

Milwaukee Public Schools (WI)

GPA: 1.71

Rank: 31st place out of 50
(tied with DeKalb County and Philadelphia)

Document Examined: *Collective bargaining agreement, July 1, 2001 – June 30, 2003**

Data from the NCTQ database were drawn from Milwaukee's July 1, 2001 – June 30, 2003 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.

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. Milwaukee'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: 1.71 (31st place out of 50—tied with DeKalb County and Philadelphia)

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

Milwaukee receives a disappointing Somewhat Restrictive rating for its 1.71 GPA, ranking thirty-first among the fifty districts studied. Although the district receives one B+, its report card is dominated by Cs, Ds, and Fs.

Compensation: C- (43rd 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.

Milwaukee's bargaining agreement allows schools to raise starting teacher salaries for previous experience teaching in a private school or working in a subject-related profession, but is silent on whether they may do so for previous college-teaching experience. The agreement is also silent on whether

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.	D
12. Teacher Leave	C

schools may reward teachers on the basis of performance or for working in high-needs schools. Milwaukee's contract receives one F in this category for barring schools from rewarding teachers of shortage subjects.

Personnel Policies: C (59th percentile)

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

Milwaukee's bargaining agreement is silent on whether school leaders may factor student performance, in general, into teacher evaluations, but does not address the permissibility of considering test scores, since Wisconsin state law prohibits that practice. The agreement is also silent on whether school leaders may retain an outstanding young teacher over one with greater seniority during layoffs; whether internal job applicants must be given priority over new hires for vacant positions; and whether transferring teachers may "bump" less senior teachers from their jobs. The data provided did not make it possible to determine whether schools are required to select the most junior teacher in a certification area if transfers are required. Tenure rules in Milwaukee, as in most places, are also governed by state law, not local decision; therefore, the district did not receive a grade for that component.

Work Rules: D (53rd percentile)

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

Milwaukee's contract receives an F for requiring schools to give teachers salary credit and/or stipends for professional development activities outside the scheduled workday. The bargaining agreement is silent on whether school leaders may subcontract school operations to nonunion workers and whether school leaders must grant teachers leave to attend union activities. The contract gets low marks for capping the length of faculty meetings at two and a half hours per month, but is silent on whether time at such meetings must be allotted to union matters, giving it a D for that component.

Conclusion

Of the eleven components on which it was graded, Milwaukee received only one grade higher than C, suggesting that school leaders enjoy few real guarantees of flexibility. To better equip its school leaders with the authority they need to manage their schools effectively, the Milwaukee Board of School Directors 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 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. (Of the three indicators directly addressing teacher transfers, the bargaining agreement is silent on two. NCTQ did not provide data for the third.)
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 and/or stipends for professional development activities outside the scheduled workday.
9. cap the length of faculty meetings. (While long meetings are not necessarily preferable, principals should have some discretion.)

* 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.