



Denver Public Schools
Professional Compensation System for Teachers

ProComp

MEETING MINUTES

ProComp Trust Board of Directors FY20 Meeting #1

Tuesday, October 22, 2019
4:30 – 6:00 pm
Emily Griffith Campus (EGC)
1860 Lincoln St., Denver, CO 80203
11th Floor – Conf. Room 1135B or
720-423-7777, Conf ID: 1417905

In Attendance: Kris Bethscheider, Erik Johnson, Chuck Carpenter, Tom Buescher, Jeff Buck, Brian Weaver

In Attendance (phone): Scott Murphy, Lisa Flores

Others: Emily Marcus, Chris Kampe, Cara Sterling

Invited: Chris Kampe, Kris Bethscheider, Jeff Buck, Cara Sterling, Chuck Carpenter, Lisa Flores, Erik Johnson, Emily Marcus, Scott Murphy, Tom Buescher, Brian Weaver (Waller); Michelle Hix & Ramona Lewis

Called to order: 4:40pm by Buescher

After calling the meeting to order, Buescher has everyone introduce themselves due to a new year with new members:

- Tom Buescher – Community representative since close to the beginning and current Chair
- Erik Johnson – Chief Financial Officer and District representative
- Chuck Carpenter – Director of Finance and District representative
- Kris Bethscheider – DCTA rep and Social Studies teacher at West Early College
- Chris Kampe – Finance manager
- Emily Marcus – Finance team and helps with background of ProComp
- Cara Sterling – Independent counsel with Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck, LLP
- Jeff Buck – DCTA representative and Engineering teacher at South High School
- Scott Murphy – Community representative for several years
- Lisa Flores – Board of Education treasurer and District representative
- Brian – DCTA representative and sixth grade math teacher at Florida Pitt Waller

Tom asked for Board's permission to rearrange agenda. All approved.

Action Item: Approve Prior Meeting Minutes – May 20, 2019

- After Buescher asks about any corrections, additions, or questions to the minutes, Murphy moves to approve the 5/22/19 meeting minutes.

- Buescher seconds the motion
- All vote in favor of the motion. No opposition or abstentions. Minutes are approved.

Action Item: ProComp 3.0 Ballot Language Compliance

Per ProComp Trust Agreement language, the Trust Board must determine if the new ProComp 3.0 Agreement complies with the ProComp Ballot Language.

**Note: Document discussed in the following section is attached at the end of the meeting minutes.*

- Buescher explains how the Trust Board is tasked with looking through and checking the Trust Agreement compliance with the new ProComp 3.0 agreement – separately from the District and DCTA. He verified that both the District and DCTA discussed and verified their position either in person or electronically.
- Bethscheider and Kampe mentioned that there was electronic discussion.
- Bethscheider and Buck agreed that DCTA was good with the language.
- Buescher wants to understand the District side better and Kampe elaborated on the position.
- Kampe explained, in conjunction with the meeting materials “Ballot Language Compliance” document, how the document details current year budget of \$35M broken into details showing how it all aligns to the ballot language.
 - The first five parts show non-base breakouts
 - The sixth of \$13.7M shows base pay on the new schedule and then explains how it follows the two parts of the ballot language:
 - Part 1: “Increasing teaching knowledge and teaching skills by successfully completing ProComp approved advanced degrees, professional teaching standards licenses and additional training to improve classroom skills”. Kampe explained how Lane movement on the schedule addresses this aspect of the ballot language and spoke to PDUs, advanced degrees, licenses, etc. to have movement on the new scale.
 - Part 2: “Positive Evaluations of Teaching Performance” and “Meeting or Exceeding Objectives for Student Learning”. Kampe connected this to the steps and how it ties to the ballot language.
 - After discussing these main items he mentioned how the overhead part in the document is not applicable to the ballot language mentioned above as this is standard operating procedure and overhead.
 - The end of the document quantifies the cost portion of base salary by showing that if nobody on the current roster was higher than Lane 1 (Base pay not affected by Part 1 ballot language above). This shows how much less expensive base pay would be and how the new agreement complies with the ballot language.
- Sterling agrees and explains why it's necessary to talk through all of this. In the May meeting she agreed to look into and see if the Trust agreement would need to be changed. After researching, she did not think any changes would need to be made. She explained how a specific provision (Article 7.1) speaks to how the Trustees need to ensure the Trust is kept within the ballot language – the Board needs to look at it separately from DCTA and the District.
- Buescher asked how the cash payments were handled – the one-time cash payments in lieu of lane change.
 - Kame said the one-time payments were lumped into the \$13.7M on the document. Even though they are cash payments, they are associated with lane change and for the same purpose of base pay – not non-base, thus included in the \$13.7M. It is included in the budget as a cash payment but in this analysis being discussed, it's

the same incentive structure as base pay, so that is why it is included in the \$13.7M base pay number.

- Johnson clarifies that since you can't move lanes but still do something to help (such as PDUs), you would get cash in lieu of moving lanes.
- Murphy asks about the District obligation is handled with how step/lane costs may go up and that the Levy will not increase at the same rate as people move up the schedule. He also asks about how the incentives are paid, if a set amount, and if the dollars in the budget for incentives could be used for base pay if not all is used for incentives.
 - Johnson verifies that the Mill Levy will not increase. He explains how incentives are set a flat amount and to change those would require negotiations. If we see fewer staff at places with these incentives, such as Title I schools, and total combination of incentives is less than expected, then yes, we could bring that back to the Implementation Team and Board with the proposed change in budget to move some of the dollars from non-base to base.
- Murphy agrees that after reading the agreement and looking at the ballot language, everything is in compliance. He asks if and how metrics are developed for the incentives.
 - Johnson says that it is up to the Implementation Team and that they are currently developing how this will work.
- Kampe, Buescher, and Johnson discuss who is on the implementation team and if there is any current overlap with the Trust Board. There are 10 voting members – equal parts District and DCTA. Kampe is a voting member on the Implementation Team but not on the Trust Board. There are no voting member overlaps between the Trust Board and the Implementation team.
- Cara reiterates that she is comfortable and that everything is in compliance after comparing the new agreement to the ballot language. After looking at the budgets, incentive items, etc. she finds that the new agreement falls within the ballot language.
- Tom wraps up the discussion and explains that there needs to be a motion to formally agree that ProComp 3.0 agreement complies or does not comply with ballot language.
 - Johnson motions that it complies with the ballot language.
 - Buck seconds the motion.
 - After no further discussion and a vote, all members were in favor of the motion. No were opposed and no abstentions.
- The motion passes.

Action Item: Select Board Positions (Tom)

Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary

- Buescher explains that every year there needs to be a vote for a new Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary. In FY19 Buescher was the Chair and Murphy was the Secretary.
- After asking for any nominations or interest in the Chair position, Betscheider nominates Buescher as Chair and motions to keep him as Chair. Johnson seconds.
 - A vote for Buescher as Chair – Buescher abstains from voting, no opposition, and the rest of the voting members vote in favor of Buescher as Chair.
 - Buescher is voted in, and will remain, as Chair for FY20.
- Buescher explains that in general the Board prefers not to have all DCTA or all District members in all positions.
- Vice Chair nomination and voting takes place next. Weaver and Johnson nominate Buck as Vice Chair. Since there are no other nominations, Buescher declares Buck as Vice Chair by acclamation.
- Murphy was Secretary last year; Buescher asks for any interest or nominations.
 - Buescher nominates Murphy for Secretary; Buck seconds.

- Buescher declares Murphy as Secretary by acclamation as there are no other nominations.

General Discussion:

- Buescher explains how the Trust is an independent body – not District, not DCTA. Members of the Trust Board act in the interest of the beneficiaries of the Trust. Legally, members are acting as a Trustee on behalf of the teachers. It's possible there may be overlap, however, members are expected and required to act in the interest of the beneficiaries of the Trust. He asked to have Sterling explain this more at the next meeting.
- Buck asks if the Board is also responsible to the tax payers of the City and County of Denver to ensure tax dollars are being spent in accordance to the ballot language.
 - Buescher explains that as long as the Board complies with acting in the interest of the beneficiaries, you are essentially already in compliance with the ballot – the Trust Board does not technically represent the tax payers but per discussion earlier in the meeting, it is up to the Board to ensure everything is in compliance.
- Buescher encourages members to reach out to him with any questions, comments, concerns, and encourages members to talk amongst each other.
- Murphy brings up if there is a need for communication about the action of the Trust Board affirming that ProComp 3.0 is in compliance with the ballot language.
 - Johnson agrees that this is a great idea and will work with the communications team to put something in Teacher Weekly or the like for all to be aware.
 - Buescher added that once minutes are approved they are placed on the ProComp Trust Board website for the public.

Discussion Item: Future Agenda Items (Tom)

First of four required meetings for FY20. Normally remaining meetings happen: November (final audit presentation), February, and April/May (approve next year's budget)

- Meetings are required four times per year. Typically they are held:
 - November – Prior year audit for Board approval.
 - February
 - Spring to talk about the Budget – must approve and done in coordination with the District's timeline
- Sterling has reviewed the bylaws and may need some changes but nothing significant. Kampe and Sterling have discussed the possibility to restate the Trust agreement and update with new amendments. This will be discussed at the next meeting.
- Meetings will be set-up closer to the time-frame when Marcus sends out a scheduling pool to ensure a quorum is reached: 1 community member, 2 District representatives, and 2 DCTA representatives.

Adjourned: 5:12pm by Tom

ProComp 3.0 – Ballot Language Compliance

Budget Description	Budget Amount	Ballot Excerpt
Highest Priority – Retention Incentive	\$3,630,849	“Teaching in hard to staff schools”
Title I Incentive	\$9,297,992	“Teaching in hard to staff schools”
Distinguished Schools Incentive	\$584,171	“Achieving distinguished school status”
Hard to Fill Positions Incentive	\$4,232,050	“Teaching in hard to fill positions such as math, science and special education”
Tuition / Student Loan Reimbursement	\$2,685,843	“Increasing teaching knowledge and teaching skills by successfully completing ProComp approved advanced degrees, professional teaching standards licenses and additional training to improve classroom skills”
Earning Grade Increases on the Salary Schedule	\$13,724,339 ^a	“Increasing teaching knowledge and teaching skills by successfully completing ProComp approved advanced degrees, professional teaching standards licenses and additional training to improve classroom skills”
Earning Step Increases on the Salary Schedule	^b	“Positive Evaluations of Teaching Performance” and “Meeting or Exceeding Objectives for Student Learning”
Overhead Costs	\$972,567	N/A – See Trust Agreement
Total – ProComp 2019-20 Budget	\$35,127,812	

a. Total ProComp Base Pay for budget year 2019-20 amounts to ~\$352M in base pay salary plus ~\$70M benefits for a total of ~\$422M. The amount shown above reflects the portion of this total that the ProComp Trust contributes to that total.

b. Base Salary figure provided includes \$239,660 budgeted for Cash in Lieu of Lane Change. While these are cash payments made to educators, they are associated with the base pay salary schedule.

Base Salary Detail

The following components are embedded in the ProComp base salary schedule of step and grade increases, satisfying the ProComp ballot language referenced above:

Excerpts taken from the Agreement:

30-2 Vertical Movement down the Salary Schedule.

30-2-1 Professional Evaluation Step. Effective August 1 of each year, a Teacher/SSP is eligible to advance one step, consistent with the Salary Schedule, if they receive an approaching or better rating on their end-of-year evaluation rating in the previous year.

Ways to earn credits to move a grade on the salary schedule:

- **30-3-2 Advanced License/National Board.** Obtaining an Advanced License or National Board Certification equals one lane change with a cap at Lane MA+54. If a Teacher/SSP is in the MA +54 or Doctorate lanes, they will receive a base increase of \$2,000. A lane change based on an Advanced License/National Board or the \$2,000 base increase can only be earned once in a career. It is calculated as one lane movement to the right of the lane that corresponds to the educator's education/credit accrual. See example above in 30-3-1.
- **30-3-3 Professional Development Units, ELA Credit, and University Credits.**
 - 30-3-3-1 Credits for salary advancement may be obtained from:
 - University credits, which must come from a regionally accredited university or college program earned post-BA in a birth through twentyone (21) content or focus area. University credits must have been completed after the Educator's most recent and highest degree was conferred.
 - Professional Development Units ("PDUs").
 - District-sponsored PDUs provided by external providers.
 - Continuing Education Units ("CEUs") approved by District in accordance with professional affiliations/associations for PDU credits. The Implementation Team will approve the guidelines for CEU-based PDU credits.
 - Participants in required DPS ELA courses will earn DPS credit and/or graduate credit that can be used for lane movement. DPS credit (15 contact hours is the equivalent of 1 credit) is available for all ELA required classes; university credit (paid for by DPS) is available for certain courses. Participants cannot earn both DPS credit and university credit for the same class. Teachers can begin acquiring DPS credit starting in the spring semester of the 2018-19 school year for ELA classes completed.
 - Salary advancement may consist of a combination of post-BA university credits as well as DPS credits. College or university credit must be from a DPS approved institution of higher learning and applicable to the employee's current or future teaching/role or related educational field.

Quantifying the ProComp Cost Portion of Base Salary

The total cost embedded in base salary for DCTA members achieving a grade (aka lane) higher than grade 1 is \$45.3M (including benefits). All allowable methods a DCTA member can achieve a grade increase satisfy the ballot language:

“Increasing teaching knowledge and teaching skills by successfully completing ProComp approved advanced degrees, professional teaching standards licenses and additional training to improve classroom skills”

This value exceeds the \$13.7M contributed to base salary pay by the ProComp Trust.

For this analysis, the value of step increases related to ProComp has not been quantified.