



ProComp

Transition Team Meeting
November 28, 2007

Minutes

Present: Jeff Buck, Kathy Kochis, Cal Hosman, Adrienne Army, Margaret Bobb, Rob Gould, Brad Jupp, Henry Roman; DPS Employees: Ed Freeman, Don Gilmore; Support: Dennis Wolfard, Bria Cunneen

Absent: Ann Christy, Anna Marcuerquiaga-Hughes, Michael Gaither, Brett Fuhrman

Action Item #1: Review and sign off on ProComp wording changes (handout provided)

- Editorial changes *only*
- Updated to remove work already done
- Transition team will review substantive changes to the agreement now and in the future
- Teachers have gone over all changes
- Transition Team approved wording changes
- District still needs to have the document reviewed by legal counsel

Action Item #2: Review language change proposal for 7.4 (included in previous handout)

- Committee (1338) met on Monday and made changes such as:
 - Brought section into present tense
 - Deleted references to work completed
 - Changed references to Development Plan → to rename collaboration action plan
- No issues or concerns with this section were voiced

Action Item #3: Review and discuss Transition Plan (handout provided)

- Reviewed executive summary
 - Disbanded ProComp Group (Shirley Scott, Henry Roman, Dennis Wolfard and Jeff Buck) to move the administration responsibilities of the elements into the departments
 - Significant changes to ProComp will still be brought back to the Transition Team
- All elements/functions are organized alphabetically with indication of completion for each
- Changes were suggested for clarification purposes (ex: separate internal and external evaluations and indicate the different due dates, internal → January 2008 and external → November 2009)
- Major milestones are reflected in the plan; should also be reflective of where we actually are with the program
- Note on technology enhancements: much of the projects are actually reports that are necessary vs. systems that need to be created and implemented

- Note on program evaluation: currently delayed due to lack of data and constant refining of data between DoTS and our internal evaluator, Dr. Wiley from CU-Boulder
- Internal vs. external evaluator: Dr. Wiley's work is considered internal; work is at the direction of the district
- Should the internal evaluation be brought (physically) internally? Yes, when the district has the capacity for the complicated, time consuming project.
- After minor changes are incorporated, the Transition Plan is ready for publication

Action Item #4: Discuss Hard to Serve criteria and possible changes (handout provided)

- Discussion of moving criteria to Free & Reduced Lunch (FRL) only; recommendation of the principal group to only use FRL and non-rolling forward rule for their own compensation system.
- Proposed criteria: 75% or higher FRL for High Schools, 85% or higher for Middle Schools and 87% or higher for Elementary Schools
- Criteria should be consistent between the two programs
- The federal government defines *high-needs* using FRL only
- Comments included:
 - Concerns re: variability (rolling forward was meant to smooth the data—how would this be handled?)
 - Need to look at correlation between special ed, Medicaid, ELL, crime data and FRL → what drove the change between the current and the proposed program
 - Need to consider the financial component (Kathy will run the fiscal model but because it's a bonus, the impact should be small)
 - Look at the criteria from the taxpayers' point of view, especially in terms of comprehensiveness
 - Current criteria is in place due to a compromise; other aspects were considered and the current criteria was the result of putting several pieces together to achieve a comprehensive picture (or as close to a comprehensive picture as possible)
 - Clear breaks between groups (those deemed Hard to Serve and those not identified as such) need to be derived.
 - Face validity is important (does not exist now)
 - Trivial cut-points are less defensible
 - The use of the principals to define the criteria will help create consistency in FRL paperwork
 - Simplicity makes an incentive easier to understand
- Next steps:
 - Kathy will bring the comments to the Principal Compensation meeting tomorrow and will run the fiscal model
 - Kathy and Henry will look at the current data, change the percentages of FRL for comparisons and look at using a range (changing the cut points) each year
- Group decided they are comfortable with using only FRL if we look at variability and cut-point issues.
- This could be finalized for January (for the upcoming staffing cycle).

Action Step #5: Evaluate annual bonus approach for any bonus component (handout provided)

- Due to the administrative burden of monthly ProComp payments, the proposal to change all bonuses to annual, one-time, lump-sum bonuses was discussed.
- Comments included:
 - Having 1 lump-sum at the end of the year would be more visible and could act as a retention incentive

- Discussion of signing bonuses for new teachers—possibly paying them their bonus at the beginning of the year and the veteran teachers would be paid their bonuses at the end of the year
 - Maybe handle signing bonuses separately
 - Fairness re: veteran teachers
- What about ribbed teachers? Starting late? Monthly interest accrued?
- Could be effective for the 2008/2009 school year
- A decision does not have to be reached immediately (tonight); everyone in the group should think about this item and we will return to the topic

Action Item #6: Discuss funding issues (handout provided)

- The current cost of administering the ProComp program is \$2.3 million/year (and incentives totaled only \$4m)
- TIF was never meant to pay for administration of ProComp—some charges actually need to be reversed
- Kathy will be taking this to the Trust for funding (asking for, minimum, funding of the evaluations)
- The burden is only increasing, for example, payroll cannot currently handle the workload
- DPSRS is also struggling with our current monthly payment system and the number of retro/exceptions each month
- The need to simplify the system is apparent.

Action Item #7: Removal of the requirement for a technical paper (handout provided)

- Revision of Article 3.3 in the ProComp agreement reduces the section to 1 sentence and removes the requirement of the technical paper.
- This sentence is meant to get to the intent of the paper
- It has been reviewed by both District and DCTA personnel
- Concerns regarding taking the general statement and applying it to specific situations
- Rob will bring it to next Monday's DCTA meeting
- Kathy will talk to the Trust Board on Wednesday regarding this possible change

Information: NBPTS update

- The current agreement does not limit the payment for multiple licenses—it calls for a 7% salary increase or a lane change
- Since a 9% of the index salary increase is usually less than a 7% salary increase, the financial impact on the trust of limiting multiple licenses is actually a non issue (the difference being greater under the traditional salary, the trust would not be charged for an incentive for an additional license)
- No change of language is necessary

Information: No payroll update this month.