Can figure out what it will take to advance and switch columns |
|  | Obtainable | Teachers move through that are not on a plan of improvement; current staff members can get to highest salary |
|  | Professional | Based on completion of Effective Educator only. Allows for movement based on Masters, Nat Board Cert, and other degrees |

Saint Francis

Published: Dec, 2015

Initial: \$40,000 Max: \$79,250

Completion of Effective Educator Project earns step each year

Movement to 2nd Column - Professional Educator or Continuing Licensure via PDP or credits.

Movement to 3rd Column - Master's Degree in designated area(s) or district developed program

Movement to 4th Column - Master Educator License Program Completion or National Board Certification or Pre-Approved Classes for Additional Licensure Needs

| Level | Initial | Professional | Experienced | Master Educator |
|-------|-----------|--------------|-------------|-----------------|
| A | \$ 40,000 | \$ 49,000 | \$ 56,000 | \$ 65,000 |
| B | \$ 41,600 | \$ 50,000 | \$ 56,750 | \$ 65,750 |
| C | \$ 43,200 | \$ 51,000 | \$ 57,500 | \$ 66,500 |
| D | \$ 44,800 | \$ 52,000 | \$ 58,250 | \$ 67,250 |
| E | \$ 46,400 | \$ 53,000 | \$ 59,000 | \$ 68,000 |
| F | \$ 48,000 | \$ 54,000 | \$ 59,750 | \$ 68,750 |
| G | | \$ 55,000 | \$ 60,500 | \$ 69,500 |
| H | | | \$ 61,250 | \$ 70,250 |
| I | | | \$ 62,000 | \$ 71,000 |
| J | | | \$ 62,750 | \$ 71,750 |
| K | | | \$ 63,500 | \$ 72,500 |
| L | | | \$ 64,250 | \$ 73,250 |
| M | | | | \$ 74,000 |
| N | | | | \$ 74,750 |
| O | | | | \$ 75,500 |
| P | | | | \$ 76,250 |
| Q | | | | \$ 77,000 |
| R | | | | \$ 77,750 |
| S | | | | \$ 78,500 |
| T | | | | \$ 79,250 |

Saint Francis

*Workload survey of members in 2012 help laid seeds with administration

*Prediction that we would lose a lot of teachers without a structure - reiterated at the bargaining table with board members and with administration.





*Board started seeing an exodus of retirees, teachers switching districts, teachers leaving profession.

*Board agreed to a committee with teachers, admin, board members, parents in Feb 2015, to come up with a fair salary structure

*Concerns: No district retirement benefits; some quirks in movement on schedule with teacher who are not new to teaching but new to district; can a new teacher ever max out?

Greendale

Overview:

| | | |
|--|--------------|--|
|  | Objective | Raises are based on clear factors like years of experience, NOT on subjective judgements of administrators or invalid, unreliable criteria like student test scores. |
|  | Predictable | The salary path is visible and a teacher can count on it. Not based on unpredictable factors like year-to-year board decisions, evaluations or assignment of extra duties. |
|  | Obtainable | Teachers move through the salary structure as long as not on a Plan of Improvement |
|  | Professional | Yes, stipend for Masters, PhD, and NB Tuition reimbursement available |

Greendale

2015-16 COMPENSATION MODEL Board Approved 5/18/2015

| Level | Salary |
|-------|-------------|
| A | \$42,000.00 |
| B | \$43,680.00 |
| C | \$45,450.00 |
| D | \$47,250.00 |
| E | \$50,000.00 |
| F | \$52,000.00 |
| G | \$54,080.00 |
| H | \$56,250.00 |
| I | \$58,500.00 |
| J | \$61,000.00 |
| K | \$63,450.00 |
| L | \$66,000.00 |
| M | \$68,700.00 |
| N | \$71,500.00 |
| O | \$75,000.00 |
| P | \$78,000.00 |

- Teachers must demonstrate proficient performance* to receive increased compensation as they advance through the structure.
 - *Proficient performance as defined by the Effectiveness Project Professional Evaluation System.*
 - *Teachers who are on a Plan of Special Assistance (PSA) will not receive a salary increase.*
- Salary structure subject to annual Board review.

Professional Development (PD) Certifications/License Incentives

Compensation for increased Professional Expertise





- National Board Certified Teacher - \$3,000 annual stipend
- Master's degree in pre-approved area such as Educational Leadership, Instructional Technology, Content area Master's at the Secondary level, Reading/Math Specialist Certification at the Elementary level – \$1500 annual stipend
- PhD in Content area - \$1,500 annual stipend

Tuition reimbursement will continue for teachers, subject to annual budget allocation.

Greendale

- 2013: Worked on a collaborative team with teacher leaders (union and nonunion) with administrators
- After weighing 3-4 compensation models, group recommended model (approved 08/2013).
- 2015: GEA negotiated the addition of Level P
- Concerns:
 - No adjustments for COLA
 - No district retirement benefit
 - Has allowed individuals to negotiate larger raises
 - Closing gap between people on top of existing structure and those above the structure who were grandfathered in

South Milwaukee

| | | |
|---|--------------|--|
|  | Objective | The requirements for advancement are clear, tied to professional criteria, and |
|  | Predictable | In most years, the district should be able to shoulder the cost of movement through the structure. The primary concern then is inflation. So the structure is predictable, but increases to the cells are not. |
|  | Obtainable | There are multiple pathways through the structure. The pathways are related to experience and professional educational standards. |
|  | Professional | Your salary is the result of your experience and educational attainment. Your |

South Milwaukee

Column and Level

Time to top: \cong 27 years

Entry: 43,000

Top: 80,883

Mastery w/Distinction:

21 Credits plus

Micro-Credentials

9 Credit Certification

National Board

2nd Master's Degree

Doctoral Degree

| Level | Professional | Mastery | Mastery w/Distinction | Mastery Grandfathered (no level movements) |
|-------|--------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--|
| O | 58,085 | 61,131** (to M/D E) | 80,883 | 80,883 |
| N | 57,495 | 60,450** (to M/D D) | 79,350 | 79,350 |
| M | 56,380 | 59,300** (to M/D C) | 77,700 | 77,700 |
| L | 55,265 | 58,150** (to M/D B) | 76,050 | 76,050 |
| K | 54,150 | 57,000** (to M/D A) | 74,400 | 74,400 |
| J | 53,035 | 55,850 | 72,750 | 72,750 |
| I | 51,920 | 54,700 | 71,100 | 71,100 |
| H | 50,805 | 53,550 | 69,450 | 69,450 |
| G | 49,690 | 52,400 | 67,800 | 67,800 |
| F | 48,575 | 51,250 | 66,150 | 66,150 |
| E | 47,460 | 50,100 | 64,500 | 64,500 |
| D | 46,345 | 48,950 | 62,600 | |
| C | 45,230 | 47,800 | 61,450 | |
| B | 44,115 | 46,650 | 60,300 | |
| A | 43,000 | 45,500 | 59,150 | |

South Milwaukee: How We Got Here

Membership Matters: 80% membership




































Relationships: Individual and Institutional

Committee Work: Diversified, Unpaid, Sweat Equity

CELT (Collaborative Engagement Leadership Team):
Regular, Calendered Discussion (“Meet and Confer”)

Diversified Local Leadership

Committed District Leadership

| Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Franklin | Cudahy | Oak Creek | Greenfield | Saint Francis | Greendale | South Milwaukee |
| Objective |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Predictable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attainable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Professional |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |