

Mesa Public Schools (AZ)

GPA: 1.75

Rank: 28th place out of 50

*Document Examined: Collective bargaining agreement, 2005 – 2006**

Data from the NCTQ database were drawn from Mesa's 2005 – 2006 bargaining agreement. The authors have confirmed that a new contract has been approved. In the interest of maintaining a clear, consistent, and reliable standard for the data analyzed in this report, however, we have adhered to NCTQ's coding. Find a more detailed explanation of this approach on page 14.

HIGHLY FLEXIBLE
FLEXIBLE
SOMEWHAT FLEXIBLE
SOMEWHAT RESTRICTIVE
RESTRICTIVE
HIGHLY RESTRICTIVE

Introduction

This study of the nation's fifty largest school districts starts from a simple premise: district labor agreements should not make it difficult for schools to be nimble, smart, flexible, high-performing organizations.

In particular, the study focuses on provisions that may limit school leaders' ability to attract and retain excellent teachers, to identify and remove ineffective instructors, to use professional development as a tool of organizational improvement, and to manage school operations in a professional manner—i.e., to run the most effective school possible in terms of core instructional and educational activities, crucial areas where school leaders need enough authority to match their mounting accountability obligations and executive responsibilities in a results-based era.

Compensation	C-
1. Credit for Previous Experience	B
2. Performance Pay	C
3. Hardship Pay for High-Needs Schools	C
4. Extra Pay for Shortage Subjects	F
Personnel Policies	C
5. Tenure	N/A
6. Evaluation.	C
7. Layoffs	C
8. Transfers	C
Work Rules	D+
9. Professional Development	F
10. Subcontracting Operations†	C
11. Faculty Meetings	C
12. Teacher Leave	C

The Grades

The scale on which districts were graded reflects the approach outlined above. Grades of A or B generally indicate provisions that confer on school leaders the latitude to manage their schools in a professional manner. A grade of C generally means the agreement is silent regarding the provision in question—i.e., it neither affirms nor denies a school leader's right to take a specific course of action. Grades of D and F generally indicate provisions that impede or explicitly bar school leaders from exercising discretion in a given area. Mesa's overall grade, therefore, reflects the degree to which district policies constrain school leaders' ability to make decisions on important management issues. It is in no way a holistic assessment of local education policy or school leadership, much less of school effectiveness.

Overall GPA: 1.75 (28th place out of 50)

Mesa's GPA is the average of its scores in three areas: Compensation, Personnel Policies, and Work Rules.

Mesa receives a disappointing Somewhat Restrictive rating for its 1.75 GPA, ranking twenty-eighth among the fifty districts studied. The district is among the "quietest" in this study; of the eleven components on which it was graded, Mesa received eight Cs, all reflecting that the agreement is silent on the issue in question.

Compensation: C- (38th percentile)

The Compensation grade combines four components: Credit for Previous Experience, Performance Pay, Hardship Pay for High-Needs Schools, and Extra Pay for Shortage Subjects.

Mesa's bargaining agreement allows schools to raise starting teacher salaries based on previous experience teaching in a private school, but is silent on whether they may do so based on experience teaching in college or working in a subject-

related field. The agreement is also silent on whether schools may reward teachers on the basis of performance or for teaching in high-needs schools. The contract receives one F in this category for barring school leaders from rewarding teachers of shortage subjects.

Personnel Policies: C (59th percentile)

The Personnel Policies grade combines four components: Tenure, Evaluation, Layoffs, and Transfers.

In this category, Mesa's bargaining agreement is silent across the board: on whether school leaders may consider student performance, including test scores, when evaluating teachers; whether school leaders may retain an outstanding young teacher over one with greater seniority during layoffs; whether school leaders must give internal job applicants priority over new hires for vacant positions; whether transferring teachers may "bump" less senior teachers from their jobs; and whether school leaders must select the most junior teacher in a certification area if transfers are necessary. Tenure rules in the Mesa Public Schools, as in most places, are set by state law, not local decision; therefore, the district did not receive a grade for that component.

Work Rules: D+ (65th percentile)

The Work Rules grade combines four components: Professional Development, Subcontracting Operations, Faculty Meetings, and Teacher Leave.

Mesa's contract receives an F for requiring schools to give teachers salary credit for professional development activities outside the scheduled workday, but is silent on whether school leaders may subcontract school operations to nonunion workers; whether the length of faculty meetings is capped; whether time at such meetings must be allotted to union matters; and whether school leaders must grant teachers leave to attend union activities.

Conclusion

As its middling overall scores suggests, Mesa's report card is dominated by Cs, with two Fs tipping it into the bottom half of the rating scale, leaving ample room for improvement. To better equip its school leaders with the flexibility they need to manage their schools effectively, the Mesa Board of Education should negotiate aggressively to make contract changes that explicitly confer on school leaders the right to:

1. raise the starting salaries of teachers with all forms of relevant prior experience. (The bargaining agreement allows this for some forms but is silent on others.)
2. reward teachers on the basis of performance. (The bargaining agreement is silent on this issue.)
3. reward teachers in high-needs schools and teachers of shortage subjects. (The bargaining agreement is silent on the former and bars the latter.)
4. consider student performance, including test scores, when evaluating teachers. (The bargaining agreement is silent on this issue.)
5. base decisions regarding teacher layoffs on individual merit and performance rather than seniority. (The bargaining agreement is silent on this issue.)
6. base decisions regarding teacher transfers on individual merit and performance rather than seniority. (The bargaining agreement is silent on all three of the indicators directly addressing teacher transfers.)
7. subcontract (i.e., outsource) certain school operations. (The bargaining agreement is silent on this issue.)

In addition, the board should amend provisions that:

8. mandate that teachers be given salary credit for professional development activities outside the scheduled workday.

* The data examined in this report come from the National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ) database, "Teacher Roles, Rules and Rights." All data were culled from the NCTQ database in November 2007. In states that permit collective bargaining, NCTQ examined collective bargaining agreements, with the exception of Jordan School District in Utah, which does not have a bargaining agreement. In states where collective bargaining is either illegal or otherwise not practiced, NCTQ examined school board policies. Where a provision in state law precludes the possibility of a collective bargaining agreement or school board policy addressing a certain component in our study, we excluded it from our analysis, marking the component "N/A." Find a more detailed explanation of this report's methodology starting on page 14.

† This indicator refers to the right of school leaders to outsource school operations to nonunion workers. NCTQ uses the term "subcontracting" in its database, which we retain here in the interest of consistency.