

## **CHARTER**

### **Career Progression Task Force**

#### **Background**

The current teacher classification system outlined in KRS 161.1211 Classifications of teachers, is based on a model first introduced in 1921.

During recent years, much attention to educator salary and career progression has been given at both the state and national levels. Asked to study the current situation as it relates to Kentucky educators, Mr. Terry Hibpshman presented details of his research, *Toward a Coherent Kentucky Teacher Career Ladder*, October, 2017 at the meeting of the Board held October 9, 2017 (<http://www.epsb.ky.gov/mod/data/view.php?d=7&rid=331>). A synopsis of his findings are included: “Since 1921, when the Denver and Des Moines public school systems first adopted it (Hassel, 2002) the standard teacher compensation approach for the United States has been the “single salary schedule,” also known as “step and lane” compensation (Boston Teaching Policy Fellows, 2011). Since the middle of the 20th century, more than 90% of US teachers have been subject to this model (Booker & Glazerman, 2008; Pham et al., 2017). Teachers subject to the single salary schedule are paid primarily on the basis of years of experience and education level (Figlio & Kenny, 2006; Podgursky & Springer, 2006), two characteristics of teachers that have, at best, shown a weak relationship with student achievement.”

“Kentucky’s rank system has been in existence since at least the 1960’s . There are a number of ranks, beginning with Rank V, but for our purposes only Ranks III, II, and I are germane. A teacher who completes preparation at the bachelor’s level is normally hired at Rank III, and is expected to acquire, within 10 years of initial certification, a master’s degree or its equivalent. Acquisition of the master’s degree will usually result in eligibility for Rank II. Teachers who have achieved Rank II and complete at least an additional 30 college credit hours are then eligible for Rank I. Both Rank II and Rank I result in salary enhancements. Districts maintain separate salary schedules for ranks III, II, and I. The magnitude of the salary enhancement for each rank change is established by individual districts, but amounts to a median improvement for Rank II of \$4168 in annual salary (Adams, 2017). National Board certification generally makes a teacher eligible for Rank I.”

“The single salary schedule was implemented nation-wide at a time when little was known about factors associated with exemplary teaching. At that time, the operative assumption was that teachers are more or less interchangeable (Hess, 2009; Weisberg et al, 2009), and the only question at issue was how to pay them equitably. Pay scales based on years of experience were common at the time. Additional education was assumed without proof to be evidence of greater competence. At the time that the single salary schedule was implemented, many teachers did not even have bachelor’s degrees (Hakel et al., 2008; Loeb & Béteille, 2008). Experience and education level were thus proxies for what we would have really liked to measure, the capabilities of the individual teacher.”

“Master’s degree requirements have increasingly come into question as the cost of higher education has risen in recent years. Since 1985, the Consumer Price Index has risen by about 115%, while inflation in the cost of college has been at about 500% (Odland, 2012). Concurrent with the rapidly-increasing cost of college, the most common means of paying the cost has

become student loans (Avery & Turner, 2012; Amromin & Eberly, 2016). Thus, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels, college-educated persons increasingly accumulate large debts by the time they complete programs.”

“A number of States, public school districts, individual schools, and foundations...have conducted experiments in teacher career policy. ...Programs were discontinued for a variety of reasons, but...two predominate:

1. Career ladder elements imposed on existing systems with little effort to integrate them with existing elements;
2. The use of special funding, rather than redirection of existing funding, making them vulnerable to rescission in times of austerity.”

“Kentucky has to some extent recapitulated the errors of these experimental systems, to equally unimpressive effect. National Board certification and teacher leadership have been imposed on the existing single salary schedule with no obvious attempt to reengineer the system to accommodate these initiatives, and Kentucky’s one attempt at pay-for-performance, the School Rewards Trust Fund, required special funding that was rescinded in 2004.”

All quotes are from the work of Mr. Terry Hibpshman, *Toward a Coherent Kentucky Teacher Career Ladder*, October, 2017, which can be found on the EPSB website at <http://www.epsb.ky.gov/mod/data/view.php?d=7&rid=331>.

### **Purpose**

Develop a task force to review and develop a new career progression system for 21st century educators.

### **Committees of the Task Force**

The Task Force shall consist of at least three committees:

1. Steering Committee
2. Research and Technical Advisory Committee
3. Unintended Consequences Committee

### **Membership of the Committees**

The following groups are suggested as potential members:

- Association of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities (AIKCU)
- Counsel on Postsecondary Education
- Education and Workforce Development Cabinet
- Education Cooperatives
- Education Professional Standards Board
- Independent Education Preparation Program Faculty Members
- Kentucky Association of Professional Educators
- Kentucky Association of School Administrators
- Kentucky Association of School Superintendents

- Kentucky Board of Education
- Kentucky Department of Education
- Kentucky Education Association
- Kentucky School Boards Association
- Kentucky School Counselor Association
- Legislative Education Committees
- Nation Board Certified Teachers
- Prichard Committee
- Public Deans
- Public Education Preparation Program Faculty Members

### **Scope of Operation**

The Board charges the task force with reviewing and developing a new career progression system for 21st century educators and making recommendations for consideration.

The task force shall remain within statutory boundaries, but it may recommend regulatory, statutory, and policy changes to the Board.

All task force members are expected to make a time commitment to the work. EPSB staff will provide support to the task force and provide the necessary resources for the task force to complete its work.

### **Objectives**

A new career progression system should:

1. redirect existing elements (e.g., National Board certification, rank, teacher leadership, etc.) to conform to a new model of teacher capability development based on a coherent model of teacher competency; and
2. call for no new sources of funding, redirecting existing sources of funding to recognize accomplishment along the continuum of the new teacher effectiveness model.

### **Time Frame**

Once it commences, the task force will submit update reports of the new system to the Board and related recommendations will be submitted to the Board within one (1) year after its first meeting.