

EVANSVILLE COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Support Staff Employee Compensation Committee Minutes

The Support Staff Employee Compensation Committee meeting was held Thursday, February 6, 2014, at 4:30 pm in the District Board and Training Center Room.

Attendance

Members in attendance: Eric Busse, Linda Gard, Barb Krumwiede, Mindy Larson, Kelly Mosher, Ivy Otto, Tina Rossmiller, Jerry Roth, Jane Sperry, Tina Thornton, and Doreen Treuden. Absent: Mary Beth Anderson and Sue Parsons.

Approve Minutes

Motion by Mr. Roth, seconded by Ms. Gard, moved to approve the minutes as presented. Discussion to add comment made on asking for comparables that have a schedule that goes beyond five years. Minutes adequate as presented. Motion carried.

Discussion on comparable data. Ms. Mosher will contact schools who had provided comparable data, asking how they handle employees with more years of service.

Review Goals and Mission Statements

Mr. Roth had provided drafts of compensation system goals and mission statement. He shared a revised draft from the Teachers Employee Compensation Committee of a combined mission statement.

Discussion on draft goals. Number 6 is vague and possible revisions:

- a. Develop, appropriate and sustainable compensation based on districts annual revenue.
- b. Develop an equitable and motivating compensation system based on districts annual revenue.
- c. Develop an equitable compensation system based on annual revenue.

Motion by Ms. Larson, seconded by Ms. Gard, to approve the Goals, with C (above) as the new #6. Motion carried.

Discussion on draft mission statement. Most liked the revised draft combined mission statement.

Motion by Ms. Mosher, seconded by Ms. Rossmiller, moved to approve the combined mission statement that the teachers had approved. Motion carried.

Review of Past Compensation Models

Past compensation models discussed and pros and cons lists created:

Pros:

1. Addresses the years of service
2. Like the longevity statement in food service
3. Added steps to the support staff handout – revise for next time
4. Having classifications is a pro

5. It's predictable
6. Administrative assistants are missing a schedule
7. Easy to understand and explain
8. It awards to 20 years which is good
9. Not performance based

Cons:

1. Not performance based
2. Classifications are too narrow

Current State of Compensation

The District is hiring staff, in the absence of a Collective Bargaining Agreement, and a compensation model, placing educational assistants' people at a starting wage that is based on the salary schedule.

Discussion of the Mayo clinic article included pros that job appreciation and time provided to staff are more important than compensation to Mayo employees. Mayo Clinic are able to hire employees at a lower pay rate because they are happy with the working conditions.

Sample Compensation Models

Pros and cons of the samples from districts were created:

East Troy –

Pros:

1. More classifications – whatever that means
2. Not impressed
3. Movement is annual 1-5 years of service
4. Educational assistants are separated by assignment

Cons:

1. Confusing
2. Schedule does not have movement after 5 years

Jefferson –

Pros:

1. Educational Assistants are separated by job duties
2. There is movement every year

Cons:

1. Educational Assistants are separated by job duties
2. Classifications reduce professional growth

Edgerton -

Pros:

1. Attract new hires because they are paid the same as a senior employee

Cons:

1. New hires are paid the same as senior employees
2. No schedule, no predictability

Whitewater -

Pros:

1. It's very easy to understand and all support staff are on one schedule

2. Predictable

Cons:

1. Steps are not clear
2. It appears there is no longevity past 6 years

Mr. Roth shared that the District has non-earmarked money of \$165,000 in the current budget, the underspent \$335,000 from the 2012-2013 budget and the non-earmarked money of \$218,000 for the 2014-2015 budget. Teachers would like the \$165,000 to go toward salaries. This will probably go to the Board of Education for discussion at the February 26 meeting. Next question is how to spend the \$218,000 next year's money and what to do with the underspent money from last year.

Mr. Roth gave an example of philosophy – increase in revenues will go to salary increases. This year the District received an increase of .7% from the State. A percentage of leftover money at the end of a fiscal year could maybe go towards staff stipends. Comments:

- It makes sense
 - It's a nice way to reward employees by giving back some of the money that is underspent
 - If it's going to be a stipend – it should be the same for all employees – not a percentage.
- Thumb vote: 4 sideways and 3 up

Set Next Meeting Date

Next meeting is Tuesday, March 4 at 4:30 pm.

Adjourn

Motion by Ms. Sperry, seconded by Ms. Larson, to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried.
Meeting adjourned at approximately 6:00 pm.

Submitted by Doreen Treuden, Business Manager

Approved: 3/4/14