

The background of the top half of the page is a dark blue, semi-transparent image of the Oregon State Capitol building. The central dome is prominent, topped with a statue. The building's facade features classical architectural elements like columns and a central entrance. The text is overlaid on this image in a clean, white, sans-serif font.

**Report:**  
**Joint Task Force on  
Statewide Educator  
Salary Schedules**



## About this Report

In 2023, [Senate Bill 283](#) created the Joint Task Force on Statewide Educator Salary Schedules. Per Section 26, subsections (3)(a) and (b), and (10)(b) of the bill, the Legislative Policy and Research Office (LPRO) drew from task force discussion to prepare this report describing the work of the Joint Task Force and its recommendations.

This report draws from presentations given to the task force by public education and government officials from Oregon and other states as well as Canada. Presenters included education policy and data science professionals, academic researchers, and both labor and management representatives who spoke about collective bargaining processes. Presenters are detailed in the Topics Discussed section of this report. Additionally, this report draws on research LPRO conducted regarding states that have statewide minimum salaries for educators. A Terms to Know section defines terminology frequently used in this report relating to the education workforce, salaries, and collective bargaining.

## Task Force Members

**Sen. Michael Dembrow, Co-Chair**, Senate District 23

**Rep. Courtney Neron, Co-Chair**, House District 26

**Susan Allen**,\* representing a union of classified staff

**Sarah Barclay**, representing teachers

**Cynthia Branger-Munoz**, representing a teachers' union

**Louis De Sitter**,\* representing a teachers' union

**Iris Hodge**, representing a union of classified staff

**Lisa Ledson**, representing parents of public school students

**Alisha McBride**, representing superintendents

**Linda Murray**, representing school district business managers

**Lori Sattenspiel**, representing an association of school boards

**Debbie Simons**, representing school administrators

**Ernest Stephens**, representing parents of public school students

**Sarah Wofford**, representing classified staff

\*Note: Susan Allen's last meeting as a task force member was April 10, 2024; Iris Hodge took Ms. Allen's place at subsequent meetings. Louis De Sitter's last meeting as a task force member was January 31, 2024; Cynthia Branger-Munoz took Mr. De Sitter's place at subsequent meetings.

### Staff

Maia Powloski, Legislative Analyst

Lisa Gezelter, Legislative Analyst

Mike Reiley, Committee Assistant

William Best, Committee Assistant

### Legislative Policy and Research Office

Oregon State Capitol | (503) 986-1813 | [www.oregonlegislature.gov/lpro](http://www.oregonlegislature.gov/lpro)

*The Legislative Policy and Research Office (LPRO) provides centralized, nonpartisan research and issue analysis for Oregon's legislative branch. LPRO does not provide legal advice. LPRO publications contain general information that is current as of the date of publication. Subsequent action by the legislative, executive, or judicial branches may affect accuracy.*

# Report:

# Joint Task Force on Statewide Educator Salary Schedules

DATE: September 15, 2024

## Executive Summary

Oregon's [Senate Bill 283 \(2023\)](#) created the [Joint Task Force on Statewide Educator Salary Schedules](#). The bill directed the task force to study and make recommendations regarding statewide salary schedules for Oregon educators and to consider regional differences in statewide systems of educator pay and differential pay for educators who serve special education students.

In addition to statewide educator salary schedules, the task force considered possibilities for statewide collective bargaining in the public education sector, statewide job classifications for classified staff, diversifying the educator workforce, the availability of relevant educator workforce data, and other concepts for the recruitment, retention, and compensation of public education professionals. This final report reflects task force work from its first meeting September 26, 2023, until this final report's publication in mid-September 2024. A Terms to Know section defines terminology frequently used in this report, relating to the education workforce, salaries, and collective bargaining.

## Process

The task force met 16 times between August 2023 and September 2024. Members heard presentations from labor economists; education scholars; government officials in Oregon, other states, and Canada; representatives of Oregon unions; and representatives of school district management. Staff researched minimum salaries in other states, and experts from those states provided presentations for the task force.



## **Values, Findings, Goals: a foundation for recommendations**

In May 2024, the task force adopted [four values and 17 associated findings and goals](#).

1. **We value adequate, stable, and equitable funding of Oregon schools.** The findings and goals under this value focus on alignment of spending decisions with state budget processes and equitable funding for districts.
2. **We value collective bargaining that provides transparency, builds trust, and uplifts all voices in Oregon education.** The findings and goals under this value focus on shared data that is trusted by all sides in collective bargaining as well as collective bargaining processes.
3. **We value competitive compensation that respects and attracts Oregon educators and provides for a stable and diverse workforce.** The findings and goals under this value focus on pay, reduced barriers, improved educator quality of life, and unified job classifications.
4. **We value the careful implementation of complex changes to state education policy.** The finding and goal under this value focuses on how collaboration and shared data should drive a multi-biennia rollout of carefully planned and fully funded policies.

## **Recommendations**

In July and August 2024, the task force [adopted 14 recommendations](#):

- Workgroup on Oregon educator compensation
- Equity impact study
- Statewide educator workforce data
- Study on statewide minimum educator salaries
- Grow Your Own statewide standards and data
- Apprenticeship expansion
- Scholarship expansion for educator candidates
- Affinity spaces for educators
- Oregon Promise expansion
- Pay for student teachers and cooperating educators
- Special education caseload caps
- Cost of living equity study
- Job classifications for classified staff
- Fiscal analyses of legislation impacting school districts



# Table of Contents

Terms to Know .....	1
Process .....	2
Topics Studied.....	5
Oregon State Budget, School Funding, and the Current Service Level.....	5
Oregon Statewide Collective Bargaining and Job Classification .....	8
Oregon School District Practices: Pay, Bargaining, Benefits .....	11
Educator Workforce Research: Academic Studies and Employment Department Data .....	14
Educator Workforce Research: Oregon Longitudinal Data Collaborative (OLDC).....	16
Educator Pay and School Finance in Other States .....	22
Educator Collective Bargaining and School Finance in Canada.....	27
Stakeholder Engagement.....	29
Values, Findings, and Goals .....	30
Recommendations.....	36
Workgroup on Oregon educator compensation .....	38
Equity impact study .....	41
Statewide education workforce data .....	44
Study on statewide minimum educator salaries.....	48
Grow Your Own statewide standards and data.....	50
Apprenticeship expansion.....	52
Scholarship expansion for educator candidates .....	54
Affinity spaces for educators .....	56
Oregon Promise expansion.....	58
Pay for student teachers and cooperating educators .....	60
Special education caseload caps .....	63
NOT ADOPTED: Special education pay differentials .....	65
NOT ADOPTED: New teacher probationary periods .....	67
Cost of living equity study .....	69
Job classifications for classified staff .....	71
Fiscal analyses of legislation impacting school districts .....	73
Appendix.....	75





## Terms to Know

**Administrators** are licensed staff who manage districts, schools, or educators. They include district superintendents, school principals, and vice or assistant principals.

**Classified staff** are non-licensed school personnel and include educational assistants, secretaries, nutrition workers, bus drivers, custodians, and many more.

**Collective bargaining** is the process by which employer and employee representatives negotiate pay, working conditions, health benefits, and other terms into a contract called a **collective bargaining agreement**.

**Educator** is an umbrella term that includes all members of the education workforce.

**Licensed staff** include teachers, administrators, and other licensed school professionals such as nurses, counselors, and psychologists.

**Minimum salary** means that employers may pay more but not less.

**Salary schedules** take the form of a grid that includes maximum and minimum pay for various years of experience and education or certification levels. Oregon school districts use locally negotiated salary schedules to determine educator pay.

**Province-wide collective bargaining** negotiates aspects of the employee-employer relationship at a level covering all school districts within an entire Canadian province, with the provincial government playing a role. No U.S. state has statewide collective bargaining for educators who are school district employees. Eight out of ten Canadian provinces have some form of province-wide bargaining for educators.

**Statewide minimum salary** means that employers may pay more but not less—and it applies to workers across a sector of employment in that state.

**Statewide minimum salary schedule** means that the state sets not only a wage floor, but a floor for every tier of educational attainment and years of experience.

**Statewide salary schedules** apply to workers across a sector of employment in a state; for example, Oregon has statewide salary schedules for state employees.

**Statewide salary** is an umbrella term to cover statewide minimum salaries and statewide minimum salary schedules. When this report uses the term “statewide salary,” it encompasses either or both of these systems. Almost half of states have statewide educator salary requirements in some form. Currently, Oregon has no statewide educator salary requirements.

**Teachers** are trained in educator preparatory programs at colleges or universities and are licensed to teach in Oregon.

## Process

Oregon's [Senate Bill 283 \(2023\)](#) created the [Joint Task Force on Statewide Educator Salary Schedules](#). The bill specified two reports the task force must complete: an [interim report](#) on benefits and challenges due December 2023; and this final report, proposing policy that may lead to statewide salaries for educators.

The task force met 16 times and had the following agendas:

### [September 26, 2023](#)

- adoption of task force rules; member and staff introductions; public records and open meetings requirements; review rules, procedures, and requirements of SB 283; discussion of draft work plan, potential research agenda, and scope
- presentation on states that set minimum salaries

### [October 11, 2023](#)

- Oregon's Legislative Information System (OLIS)
- review of statewide minimum salaries presentation
- existing data on Oregon's education workforce from Oregon Longitudinal Data Collaborative (OLDC)
- task force discussion on benefits and challenges of statewide minimum educator salaries
- educator salaries in Washington

### [October 25, 2023](#)

- minimum salaries and school finance in West Virginia
- Oregon educator public employment report from OLDC
- minimum salaries and school finance in Delaware
- task force discussion of interim report
- funding educator benefits in Washington

### [November 15, 2023](#)

- teacher job postings and teacher labor market research
- task force discussion: pros and cons from Delaware, West Virginia, and Washington systems of school personnel pay
- Department of Administrative Services (DAS) process for statewide collective bargaining in Oregon
- task force discussion of draft of interim report



December 15, 2023

- OLDC educator wage data
- task force discussion and adoption of interim report

January 31, 2024

- public comment; recent research on Oregon teacher retention

March 20, 2024

- introduction and reorientation
- labor perspectives on statewide Bargaining and multi-employer bargaining
- After School: An Examination of the Career Paths and Earnings of Former Teachers
- task force discussion

April 10, 2024

- task force discussion
- raising minimum salaries in Baker School District;
- sectoral bargaining in Ontario, Canada

April 24, 2024

- sectoral bargaining for elementary and secondary employees in Canadian provinces
- Oregon state budget processes, revenue forecasts, and timelines;
- state job classification processes

May 8, 2024

- sectoral bargaining in higher education: employer perspectives;
- task force discussion of draft Values, Findings and Goals

June 5, 2024

- level-setting presentation on school district bargaining current practices;
- data from Oregon Employment Department;
- OLDC teaser of upcoming educator supply and demand study;
- Public Employees' Benefit Board (PEBB) and Oregon Educators Benefit Board (OEBB)
- task force discussion: Values, Findings, and Goals

## Final Report | **Joint Task Force on Statewide Educator Salary Schedules**

### June 26, 2024

- task force discussion: Values, Findings, and Goals
- effects of imposing minimum educator salaries in Arkansas
- student teacher pay in other states

### July 1, 2024

- adoption of Values, Findings, and Goals;
- OLDC educator supply and demand study.

### July 17, 2024

- State School Fund Current Service Level (CSL)

### July 17, July 31, August 14, and August 28, 2024

- task force discussion: members' proposed recommendations; adoption of recommendations

## Topics Studied

### **Oregon State Budget, School Funding, and the Current Service Level**

The task force learned from the Legislative Fiscal Office and Legislative Revenue Office about state budget, revenue, and appropriations timelines. Later, the task force learned from the Governor's office about current projects regarding changes to the State School Fund and the Current Service Level calculation.

#### ***Oregon Budget, Revenue Forecasts, and Appropriations***

[On April 24](#), the task force learned about Oregon's state budget processes, revenue forecasts, and timelines from Legislative Fiscal Officer Amanda Beitel and Budget Analyst Julie Neburka, and Legislative Revenue Officer Chris Allenach. Ms. Beitel's [presentation overviewed Oregon's budget development process](#).

Presenters shared that DAS instructs state agencies on timelines, inflation considerations, and prices for goods and services. Agencies' budget requests are their current service level (CSL), plus policy option packages—which are requests for new funding beyond the CSL. Each agency CSL is the prior biennium's legislatively approved funding, plus phase-ins, one-time costs, inflation, and projected revenue shortfalls, as well as phase-outs—programs discontinued or approved as one-time-only. CSL does not include employees' increases in COLA or the salary schedule for the next biennium; those are in the special purpose appropriation during the legislative short session, after statewide collective bargaining occurs for state workers.

Presenters explained that the Oregon Position Information Control System (ORPICS) informs the state budget for each state job position. The "PICS Freeze" in spring of even-numbered years captures existing payroll information and is adjusted for COLAs and step increases. Rather than relying on averages, the PICS Freeze uses position-specific data. The task force discussed the differences between this system and the one in use for school districts. Without statewide educator workforce data, members advised, the state cannot use position-specific data for school budgets the way it does for agency budgets.

Legislative Fiscal Office (LFO) budget analyst Julie Neburka described differences between state agencies' CSL and the State School Fund CSL. The Joint Committee on Ways and Means Subcommittee on Education heard [a presentation on the State School Fund CSL calculation](#) on February 6, 2023; Ms. Neburka recommended task force members listen to it.

The biggest difference between the State School Fund budget and state agencies' budgets, Ms. Neburka advised, is that, since school employees are not state employees, the state cannot go position-by-position to estimate personnel costs. The state assumes that 85 percent of school district costs are personnel. It assumes that services and supplies are the remaining 15 percent. The state also assumes that health care costs increase yearly; these cost increases are statutorily capped at 3.4 percent annually. Ms. Neburka added that the cost of the Public Employee Retirement System (PERS) currently is not factored into CSL, but it has come up in the Governor's Office workgroup on State School Fund CSL.

Ms. Beitel explained that, in the first phase of budgeting, agencies' policy option packages may exceed a balanced budget, but, once the process reaches the stage of the Governor's Budget, it must be balanced based on the DAS Office of Economic Analysis revenue forecast. The task force and presenters discussed the need for reliance on the May economic forecast based on the tax filing deadline of April 15.

### ***Oregon State School Fund and Current Service Level***

At the task force's [July 17](#) meeting, guest speakers from Governor Kokek's office, DAS, and ODE spoke about recent work to improve the Current Service Level (CSL) calculation for the State School Fund. Pooja Bhatt, Education Initiative Director from the Office of Governor Koteck, led [the presentation](#). Ms. Bhatt was joined by Adam Crawford, Policy and Budget Analyst at the DAS Chief Financial Office; Dr. Charlene Williams, ODE Director; Kai Turner, Assistant Superintendent at the ODE Office of Finance and Information Technology; and Mike Wiltfong, Education Programs Administrator at the ODE Office of Finance and Information Technology.

The presentation went over the structure and size of Oregon's school finance system. Presenters noted that 85 percent of the state's investment in K-12 pays for personnel; the remaining 15 percent pays for supplies and services.

### **State Budgets, Local Spending, Local Bargaining**

Presenters relayed that the executive branch's work has focused on the accuracy of the calculation for state budgeting purposes, and not on the adequacy of the amount. The presentation described the state's role as the biggest funder of Oregon K-12 public education and noted that the state is not the employer of public education professionals. Presenters described the absence of state government in negotiating raises and cost-of-living adjustments, controlling local costs or spending, and the resulting inability of the state to predict future costs. The presentation described requests from stakeholders that the state make appropriation and budgeting decisions based on current collective bargaining agreements and estimates of future labor costs instead of the state's current practice of using historical data. Honoring that request, the presentation said, would be impossible because of the current division of roles between the state and local districts. Additionally, the presentation explained the impossibility of committing to spending based on predictions.

### **Changes to the CSL Calculation**

The presentation described three key changes to the calculation of CSL:

1. First was a move towards a 49-to-51 split for the State School Fund biennial distribution. Currently, the State School Fund is distributed in equal amounts over two years. This two-point difference would have an approximate impact of \$217 million dollars for Oregon schools.
2. The second update was an effort to make the CSL calculation more precise by correcting for historic errors. This update would have an approximate impact of \$240 million dollars.
3. The third update aimed to ensure that the CSL includes annual updates to local revenues. This update would have an approximate impact of \$55 million dollars.

### **State Funding and Local Spending**

The presentation focused on the relationship between school funding and student outcomes. Presenters compared and contrasted the roles that funding and spending play in student outcomes, as well as the need for better data about personnel costs to inform state budget processes. The task force discussed the impact of state grants, the importance of stakeholder engagement, and future roundtables to discuss these issues. The task force also discussed the impact of school funding decisions on classified staff.

## **Oregon Statewide Collective Bargaining and Job Classification**

The task force heard several perspectives on statewide collective bargaining in Oregon. First, it heard from the Department of Administrative Services (DAS), which represents the management side in statewide collective bargaining for state workers. Second, it heard from SEIU and AFSCME, two of the unions that represent the employee side in statewide collective bargaining for state workers. Third, it heard several perspectives on statewide collective bargaining for Oregon public university employees. Then the task force heard from DAS again, this time regarding the agency's statewide job classifications for state workers; the task force had determined that statewide educator job classifications could aid in the development of statewide educator salaries or statewide educator collective bargaining.

### ***DAS Perspective on Oregon Statewide Collective Bargaining***

At the [November 15](#) meeting, [DAS presented](#) the process for statewide collective bargaining for Oregon state employees. Nettie Pye, DAS State Labor Relations Manager, led the presentation, with colleagues, including Meliah Masiba, DAS Legislative Director, and Erin Haney, a DAS state labor relations manager.

Presenters shared that two documents guide statewide public employee bargaining in Oregon: First, [ORS 243, the Public Employees Collective Bargaining Act \(PECBA\)](#); and, second, Oregon [Executive Order 17-08](#), relating to legislative appropriations and special purpose appropriations—commonly referred to as the “salary pot.”

Bargaining happens in odd-numbered years, presenters explained, often overlapping with the legislative long session. The process involves the executive branch (DAS), twelve unions, and thirty-two collective bargaining agreements.

The task force discussed differences between the governor's recommended budget, the legislatively approved budget, and the legislatively adopted budget. Ms. Pye stated that DAS's recommended budget is based on the governor's recommended budget, subject to legislative approval and appropriations. If either approval or appropriations change the picture, then DAS must revisit its budget.

### ***Labor Perspective on Oregon Statewide Collective Bargaining***

The task force examined labor perspectives on Oregon’s established models for statewide collective bargaining on March 20, 2024. The task force heard first from Melissa Unger, executive director of the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) Local 503, and then from Jade McCredy, the state program manager for the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (Oregon AFSCME).

Ms. Unger described three categories of statewide bargaining: sectoral bargaining, multi-employer industry bargaining, and the bargaining SEIU engages in with DAS on behalf of Oregon public employees. Ms. Unger discussed “sectoral tables,” in which industry, workers, and the government bargain together.

AFSCME also engages in statewide bargaining on behalf of public employees. [Ms. McCredy's presentation](#) explained that the AFSCME “central table” includes 18 local unions and 17 state agencies. Some bargaining topics are negotiated at the central table, while the rest are negotiated at local tables. She described the difference between central table topics, such as the state salary pot, COLAs, and insurance, and local table topics, such as work schedules, health and safety, and workplace committees.

In statewide bargaining for Oregon state employees, unions and employers share the same cost calculators, at both the local and state levels, so all parties bargain using the same data. Ms. McCredy described the transparency of data available to bargaining teams at the state level, and the timeline for bargaining and ratification.

### ***Statewide Collective Bargaining at Oregon Universities***

[On May 8](#), the task force heard about statewide bargaining in Oregon public universities from Dana Richardson of the Council of Presidents; Brian Caufield, Director of Labor Relations Services at University Shared Services Enterprise; and Rob Fullmer, classified staff at Portland State University and former HECC commissioner.

#### **Background**

Presenters explained that higher education classified staff bargained with DAS until 1996. Between then and 2011, the Oregon University System bargained as a single entity. Things changed with the dissolution of the Oregon University System in 2013. After dissolution, University Shared Services Enterprise—Mr. Caufield’s employer—

replaced the old university governing system. Labor relations services is one of the responsibilities of University Shared Services Enterprise.

Mr. Caufield described 1996 to 2013 as a transition towards less coordination between DAS and university employers. Today, each university is a separate employer, but a single contract governs all. Salaries and benefits, including health and retirement, are negotiated at a central bargaining table.

More than 30 years ago, university job classifications and state worker job classifications were very similar. That has changed over the years, presenters said. Mr. Fullmer described challenges with job classifications for university classified staff since their most recent wide-scale update in 1995. Mr. Caufield stated that university employers did a classification study from 2011 to 2015, with some input from unions, but, due to differences of opinion between employers and unions, changes were never implemented.

### **Lack of Regionalization**

Statewide bargaining ensures equal pay for equal work, Mr. Fullmer stated. Presenters proceeded to describe the collective bargaining process for university classified staff.

The task force and presenters discussed how different employee groups may need different ways to address working conditions. Mr. Fullmer explained that although terms must apply equally across all Oregon university staff, on the ground, the same contract terms have a different impact on different campuses and at different universities.

In response to task force questions, Mr. Fullmer described the ethos of “equal pay for equal work” that governs classified staff collective bargaining with universities, and how his constituents prefer standardization over a regionalized system of pay.

### ***Statewide Job Classifications for Oregon State Employees***

On [April 24](#), the task force heard from Jen Coney, administrator of classification and compensation at the DAS Chief Human Resources Office. [Ms. Coney presented about Oregon’s processes for classifying government jobs](#). Because Oregon has no statewide system for educator job classifications, the task force requested a



presentation on how Oregon handles the many job classifications for state workers, and whether Oregon could use a similar model for public education employers.

Ms. Coney explained that DAS has no regional variation in pay. She described how the state of Oregon defines work and salaries the same statewide. Some job classifications are agency-specific, but most are shared by many state agencies. The system “goes all the way to the top,” Ms. Coney added—agency heads, the Governor's staff, and other top management and political appointees all are governed by DAS's statewide job classifications.

Ms. Coney described how new job classifications, and edits to established ones, typically arise during collective bargaining. She went over what DAS needs to know and how state agencies and labor professionals inform the process. Ms. Coney shared that every two years, DAS conducts a [Salary and Benefit Report](#) to ensure competitiveness with jobs outside state government—although some state jobs have no private-sector equivalent.

Ms. Coney described the recent removal of the bottom steps of several salary schedules. She stated that raising salaries for the lowest-paid state workers was a change made mid-biennium and agreed upon during contract negotiations last summer.

## **Oregon School District Practices: Pay, Bargaining, Benefits**

At the April 10 meeting, members discussed collective bargaining issues explored at recent meetings. Members expressed uncertainty about how statewide bargaining could work in K-12 education. AFSCME's and SEIU's systems of statewide bargaining have been functioning for decades, one member noted; in contrast, statewide educator bargaining would be new not just to Oregon but to the United States.

On April 10, Task Force members also discussed

- the need for adequate time to develop and roll out a new statewide system of collective bargaining;
- the idea of local versus central bargaining tables;
- concern that any statewide bargaining system prioritize workers' rights;
- how statewide bargaining for educator pay could lead to legislative appropriations that better align with district and educator needs;

- potential benefits of moving statewide educator salaries closer to the legislature;
- potential unintended consequences of a statewide wage floor for classified staff;
- the decision-making authority about minimum salaries in other states; and
- how Oregon might raise the bottom of educator salary schedules to support early-career educators, while keeping in mind the effect on educators on higher tiers of the salary schedule.

### ***Educator Salary Schedules in Baker School District***

On [April 10](#), a [presentation from Baker School District](#) described recent changes to their salary schedule. Erin Lair, former Baker superintendent, led the presentation. She was joined by Toni Myers, president of the Baker Education Association. The district had given a similar presentation at the [May 17, 2023 meeting of the Joint Ways and Means Subcommittee on Education](#). Ms. Lair explained how Baker School District chose to condense its salary schedules from 16 steps down to four in order to help early career educators by establishing a minimum starting salary of \$60,000. While the condensing of steps helped fund the change, the district sought other funding for increased minimum salaries by improving Medicaid billing. Improved Medicaid billing practices increased the district's federal funding.

### **Educator reflections**

Toni Myers, president of the Baker Education Association, shared that older union members recalled their own struggles as early-career educators, particularly regarding childcare and housing costs. Ms. Myers described the perspectives of Baker's most experienced teachers. Ms. Lair added that, in Baker's collective bargaining process, the district received 100 percent ratification on the salary schedule changes and that in the 2023-2024 school year, Baker had no licensed teachers leaving the district.

### ***Current Oregon educator collective bargaining***

[The June 5](#) task force meeting began with a presentation on current school district bargaining practices led by members Cynthia Branger-Munoz of OEA and Lori Sattenspiel of OSBA. Joining them were Robert Young, Bargaining Coordinator for OEA, and Susan Miller, Executive Director of OSEA.

[Presenters' slides](#) enumerated differences between OEA and OSEA structures. OEA is an affiliate of the National Education Association (NEA) with 229 locals—some with as few as five members, and others with members numbering in the thousands. OEA members include licensed teachers and specialists, as well as some classified staff such as educational assistants. Beyond K-12, OEA also represents community college faculty and some student members. OSEA is an affiliate of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT). It has 138 chapters, not just at school districts, but also education service districts (ESDs), Head Starts, community colleges, charter schools, and local parks and recreation departments. Its members are mostly classified staff, but some of the same types of specialists OEA represents, such as speech and language pathologists.

Presenters described the Public Employee Collective Bargaining Act (PECBA), which governs timelines and other aspects of the bargaining process. Bargaining usually begins in summer. If it starts in the spring and does not finish by summer vacation, then it finishes in fall. Either party may call for mediation or declare an impasse—but usually bargainers settle rather than declaring an impasse. It usually takes one to two months to finalize the collective bargaining agreement, then two to three weeks to ratify it.

### ***Public Employee and Educator Health Benefits***

The final presenter at the [June 5](#) meeting was Damian Brayko, Deputy Director of PEBB and OEBC. Task force members had requested more information on PEBB and OEBC, because health benefits may [impact](#) recruitment and retention and because potential statewide educator bargaining could include benefits at the central table. Additionally, some members were interested in whether Oregon educators might see improved health care costs and accessibility if they had PEBB rather than OEBC.

[Mr. Brayko's slides](#) outlined PEBB and OEBC renewal cycles. In OEBC the first stage is to study key cost drivers and programs that need improvement. Second, OEBC requests renewal dates for new programs, and for existing programs that have had changes. Next are evaluation, preparation, selection, and enrollment stages. Finally, the cycle returns to the study phase. The PEBB renewal cycle is very similar but, since all PEBB plans are offered to all employees, the selection stage is not present.

Mr. Brayko described the differences in plan offerings between PEBB and OEBC, as well as differences in the cost of premiums and the different risk pools involved.

## **Educator Workforce Research: Academic Studies and Employment Department Data**

Education policy academics presented to the task force on the labor economics of the Oregon educator recruitment, qualitative findings on Oregon educator retention, and the earnings of Oregon educators who have left the education sector. Additionally, the Oregon Employment Department presented its educator workforce data to the task force.

### ***Labor Economics and Oregon Teacher Job Postings***

At the [November 15](#) meeting, Dr. Dan Goldhaber of the University of Washington and American Institutes for Research [presented](#) on teacher job postings, the teacher labor market, and the Oregon education workforce. [November 15 Meeting Materials include three papers](#) from Dr. Goldhaber on the economics of the teacher workforce.

Dr. Goldhaber researched job postings to study workforce issues. He found that the education workforce has high attrition early in teachers' careers and low attrition later in teachers' careers. He suggested that, to respond to attrition patterns, policymakers should focus salary increases on early-career educators.

When asked about the impact of benefits packages or total compensation, Dr. Goldhaber indicated that benefits have little impact early in educators' careers because younger educators may be less likely to prioritize health care or retirement.

### ***Oregon Educator Retention***

[On January 31](#), members heard a presentation from Dr. Ben Ewing, a new teacher mentor at Lincoln County School District and a fellow at the University of South Carolina College of Education. Dr. Ewing shared findings from [his 2022 dissertation](#) at Oregon State University on Oregon teachers' early-career financial struggles, teachers' preferences to live within or outside their district, and complexities beyond compensation that support decisions to remain in education careers.

### **Additional Jobs for Early-Career Teachers**

Dr. Ewing found that mid- and late-career teachers noted the difficulty of low pay early in their careers. All the educators Dr. Ewing interviewed discussed supplementing their low early-career salary with coaching, tutoring, summer school instruction, paid positions within their union, or working for school facilities during

school breaks. A few, during their early careers, had additional jobs outside of public education.

### **Three Key Findings**

Dr. Ewing shared what he viewed as his three most significant findings.

1. First, he advised that policymakers target higher pay and faster raises early in teachers' careers, but support tuition reimbursements across teachers' career trajectories. Tuition reimbursements, he advised, are useful to educators' professional development, not just their initial degree and licensure.
2. Second, Dr. Ewing noted that educators' reasons to stay working in public schools are much more complex than merely compensation, and that many teachers are unaware of salary comparisons beyond their immediate neighbor districts.
3. Third, regarding where to reside, Dr. Ewing characterized his research as pushing back against the practice of holding up resident teachers as the "gold standard." He would instead support "commuting teachers as a viable retention model." He observed "a really strong theme how happy these commuting teachers were."

### ***Earnings of Former Educators***

The task force heard [March 20](#) from Professor Emily Penner of the University of California, Irvine, on findings from [After School: An Examination of the Career Paths and Earnings of Former Teachers](#), which Prof. Penner co-authored with collaborators from the University of Chicago and the United States Census Bureau.

Research from Prof. Penner's team showed that, on average, teachers' earnings decline after leaving schools. Female voluntary leavers who left education careers due to parenthood experienced a long-term impact on their potential earnings, particularly due to the way salary schedules typically calculate years of experience.

Regarding competition between localities for staff, Prof. Penner's team found that new teachers and special education professionals were those most responsive to higher salaries offered in neighboring school districts.

Dr. Penner also completed a study specific to Oregon. Its findings were similar to the study she presented in March, and were included in the [meeting materials for the July 31 meeting](#).

### ***Oregon Employment Department Educator Data***

At [the June 5](#) meeting, the task force heard about education workforce data from Jason Peyton, an occupational economist at the Oregon Employment Department (OED). Mr. Peyton shared that he was familiar with [Dr. Goldhaber's](#) research, which he described as "a good corollary" to the data he would be sharing.

The hardest-to-fill jobs, Mr. Peyton stated, tend to be part time and odd hours; in the education sector, those are typically classified positions. The OED categorizes hundreds of jobs but uses only a few categories for most classified positions. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics classifications allow for apples-to-apples wage data comparisons nationwide and regionally.

[Mr. Peyton's presentation](#) included wage ranges, from the 10th to 90th percentiles, for selected classified staff jobs; and a comparison of these jobs to similar positions outside the education sector. Regarding janitors, accounting clerks, and maintenance workers, OED data showed that schools pay as well or better than sectors outside education. The same is true for cafeteria cooks, although the OED compared school cafeteria cooks and cafeteria cooks in other institutional settings; it does not compare school nutrition workers to fast food or restaurant workers.

### **Educator Workforce Research: Oregon Longitudinal Data Collaborative (OLDC)**

The task force heard a total of five presentations from the Oregon Longitudinal Data Collaborative (OLDC), three in 2023 and two in 2024. OLDC is housed within the Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC) and uses the Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) to conduct research projects using administrative data collected by state agencies. OLDC data-sharing partner agencies include HECC, the Oregon Department of Education (ODE), the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC), and the Oregon Employment Department, among others.

The [OLDC October 11 presentation](#) reviewed available Oregon education workforce data. Presenters noted that ODE data has the limitation of being "a snapshot in time" of educators employed for at least twenty days as of December 1 of each year and that classified staff position codes are all categorized into the same "other" category, which means that "other" category includes classified staff whose job descriptions, duties, pay, and hours may be very different.

On [October 25](#), OLDC presented more on the [Oregon Educator Public Employment Report](#). This report was a result of conversations between TSPC and Oregon's educator preparatory programs (EPPs). Data came from TSPC and ODE. The goal was to provide EPPs the data they needed in order to meet national accreditation standards. This report analyzed hiring and retention rates only; it did not research or map educator salaries. OLDC did, however, research educator pay later; those efforts are detailed below, in discussions of the 2024 presentations at the [June 5](#) and [July 1](#) task force meetings.

OLDC explained the three metrics in their Oregon Educator Public Employment Report: First, the number of Oregon EPP graduates, over time, who were recommended for preliminary licensure; second, the number of licensees who were hired as Oregon public school teachers in the first, second, and third years after graduation; and third, how long licensees who were hired their first year stayed teaching in Oregon. The report's data represented the decade of school years between 2010 and 2020. OLDC researchers noticed hiring trends that appeared to correlate with economic downturns and recoveries.

Asked about moving from this descriptive research into predictive research, OLDC shared that all current projects analyzed historic data, but that they were considering possible future projects that could make predictions based on trends in student and educator populations.

On [December 15](#), OLDC [presented](#) again to the task force. Presenters included Ben Tate, OLDC director, and Jesse Hellingso, OLDC Senior Research and Data Analyst. This early analysis from December 2023 was fleshed out in the [July 1, 2024 final OLDC study](#) provided to the task force and discussed in detail below.

On [June 5](#), OLDC provided [a preview of their educator supply and demand report](#), presented in full [July 1](#). Presenters were Jesse Hellingso, OLDC senior research and data analyst, Brittany Kenison, HECC data strategy and operations lead, and Amy Cox, HECC Director of Research and Data.

Dr. Hellingso explained that Oregon lacks statewide data on classified staff because ODE does not require districts to submit the same data on classified staff that it requires for licensed staff. He relayed that OLDC data showed that the racial and ethnic diversity of Oregon educators reflects the demographics of the state as a

whole but does not reflect the demographics of Oregon children—a more diverse population than adults. Further, the racial and ethnic diversity of Oregon educators may not reflect the demographics of specific school or district communities.

### ***Educator Supply and Demand Report from OLDC***

On [July 1](#), OLDC presented its [teacher supply and demand study](#). Jesse Hellingso, OLDC senior research and data analyst, led the presentation, joined by Amy Cox, OLDC interim director, and Brittany Kenison, OLDC operations and policy lead.

OLDC hypotheses tested several questions:

- Is there a shortage in the supply of graduates from Oregon educator preparatory programs (EPPs)?
- Are enough qualified individuals applying to Oregon EPPs?
- Are the differences in employment and student-to-teacher ratios within Oregon due to regional pay and cost of living differences within the state?
- Does Oregon’s high rate of inclusion for special education students tie to increased student-to-teacher ratios, compared to states where special education students are less integrated into general education classrooms?
- Is Oregon’s new teacher starting pay competitive with neighboring states?
- Is there a link between an unmet need for educators in Oregon and limits on school resources in the state?

In addressing these questions, OLDC reached findings on educator supply and preparation, educator retention, student-to-teacher ratios, special education inclusion and staffing, housing for educators, teacher salaries, and the spending tradeoffs that school districts make.

### **Educator Supply and Preparation**

Researchers found that Oregon EPPs are not graduating as many educators per capita as the national median. Oregon is, however, graduating more teachers per capita than neighboring states of Nevada, Washington, and California.

Roughly two-thirds of graduates from Oregon’s public EPPs come from Oregon high schools, and often enroll in EPPs within the same region as their high school. Most who remain in the state work in the same Oregon region as the EPP from which they graduated. Historically, the majority of new teachers in Oregon graduated from Oregon EPPs, although that percentage has declined every school year since 2017.



Over 85 percent of Oregon public EPP graduates work in Oregon post-graduation. Of the less than 15 percent who leave, roughly one-third go to Washington. A member asked whether OLDC analysis captures where these graduates reside or grew up. The member stated that, for those who come from just across the border and attend an EPP in northern Oregon, it may be understandable to return to Washington. OLDC did not have analysis to address to this question.

OLDC found that Oregon’s projected teacher job openings are primarily replacement openings, and that Oregon EPPs provide enough graduates to meet current projected demands. Projected job openings in Oregon match historical trends in teacher staffing, with higher turnover recently due to the pandemic. Expanding teacher supply would require more qualified students to enter Oregon EPPs—which already accept 89 to 100 percent of qualified applicants.

OLDC surveyed public and private Oregon EPPs. Survey results indicated that EPPs perceive the top barriers to program expansion and student recruitment to be the public perception of the teaching profession, the cost of tuition and fees, and recruiting enough high-quality applicants.

### **Educator Retention**

Dr. Hellingso noted that data in the report’s appendix discusses teacher “survivor rates,” or, how long teachers work before leaving via attrition or retirement. Those who leave for full-time work outside K-12 tend to earn slightly more; those who leave for part-time work outside K-12 earn less. Sen. Dembrow asked if OLDC could compare the survivor rate for Oregon EPP graduates to teachers educated out-of-state. OLDC replied that, although they have not yet made this comparison, they would be able to do so.

### **Student-to-Teacher Ratios**

OLDC estimated student-to-teacher ratios by dividing the number of students in the county by the number of teachers in that county. Actual ratios vary at the level of district, school, and classroom. Oregon student-to-teacher ratios are higher than national medians, Washington, and Idaho, but lower than California and Nevada. Ratios vary across Oregon counties and regions, from less than 15 students per teacher to more than 22 students per teacher. Oregon’s lowest ratios are in rural counties (Gilliam, Wheeler, Grant, and Harney), but other rural counties have high ratios.

### **Special Education Inclusion and Staffing**

OLDC researchers found that Oregon uses more inclusion time for special education students than other states. This may impact student-to-teacher ratios. Members discussed how to balance inclusion with lowering student-to-staff ratios.

Researchers described how federal mandates on special education data collection mean that OLDC data covers special education positions. Outside of classified staff who work in special education, however, researchers stated that Oregon classified staff data is inconsistent and incomplete at the state level, and that ODE's statewide data groups together many different classified positions into one dataset.

### **Housing for Educators**

OLDC measured housing affordability for teachers using the 40th-percentile cost for a two-bedroom apartment in every Oregon county. Researchers then calculated the percent of a new teacher's income needed to afford rent, based on average new teacher salaries in each county. By that measure, in a third of Oregon counties, new teachers could not afford to rent a below-average-cost two-bedroom apartment.

The percent of a new teacher's income required to rent a two-bedroom apartment is highest in the Portland tri-county area and the four counties that border it, as well as Benton County (home to parts of Corvallis and Albany), and Deschutes County (home to Bend). In rural Southern and Eastern Oregon counties, new teachers pay the lowest percent of income towards rent. OLDC found that, even in comparably more affordable regions of Oregon, there nonetheless may be a housing shortage, because affordable housing might exist, but be unavailable.

### **Teacher Salaries**

OLDC found that Oregon teacher salaries are nationally competitive but that, compared to neighboring states, the degree of competitiveness varies. Average Oregon teacher salaries are almost \$200 less than the average Washington teacher salary, and about \$4,000 less than the average California teacher salary. The average Oregon teacher makes over \$12,000 more than the average Nevada teacher, and \$19,000 more than the average Idaho teacher. OLDC adjusted these numbers to account for cost-of-living variation.

Nationally and regionally, there is much less variation in new teacher pay. New Oregon teachers make almost \$9,000 more than new Idaho teachers, about \$2,000

less than new Nevada teachers, about \$3,000 less than new California teachers, and about \$7,000 less than new Washington teachers.

### **Unmet Need**

OLDC found that Oregon has a measurable unmet need for teachers, likely due to limits on resources to hire more educators and tied these limits on resources to tradeoffs that districts make when formulating budgets.

### **Educator Workforce Data**

At the conclusion of the OLDC presentation, the task force discussed possible future educator workforce research in Oregon. Members discussed educator workforce data, including [SB 283 \(2023\)](#), which set in motion the creation of a connected education workforce data system. The task force also discussed ODE's data collections and the need for end-of-year data and the potential for improving data collections related to educators.

## **Educator Pay and School Finance in Other States**

The task force learned about school finance and statewide educator salaries in states around the country, with in-depth presentations on the 24 states that set minimum salaries as well as presentations specific to conditions in Arkansas, Delaware, Washington, and West Virginia. Additionally, from national education policy researchers, the task force learned about states that pay student teachers.

### ***Statewide Minimum Educator Salaries in 24 States***

A [September 26 staff presentation](#) provided the task force with background on educator salary systems in the 24 states that have minimum salaries for educators. A [staff presentation October 11](#) provided new information on statewide minimum pay for classified staff in Delaware and West Virginia. The states profiled in the staff reports may have made legislative or policy changes since that time. In November 2023, LPRO staff prepared a [report on statewide teacher salaries](#), which was informed by feedback from task force members.

### ***Educator Pay and School Finance in Other States***

[Senate Bill 283 \(2023\)](#) directed the task force to study statewide minimum pay for classified staff and regional variation in statewide minimum pay. Officials from Delaware and West Virginia, the only two states with minimum pay requirements for classified staff, spoke to the task force. Officials from Washington State, the only state that uses regional variation in its statewide minimum teacher salaries, also presented to the task force. Researchers from Arkansas discussed the implementation and impact of statewide minimum salaries in that state.

### **Arkansas**

On [June 26](#), the task force heard [a presentation on the effects of imposing statewide minimum teacher salaries in Arkansas](#) from researchers at the University of Arkansas. Andrew Camp, Senior Research Associate at the Annenberg Institute of Brown University and Affiliated Researcher at the University of Arkansas Department of Education Reform, led the presentation. He was joined by three colleagues from the University of Arkansas Department of Education Reform: Gema Zamarro, Endowed Chair in Teacher Quality; Josh McGee, Endowed Chair in Education Accountability & Transparency; and Miranda Vernon, Research Associate.

### ***Background and History***

From 2004 to 2023, Arkansas had a statewide minimum salary schedule. Districts could pay more but not less than the statewide minimum salary schedule, which was a grid with years of experience on one axis and level of education on the other. However, inflation had been outpacing Arkansas minimum salary growth and continues to do so. In response, the Arkansas legislature passed the LEARNS Act in 2023, which eliminated the statewide minimum salary schedule and instituted a statewide base-level minimum salary in its place. The statewide minimum was \$50,000. It applies only to teachers, not to other school personnel. The change was fully funded by the state with \$138 million in new spending.

### ***School District Responses to the Minimum Salary for Teachers***

The researchers found that most Arkansas school districts responded to the statewide minimum teacher salary in one of three ways.

1. In districts where all teachers had been paid below \$50,000 prior to the LEARNS Act, afterward, most teachers earned a flat \$50,000—eliminating most pay differences between new and veteran teachers.
2. In districts where, prior to the LEARNS Act, some teachers had been paid more than \$50,000 and some had been paid less, afterward, the district raised the lower steps in its salary schedule to \$50,000 and teachers paid above that salary got a flat \$2,000 raise.
3. In districts where all teachers had been making \$50,000 or above when the LEARNS Act passed, afterward, all teachers got a \$2,000 raise, but the district's salary schedule remained otherwise unchanged.

In these ways, the distribution of teacher salaries in Arkansas became compressed, particularly for early-career teachers.

### ***Collective Bargaining***

Unlike Oregon, where all districts bargain with local unions, Arkansas is a “right-to-work” state. The researchers noted that no districts negotiate with unions in Arkansas. In fact, the state does not recognize the educator union in its area.

### ***Lessons Learned***

In response to task force discussion about imposing a minimum salary, researchers shared that a statewide minimum salary does not impact higher paying districts much, but it does raise salaries for rural and poorer districts. They advised that

Oregon note the rapid implementation of the LEARNS Act—rolled out over the course of just a few months, from January to March. The researchers recommended a slower rollout of statewide changes to education policy.

## **Delaware**

Also on [October 25](#), the task force heard from Kimberly Klein, Associate Secretary of Operations Support at the Delaware Department of Education because Delaware is the other state with minimum salaries for classified staff. In the October 11 Meeting Materials, staff provided copies of [Delaware law relating to statewide salaries for classified staff](#).

Ms. Klein shared that Delaware policymakers recently had been concerned about competition with neighboring states for educator jobs—particularly Maryland and Pennsylvania, where salaries are higher. She discussed Delaware’s 2023 [Public Education Compensation Committee](#), which had been charged by [SB 100](#) to recommend changes to statewide educator salary schedules. The Public Education Compensation Committee had finished and was about to release [its final recommendations](#) at the time that Ms. Klein spoke to the task force. Policymakers on this Delaware committee recommended that the state’s minimum teacher salary be increased to \$60,000 over the course of four school years. This, Ms. Klein said, was in direct response to Maryland’s recent teacher raises.

Delaware statewide minimum salaries are set in state statute as well as in administrative rules and supplements developed by the state education agency. Task force members representing classified staff observed that in Delaware, statewide minimum salaries for some of the classified positions do not consider employee years of experience. In contrast, all licensed educator minimum salaries in Delaware account for years of experience.

Like Washington and West Virginia, Delaware has a resource-based model to fund schools. Instead of funding based solely on student enrollment, as in Oregon, Delaware funds staff positions using ratios.

## **Washington**

T.J. Kelly, Chief Financial Officer of Washington’s Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), [presented to the task force](#) on [October 11](#) and [October 25](#) to discuss [funding for school personnel benefits](#). He shared that Washington’s school

funding formula allocates funding to schools for specified numbers of positions, and that Washington has two allocations for educator benefits: fringe, as a percentage of allocated salary, and health, through a per allocated staff unit methodology. Both categories are for allocation purposes only, and do not guarantee any educator a specific benefits package or compensation type. Mr. Kelly explained the relationship between the regionalization factors in Washington's school funding methodology and its educator benefits allocations for certified, classified, and administrative school employees. Mr. Kelly discussed the challenges of Washington's regionalization requirement for salaries.

## **West Virginia**

On [October 25](#), the task force heard [a presentation on statewide minimum salaries in West Virginia](#) from Uriah Cummings, Director of School Finance at the West Virginia Department of Education because West Virginia is one of two states that has these for classified staff. In the October 11 Meeting Materials, staff provided copies of [West Virginia law relating to statewide salaries for classified staff](#).

Mr. Cummings described how, since the 1976-1977 school year, statewide minimum educator salary schedules have been housed in West Virginia statute. Since then, the West Virginia legislature has made more than 25 increases to statewide minimum educator salaries. West Virginia educators may receive supplemental pay related to experience, certification, and teaching math or special education. He also described West Virginia's funding model of allocating positions to districts, and then funding those positions.

## ***States That Pay Student Teachers***

Last on the [June 26](#) agenda was [a presentation on student teacher pay in other states from Education Commission of the States \(ECS\)](#) policy researchers Gabriela Rodriguez, Tiffany McDole, and Lauren Peisach. Researchers discussed impact of unpaid student teaching on students of low-income families and students who have had to borrow to pay for significant portions of their schooling.

ECS highlighted programs to pay student teachers in four states. They noted that some states open their programs not just to student teachers, but also to other school professionals working towards licensure—for example, school counselors.

- In Colorado, student teachers who use stipend funds for primary expenses like housing and food report lower rates of anxiety. Colorado also provides rural-

specific funds, which come with a commitment teacher candidates must make to teach in a rural district for at least two years.

- In Maryland, all student teachers who wish to receive a stipend from the state must pledge to teach in rural or high-needs schools, or to teach high-needs subject matter, for at least two years.
- Instead of stipends, Minnesota has two grant programs for student teachers: one for those working in shortage areas, and another for student teachers from underrepresented backgrounds.
- Pennsylvania has \$10,000 grants for student teachers, plus an additional \$5,000 for those in schools that have more openings for student teachers. Pennsylvania mentor teachers also get a \$2,500 grant if districts are not otherwise compensating them for their mentorship.

Researchers shared that the program that paid the least was probably the \$3,000 in Oklahoma. In Colorado and Maryland, student teachers may receive up to \$20,000. The amount of pay may correlate to the length of the student teaching experience in the state or Educator Preparation Program (EPP). Some states consider cost of living or financial need in determining the amount of student teacher pay. Colorado, for example, prioritizes rural areas, which can sometimes be more expensive than urban and suburban areas.

The ECS researchers shared that states have had more success recruiting licensed special education professionals from the paraprofessional workforce than from EPPs. In contrast, states tend to be more successful recruiting from four-year universities for educators in science, technology, engineering, and math.

ECS provided four questions to consider regarding student teacher pay:

- Is the goal to support all educator candidates? Or to provide targeted support for specific candidates?
- Is the financial incentive sufficient to influence candidate behavior?
- What other factors influence program completion and initial hiring for candidates?
- How will the policy be evaluated?



## **Educator Collective Bargaining and School Finance in Canada**

In April, the task force learned about Canadian province-wide educator bargaining. First, it heard on [April 10](#) from Andrew Davis, Assistant Deputy Minister, Education Labour and Finance Division, Ontario Ministry of Education. Next, on [April 24](#), the task force heard from Professor Sara Slinn of Osgoode Hall Law School at York University in Toronto.

### ***Background and History of Province-wide Bargaining in Canada***

As in the United States, local bargaining for Canadian educators involves local school boards and local unions. Unlike in the U.S., province-wide educator bargaining is common in Canada. Only two of the 10 provinces use exclusively local bargaining. The other eight use what Professor Slinn termed “multi-tier sectoral bargaining.” Ontario and British Columbia use two-tier bargaining: a “central” (province-wide) tier, and a local tier, with the provincial government involved at the central tier.

### ***Alignment of Bargaining, Budgeting, and Legislative Appropriations***

Canadian provinces had introduced province-wide bargaining, Prof. Slinn said, to address a mismatch between the central source of funding from the legislature, and locally bargained commitments. It had been difficult to have a key player—the provincial government—not involved in bargaining. Additionally, province-wide bargaining aimed to address tension between the district’s role as employer and its role of service provider to children and families. Province-wide bargaining aimed to control costs and to remove inequalities in bargaining power, and to increase coordination among education stakeholders and accountability to the provincial government.

Mr. Davis shared that Ontario has achieved some alignment among bargaining, budgeting, and legislative appropriations. When the Ministry of Education gets its budget from the provincial cabinet, the education budget reflects the appropriation that the Ministry sought from the legislature based on the provincial government’s involvement in collective bargaining.

Prior to province-wide bargaining, Mr. Davis said, wealth inequities had persisted among districts. He described how province-wide bargaining and a “robust” funding

formula now mean that families can expect similar levels of service everywhere in Ontario.

Prof. Slinn described tensions over the role of government. Education stakeholders question whether government should be a policymaker, a bargaining participant, or both. Asked what lessons learned Prof. Slinn would advise for Oregon, she responded that, in early years of the transition to province-wide bargaining, Ontario had no clear pathway for the integration of local agreements into central agreements. This led to complex and difficult early years.

### ***Province-wide Bargaining, Local Salary Schedules***

Prof. Slinn shared that, although Canadian educator salary schedules have local variation, salaries are nonetheless bargained province-wide. Thus, the government knows how much money to appropriate for the education workforce, because the government is involved in setting local wage grids. Negotiating local salary schedules at the province-wide level means that the government has the necessary local data for appropriations that better match local needs.

According to Mr. Davis, Ontario experiences some inequities between districts in its early- and mid-career teacher salaries but has harmonized top salaries, and localities have a high degree of uniformity in the number of steps in their salary schedules, typically a total of ten.

In response to task force discussion of standardized job titles for classified staff, Prof. Slinn reflected that lack of job title uniformity had been a struggle, and that it may be part of why the provinces have separate compensation grids for different districts and positions.

### ***Division of Centrally and Locally Bargained Issues***

Professor Slinn described how province-wide bargaining has reduced political pressures on local officials by negotiating costs centrally, while keeping non-economic issues locally bargained. Presenters discussed how Canadian provinces handle disagreements about which issues should be bargained locally versus centrally, the details of two-tiered province-wide bargaining, and the changing nature of work stoppages in Canadian provinces.

## Stakeholder Engagement

The co-chairs requested [November 15](#) presentations from four members regarding their organizations' views on educator pay and school funding models the task force had learned about in Washington, West Virginia, and Delaware. Representatives of the Oregon Education Association, Oregon School Boards Association, Coalition of Oregon School Administrators, and Oregon School Employees Association shared their perspectives on the presentations from other states.

Topics discussed included the following:

- Flexibility for collective bargaining
- Regional differences in pay
- Oregon's equalization formula for school funding
- Definitions for classified positions
- School funding models in other states
- Inconsistencies between job titles and assigned work
- Cost of living calculations

The task force had [its first 2024 meeting January 31](#), where it heard public testimony. Two individuals testified about the challenges of implementing any statewide system for educator pay.

On June 3, Sen. Dembrow and Rep. Neron co-hosted two virtual listening sessions, one each for classified and licensed school staff. At the Task Force's [June 5 meeting](#), Co-chairs Neron and Dembrow overviewed what they had heard with education stakeholders from outside the task force. Themes included concerns about workplace violence from students, chronic stress, and a lack of respect for educators in their communities. Participants additionally expressed the value of education to local families and communities. Asked what contributed to their decisions to stay in education careers, participants consistently spoke about valuing schools as crucial to local communities and families, particularly in small and rural communities.

## Values, Findings, and Goals

On [May 8](#), the task force began discussions of its values, findings, and goals. Staff created [an initial draft](#) for task force members to review, and then met with each task force member for feedback. The task force [discussed a revised draft](#) at the [June 26](#) meeting, [made further revisions](#), and adopted the final version below on [July 1](#).

Values are broad statements that act as guideposts. Pairs of findings and goals nest under each value. A finding is a statement outlining a problem. A goal is an ideal outcome that corresponds to each finding.

The order in which these values, findings, and goals appear below does not reflect their relative importance and does not indicate that the task force prioritizes any value or goal over any other.

### **We value adequate, stable, and equitable funding of Oregon schools.**

#### ***Alignment***

- **Finding 1:** State appropriations do not align with collective bargaining or local budgeting timelines and obligations. Misaligned state and local budgeting processes make it difficult for the legislature to provide school districts the resources they need and that the state can afford.
- **Goal 1:** By aligning collective bargaining, local budgeting, and the adequacy of state appropriations, Oregon will better serve its students and achieve more stability for the education workforce. Aligned state and local budgeting processes will allow the legislature to better provide school districts the resources they need and that the state can afford.

#### ***Equity***

- **Finding 2:** Despite Oregon's equalization formula, inequities persist among Oregon school communities.

- **Goal 2:** Oregon will achieve adequate and more equitable school funding to better serve the needs of Oregon students in all parts of the state.

**We value collective bargaining that provides transparency, builds trust, and uplifts all voices in Oregon education.**

### ***Shared data***

- **Finding 3:** Stakeholders in Oregon’s education sector lack the accurate and trusted shared data necessary for collaborative collective bargaining. This has led to unnecessarily protracted and contentious bargaining with harmful impacts on students and communities.
- **Goal 3:** State government, education employers, and educator associations will share the same accurate, trusted, complete, and up-to-date financial and workforce data with one another and with the public.

### ***Statewide collective bargaining of pay and benefits***

- **Finding 4:** Examining systems in Canada and the United States revealed varied statewide approaches to collective bargaining of pay and benefits in public education some of which could have potential benefits for Oregon. However, many questions and concerns remain, particularly around how it would work for classified educators.
- **Goal 4:** Oregon will continue to explore statewide approaches to collective bargaining of pay and benefits as a possibility for Oregon educators—clarifying both the potential benefits and challenges of different models. These efforts will result in more successfully securing the funding that schools and students need and that the state can afford.

## **We value competitive compensation that respects and attracts Oregon educators and provides for a stable and diverse workforce.**

### ***Statewide salaries***

- **Finding 5:** Differences in educator pay around the state may impact educators' decisions to seek jobs in other school districts or outside of Oregon K-12 public education. Examining systems in Canada and the United States revealed varied approaches to statewide salary schedules in public education.
- **Goal 5:** Oregon will continue to explore challenges and benefits associated with moving toward statewide salary schedules or statewide minimum salaries for Oregon educators.

### ***Diverse workforce***

- **Finding 6:** Oregon educator demographics do not yet align with the diversity of the state's students, families, and communities.
- **Goal 6:** Compensation will strategically attract, support, and retain diverse candidates to Oregon education careers, including first-generation college graduates and educators from low-income backgrounds.

### ***College costs***

- **Finding 7:** Oregon educator preparatory programs (EPPs) do not produce new licensed educators in the numbers Oregon schools need. University costs and program capacity act as barriers to licensed education careers, particularly for diverse candidates.
- **Goal 7:** Students of all backgrounds will be able to obtain affordable degrees and accessible licensure and credentials at Oregon EPPs.

### ***Student teacher pay***

- **Finding 8:** Unpaid student teaching may impair recruitment to education careers, particularly for first-generation college students and students from low-income backgrounds. Cooperating educators are sometimes unpaid or inadequately paid for the additional work they do mentoring candidates for licensure.
- **Goal 8:** To improve recruitment and diversify the education workforce, Oregon will pay educator candidates and cooperating educators for their work.

### ***Special education and hard-to-hire educator positions***

- **Finding 9:** Despite efforts in all parts of the state, Oregon does not sufficiently recruit, retain, support, or compensate special education and other hard-to-hire educator positions. Recent workforce and labor economics studies indicate that unfilled vacancies in special education and other hard-to-hire areas continue to be a problem. Unfilled positions result in inadequate services for vulnerable student populations, particularly in special education.
- **Goal 9:** Improvements to Oregon's compensation and working conditions will help districts recruit, retain, and support special education professionals and other educators in hard-to-hire positions. Schools will be able to fill hard-to-hire vacancies and better serve Oregon special education students and other vulnerable populations.

### ***Early-career educators***

- **Finding 10:** Salary schedules often do not prioritize early-career educators. This disincentivizes Oregonians of low-income and other diverse backgrounds from entering education careers.
- **Goal 10:** To improve recruitment and retention and diversify the educator workforce, compensation will meet the needs of Oregon's early career educators.

### ***Annual pay increases and cost of living adjustments***

- **Finding 11:** Current cost of living (COLA) calculations and annual pay increases may not accurately reflect the lives of today's educators, particularly in light of rises in inflation, housing costs, childcare costs, and higher education tuition.
- **Goal 11:** COLA calculations and annual pay increases will better reflect current economic realities and prepare for Oregon's future needs and funding capacity.

### ***Long-term career growth***

- **Finding 12:** Current policies may disincentivize mid- or late-career licensure for classified staff, particularly candidates of diverse backgrounds.
- **Goal 12:** Salary schedules will incentivize growth throughout education careers for educators of all backgrounds.

### ***Full licensure***

- **Finding 13:** A lack of clarity around licensure types and pay might mean that educators with emergency licensure may be paid as much as educators who have earned full licensure, which may discourage licensees from seeking full licensure.
- **Goal 13:** Oregon salary schedules will encourage full licensure.

### ***Childcare, housing, and quality of life for educators***

- **Finding 14:** Research shows that those who leave education careers are often women with children. Childcare availability and costs may influence educators' decisions to leave the education workforce. Additionally, housing costs and other quality of life issues can impact educator retention and wellbeing.
- **Goal 14:** Oregon educators with young children will have access to quality affordable childcare. Oregon will explore affordable housing and other policy options to improve wellbeing and quality of life for educators.



### ***Regional needs***

- **Finding 15:** Regionalization has potential benefits and potential challenges in any statewide approach to educator compensation.
- **Goal 15:** Compensation structures and other policies will incentivize educators to work in rural districts and will meet educators' cost-of-living needs across the state.

### ***Job classifications***

- **Finding 16:** Educator job classifications differ greatly across Oregon. Districts use different terminology to describe similar jobs, creating challenges to formulating statewide policy, and difficulties for classified job seekers.
- **Goal 16:** To support data-driven decision making, ensure comparability, and better address the needs of classified staff, Oregon will continue to explore the benefits and challenges of consistent job classifications across school districts.

## **We value the careful implementation of complex changes to state education policy.**

### ***Careful implementation***

- **Finding 17:** Recent implementations of large-scale policy changes in Oregon have at times prioritized speed over quality, resulting in inadequate or ineffective programs and diminished public trust in government. This can result in unmet needs for educators, students, and families.
- **Goal 17:** State government, school districts, educator associations, and other stakeholders will collaborate and share data and analyses, leading to solutions that meet the needs of educators, students, and families in all parts of Oregon. This collaboration and shared data will drive a carefully planned, fully funded, multi-biennia rollout of research-based changes to statewide education policy.

## Recommendations

The task force adopted 14 recommendations. In July and August, task force members and co-chairs drafted proposed recommendations. Co-chairs and staff made themselves available to consult with any member or group of members to assist or provide feedback in drafting recommendation proposals. Drafts of proposed recommendations were discussed on [July 17](#), [July 31](#), [August 14](#), and [August 28](#).

The text of these recommendations was drafted and edited solely by task force members themselves.

The task force voted on recommendations August 14 and August 28. In voting, members had three choices: Yes, Yes with Reservations, or No. Recommendations for which a majority of members voted Yes or Yes with Reservations were adopted. Excused votes indicate the number of members who were not present to vote on a recommendation. Each recommendation required seven yes votes in order to be adopted. Those seven votes represent the majority of total task force members, not necessarily a majority of those present at any given meeting.

No matter how or whether members voted, they had the option to write short vote explanations. The text of each vote explanation was drafted and edited solely by members themselves.

Task force recommendations do not constitute changes to state policy. The legislature, the governor, or a state agency must take action to turn any task force recommendation into state law or policy.

Recommendations are grouped under their associated value from the task force's Values, Findings, and Goals. The order the recommendations appear does not reflect their relative importance, and does not indicate that the task force prioritized any recommendation over any other.

We value adequate,  
stable, and equitable  
funding of Oregon  
schools.

## Workgroup on Oregon educator compensation

[McBride-Murray-Sattenspiel-Simons Recommendation 1](#)

**Authors:** Alisha McBride, superintendent; Linda Murray, Oregon Association of School Business Officials; Lori Sattenspiel, Oregon School Boards Association; and Debbie Simons, Coalition of School Administrators

Working Group to Develop a Framework for A Statewide Salary Structure

Yes		No	Excused
Yes	with Reservations		
11	0	0	1

### All Goals.

Generally, this recommendation applies to all of the Findings and Goals approved by the Task Force as it is meant to come up with a comprehensive plan to create a path forward to implement them.

A statewide salary minimum, statewide salary schedule, and statewide collective bargaining have been examined by the task force. The task force has also adopted a well- researched and vetted list of goals, findings, and values that have broad agreement and consensus among partners. Pay and benefits are a critical issue, but we believe any plan for consideration needs significant discussion and work from impacted partners.

### Problem statement

The Task Force has gathered important data, heard key information about the status of educator pay in Oregon and around the country, and had robust discussions about salaries, benefits, and bargaining. We believe there is a shared desire from all participating partners to provide salaries, wages, and benefits that attract and retain a diverse education workforce.

Too often, the information and recommendations of a work group or task force do not make it past the “report out” phase. We believe that there is merit to continuing to discuss issues related to educator salaries and benefits *and* we need a forum to continue the work and craft specific proposals for consideration.

### **Detailed description**

We support setting up a formal mechanism or process to develop a specific plan that includes the time needed to produce a balanced proposal that is supported by all partners. We need to convene experts and impacted organizations and allow them time and space to develop options and vet them. At this time, any proposal to implement a statewide salary schedule (for example) feels incomplete, not thoroughly vetted, and will likely meet lots of opposition. We need to take our time and invest in developing a system that better meets the needs of our students. We want to propose this framework to see if there is interest in collaboration on a joint recommendation. Key components for consideration include:

- Timeline – We believe the group needs at least 12 months to develop any proposal.
- Participants – We want to keep the group nimble (in the 12–16-member range) and should include impacted partners (OEA, OSEA, OSBA, OSPA, COSA, OASBO, OAESD, parents), legislative representation, TSPC, EAC, and ODE, with support from DAS, LRO, and LFO.
- Staffing – The group needs professional staffing and/or facilitation so that there are dedicated resources to ensure any deliverables are on time. Because the costs of various policy options must be considered, LFO should be included along with LPRO as staff supporting the work of this group.
- Funding – Any proposal needs to be costed out and a fiscal impact statement needs to be prepared, including potential impacts upstream on salary schedules and bargaining.
- Task – The group needs to review the work of this task force, the study of state funding and the Quality Education Model (due January 2025), and the work of the executive branch’s work group on accountability and CSL in order to formulate a comprehensive plan for education funding for the State of Oregon in line with the values and goals identified by our task force.

We know there are lots of additional details that need to be decided upon, but we hope to engage the entire task force during the recommendation discussions to help fully form a proposal.

### **Enforcement**—*how to make sure the policy is followed*

We would recommend that the group report back to the Education Policy Committees and the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Education regularly with updates and submit a final report to the Legislature.

**Reporting**—*how the legislature knows whether the policy is working*

See Enforcement.

**Implementation**—*which agencies or entities are responsible*

The more-developed recommendations coming from this working group will likely require legislative action, though in some cases they may be able to be implemented directly by ODE, TSPC, and DAS.

## Equity impact study

### [Branger-Munoz-Neron-Stephens Recommendation 1](#)

**Authors:** Cynthia Branger-Muñoz, Oregon Education Association; Representative Courtney Neron, House District 11; Ernest Stephens, parent of an Oregon public school student

Understanding the Equity Impacts of Statewide Educator Salary Schedules with a Focus on Regionalization Related Policy

Yes		No	Excused
Yes	with Reservations		
11	0	0	1

### Goal 2: Equity

Oregon will achieve adequate and more equitable school funding to better serve the needs of Oregon students in all parts of the state.

### Problem statement

Policy pertaining to statewide educator salary schedules can cause un-anticipated phenomenon, and can lead to inequitable pay outcomes. Although this may pertain to any policy, in particular regionalization formulas can lead to inequities in pay. Similar phenomenon may also lead to discrepancies in quality between regions. Regionalization formulas that guide educator salary schedules like those utilized in the State of Washington can also contribute to gentrification or similar phenomenon, which can affect the cost of living for educators. Regionalization in statewide educator salaries is an important conversation, and with proper consideration can be done well.

### Detailed description

As discussed in the following:

- Washington State School Funding presentation from October 11, 2023.
- Oregon Wage Information and the Education Sector presentation from June 5, 2024. Pg 9
- OLDC Oregon Regional Trends in New Teacher Salaries from June 5, 2024. Pg 24

With the goal of providing the executive and legislative branches the opportunity to create equitable policy and the decisions, the following is proposed:

Any policy that pertains to minimum statewide educator salary schedules, minimum salaries, tiered salaries, or similar; classified, certified, licensed, or other should require an impact study (equity impact study) that anticipates inequitable phenomenon; with a focus on the potential for inequitable pay outcomes, inequitable increases in cost of living, and potential inequitable quality outcomes. For the purposes of this proposal, equity is contemplated as the principles of fairness and justice in the context of education. It requires that every educator, despite their specific circumstances, have fair access to resources, opportunities, and support to help them achieve professional advancement. Equity recognizes that educators come from various backgrounds and many require varied amounts of resources to level the professional playing field. The impacts of educator inequities also extend the student experience and can have impacts on workplace belonging, psychological safety, workloads, retention, and district expenditures.

This proposal will be supported by the Legislature budget; or the Oregon Department of Education budget.

This proposal can only be successful if fully funded.

**Enforcement**—*how to make sure the policy is followed*

Policy pertaining to statewide educator salary schedules should be required to comment on this impact study, how it aligns, and where it does not align.

**Reporting**—*how the legislature knows whether the policy is working*

Legislative Policy and Research Office or the Oregon Department of Education report detailing alignment with equity goals.

**Implementation**—*which agencies or entities are responsible*

Legislative Policy and Research Office or the Oregon Department of Education to contract independent organizations for this work.



We value collective bargaining that provides transparency, builds trust, and uplifts all voices in Oregon education.

## Statewide education workforce data

### [Neron-Hodge-Wofford Recommendation 1](#)

**Authors:** Representative Courtney Neron, House District 11; Iris Hodge and Sarah Wofford, Oregon School Employees Association

Require efficient and complete statewide data on all K-12 public education staff—including classified, licensed, and administrative—including pay and benefits, reported annually, and accessible to the public online.

Yes		No	Excused
Yes	with Reservations		
7	3	0	2

### **Goal 1: Alignment, Goal 3: Shared data, and Goal 17: Careful Implementation**

By aligning collective bargaining, local budgeting, and the adequacy of state appropriations, Oregon will better serve its students and achieve more stability for the education workforce. Aligned state and local budgeting processes will allow the legislature to better provide school districts the resources they need and that the state can afford.

State government, education employers, and educator associations will share the same accurate, trusted, complete, and up-to-date financial and workforce data with one another and with the public.

State government, school districts, educator associations, and other stakeholders will collaborate and share data and analyses, leading to solutions that meet the needs of educators, students, and families in all parts of Oregon. This collaboration and shared data will drive a carefully planned, fully funded, multi-biennia rollout of research-based changes to statewide education policy.

### **Problem statement**

The state’s public education workforce data is incomplete and lacks transparency. Oregon law requires school districts to report comprehensive data on licensed educators and administrators but does not require the same for non-licensed (classified) employees. For this reason, there are gaps in the Oregon Department of Education (ODE)’s Staff Position File, particularly regarding compensation. Additionally, although it is available upon request, ODE’s Staff Position File is not easily accessible to the public.

In order to provide greater transparency to the public, to align state and local budgeting processes, and to calculate accurately the funds Oregon schools need, ODE's Staff Position File must have complete data on all public education professionals—classified, licensed, and administrative. The state must also collect information on the cost of benefits. This data must be easily accessible online to the public. In achieving this goal, Oregon will balance the needs of local education agencies (LEAs) to minimize administrative reporting burdens.

**Detailed description**

ODE will require each LEA to submit workforce data on all staff—including classified, licensed, and administrative—as part of the agency's Staff Position File. Districts would be required to include all classified staff in their reporting. ODE will also coordinate the collection of actual district expenditures for benefits. Currently, LEAs must submit complete salary information only on licensed teachers and administrators. New requirements should be enacted to ensure that this current dataset is expanded to include accurate reporting on all members of the K-12 public education workforce, and to ensure that the state has an accurate picture of districts' benefit costs.

In developing these requirements, policymakers will collaborate with LEA professionals who have expertise in data collection and reporting, to ensure that new requirements are streamlined and efficient at the local level, particularly for Oregon's small and rural LEAs.

To understand more clearly where state funding is allocated, and to avoid contentious bargaining environments between educator associations and employers, ODE's Staff Position File will be accessible for all K-12 public education staff, their unions, and the public. This will be achieved via a public-facing website.

**Enforcement**—*how to make sure the policy is followed*

Bureau of Labor and Industries (BOLI)

**Reporting**—*how the legislature knows whether the policy is working*

Biannual reporting in line with state budget cycle

**Implementation**—*which agencies or entities are responsible*

Oregon Department of Education (ODE)

**Vote explanation**

Complete data on salary and benefits is a worthy goal. But, this will likely be another unfunded mandate; districts won't receive the resources to implement.

– *Alisha McBride, Lindy Murray, Lori Sattenspiel, and Debbie Simons*

We value competitive  
compensation that  
respects and attracts  
Oregon educators and  
provides for a stable  
and diverse workforce.

## Study on statewide minimum educator salaries

### [Branger-Munoz-Hodge-Wofford Recommendation 1](#)

**Authors:** Cynthia Branger-Muñoz, Oregon Education Association; Iris Hodge and Sarah Wofford, Oregon School Employees Association

Study of Statewide Minimum Salaries: a baseline for educators across Oregon

Yes		No	Excused
Yes	with Reservations		
11	0	0	1

### **Goal 5: Statewide salaries** and **Goal 10: Early-career educators**

Oregon will continue to explore challenges and benefits associated with moving toward statewide salary schedules or statewide minimum salaries for Oregon educators.

To improve recruitment and retention and diversify the educator workforce, compensation will meet the needs of Oregon’s early career educators.

#### **Problem statement**

Minimum salaries needed for represented educators to level the playing field in Oregon public schools.

#### **Detailed description**

Requesting a study that informs potential statewide salary schedules with steps that align with state budget timing and statewide minimum salaries that include:

- A. A yearly COLA increase
- B. Equity from rural to metro areas
- C. Differentials for hard to fill positions
- D. A model that incentivizes compensation for starting work in education fields but also accounts for professional growth through an educator’s career.

Research and Benchmarking:

- Conduct a comprehensive analysis of a structure that sets minimums for early, mid and late career proposed and implemented minimum salary schedules.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of statewide salary models in addressing salary disparities and promoting career growth within the education sector.
- Adaptation to Oregon's Funding System:

- Assess how a minimum salary schedule could be integrated with Oregon's existing funding mechanisms for education.
- Identify potential financial implications and funding sources to support the implementation of minimum salary standards without compromising other educational resources.
- Consider options for implementation to transition to the new salary structure, ensuring minimal disruption to current budgeting processes and maintaining financial stability..

**Enforcement**—*how to make sure the policy is followed*

*No Enforcement text provided by task force members.*

**Reporting**—*how the legislature knows whether the policy is working*

*No Reporting text provided by task force members.*

**Implementation**—*which agencies or entities are responsible*

Legislative Policy and Research Office (LPRO).

## Grow Your Own statewide standards and data

### [Branger-Muñoz Recommendation 1](#)

**Author:** Cynthia Branger-Muñoz, Oregon Education Association

Educator diversification

Yes		No	Excused
Yes	Yes with Reservations		
7	2	1	2

### Goal 6: Diverse workforce

Compensation will strategically attract, support, and retain diverse candidates to Oregon education careers, including first-generation college graduates and educators from low-income backgrounds.

#### Problem statement

In response to the evolving educational landscape, this policy proposal aims to bolster diversification efforts within the teaching profession by imposing standards on grow-your-own programs.

#### Detailed description

Establishing rigorous standards and guidelines for Grow Your Own programs involves creating clear criteria for program design, participant selection, and educational outcomes. By fostering partnerships between schools, community organizations, and higher education institutions, these programs aim to cultivate local talent pools and address teacher shortages in underserved communities.

#### Enforcement—*how to make sure the policy is followed*

To ensure rigorous adherence to the policy, the legislature has designated specific enforcement responsibilities to key entities. The Educator Advancement Council (EAC) will oversee the implementation and enforcement of Grow Your Own program standards, ensuring consistency and effectiveness across participating institutions. The EAC will enforce reporting requirements on the allocation and expenditure of funds, ensuring transparency and accountability in financial management.



**Reporting**—*how the legislature knows whether the policy is working*

The EAC will collect detailed data on:

- Participation rates and demographics in Grow Your Own programs, including geographic distribution and diversity metrics among program participants.
- Effectiveness of partnerships between schools, community organizations, and higher education institutions in implementing Grow Your Own programs and addressing local teacher shortages.

Furthermore, the EAC will enforce robust reporting requirements on the allocation and expenditure of funds for Grow Your Own programs. Detailed financial reports will ensure transparency and accountability in fund management, providing legislators with insights into resource utilization and the fiscal impact of these initiatives on educational outcomes.

**Implementation**—*which agencies or entities are responsible*

EAC.

**Vote explanation**

We support the current EAC structure that provides input from local Regional Educator Networks (RENs) to determine how to invest Grow Your Own dollars.

– *Alisha McBride, Lindy Murray, Lori Sattenspiel, and Debbie Simons*

## Apprenticeship expansion

### [Branger-Muñoz Recommendation 4](#)

**Author:** Cynthia Branger-Muñoz, Oregon Education Association

Expansion of Teacher Apprenticeship Program Pathways

Yes		No	Excused
Yes	with Reservations		
9	1	0	2

### Goal 6: Diverse workforce

Compensation will strategically attract, support, and retain diverse candidates to Oregon education careers, including first-generation college graduates and educators from low-income backgrounds.

#### Problem statement

In response to the evolving educational landscape, this policy proposal aims to bolster diversification efforts within the teaching profession by expanding apprenticeship pathways.

#### Detailed description

Introducing additional pathways within the teacher apprenticeship program will cater to diverse career entry points. This initiative targets career changers, paraprofessionals, and military veterans by offering structured mentorship, professional development opportunities, and support for certification. Acknowledging the need for increased funding, this expansion aims to ensure adequate resources to sustain and scale these pathways effectively, thereby enriching the profession with varied experiences and expertise.

#### **Enforcement**—*how to make sure the policy is followed*

TSPC will oversee the teacher apprenticeship program, providing structured pathways into the profession. Regular reporting by TSPC will support program oversight and evaluation.

**Reporting**—*how the legislature knows whether the policy is working*

Regular reporting by TSPC to the legislature.

**Implementation**—*which agencies or entities are responsible*

TSPC.

**Vote explanation**

We share the goal of recruiting and retaining a diverse workforce. We would like to see a funding source and collaboration with current GYO programs.

– *Alisha McBride, Lindy Murray, Lori Sattenspiel, and Debbie Simons*

## Scholarship expansion for educator candidates

### [Branger-Muñoz Recommendation 5](#)

**Author:** Cynthia Branger-Muñoz, Oregon Education Association

Increase in Scholarships and Funding for Teacher Preparation.

Yes		No	Excused
Yes	with Reservations		
7	3	0	2

### Goal 6: Diverse workforce

Compensation will strategically attract, support, and retain diverse candidates to Oregon education careers, including first-generation college graduates and educators from low-income backgrounds.

#### Problem statement

In response to the evolving educational landscape, this policy proposal aims to bolster diversification efforts within the teaching profession by bolstering programs to help higher education students pay for educator preparation programs.

#### Detailed description

Enhancing financial support mechanisms through increased scholarships and funding allocations aims to reduce economic barriers for prospective educators entering teacher preparation programs. Specifically, funding will be allocated to enhance The Oregon Teacher Scholars Program (OTSP) Grant, increasing it from \$12,000 annually and allowing recipients to access funds during the summer term. This initiative prioritizes underrepresented groups and high-need subject areas, attracting talented individuals and ensuring a robust pipeline of well-prepared teachers for all students.

#### Enforcement—*how to make sure the policy is followed*

The Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC) will continue managing grants under The Oregon Teacher Scholars Program (OTSP), ensuring effective distribution and utilization to enhance teacher preparation. TSPC will oversee the

teacher apprenticeship program, providing structured pathways into the profession. Regular reporting by HECC and TSPC will support program oversight and evaluation.

**Reporting**—*how the legislature knows whether the policy is working*

HECC and TSPC will maintain their data collection efforts diligently.

**Implementation**—*which agencies or entities are responsible*

HECC and TSPC.

**Vote explanation**

We support the goal of increasing funding for teacher scholarships, but are concerned this proposal does not identify a sustainable funding source.

– *Alisha McBride, Lindy Murray, Lori Sattenspiel, and Debbie Simons*

## Affinity spaces for educators

### [Branger-Muñoz Recommendation 6](#)

**Author:** Cynthia Branger-Muñoz, Oregon Education Association

Establishment of Affinity Spaces through the Educator Advancement Council (EAC)

Yes		No	Excused
Yes	with Reservations		
10	0	0	2

### Goal 6: Diverse workforce

Compensation will strategically attract, support, and retain diverse candidates to Oregon education careers, including first-generation college graduates and educators from low-income backgrounds.

#### Problem statement

In response to the evolving educational landscape, this policy proposal aims to bolster diversification efforts within the teaching profession by creating affinity spaces for educators.

#### Detailed description

Affinity spaces will be established under the oversight of the Educator Advancement Council (EAC). These dedicated spaces within educational institutions and communities are crucial for fostering a sense of belonging, supporting ongoing professional development, and enhancing cultural competence among educators. Managed by the EAC, these spaces will serve as collaborative forums for mentorship, the exchange of best practices, and the cultivation of inclusive teaching practices. Ultimately, they contribute to higher retention rates and increased professional satisfaction among a diverse cadre of educators.

#### Enforcement—*how to make sure the policy is followed*

The EAC will oversee the establishment and management of affinity spaces within educational institutions and communities. These spaces will be subject to stringent guidelines to foster belonging, support professional development, and promote cultural competence among educators.

**Reporting**—*how the legislature knows whether the policy is working*

The EAC will collect detailed data on:

- Retention rates and professional satisfaction among educators utilizing affinity spaces, with specific metrics on participation in mentorship programs and professional development opportunities
- Feedback on the cultural competence initiatives implemented through affinity spaces, including the impact on inclusive teaching practices and educator collaboration.

Furthermore, the EAC will enforce robust reporting requirements on the allocation and expenditure of funds for affinity spaces. Detailed financial reports will ensure transparency and accountability in fund management, providing legislators with insights into resource utilization and the fiscal impact of these initiatives on educational outcomes.

**Implementation**—*which agencies or entities are responsible*

Educator Advancement Council (EAC).

## Oregon Promise expansion

[Sen. Dembrow Recommendation 2](#)

**Author:** Senator Michael Dembrow, Senate District 23

Extending Oregon Promise to Future Educators

Yes		No	Excused
Yes	with Reservations		
10	0	0	2

### Goal 7: College costs

Students of all backgrounds will be able to obtain affordable degrees and accessible licensure and credentials at Oregon EPPs.

#### Problem statement

Need to Increase the Educator Pipeline

#### Detailed description

Even if we are successful in increasing the number of young Oregonians choosing education as a profession, this will not suffice in meeting our needs (especially with fewer high school graduates in general). We need to make it easier for older Oregonians to return to school and embark on this career. For many Oregonians, that journey will begin at the community college. Unfortunately, returning students are not currently eligible for the Oregon Promise, which creates a substantial disincentive. That barrier must be removed for those committing to become Oregon educators. This proposal calls for legislation that will extend the Promise to returning students who intend to be educators. If budget constraints require, we could begin with a subset, e.g., those on track to work in special education or other hard-to-hire/retain areas, or perhaps those who are part of a Grow-Your-Own or apprenticeship program.



**Enforcement**—*how to make sure the policy is followed*

The Legislature will need to provide stable funding for this expansion and establish KPMs and regular reporting to the Education committees.

**Reporting**—*how the legislature knows whether the policy is working*

Oregon Promise utilization and then the number of recipients who become educators.

**Implementation**—*which agencies or entities are responsible*

The HECC (via OSAC and the OLDC), ODE (via EAC), and potentially TSPC

## Pay for student teachers and cooperating educators

### [Branger-Muñoz Recommendation 2](#)

**Author:** Cynthia Branger-Muñoz, Oregon Education Association

New and Early Career Incentives

Yes		No	Excused
Yes	with Reservations		
7	0	4	2

### **Goal 8: Student teacher pay** and **Goal 10: Early-career educators**

To improve recruitment and diversify the education workforce, Oregon will pay educator candidates and cooperating educators for their work. To improve recruitment and retention and diversify the educator workforce, compensation will meet the needs of Oregon’s early career educators.

#### **Problem statement**

This policy proposal addresses critical challenges within the education sector by aiming to strengthen support and stability for educator candidates and newly hired teachers. By implementing structured compensation and reducing probationary periods from three years to one, alongside comprehensive mentorship and support, the proposal seeks to enhance retention rates and improve educational outcomes, thereby fostering a more stable teaching environment.

#### **Detailed description**

Compensation for Educator Candidates and Cooperating Educators:

Educator candidates, particularly those from diverse backgrounds, often face financial strain during their training. To attract a diverse pool of candidates, we propose:  
 Stipends for Educator Candidates: Providing financial compensation to educator candidates enrolled in Educator Preparation programs. This stipend will facilitate their participation in practical teaching experiences, enabling them to focus on professional development without financial hardship.

Compensation for Cooperating Educators: Recognizing the pivotal role of cooperating educators who mentor candidates. Offering stipends or incentives acknowledges their expertise and commitment to nurturing future teachers.

**Enforcement**—*how to make sure the policy is followed*

1. ODE Oversight and Data Collection: The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) will be responsible for overseeing the implementation of the policy, particularly in the collection and management of data related to educator stipends and other programmatic aspects. ODE will ensure that funds allocated for stipends are distributed appropriately to educator candidates in Educator Preparation programs.
2. BOLI Reporting Mechanism: The Bureau of Labor and Industries (BOLI) will establish a reporting mechanism for educators to report instances of non-compliance by school districts or educational institutions with the policy's stipulations. Educators can use this mechanism to report discrepancies related to stipend distribution, cooperating educator involvement, or adherence to reduced probationary periods for newly hired teachers.
3. Evaluation and Adjustment: An evaluation framework will be implemented to assess the effectiveness of the policy in improving educator retention rates and student outcomes. Data collected by ODE and reports received by BOLI will inform legislative oversight committees about the impact of the policy, facilitating informed adjustments and enhancements as needed.
4. Penalties for Non-compliance: Penalties for non-compliance will be clearly established, outlining consequences for school districts or educational institutions found to be in violation of the policy. These consequences may involve financial sanctions, potential loss of funding opportunities, or other corrective measures aimed at ensuring compliance and policy effectiveness.

**Reporting**—*how the legislature knows whether the policy is working*

1. Oregon Department of Education (ODE): ODE will collect data on the allocation and distribution of stipends to educator candidates enrolled in Educator Preparation programs. This includes tracking the number of stipends disbursed, the demographic diversity of recipients, and assessing the impact of stipends on candidate participation and completion rates.
2. Bureau of Labor and Industries (BOLI): BOLI will establish a reporting mechanism for educators to provide feedback on the engagement and support provided by cooperating educators who mentor candidates. This will

include gathering information on the effectiveness of mentoring relationships and their contribution to candidate readiness and confidence.

3. Evaluation Framework: ODE and BOLI will collaborate on an evaluation framework to assess broader impacts on educator retention rates and student outcomes. This includes collecting data on teacher retention, student academic performance metrics, and feedback from educators and students on the overall educational environment.

**Implementation**—*which agencies or entities are responsible*

ODE, BOLI

**Vote explanation**

This would limit the ability of districts and mentor teachers to design programs locally; student teachers shouldn't be employees. Lack of funding is also problematic.  
– *Alisha McBride, Lindy Murray, Lori Sattenspiel, and Debbie Simons*

## Special education caseload caps

### [Hodge-Ledson-Wofford Recommendation 3](#)

**Authors:** Iris Hodge, Oregon School Employees Association (OSEA); Lisa Ledson, parent of an Oregon public school student; Sarah Wofford, OSEA

Manageable workloads for educational assistants to ensure disabled students have their support needs met.

Yes		No	Excused
Yes	Yes with Reservations		
7	0	4	2

### Goal 9: Special education and hard-to-hire educator positions

Improvements to Oregon’s compensation and working conditions will help districts recruit, retain, and support special education professionals and other educators in hard-to-hire positions. Schools will be able to fill hard-to-hire vacancies and better serve Oregon special education students and other vulnerable populations.

#### Problem statement

Addressing the ongoing challenges in recruiting, retaining, and supporting special education assistant positions in Oregon. Specifically, ensure manageable workloads by capping caseloads for educational assistants in order to meet the needs of students in self-contained classrooms.

#### Detailed description

1. Ensure dedicated 1:1 support for students: Students who have been assessed as needing 1:1 support should always have an educational assistant dedicated exclusively to them. Educational assistants should not be assigned to support more than one student simultaneously.
2. Provide stipends for additional responsibilities: In classrooms with students who have moderate to severe Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (ID/DD), if an educational assistant is required to support more than their designated 1:1 student for over one hour of instructional or personal care time per day, then they should receive a per diem stipend or other mechanism as determined through collective bargaining, as allowed by federal law.

**Enforcement**—*how to make sure the policy is followed*

Caseload management: implement and uphold limits on caseloads, and make sure schools regularly report on how they manage workloads. This will ensure students with disabilities, those on IEPs/504s, and other specialized education plans receive balanced and effective support. (ODE)

**Reporting**—*how the legislature knows whether the policy is working*

Workload metrics: Collect and analyze detailed reports on caseload sizes, overall staff workload, and the extent to which administrative helpers are utilized to support staff responsibilities.

**Implementation**—*which agencies or entities are responsible*

ODE, BOLI

**Vote explanation**

The proposal is too prescriptive and diminishes local control. It likely conflicts with IDEA and the IEP team decision making process for placement of students.

– *Alisha McBride, Lindy Murray, Lori Sattenspiel, and Debbie Simons*

## **NOT ADOPTED: Special education pay differentials**

### [Hodge-Ledson-Wofford Recommendation 2](#)

**Authors:** Iris Hodge, Oregon School Employees Association (OSEA); Lisa Ledson, parent of an Oregon public school student; Sarah Wofford, OSEA

Incentive pay and tuition reimbursement for educational assistants who support students with disabilities.

	Yes	Yes with Reservations	No	Excused
Yes	4	2	4	2

### **Goal 9: Special education and hard-to-hire educator positions**

Improvements to Oregon’s compensation and working conditions will help districts recruit, retain, and support special education professionals and other educators in hard-to-hire positions. Schools will be able to fill hard-to-hire vacancies and better serve Oregon special education students and other vulnerable populations.

#### **Problem statement**

Addressing the ongoing challenges in recruiting, retaining, and supporting special educator and other hard-to-hire educational assistant positions in Oregon..

#### **Detailed description**

Incentive pay and compensation: Provide a yearly stipend of \$8,000 or a \$5 per hour increase for classified staff (educational assistants) working directly with disabled students and offer tuition reimbursement to address staffing shortages.

#### **Enforcement**—*how to make sure the policy is followed*

Monitoring and oversight: Establish a monitoring and evaluation committee to oversee the distribution of incentive pay and tuition reimbursement (EAC).

#### **Reporting**—*how the legislature knows whether the policy is working*

Incentive and tuition program data: Track the number of staff receiving incentive pay and tuition reimbursement and assess their impact on staff retention and shortages.

**Implementation**—*which agencies or entities are responsible*

ODE, EAC



## **NOT ADOPTED: New teacher probationary periods**

[Branger Muñoz Recommendation 7](#)

**Author:** Cynthia Branger-Muñoz, Oregon Education Association

Reduced Probationary Periods

Yes		No	Excused
Yes	Yes with Reservations		
4	1	6	1

### **Goal 10: Early-career educators**

To improve recruitment and retention and diversify the educator workforce, compensation will meet the needs of Oregon’s early career educators.

#### **Problem statement**

Instability, initial workloads, and lack of supportive working environments for new teachers.

#### **Detailed description**

Currently set at 3 years, probationary periods for newly hired teachers will be streamlined to:

Structured One-Year Probationary Period: Newly hired teachers will undergo a one-year probationary period upon employment, which can be expanded to 3 years if mutually agreed upon by their supervisor and themselves. This period includes mentorship and support, enabling teachers to acclimate to their school environment and refine teaching skills. This adjustment aims to reduce initial workload and promote stability, creating a supportive environment for professional growth.

#### **Enforcement**—*how to make sure the policy is followed*

Via contracts or individual complaints.

#### **Reporting**—*how the legislature knows whether the policy is working*

*No Reporting text provided by the task force member.*

**Implementation**—*which agencies or entities are responsible*

*No Implementation text provided by the task force member.*

**Vote explanation**

This is a reasonable proposal and one that I would support legislatively, but I see it as outside of the charge of this task force.

– *Senator Michael Dembrow*

## Cost of living equity study

### [Branger-Muñoz-Neron-Stephens Recommendation 2](#)

**Authors:** Cynthia Branger-Muñoz, Oregon Education Association; Representative Courtney Neron, House District 11; Ernest Stephens, parent of an Oregon public school student

Clear Picture for the Cost of Living for Educators in Consideration of Policy Related to Statewide Educator Salary Schedules

Yes		No	Excused
Yes	with Reservations		
11	0	0	1

### **Goal 14: Childcare, housing, and quality of life for educators and Goal 15: Regional needs**

Oregon educators with young children will have access to quality affordable childcare. Oregon will explore affordable housing and other policy options to improve wellbeing and quality of life for educators.

Compensation structures and other policies will incentivize educators to work in rural districts and will meet educators’ cost-of-living needs across the state.

#### **Problem statement**

Educator incomes are a primary reason for obtaining another position within education or leaving the labor force entirely (Brummet et al, 2024; presented on March 20, 2024). Policy pertaining to statewide educator salary schedules focus on gross incomes and benefits; however the reality of individual experience regarding cost of living is more complex. Research suggests that incomes and cost of living are connected, and the differences between the two contribute to retention, which then impacts district expenditures.

#### **Detailed description**

As discussed in the following:

- After School: An Examination of the Career Paths and Earnings of Former Teachers presented on March 20, 2024. Pg 2, 14.
- OLDC Overview of Educator Data in the SLDS, presented on October 11, 2023.

With the goal of providing the executive and legislative branches a clear picture of information for understanding the financial impacts of policy on educators, retention of educators, and how retention may affect district expenditures:

Any policy that pertains to minimum statewide educator salary schedules, minimum salaries, tiered salaries, or similar; classified, certified, licensed, or other should require a comparative salary schedule vs cost of living analysis by geographic area. The analysis should have a particular focus on available income after cost of living expenses for the geographic area; comparable available income after cost of living expenses from other jobs in the geographic area; and comparable available income after cost of living expenses for remote jobs available in the geographic area.

Policy should comment on how it included the information from the analysis. Indeterminate outcomes should not be utilized. In the event of indeterminate outcomes, different variables of the same level of quality should be used to meet the goal of this proposal.

Among the following geographic areas may be considered, but not limited to: zip code, county, school district, and / or educational service area.

The MIT cost of living calculator, or another calculator of equal or higher quality should be used for the analysis. All data sources and methodologies should be disclosed.

This proposal aligns with other recommendations pertaining to stable funding sources, data collection, full funding, and accurate financial methodologies (CSL calculation).

This will be fully funded by the Legislature. This proposal can only be successful if fully funded.

**Enforcement**—*how to make sure the policy is followed*

Policy pertaining to statewide educator salary schedules should be required to comment on this analysis, and how the information was taken into consideration.

**Reporting**—*how the legislature knows whether the policy is working*

To be explicitly named in the policy the extent to how the information was considered.

**Implementation**—*which agencies or entities are responsible*

It is contemplated that the Legislative Fiscal Office may contract with independent organizations for this work, or perform the work itself.

## Job classifications for classified staff

### [Hodge-Wofford Recommendation 3](#)

**Authors:** Iris Hodge and Sarah Wofford, Oregon School Employees Association  
Oregon will issue a study on consistent job classifications in our public education system.

Yes		No	Excused
Yes	with Reservations		
10	0	0	2

### Goal 16: Job classifications.

To support data-driven decision making, ensure comparability, and better address the needs of classified staff, Oregon will continue to explore the benefits and challenges of consistent job classifications across school districts.

#### Problem statement

Parity in job classifications to better address pay inequities across the state.

#### Detailed description

Oregon’s public education system reinforces societal inequities by allowing for thousands of different job classifications for classified workers. By streamlining the classification system in all education settings, using systems that already exist, such as the State of Oregon employee classification tables, Oregon educators will be on a more equitable starting line. A study using data from classified staff in Oregon will help to clearly show the viability of consistent job classifications for Oregon classified educators.

#### Enforcement—*how to make sure the policy is followed*

Bureau of Labor and Industries (BOLI)

#### Reporting—*how the legislature knows whether the policy is working*

Biannual reporting in line with state budget cycle

#### Implementation—*which agencies or entities are responsible*

Oregon Department of Education (ODE)

We value the careful  
implementation of  
complex changes to  
state education policy.

## Fiscal analyses of legislation impacting school districts

### [Sen. Dembrow Recommendation 1](#)

**Author:** Senator Michael Dembrow

Improving the analysis of potential fiscal impacts of legislation on districts.

Yes	Yes with Reservations	No	Excused
10	0	0	2

### Goal 17: Careful implementation

State government, school districts, educator associations, and other stakeholders will collaborate and share data and analyses, leading to solutions that meet the needs of educators, students, and families in all parts of Oregon. This collaboration and shared data will drive a carefully planned, fully funded, multi-biennia rollout of research-based changes to statewide education policy.

#### Problem statement

A need for more transparency on the impacts of legislatively-mandated workforce requirements.

#### Detailed description

It’s important that any steps the Legislature takes to address educator workforce challenges beyond current expectations not be unfunded mandates placed upon local school districts. Rather, stable sources of funding must be identified and appropriated. This will require fiscal analyses that are built on trusted, impartial data. Unfortunately, our current process for identifying local impacts too often falls short of this standard. Rather than relying on school district advocates to provide this information, we need an objective, transparent process that can lead to LFO’s analysis. We propose that a workgroup process involving LFO, LPRO, ODE, and relevant education stakeholders be initiated in time for implementation during the 2025 legislative session.

#### **Enforcement**—*how to make sure the policy is followed*

Legislative leadership, LFO, and LPRO will create the necessary policy

**Reporting**—*how the legislature knows whether the policy is working*

The fiscal analyses and the data basis for determining them

**Implementation**—*which agencies or entities are responsible*

Oregon Department of Education (ODE) and the Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC)



## Appendix

Task force members proposed the recommendations below but did not vote on them. Per feedback from task force colleagues, these proposals were revised by the authors and submitted as subsequent drafts. In some cases, members learned that fellow members had similar ideas, so they came together to submit a collaborative proposal instead of competing proposals.

- [Branger Muñoz Proposed Rec 1 Draft 1](#)  
Educator diversification
- [Branger Muñoz Proposed Rec 2 Draft 1](#)  
New and early career incentives
- [Branger Muñoz Proposed Rec 3 Draft 1](#)  
Minimum salaries with research into the tiered system
- [Branger Muñoz Proposed Rec 7 Draft 1](#)  
Reduced probationary periods
- [Hodge Wofford Proposed Rec 1 Draft 1](#),  
Lack of transparency in workforce data
- [Hodge Wofford Proposed Rec 2 Draft 1](#)  
Statewide minimum salaries: a baseline for classified educators across Oregon
- [Ledson Proposed Rec 1 Draft 1](#)  
Monetary retention payments for paraeducators
- [McBride Murray Sattenspiel Simons Proposed Rec 1 Draft 1](#)  
Steering committee / working group to develop a framework for a statewide salary structure
- [Neron Hodge Wofford Proposed Rec 1 Draft 1](#)  
Efficient and complete statewide data on all K-12 public education staff—including classified, licensed, and administrative—including pay and benefits, reported annually, and accessible to the public online
- [Sen. Dembrow Proposed Rec 2 Draft 1](#)  
Improving the analysis of potential fiscal impacts of legislation on districts