

Amended 4-7-10

WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT #6

TO:	Governing Board	<u> X </u>	Action
		<u> X </u>	Discussion
FROM:	Dr. Susan J. Cook, Superintendent	<u> </u>	Information
		<u> </u>	1st Reading
DATE:	April 8, 2010		

AGENDA ITEM: Interest-Based Negotiations (IBN) Team’s Recommendations for 2010-2011

INITIATED BY:	<u>Interest-Based Negotiations Team</u>	SUBMITTED BY:	<u>Dr. Susan J. Cook, Superintendent and Interest-Based Negotiations Team Members</u>
---------------	---	---------------	---

GOVERNING BOARD POLICY REFERENCE OR STATUTORY CITATION: BBA and A.R.S.§15-502

SUPPORTING DATA

Funding Source: Various
Budgeted: In Process

The mission of the Interest-Based Negotiations (IBN) Team is to provide a collaborative forum for addressing District-wide terms and conditions of employment. The group is comprised of certified, classified and administrator employee representatives; additionally, Superintendent Dr. Susie Cook serves as representative for the Governing Board. IBN members utilize interest-based strategies, including consensus-building and trust-building techniques, to reach agreement regarding compensation and working condition recommendations.

The issues addressed by the 2009-2010 IBN Team are ones that emerged in response to federal legislation, including the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and Race to the Top; state legislation, specifically House Bill 2011; and continuing economic challenges at all levels of government. The group considered each issue in light of the following Governing Board interests and IBN Team interests:

- Governing Board Interests
 - Attract and maintain a stable workforce through working conditions.
 - Develop fair, equitable and clear procedures for reduction in force, should they be necessary.
 - Develop fair, equitable and clear procedures for excessing personnel.
 - Maintain District autonomy in decision-making.
 - Promote positive community relations throughout the budget process.
 - Promote the integrity of programming and parity, focusing on student achievement.
 - Balance the budget.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

See pages 3-4.

Superintendent _____

Board Action	Motion	Second	Ave	Nav	Abstain
Adams					
Graziano					
Jahneke					
Lambert					
Maza					

Interest-Based Negotiations (IBN) Team's Recommendations for 2010-2011

April 8, 2010

Page 2

- IBN Team Interests
 - Balance the budget.
 - Maintain autonomy.
 - Maintain the trust of voters.
 - Work toward what's best for students.
 - Maintain equity throughout the system.
 - Shrink the organization rather than chopping pieces.
 - Maintain staff morale.
 - Maintain a stable, quality workforce.

Historically, for years during which increased District revenue was projected, IBN focused on compensation options to maximize the effective and equitable distribution of such increases; the team's recommendations addressed individual salary adjustments, market adjustments, compression relief, anomalies, service awards, supplemental monies, incentives and stipends. Last year, IBN considered compensation components in the context of significant funding *reductions*; during the current year, the team has sought to generate recommendations that minimize the negative impact of still further anticipated reductions.

Among the issues addressed in this year's IBN recommendations are the following:

- Furlough days for teachers, administrators and support staff
- Departmental reductions
- Common dismissal times for students in grades one through six within each particular elementary school
- Elimination of gradual entry for kindergartners
- Class size increase
- Reauthorization of several recommendations that had been previously approved for the 2009-2010 school year

The 2009-2010 IBN Team has continued to e-mail an "Interest-Based Negotiations Team Communiqué" to WESD employees subsequent to each scheduled, full-day IBN meeting (*Attachment A*). Additional measures, including posting the communiqué in staff lounges, making hard copies available and translating the communiqué into Spanish, were instituted this year to further promote process transparency and to help employees understand the impact of external legislative and economic factors on WESD's budget.

Another medium for employee communication was the November 2010 WESD Working Conditions Survey. Developed by an IBN subcommittee and accessible online to all staff, this anonymous questionnaire assessed employees' perceptions of their work environment. In addition to serving as a vehicle for staff input, the survey encouraged and facilitated communication between supervisors and employees. Each school and department supervisor received the overall District-wide survey results (*Attachment B*), as well as a general recap of the given site's responses to survey questions; the sharing of this information with staff prompted valuable site-level discussion and idea generation.

Interest-Based Negotiations (IBN) Team's Recommendations for 2010-2011

April 8, 2010

Page 3

The recommendations that are included in this agenda item address the “best-case scenario” with regard to anticipated WESD budget reductions. If Proposition 100, Arizona’s temporary one-cent sales tax initiative, is not approved by voters on May 18, 2010, the District’s budget reductions will increase from \$8.2 million (reduced from Maintenance and Operations budget) to \$19.3 million (\$14.3 million reduced from Maintenance and Operations budget, plus \$5.0 million reduction of other funds). Should that occur, additional budget reduction recommendations will be submitted to the Governing Board.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

Contingent on the passage of Proposition 100 on May 18, 2010, it is recommended that the Governing Board approve the following:

1. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve implementation of the 2010-2011 work furlough plan that is designated as *Attachment C*.
2. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve District departmental budget reductions of at least \$800,000, to include staff and other resources, for 2010-2011.
3. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve common dismissal times for 2010-2011 for students in grades kindergarten through six within each particular elementary school.
4. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve the elimination of gradual entry for kindergartners for 2010-2011.
5. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve maintaining the 2009-2010 class size increase of 1.4 and increasing the maximum class size by an additional 0.6 for 2010-2011.
6. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve continuing the current status of eliminating the teacher attendance incentive for 2010-2011.
7. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve continuing the current status of eliminating all hard-to-fill stipends, including those for mathematics, science and special education teachers, for 2010-2011.
8. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve continuing the current status of the 25 percent reduction of the stipend paid to National Board certified teachers for 2010-2011.
9. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve continuing the current status of the 25 percent reduction of the stipend paid to BEGIN teachers for each of the three years of the BEGIN program for 2010-2011.
10. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve continuing the current status of the 25 percent reduction of the stipend paid to program coaches for summer work for 2010-2011.
11. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve continuing the current status of the 25 percent reduction of the stipend paid to “other professionals,” including psychologists, speech therapists, social workers and counselors, for 2010-2011.

Interest-Based Negotiations (IBN) Team's Recommendations for 2010-2011

April 8, 2010

Page 4

12. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve continuing the current status of the 25 percent reduction of the stipend paid to after-school athletic coaches for 2010-2011.
13. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve continuing the current pay-to-play fees for after-school athletics for 2010-2011.
14. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve continuing the current status of the 25 percent reduction of the substitute budget for 2010-2011.
15. It is recommended that the Governing Board authorize the Superintendent or designee to give each school a substitute budget allocation for each semester during 2010-2011, to be used for both substitutes and class coverage. It is further recommended that the Governing Board approve that if the allocation is fully used, classrooms must be covered at the site level, without benefit of class coverage pay. It is further recommended that the Governing Board approve that long-term absences be excluded from the substitute allocation.
16. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve honoring all lane changes for teachers, speech therapists, principals and assistant principals for 2010-2011.
17. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve permitting out-of-county and/or out-of-state field trips for 2010-2011, as long as no District funding (M&O funding) is utilized.
18. It is recommended the Governing Board approve that stipends for yearbook, National Junior Honor Society and student council advisors be added for 2010-2011 at a 25 percent reduction from their respective 2008-2009 stipend level; it is further recommended that the Governing Board approve the addition of 25 hours of discretionary funding per school for 2010-2011. The cost of these additions is \$70,000.

Interest-Based Negotiations Recommendations for 2010-2011

I. Identify the issue from the perspective of involved stakeholders.

Issue:

Each school year, the Interest-Based Negotiations (IBN) Team analyzes the District's employee compensation programs and makes recommendations to the Governing Board for the subsequent year. The recommendations should meet the best interests of the District, with student achievement the ultimate goal. In planning for a year in which District revenues are likely to increase, IBN's proposal typically includes some or all of the following: individual salary increases, market salary adjustments, compression relief, service awards, supplemental monies, incentives and stipends. When considering a year in which diminished revenues are anticipated, IBN's proposal focuses on budget reductions. In both scenarios, however, IBN seeks to attract and retain a stable, quality, motivated workforce, maintain parity and protect the integrity of programs throughout WESD and support the District's vision, mission and values.

As IBN Team members have pursued their charge this school year, they have faced significant fiscal and legislative challenges. Economically, they have had to address potential Maintenance and Operations budget reductions of \$8.6 million, if Proposition 100, the temporary, one-cent sales tax initiative, passes on May 18, 2010, and \$14.6 million, if the proposition fails. The state legislature's approval of HB2011 necessitated that IBN address WESD's current reduction in force (RIF) and excess procedures. The team's recommendations have also been influenced by federal legislation such as the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and Race to the Top. Throughout their very challenging process, IBN members have struggled to *preserve* compensation to the greatest extent possible, while minimizing adverse impact on students.

Involved Stakeholders:

The 2009-2010 IBN Team is comprised of certified, classified and administrator employee representatives; Superintendent Dr. Susie Cook serves as representative for the Governing Board. Of the 24-member team, 18 are voting members, and the remaining 6 are non-voting, resource persons. Please refer to *Attachment D* for a list of 2009-2010 IBN members.

IBN Team members participated in five scheduled, full-day meetings. IBN also met as a full group on three additional dates for after-school meetings. Members of IBN's three subcommittees, Working Conditions, Reduction in Force and Budget, met on numerous other occasions during late afternoon/early evening hours.

II. Identify the options or alternatives that address the issue, including an option to maintain the status quo, utilizing the efficient and sufficient use of research and data. For each option, identify advantages and disadvantages.

Research/Data:

Research conducted by the IBN Team included the following:

- Developing, implementing and analyzing results (*Attachment B*) of a District-wide employee working conditions survey
- Tracking legislative updates at the state level, e.g., status of proposed K-12 education-related bills, particularly HB2011; 2010-2011 education funding, Proposition 301 funds, etc.
- Tracking legislative activity at the federal level, e.g., Federal Stimulus Funds for Title I, Federal Stimulus Funds for IDEA, State Fiscal Stabilization Funds, Race to the Top and other funding provisions of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)
- Receiving frequent WESD financial status updates from Director of Business Services Cathy Thompson
- Reviewing WESD policies/regulations that pertain to reduction in force and staff assignments and transfers

Options – 2010-2011 SCHOOL YEAR

In light of legislative and economic conditions, several issues materialized as priority concerns of the 2009-2010 IBN Team. These issues, the related options that team members generated, the criteria according to which they considered each option and their ensuing IBN recommendations are described below.

ISSUE: TEACHER REDUCTION IN FORCE (RIF) CRITERIA

- **Description**
 - With the passage of HB2011, seniority can no longer be used as a criterion for determining which teachers would be RIFFED, if a RIF were implemented.
 - Based on the December 2009 opinion of outside legal counsel, procedures outlined in the current Governing Board Policy GCQA will apply to a RIF that becomes effective at the end of the 2009-2010 school year.
 - Prior to issuing 2010-2011 teacher contracts, GCQA must be revised to include RIF criteria other than seniority
- **Options**

The following options were brainstormed in response to the question, “Upon what criteria should the reduction in force of teachers be based?”

 - Employee on an improvement plan
 - Educational background: years of experience; advanced degrees
 - Return-to-work employees
 - Number of days absent/overall attendance
 - Emergency-certified/not highly qualified
 - Tie it in with productive culture, possibly including peer survey
 - Additional professional development related to assignment
 - Performance evaluation – four considerations:

- Change WESD certified evaluation to include more factors or ratings
- Differing criteria for less-than-three-year teachers and more-than-three-year teachers
- Same criteria for all
- Peer-to-peer evaluation
- Early retirement program
- Parent satisfaction
- Point system that incorporates more than one option, e.g., productive culture, Teacher Supervisory Process
- Highly qualified or endorsed in multiple areas
- Categories of contracts, e.g., interim contract
- Probationary employment period
- Individuals who occupy positions that are being eliminated
- Part-time employees
- Overall teaching experience, e.g., grades taught, out-of-state experience, teaching in various programs
- Achievement/growth of students
- Other things a teacher does/did for the school, e.g., serving on committees, leadership
- Discipline, e.g., letter of reprimand

• **Evaluating Options**

- Some options were eliminated because they are not viable, e.g., impossible to quantify, difficult to apply consistently throughout the District, more appropriately addressed via disciplinary action.
- Other options were eliminated because they are regarded as having negligible correlation with teacher effectiveness.
- The advantages and disadvantages of the following options were considered:

- **Improvement plan**

Plus	Minus
An employee is put on a plan for a reason.	Does an employee on a plan have to be given the entire length of plan to improve (legal question)?
Every employee has the opportunity to avoid being put on a plan.	What evaluation tool do we use?
It is best for students.	Which evaluation should be used? Last year's evaluation? Average of past three years of evaluations?
Meets direction in which education is going (RTTT)	Possible evaluator inconsistencies; supervisors need to be educated on evaluations; need to be consistent and use same standards
Since 98% of teachers are "exceeding," those on an improvement plan must have a "glaring" problem.	If RIF teachers have recall rights, person on improvement plan could be brought back
Would allow administrators to focus on things that are good for kids	

▪ Productive Culture Rubric

Plus	Minus
Schools would be happy places.	Principals would have to use the rubric to rate every teacher.
Principals would be happy.	Could be seen as subjective; would need to have evidence; would need to be quantifiable
Supports life-long learning	Possibly would be applied inconsistently
Focus would be on kids	
More sharing of the responsibilities	
Rubric already exists and supports WESD philosophy	
Every employee has opportunity to own his or her behavior	
Can be used in conjunction with other criteria, e.g., the performance piece	

▪ Performance evaluation

Plus	Minus
Every employee has the opportunity to avoid a poor evaluation; employee has ownership	What evaluation tool do we use?
It is best for students.	Which evaluation should be used? Last year's evaluation? Average of past three years of evaluations?
Meets direction in which education is going (RTTT)	Possible evaluator inconsistencies; supervisors need to be educated on evaluations; need to be consistent and use same standards
Since 98% of teachers are "exceeding," those who receive a poor evaluation must have a "glaring" problem.	Current evaluation tool too limited; need to expand
Would allow administrators to focus on things that are good for kids	Hard to commit to something that hasn't been created
	Is the principal capable of evaluating special area teachers?
Current evaluation tool includes "areas of growth," and principal can designate areas of growth even if teacher receives satisfactory rating; however, "area of growth" section is applied inconsistently among principals	
Can create consistency in use of current evaluation instrument if training is provided for principals	

Use of instrument with first-year teachers
Use of directed growth plan

▪ Achievement/growth of students

Plus	Minus
Use of multiple data sources	How would growth be measured?
Define the meaning of growth	
“Monitoring Student Progress” is part of current teacher evaluation instrument	

Achievement/growth of students not tied to AIMS
Tool for measuring student growth would have to be applicable to clientele, including high-mobility students
Consider a variety of measures of student growth, e.g., student attendance

▪ Discipline

Plus	Minus
Employees have the opportunity to avoid discipline.	Inconsistent implementation by supervisors
Best for students	Behavior may have changed.
	Teachers who are new to the District have not had time to establish a discipline pattern.

<i>How far to go back?</i>
<i>What level of discipline to use?</i>
<i>How do you quantify?</i>
<i>Not a stand-alone criterion</i>
<i>Should this be included under Performance Evaluation? Two reasons statement of charges can be brought against a teacher: conduct and inadequacy of performance. If teacher demonstrates inadequacy of performance, has opportunity to improve; not the case if conduct issue</i>

▪ Service and leadership, i.e., things teachers have done for their school

Plus	Minus
Opportunity to recognize people who go above and beyond	Can this turn into career ladder?
Employees have the opportunity	Instruction may suffer by teacher who devotes too much time/effort to service/leadership
	Some teachers may get paid for service/leadership positions
	Less-than-3-yr teachers are encouraged not to participate in service/leadership

	activities.
	Personal circumstances may prohibit teachers from participating.
	We may not want some teachers to participate.
<i>Must be reasonable and attainable</i>	
<i>Everyone must be given equal opportunity</i>	
<i>Does this impact student achievement?</i>	

- Educational background

Plus	Minus
More knowledge, skills	Doesn't necessarily correlate with performance
Consistent with current salary schedule	Personal circumstances may prohibit pursuing additional education
Reinforcing life-long learning/valuing education	Less-than-3-yr teachers are encouraged not to take additional coursework.
May positively impact teaching	May be unfair for people new to the profession – haven't had opportunity to complete additional coursework
<i>Value may depend on how, where person receives their education</i>	

- Highly qualified/certification/endorsement/experience

Plus	Minus
Staffing	
Consideration for hard to fill positions	
Aligns with District mission	
Positive impact on kids	
Multiple endorsements/certification shows adaptability	
Overall teaching experience	
<i>Showing evidence of working on certification</i>	
<i>Multiple endorsements/certificates not necessarily better than 1 certificate in hard-to-fill area</i>	
<i>Highly qualified and highly effective are 2 different things</i>	

- Categories of contracts

Plus	Minus
<i>Currently have emergency-certified contracts and return-to-work contracts: No expectations (per statute) of being issued a contract for the following year. Stated in contract that it is non-renewable</i>	

- Each of the options above was then evaluated against the following four evaluation criteria that subcommittee members had previously established:
 - Attract and maintain a stable, highly qualified workforce while protecting the integrity of programming and parity.
 - Develop fair, equitable and clear procedures for RIF, should they be necessary.
 - Maintain District autonomy in decision-making while meeting the requirements of statute and regulation, including Race to the Top.
 - Focus on/maximize student achievement/growth.

The options for which there was consensus were weighted and integrated into a rubric (*Attachment E*).

- **Recommendation**

In light of the evaluation results, IBN has recommended an amended version of Governing Board Policy GCQA, which includes implementation of the Reduction in Force Rubric.

ISSUE: TEACHER REDUCTION IN FORCE (RIF) REAPPOINTMENT

- **Description**

- With the passage of HB2011, the preferred right of reappointment for RIFFED teachers has been eliminated.
- The elimination of statutory RIF reappointment rights does not preclude the District from establishing RIF reappointment procedures.

- **Options/Evaluating Options**

- Option A: Include no RIF reappointment in relevant District policy.

Plus	Minus
Doesn't bind District into placing low-performing teachers back in classroom	Deep RIF could get rid of good teachers
Could restrict us from placing most qualified person in position	Uncertainties regarding years of service and salary credit given if RIFFED and rehired
Would help move education forward by removing poor teachers and giving new teachers opportunities	
Still have opportunity to rehire RIFFED teachers; hiring principal could be given rubric information	
Timeliness to fill positions	

- Option B: Reestablish RIF reappointment procedures that existed in policy prior to HB2011.

Plus	Minus
Some RIFFED teachers may be okay	Could be bringing back unproductive personnel
Good for teacher morale	Causes delays in hiring

	May violate prohibition of using seniority since reappointment is based on seniority
--	--

- Option C: Implement revised RIF reappointment procedures.
 - Revision suggestion #1: RIF reappointment based on rubric scores; eliminate anyone on improvement plan; shorten timeline to 2-3 days; valid for one year only
 - Revision suggestion #2: If RIFFED and reemployed, would receive years of service and salary credit; valid for one year only
 - Revision suggestion #3: No reappointment rights, but if RIFFED and reemployed, would receive years of service and salary credit; valid for one year only
 - Revision suggestion #4: No reappointment rights, but streamlined RIF rehiring process; prior to external posting of certified vacancies, principals would receive list of RIFFED teachers and their rubric scores; RIFFED teacher would not have to reapply if a principal wishes to place teacher at his or her school; if RIFFED and reemployed, would receive years of service and salary credit; valid for one year only

Rif Subcommittee members reached a consensus decision to recommend Option C/Revision suggestion #4.

- **Recommendation**

In light of the evaluation results, IBN has recommended an amended version of Governing Board Policy GCQA, which includes Option C/Revision suggestion #4.

ISSUE: BUDGET REDUCTIONS – BEST-CASE SCENARIO (\$8.2 MILLION REDUCTION OF MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS FUNDS)

- **Description**

The 2010-2011 budget that was approved by the Arizona Legislature in March 2010 is contingent upon voters’ approval of Proposition 100, Arizona’s temporary one-cent sales tax initiative, on May 18, 2010. If Proposition 100 passes, WESD anticipates making Maintenance and Operations budget reductions of \$8.6 million.

- **Options/Evaluating Options**

IBN members brainstormed budget savings options for the District, and the IBN Budget Subcommittee refined and evaluated those options.

Options I through VI, below, are included in IBN’s 2010-2011 best-case scenario recommendations.

- **Option I: Increase 2009-2010 maximum class sizes by 0.6 students at each grade level. Projected M&O Savings for 2010-2011: \$1.9 M**

Plus	Minus
Class size average not near our goal (1.4 plus old maximum)	Morale for those having larger class size
Assists with budget (\$900K savings)	Physical limitations of classroom, e.g., Fire Marshall, SFB

Student enrollment has been decreasing.	Affects larger schools more than smaller ones
At least one class may have that maximum; just the others do not.	Parents may withdraw from District
	RIF may be necessary
	Added workload

- **Option II: Implement common dismissal for grades K-6 within each particular school.**
Projected M&O Savings for 2010-2011: \$0.25M*

Plus	Minus
K-2 students will be able to walk home with older siblings.	Longer day for K-2 students
Less chance for lost K-2 students	Increase in FTE for special area teachers
Less daycare costs for parents	MOST program impacted – loss of funds from K-2 students
Increased instructional time in grades K-2 (40 minutes additional per day equates to 18 days per year)	Loss of state funding for fewer miles driven (minimal impact)
Reduced Transportation Dept. costs	Parking lot logistics; concern about all parents arriving at school at same time to pick up students
Route consistency; same bus for morning and afternoon run; less confusion for parents, students and school staff; better student behavior with consistent driver	
K-2 students not sitting in office after early dismissal	
Increased time for daily field trips; could return an hour later than current	
School staff has bus duty one time.	
Pool of spare buses would increase	
Less miles accumulated on buses; less fuel consumption	
If a bus is running late for first run, second run at same school won't be affected	
3.3 hours less per week will help eliminate driver overtime	
Mechanics would have nearly an additional hour per day to service/repair buses.	

*Summary of Estimated Cost Savings – Common Dismissal

Transportation Savings		
Wages (40 minutes per day per route)	\$	265,273
Mileage (954 miles per day)		343,440
Eliminate 10 routes (driver wages)		144,892
Eliminate 5 routes (assistant wages)		50,591
<u>Mileage savings for 10 routes</u>		<u>216,000</u>
		\$ 1,020,196
Increased Cost – Special Area Teachers (Approx. 14 FTE at current class size rubric)		-700,000
Increased Cost – Instructional Assistants (Estimated 1.25 FTE added)		-88,218
Estimated Savings – Crossing Guards (Eliminate 4.8 FTE)		80,000
Est. Net Savings for Common Dismissal		\$311,977.55
Adjustment for Unforeseen Program Expenses		-61,977.55
FINAL Net Savings for Common Dismissal		\$250,000.00

- **Option III: Implement the work furlough plan designated as Attachment C.**
Projected M&O Savings for 2010-2011: \$3.8M

Plus	Minus
Temporary	May be hard for individuals to budget for
Generates significant savings	Only have so many days without affecting student days
Retain current salary level/scale	Furlough days usually happen around holidays
Since budget is unknown, may be able to eliminate some approved furlough days throughout upcoming school year	Have not had to take furlough days this year; not a reality to employees
Employees are familiar with this measure.	If economy does not improve, we will be doing this again
Other districts have done this.	
“We are all in this together.”	

- **Option IV: Reduce department budgets.**
Projected M&O Savings for 2010-2011: \$0.8M

Plus	Minus
Shows everyone is in same boat	Made significant department reductions last year
Might help change perception that more money is spent outside of classroom	Spreads departments too thin
Some would rather see a cut in service	Workload increases for others,

than other cuts, e.g., salary	including school staff.
	Service is reduced or delayed.
	Hurts morale
	Staff may be improving efficiency and/or saving money; those benefits would be eliminated.
	Could have compliance issues

- **Option V: Reduce administrator positions.**

Projected M&O Savings for 2010-2011: \$0.3M

Plus	Minus
Shows everyone is in same boat	Administration accounts for relatively low percentage of WESD budget compared to other districts
Might help change perception that more money is spent outside of classroom	Would increase workload of other employees
	Service may be reduced or delayed.

- **Option VI: Maximize the K-3 override and Title I budget to alleviate the M&O budget.**

Projected M&O Savings for 2010-2011: \$1.6M

Plus	Minus
No salary reduction	7 “unfunded” positions
Possibly fewer furlough days	Requires much effort to put into place
Less stress	If Senator Braswell’s initiative doesn’t pass in the Legislature, all planned furlough days will persist.
Could help employee morale	Puts full-day kindergarten at risk five years from now
More transparency to voters and employees with regard to full-day kindergarten	

Options VII through XIV were considered by IBN; however, they are not included in IBN’s 2010-2011 best-case scenario recommendations.

- **Option VII: Reduce schools’ supply budget.**
- **Option VIII: Reduce teacher salaries by 4% (Proposition 301).**
- **Option IX: Reduce all employee salaries by 4%.**
- **Option X: Replace librarians with library technicians**
- **Option XI: Eliminate all M&O stipends.**
- **Option XII: Eliminate computer technicians.**
- **Option XIII: Replace nurses with health services technicians.**
- **Option XIV: Reduce computer technicians and library technicians to 0.75 FTE.**

IBN members also discussed and approved recommending continuation of the current status of several recommendations that had been approved by the Governing Board for 2009-2010; these are designated as numbers 6 through 17 under the “recommendations” section that follows.

III. Prepare a cost-benefit analysis/cost assessment of each option.

The following recap of estimated budget reductions for 2010-2011 incorporates and reflects the recommendations proposed by the IBN Team:

<i>Estimated Funding Loss – Levy Funds</i>	\$7,911,840
<i>Estimated Funding Loss –Prop. 301 (salary portion)</i>	3,289,679
TOTAL REDUCTION	11,201,519

Type of Reduction	Amount of Reduction
Maintain Class Size	\$1,000,000
Common Dismissal	250,000
Work Furlough	3,803,149
Increase Class Size by Additional 0.6 Student at Each Grade Level	900,000
Department Reductions	800,000
Reduce Administrator Positions	300,000
Academic Intervention (K-3 Override)	1,576,256
SUBTOTAL	8,629,405
Unused 2010 Budget Capacity	2,600,000
NET	\$ 27,886

IV. Seeking stakeholder feedback when relevant and/or necessary.

Employees received IBN communiqués (*Attachment A*) via e-mail following each IBN meeting. In addition to providing updated information, each communiqué sought to dispel rumors and to encourage employees to share their questions, comments and suggestions with their respective IBN representative. Each communiqué listed the names and e-mail addresses of all IBN Team members.

V. Use conclusion(s) to develop a rationale and prepare recommendation(s) to present to the Governing Board for action.

Conclusions:

- As a result of national, state and local economic challenges, declining student enrollment and Arizona’s budget shortfall, WESD is faced with significant fiscal challenges for 2010-2011.

- With regard to the 2009-2010 IBN process, the Governing Board's interests and those of the IBN Team are very closely aligned. Both groups have sought to balance the budget, protect programming, support morale, obtain staff buy-in, retain employees, focus on student achievement and maintain parity among schools. These interests are reflected in the recommendations that IBN is presenting.

Recommendations:

1. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve implementation of the 2010-2011 work furlough plan that is designated as *Attachment C*.
2. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve District departmental budget reductions of \$800,000 for 2010-2011.
3. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve common dismissal times for 2010-2011 for students in grades kindergarten through six within each particular elementary school.
4. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve the elimination of gradual entry for kindergartners for 2010-2011.
5. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve maintaining the 2009-2010 class size increase of 1.4 and increasing the maximum class size by an additional 0.6 for 2010-2011.
6. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve continuing the current status of eliminating the teacher attendance incentive for 2010-2011.
7. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve continuing the current status of eliminating all hard-to-fill stipends, including those for mathematics, science and special education teachers, for 2010-2011.
8. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve continuing the current status of the 25 percent reduction of the stipend paid to National Board certified teachers for 2010-2011.
9. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve continuing the current status of the 25 percent reduction of the stipend paid to BEGIN teachers for each of the three years of the BEGIN program for 2010-2011.
10. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve continuing the current status of the 25 percent reduction of the stipend paid to program coaches for summer work for 2010-2011.
11. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve continuing the current status of the 25 percent reduction of the stipend paid to "other professionals," including psychologists, speech therapists, social workers and counselors, for 2010-2011.
12. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve continuing the current status of the 25 percent reduction of the stipend paid to after-school athletic coaches for 2010-2011.

13. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve continuing the current pay-to-play fees for after-school athletics for 2010-2011.
14. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve continuing the current status of the 25 percent reduction of the substitute budget for 2010-2011.
15. It is recommended that the Governing Board authorize the Superintendent or designee to give each school a substitute budget allocation for each semester during 2010-2011, to be used for both substitutes and class coverage. It is further recommended that the Governing Board approve that if the allocation is fully used, classrooms must be covered at the site level, without benefit of class coverage pay. It is further recommended that the Governing Board approve that long-term absences be excluded from the substitute allocation.
16. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve honoring all lane changes for teachers, speech therapists, principals and assistant principals for 2010-2011.
17. It is recommended that the Governing Board approve permitting out-of-county and/or out-of-state field trips for 2010-2011, as long as no District funding (M&O funding) is utilized.
18. It is recommended the Governing Board approve that stipends for yearbook, National Junior Honor Society and student council advisors be added for 2010-2011 at a 25 percent reduction from their respective 2008-2009 stipend level; it is further recommended that the Governing Board approve the addition of 25 hours of discretionary funding per school for 2010-2011. The cost of these additions is \$70,000.

IBN Recommended Work Furlough Plan for 2010-2011 – DRAFT OF PROPOSED SCHEDULE

The work furlough plan distinguishes work furlough days by calendar days paid, providing for employees who work 193 days to take up to 7 furlough days, employees who work 208 or 220 days to take up to 8 furlough days, employees who work 227 days to take up to 9 furlough days and employees who work 261 days to take up to 10 furlough days. A draft of the specific days and the order in which the days would be taken, based on budgetary need, are indicated below. Final dates are to be determined by IBN.

Paid Days	Employee Groups	Labor Day 9/6/2010	One Day During Fall Break 10/12/2010	Day After Veterans Day 11/12/2010	Day After Thanks-giving 11/26/2010	Day Before Winter Break 12/17/2010	One Day During Winter Break 12/22/2010	MLK Day 1/17/2011	Presidents Day 2/21/2011	One Day During Spring Break 3/17/2011	Second Day During Spring Break 3/18/2011	Last Day of Contract
193	Instructional Assts, Crossing Guards, Bus Drivers, Bus Assts, Monitors, Office Assts, Food Service	X			X		X	X	X	X	X	
208	Teachers, Speech Therapists, Librarians, Nurses, Health Service Techs, OTs/PTs, Social Workers, Audiologists, Food Service Mgrs, Head Start Instructors, Head Start Support Instructors	X			X	X		X	X	X	X	5/26/2011
220	Psychologists	X			X	X		X	X	X	X	6/9/2011
227	Principals, Asst Principals, Office Mgrs, School Office Techs	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	6/9/2011
261	12-Month Employees	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	

WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 6

TO: Governing Board X Action
X Discussion
FROM: Dr. Susan J. Cook, Superintendent Information
1st Reading

DATE: October 28, 2010

AGENDA ITEM: Work Furlough

INITIATED BY: Cathy Thompson, Director of Business Services SUBMITTED BY: Dr. Susan J. Cook, Superintendent

PRESENTER AT GOVERNING BOARD MEETING: Dr. Susan J. Cook, Superintendent

GOVERNING BOARD POLICY REFERENCE OR STATUTORY CITATION: BBA

SUPPORTING DATA

Funding Source: Various
 Budgeted: Yes

On April 8, 2010, IBN offered a series of recommendations to the Governing Board regarding the budget for 2010-2011, including scheduling two work furlough days for employees if necessary. The two furlough days were scheduled for November 26, 2010 and March 18, 2011. There is a need to consider each day separately and account for the current budget conditions at the appropriate time when recommendations are being offered.

At this time, districts in Arizona are awaiting information regarding accessing the federal Education Jobs funding. Preliminary allocations have been posted, but for a variety of reasons, likely including the State's deficit, districts do not yet have access to the funding.

WESD has implemented a consistent and aggressive energy conservation program. Because of the efforts of our staff, WESD was able to spend \$600,000.00 less on energy last year than budgeted. If those same efforts continue this year, there will be sufficient budget capacity to remove one furlough day.

Combining the two variables, the potential Education Jobs funding and the track record of energy savings, we believe that it is fiscally responsible to recommend that November 26, 2010 be designated as a regular, paid holiday for employees. In these difficult economic times, we believe that every effort must be exhausted to preserve jobs and support our employees to the extent possible.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Governing Board designate November 26, 2010 as a regular, paid holiday.

Superintendent _____

Board Action	Motion	Second	Ave	Nav	Abstain
Adams					
Graziano					
Jahneke					
Lambert					
Maza					

WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 6

TO: Governing Board X Action
X Discussion
FROM: Dr. Susan J. Cook, Superintendent Information
1st Reading

DATE: January 27, 2011

AGENDA ITEM: Work Furlough

INITIATED BY: Cathy Thompson, Director of Business Services SUBMITTED BY: Dr. Susan J. Cook, Superintendent

PRESENTER AT GOVERNING BOARD MEETING: Dr. Susan J. Cook, Superintendent

GOVERNING BOARD POLICY REFERENCE OR STATUTORY CITATION: BBA, Public Law No. 111-226 (Act)

SUPPORTING DATA

Funding Source: Education Jobs Funding, Various
 Budgeted: Yes

On April 8, 2010, IBN offered a series of recommendations to the Governing Board regarding the budget for 2010-2011, including scheduling two work furlough days for employees if necessary. The two furlough days were scheduled for November 26, 2010 and March 18, 2011. Eligible employees were paid for the November 26 holiday in accordance with the Governing Board’s action on October 28, 2010. There is a need to consider each day separately and account for the current budget conditions at the appropriate time when recommendations are being offered.

In November 2010, Washington Elementary School District was awarded approximately \$4.1 million in federal Education Jobs funding. WESD’s Interest-Based Negotiation (IBN) Team has been charged with developing recommendations for the District’s use of its fund allocation. During their January 13, 2011 meeting, team members applied an interest-based approach to consider how the funds might be spent most judiciously and in compliance with legislated timelines and allowable expenditures. Director of Business Services Cathy Thompson shared background information (“story”), and IBN members discussed “interests,” i.e., underlying concerns, needs and desires pertaining to the issue. The following are among their identified interests:

- Maximizing resources
- Spending wisely and according to a prudent timeline

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Governing Board designate March 18, 2011 as a regular, paid holiday.

Superintendent _____

Board Action	Motion	Second	Aye	Nay	Abstain
Adams					
Graziano					
Jahneke					
Lambert					
Maza					

- Protecting the financial status of employees
- Being good stewards of the public's money
- Allocating funds fairly
- Improving employee morale
- Protecting the 2011-2012 budget and offsetting the impact on employees of possible budget reductions

IBN members proposed and discussed several options based on those Education Jobs fund expenditures deemed allowable according to the U.S. Department of Education's August 13, 2010 publication, "Initial Guidance for States on the Education Jobs Fund Program." After evaluating each option for alignment with the stated interests, the team reached a consensus decision to recommend that a portion of the funds (approximately \$339,000) be used to eliminate the scheduled March 18, 2011 furlough day for eligible employees. Members also agreed that the remainder of the Education Jobs funding will be further discussed at subsequent IBN meetings and with the Governing Board. If the District receives notification that unused funds will be recalled prior to the published September 30, 2012 deadline for local education authorities' use of allocated funds, recommendations for any unused funds will be brought to the Governing Board immediately. Otherwise, this is the first of many recommendations that IBN will bring forth regarding WESD's use of its Education Jobs fund allocation.

Because some positions at the District level are not eligible to be paid from Education Jobs funds, other funding sources must be applied if the March furlough day is to be eliminated for the employees who hold those positions. At this time, there is sufficient budget capacity to cover the furlough day for this group of employees.

Combining the two variables, the Education Jobs funding and the budget savings realized to date, we believe that it is fiscally responsible to recommend that March 18, 2011 be designated as a regular, paid holiday for employees. In these difficult economic times, we believe that every effort must be exhausted to preserve jobs and support our employees to the extent possible.