

Good afternoon Senators:

My name is Paul Kyлло. I live at 4054 Ibex St. NE, Salem Oregon 97305: House District 22 and Senate District 11.

I am here as a member of the Salem Keizer School Board and am speaking as an individual.

I am concerned that the proposed changes to PERS will make it more difficult for Salem Keizer and other school districts to recruit and retain employees. Salem Keizer is experiencing the same hardships in recruiting teachers as other Oregon Districts and the nation. The schools of education in Oregon do not turn out enough graduates every year to fill the open positions created through natural attrition. In the Salem Keizer School District at any given moment during the year there are between 20 - 30 positions that are not filled because we cannot find qualified applicants. Recruiters are attending career fairs around the United States to attract teachers: most recently Northern California. One of the attractions for teachers to teach in Oregon has been the promise of a reasonable retirement that would be better than in their home state at the end of a career. Without that promise, we will need to find other incentives to attract teachers: incentives that will increase district costs.

Long term teachers who still have a great deal to offer our students are waiting to see what reductions are coming so they can determine whether to continue in careers they love, working with students that they care about, or retire. Retirements mean more positions to fill and more competition for the teachers who are available. We, in Salem, will be looking at more positions we cannot fill: positions in advanced math, advanced writing, career technical programs, special education, administration and others across the learning spectrum. We need the incentive of a stable and secure retirement program to retain and attract teachers to fill our classrooms.

The proposal shared here will cost the districts more money and create heightened labor strife. If the 6% is funneled into PERS away from the IAP accounts, we face another challenge at the collective bargaining table. For employers who pay the six-percent pickup like us, we do not pay taxes on that money. Currently, the money funding the IAPs is not taxable, but replacement money other "make whole" solutions would likely be taxable adding to the funding burden of the school districts. You will be trading one

problem for another. As a union negotiator for over twenty years, I can assure you that this type of change is an issue that would push normally complacent members to the street with picket signs.

The employees who currently work for our District were given a promise when they came to work for us: a decent retirement. This is a promise we will be obligated to keep as we face our employees at the negotiations table, which will be at the expense of programs for students in need, career technical programs, reconditioned facilities, and smaller class sizes. Classrooms without teachers will not do any good. Please keep the retirement system intact so we can use it as a hook to fill our classrooms.

I am the uncle of two wonderful children: one a first year career tech teacher and the other is looking for her first job as a middle school math teacher upon graduation in May. Both are dedicated to being good teachers, and both have amassed huge student debt in pursuit of their education to become teachers. They went into teaching knowing that the salaries would not be as high as they could earn in engineering or design. Having watched their mother work in schools as a teacher and administrator for over thirty years, they hope to have a retirement at the end that will allow them to live securely. The proposed PERS changes will not let that hope come to fruition.

Please reject these harmful proposals. They will make it harder to hire and recruit qualified educators when we already have shortfalls, they will actually increase costs to school districts, and they break the promises we made to our teachers.

Thank you.