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INTRODUCTION

The Governor’s Education Excellence Commission, led by Governor Gary Herbert, released its Education Roadmap in 2018. This roadmap seeks to improve educational outcomes for Utah’s students through four areas of focus. One of these is to elevate the education profession by strengthening and supporting teachers, in part by supporting “compensation aimed at recruiting and retaining high-quality educators within the K-12 and higher education systems.”

Schools and districts across the state struggle to staff classrooms with qualified teachers. According to a 2015 survey of school districts by the Utah State Board of Education, 90% “reported the pool of qualified applicants has been shrinking.” These shortages are particularly present in hard-to-staff teaching areas, such as math, science and special education. Given the consensus of research connecting teacher quality with improved educational outcomes, it is imperative that Utah’s education stakeholders continue considering how it can attract and maintain a highly effective teacher workforce.

Teacher compensation is one key aspect of the issue. Is compensation well-calibrated to attract and maintain great personnel? This is a key question for any responsible employer. As the employers of 30,000 teachers, the 41 school districts and the 120-plus charter schools – along with state policymakers – are responsible for finding ways to enhance compensation in a way that helps to put strong teachers in the classrooms.

In addressing teacher pay, this report does not make recommendations for increases or decreases. Rather, it aims to make an objective analysis of Utah’s teacher workforce, particularly focusing on salaries and benefits – and the extent to which they may be related to attracting and retaining teachers in Utah’s schools.

KEY FINDINGS OF THIS REPORT

- Utah’s average teacher pay ($47,604) is significantly lower than the national average ($60,483).
- When comparing average teacher pay in Utah to other Mountain States, Utah fares a bit better than it does nationally, but is still nearly 10% below the median state ($52,389). Utah’s average pay is also the lowest among the eight Mountain States. However, when factoring in experience and education levels, Utah is in the middle of the pack.
- Teacher pay varies widely among school districts within Utah, with pay for comparable levels of education and experience ranging nearly 40%.
- Utah’s teachers on average earn less than three-quarters of what private sector professionals with bachelor’s degrees in other fields earn.
- The state’s largest districts increased teacher pay by more than 10%, on average, for the 2017-18 school year – through a combination of increases to the state’s Weighted Pupil Unit program and increases in local funds, including property taxes.
- Additional increases in pay could come indirectly from the Utah Legislature or through higher local property taxes, but the level of teacher compensation is to some extent a matter of district priorities.
- A key consideration for policymakers is to consider pay in the context of total compensation, with an eye toward calibrating the compensation components to attract and retain a highly effective teaching corps.
- Nearly one out of every five education dollars is spent on teacher benefits, though a recent survey shows that most prospects for college teaching programs appear to be more interested in pay than benefits.
METHODOLOGY

To examine teacher compensation, Utah Foundation collected and analyzed data from a variety of sources, including (a) Utah State Board of Education (USBE) reports, (b) USBE Comprehensive Administration of Credentials for Teachers in Utah Schools (CACTUS) data, (c) National Education Association reports, (d) Utah Education Association (UEA) teacher salary reports, (e) individual salary schedules from districts throughout the region, and (f) the most recent results of National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) surveys which include (1) the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) and (2) the National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS).

It should be noted that the most recent NCES survey for which Utah state-level data are available is from the final Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) from the 2011-12 school year. The National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS) replaced the SASS with the first year of its data from 2016-17. However, since state-by-state NTPS are unavailable, Utah Foundation used these recent data for a national analysis but relied on 2011-12 SASS data for state-level analysis.

For this report, Utah Foundation looked to the other Mountain States for comparisons for two reasons. First, several of these surrounding states create an immediate pressure on teacher workforce in certain Utah districts, as some Utah teachers look across the border for higher pay. Second, these states – like Utah – are experiencing population growth that far outpaces national growth, requiring a quickly expanding number of teachers.

The report does not focus on charter school pay, which varies greatly across the more-than 120 charter schools in the state. On average, charter school teacher salaries are lower than those in district schools. For a deeper analysis, see Utah Foundation’s 2016 report, Utah’s Charter Schools: Comparisons and Funding Equity with District Schools.

THE TEACHER “PIPELINE”

Making adjustments to compensation is one of the policy levers that can help with teacher supply and keep highly effective teachers in classrooms. To address teacher staffing challenges, the Governor’s Education Roadmap states that Utah must prepare, recruit, support, develop and retain highly effective educators and school leaders. The pool of these teachers – and potential teachers – can be thought of as a pipeline. It includes students coming from traditional four-year teaching programs, out-of-state teachers, people entering the field through the Alternative Route to Licensure (ARL) program and Academic Pathways to Teaching (APT) programs, as well as returning teachers.

Utah’s higher education students gained teacher licensure in 10 programs around the state. The number of newly licensed teachers had been steady through the mid-2010s, but has declined since the 2015-16 school year. See Figure 1.

Historically, this group has made up the majority of new teachers. As recent as the 2010-11 school year, 62% of new teachers came from a traditional four-year college or university teaching
program. By the 2017-18 school year, that number had shrunk to just 40%. (See Figure 2.) Over the same period, the proportion of new teachers who were temporarily-licensed or had no license increased from 18% to 41%. This is significant because, due to the time and effort it entails, licensure generally suggests a longer-term commitment to the teaching profession. (It should be noted that the temporarily-licensed or non-licensed population includes teachers who were licensed in other states, but whose credentials have not yet transferred, and teacher interns who are finishing up their degrees; being temporarily-licensed or non-licensed is not necessarily synonymous with a lower level of training or commitment to the profession.)

Even as new teachers become employed with Utah districts, the teacher pipeline is not totally secure: It has leaks. These leaks include teacher retirement and other departures, both voluntary and involuntary, such as teachers leaving their school, district or state to teach elsewhere or changing their profession entirely.

**RETENTION RATES**

As with recruitment, teacher retention has some relation to teacher pay. But teacher retention is not an unmitigated good. Turnover, particularly of lower-quality staff, is healthy – research suggests that students may benefit when less-effective teachers leave. And teacher retention is not dissimilar to other professions with equivalent education levels – at least nationally.

Data show that new teacher retention rates fluctuate minimally from year to year. Retention rates among new Utah teachers show about 15% of new teachers leave the state’s public-school rolls after their first year – meaning that they may have moved to private schools, other states, or out of the teaching profession altogether. But in total, thousands of Utah’s nearly 30,000 teachers leave the profession each year.

The five-year retention rate has also remained consistent. Approximately three out of five teachers remain in the state’s public-school system after their first five years. In the 2016-17 school year, nearly half of teachers were still in the district or the charter school in which they began teaching five years earlier in 2012-13.

In 2017, the Utah Education Policy Center found that the eight-year retention rate had been 56% from the 2008 cohort of new Utah teachers. Accordingly, if teachers make it past the first year, they appear to be more likely to stick around, but are much more likely if they make it past the five-year mark – with the year-over-year attrition rate declining significantly between their fifth and eighth years.
Retention rates are not constant across all groups of teachers – teacher training programs can have a significant impact on whether teachers keep teaching. Those who have been through four-year teacher training programs choose to leave teaching at much lower rates (9% before their second year) than those who have not (as high as 23% for those with temporary licenses or no license).\(^\text{18}\)

But again, it is important to keep in mind that there is turnover in any profession. Teacher turnover rates are not particularly high compared to the rates in other professions that entail similar education levels – at least on a national comparison. And, unless they are retiring, most teachers that do leave a teaching post actually stay in the education field, opting for other jobs within schools or school districts.\(^\text{19}\)

**TEACHER SHORTAGES IN PERSPECTIVE**

Utah has not always had a teacher shortage. In fact, a Utah Foundation research brief released in 1971 suggested that “high school counselors and college advisers might well apprise young people of the limited employment prospects for school teachers before costly training in the area is encouraged for large numbers of students.” At that time, Utah’s student population was stagnant and the unemployment rate for teachers was 8.2%.

HOW MUCH DOES PAY MATTER?

The National Scene

Teachers do not leave the profession for any single reason; salary levels alone do not explain teacher attrition. One national survey found that, of the teachers who left in 2012-13, the most common response was for personal life matters (two-in-five teachers), while salaries and other job benefits only accounted for about one-in-10 teachers leaving.\(^\text{20}\) In fact, most teachers are satisfied with their jobs. About 9-in-10 strongly or somewhat agree that they are generally satisfied with being a teacher at their school.\(^\text{21}\)

That does not mean that teachers are satisfied with their pay – more than half of 2015-16 school-year teachers somewhat or strongly disagreed that they were satisfied with their teaching salaries (55%).\(^\text{22}\)

Recent months have seen a wave of teacher discontent nationally. In February of 2018, teachers in West Virginia, a state where teacher pay ranked 48\textsuperscript{th} in the nation in 2016, went on strike, forcing schools to close in all counties.\(^\text{23}\) Later that spring, teachers in Oklahoma, Arizona, Kentucky and Colorado followed suit. At the start of the 2018-19 school year, strikes began in Washington state, followed by Los Angeles, Denver and Oakland, as well as a charter school network in Chicago. Virginia and Indiana teachers also considered striking during the 2018-19 school year.\(^\text{24}\)

The core issue in these strikes was teacher compensation, whether in the form of pay or benefits, though striking teachers in some states have spoken more broadly of budgetary concerns.

Nationally, teachers’ inflation-adjusted salaries are down five percent since the Great Recession.\(^\text{25}\) In the states with teacher strikes, inflation-adjusted wages are less than they were in 1990.\(^\text{26}\)

One counterargument to the decrease in real wages for teachers is that, as baby boomers age, more teachers are retiring, meaning younger teachers are entering the profession, lowering the average pay for teachers. However, one national analysis found that, based on age and qualifications, teacher pay should actually be higher in 2016 than in 2007.\(^\text{27}\) The analysis shows that teachers are on average three months older in 2016 and have higher rates of masters and doctorate degrees; experience and degrees generally equate to higher pay.
Furthermore, according to a 2012 national survey of public-school teachers who decided to leave the teaching profession but indicated that they would consider returning, “67% rated an increase in salary as extremely or very important to their decision to return.”

The public seems to agree. In 1969, based upon survey data from the first *PDK Poll of the Public’s Attitudes Toward the Public Schools*, one-third of Americans indicated that teachers’ salaries were too low. That percentage had decreased to a low of 30% by 1981. But by 2018, two-thirds of people indicated that teacher salaries are too low.

**The Picture in Utah**

Closer to home, a 2018 study by the Utah Education Policy Center at the University of Utah shows salary levels do not strongly motivate teachers to stay in the profession; it was ranked as the second-lowest factor influencing teachers to stay in teaching. This shows that salary levels are not necessary sufficient to retain teachers – but that many teachers are staying despite their pay.

Envision Utah reached out to former teachers in late 2018 to determine how to increase the rate of return to teaching. As part of this outreach, Envision received 315 responses to a question asking former teachers to “list any additional accommodations you would need or which would support you in returning to work as an educator.” The most common answer was “higher salary” (33%), followed by help renewing their licensure (11%), part-time options for teaching (8%), and affordable childcare and smaller class sizes (6% each).

Envision Utah also surveyed more than 4,100 Utah college students and found almost half had considered teaching, but ultimately chose other careers. The most cited reason for choosing another career path was “other interests” (37%) followed by “salaries are too low” (36%). Respondents of the survey said “higher salaries, more opportunities for career advancement, and increased scholarships and financial aid for teachers” were all possible incentives that would make them consider becoming teachers.

**WHAT DO TEACHER SALARIES LOOK LIKE?**

Teacher salaries are typically determined by salary schedules set either by state legislatures or local school districts. In Utah, salary schedules are set by individual school districts.

Typically, teacher salaries have been based upon years of teaching experience, which are known as “steps” in salary calculation, and educational attainment, which are known as “lanes.” When using the steps and lanes approach, school districts produce a matrix to determine individual teacher salaries. A base salary is set at the pay rate for a first-year teacher with a bachelor’s degree, with all other salaries based on this starting amount. Teachers are often eligible for pay increases for each year of experience they gain, as they complete more course work toward graduate degrees and as they complete those degrees.

Steps and lanes become less clear-cut as other factors come into play. These factors include non-traditional licensure, cost of living adjustments for teachers who have reached the highest steps in their lanes, additional certifications, and additional amounts for teaching certain subjects or at Title 1 schools.
Many large school districts, including Davis, Canyons and Jordan, have recently altered their salary schedules from the standard multi-lane schedules dependent on education and experience to new single-lane schedules. These salary schedules allow education and experience to operate independently of one another. Additionally, pay raises for experience are the same from one year to the next instead of tapering off over time.

**National Comparisons**

Beyond the pay schedules of specific districts, how does Utah compare to other states across the nation? In Utah, the average teacher pay in 2018 was $47,604 per year. Nationally, the average pay was $60,483. This puts Utah’s average at 79% of the U.S. average. See Figure 5.

However, states with very high costs of living like New York and California draw up the U.S. average teacher pay – with those two states’ average teacher pay above $80,000 per year. These two states together also contain nearly one-fifth of the nation’s population. As such, it is useful to compare Utah to the median state’s teacher pay to get a better representation of where Utah lies compared to other states in the nation. The median state is North Dakota, with an average salary of $54,421. Utah’s average salary is 87% of North Dakota’s average salary.
Mountain State Comparisons

Due in part to population growth and the relatively less-experienced teacher workforce in Utah, it is important to look beyond national comparisons. This is because less experienced teachers have lower salaries than veteran teachers.

An important comparison group for Utah is other Mountain States, which are Utah’s bordering states of Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Nevada, New Mexico, and Wyoming, as well as Montana. These states share multiple similarities, but most importantly they have seen similar levels of population growth – and a younger teacher core.

Since 1970, Utah has been below the median state teacher pay for the Mountain States. The median Mountain State in 2018 was Colorado – with an average pay of $52,389. This puts Utah’s pay at 91% of Colorado’s. See Figure 6.

It is also important to take into account education and experience levels, in order to make apples-to-apples comparisons. Salaries in Utah appear to be somewhat better when separated by various educational and experience levels.

---

**Utah is at the bottom of the Mountain States for average pay.**

Figure 6: Utah, U.S., and Mountain States’ Average Teacher Pay, 2016-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Average Pay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>$55,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>$56,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>$47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>$57,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>$47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>$47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>$52,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>$52,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Department of Education, NCES.
Using the Department of Education data from 2011-12, the most recent detailed data available, Utah’s teachers were in the middle of the pack across all levels compared to the other seven Mountain States. See Figure 7.

In addition to geographic and population growth similarities, Mountain States are similar in terms of purchasing power or cost of living. A person in Colorado can purchase less than the average American with $100, but a person in Utah and other Mountain States can purchase more than the average American. Utah is similar to Nevada and Wyoming, but Montana, Idaho and Arizona are somewhat less expensive places to live. See Figure 8.

Based on the detailed Department of Education data from 2011-12, salaries for teachers in Utah were average or less in the Mountain States across all education and experience levels. With respect to the lowest and highest districts’ average base salaries in the region,
Nevada and Wyoming offered more competitive salaries on both ends of the salary spectrum.\textsuperscript{41} (See Figure 9.)

It is important to bear in mind that teacher pay at the district level is often simply a reflection of states’ level of funding for education in general and the relative wealth of districts. This is because most education funding is used for teacher salaries and benefits.\textsuperscript{42} For a discussion of teacher pay with respect to school finances, see Utah Foundation’s 2018 report Simple Arithmetic? K-12 Education Spending in Utah at www.utahfoundation.org.

## TEACHER PAY IN CONTEXT

During a legislative committee meeting at the Utah State Capitol in 2018, discussion arose as to whether teachers should earn less than other professionals with similar education levels because they work less – taking summers and school holidays off. In addition, discussion arose as to whether the summer months afford an opportunity to supplement their salary with outside pay.

With respect to this question, it is important to consider two factors: the amount of time teachers spend after hours doing prep work and grading tests and papers; and the extent to which summer jobs, which are unlikely to pay career-level wages, can make up the pay gap.* See a discussion of additional pay earned by teachers in Appendix C.

Comparisons Within Utah

Utah teachers’ salaries strongly vary depending on the district. Figure 10 and Figure A (in Appendix A) depict the base salaries for public school teachers with bachelor’s or master’s degrees by district in 2015-16. These figures convey the variance in pay available to beginning teachers throughout the state – a difference of nearly 40% from the lowest to highest of the range. For example, whereas new teachers with bachelor’s degrees could earn approximately $37,000 working in North Summit School District, those teachers could earn more than $50,000 working in the adjacent Park City School District; that’s an extra $1,000 per month. The lowest starting salary for a teacher with a bachelor’s degree is just under $34,000, in Piute County School District. (See Appendix A for the range of low, average and high salaries by district.)

Any discussion of Park City brings up the concept of purchasing power – as that city is far-and-away the most expensive community in the state, with the Utah Realtors Association show housing prices as two-to-three times the state average. While pay for teachers in Park City is high compared to other districts, district starting-salary differences do not necessarily align costs of living or the purchasing power of the dollar in their respective areas across the state. For instance, Alpine School District, with one of the lowest base salaries in the state for teachers with bachelor’s and master’s degrees, is in one of the more expensive parts of the state. On the other hand, Ogden City School District teachers’ starting pay is far above Alpine, but a dollar in the Ogden-Clearfield area goes further than in Alpine. (See Figure 11 for purchasing power in Utah.)
Purchasing power ranges by nearly 10% in Utah while, as noted, starting teacher pay in districts ranges by nearly 40%.

Variations in teacher salaries encourage teachers to cross district boundaries, but could also potentially encourage teachers to work in a neighboring state for more competitive salaries. Figure 12 depicts the salaries for teachers at various education and experience levels in adjacent school districts in northeastern Utah and across the border in southwestern Wyoming for 2015-16. The three Utah school districts included are North Summit, South Summit and Rich school districts, the borders of which are near or adjacent to Uinta #1, Uinta #2 and Lincoln #2 school districts in Wyoming. Given the approximately $5,000 to $10,000 difference in salaries between Wyoming and Utah across education and experience levels, it would be unsurprising to find that Utah teachers living near the boundaries of these districts might prefer to work in nearby Wyoming, even given any cross-state barriers to educators (such as state-specific licensure) and the potentially longer commute into work.

Such large differences in out-of-state teacher salaries are not present along all of Utah’s borders. For example, whereas the starting base salary for teachers in Washington County School District in southwestern Utah for the 2017-18 school year was $40,000, adjacent Clark county in Nevada offered a similar $40,900.45

Comparisons with other Professions

How does teacher pay compare with other professions? There is a gap between the wages in the teaching profession and other similarly credentialed, private sector jobs. When looking at the median salaries and wages for full-time workers (over 25 years old) with bachelor’s degrees, teachers nationally earned three-quarters what their counterparts in other professions earned. The Mountain States median is just below the national median. Utah is just below that, at 73%.

The pay gap is increasing. Between 2010 and 2016, private sector jobs in the U.S. saw salary and wage increases of 8%, while education jobs increased 5%.
The pay gap is increasing. Between 2010 and 2016, private sector jobs in the U.S. saw salary and wage increases of 8%, while education jobs increased 5%. This increase in the pay gap is similar to the Mountain State median. However, Utah private sector pay rose nearly 10%, while education employees saw a less than 4% increase.

And nationally, the pay gap is far higher than most countries within the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. International analysis shows that the U.S. gap is smaller than only two countries, but larger than 27. See Figure 14.

This increasing wage gap between teaching and private sector professions may provide stronger incentives for teachers to leave education, in addition to discouraging students and others from deciding to become teachers.

Utah’s pay gap between teacher and other professions is in line with and the U.S. and Mountain States averages.

Figure 13: Percent of Teachers’ Salaries and Wages Compared to Private Sector Professions, Full-Time Employees with Bachelor’s Degrees, 2016

![Bar chart showing percent of teachers' salaries and wages compared to private sector professions in various states and the U.S.](chart.png)

Source: Governing Magazine.

The U.S. teacher-pay gap is far larger than most countries in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Figure 14: Annual average salaries (including bonuses and allowances) of middle school teachers in public institutions compared to full-time, full-year post-secondary educated worker, aged 25-64.

![Bar chart showing annual average salaries of middle school teachers compared to full-time, full-year post-secondary educated worker, aged 25-64](chart2.png)

Note: Utah’s rate has been adjusted by Utah Foundation to fit OECD’s calculations.

Source: OECD.
teachers, regardless of any altruistic or personal reasons teachers may have to join the profession.

**RECENT LEGISLATION AND DISTRICT CHANGES IN UTAH TEACHER SALARIES**

**Legislation**

The weighted pupil unit or WPU determines how state education funds are directed to districts and schools according to their school sizes and characteristics.\(^48\) During the Utah General Legislative Session ending March of 2017, the Utah Legislature approved a 4% increase of the WPU.\(^49\) By March of 2018, they had approved another 2.5% increase – enough to cover inflation cost increases. However, additional 2018 education funding, such as local property tax changes and Education Fund changes, had an overall effect of increasing the WPU by approximately 7%.\(^50\) Changes during the 2019 Session had an overall effect of increasing the WPU by another 6%.\(^51\) This allotment of funds above anticipated growth rates will likely increase teacher pay rates across the state.

The 2017 Utah General Legislative Session also saw the passage of House Bill 212 – Incentive for Effective Teachers in High Poverty Schools – which calls for an ongoing appropriation of $250,000.\(^52\) The bill authorizes funding for an incentive program that gives teachers in high-poverty schools a $5,000 bonus if they achieve a defined level of improvement on end-of-year standardized tests.\(^53\) Given the specific qualifications under the program, only a small portion of Utah teachers are likely to receive the incentive.

There is some evidence to suggest that similar incentive programs have temporarily improved retention rates in high-poverty schools during the years they were implemented.\(^54\) However, there also is evidence to suggest that one-time pay increases that do not also address overall school quality and working conditions will not be effective in having a long-term impact on the retention rates in these areas.\(^55\)

Lastly, 2017’s House Bill 43 – American Indian and Alaskan Native Education Amendments – directs $250,000 per year during a four-year pilot program toward grants to districts and charter schools for stipends, recruitment, retention and professional development of teachers in schools with large percentages of youth who identify as American Indian and Alaskan Native.\(^56\)

**School District Changes**

At the district level, numerous school boards have been taking the initiative to substantially increase teachers’ salaries in an effort to recruit and retain talented teachers. Three contiguous school districts in the Wasatch Front area in particular – Canyons, Granite and Jordan which together represent one-quarter of Utah’s K-12 enrollment – increased their teachers’ salaries by approximately $5,000
for the 2017-18 school year, with new teachers in these districts earning base salaries above $40,000 per year. In doing so, the school districts’ boards have cited attracting highly effective teachers to their district as the primary motivating factor in their decisions to substantially increase teachers’ salaries.

In the nine school districts in the state with more than 20,000 students, school boards raised the average starting salaries for bachelor’s and master’s degree-holding teachers by 2% between 2015-16 and 2016-17. The following year, boards raised starting salaries by an average of 11% for those with bachelor’s degrees and 12% for those with master’s degrees. (See Figure 15 as well as Figure C in Appendix B.)

While the statewide increases to the WPU aided these districts in being able to increase teacher pay, the districts are funding the remainder of the increases by various means. For example, Jordan School District has been pulling from emergency reserves to fund salary increases, while Granite School District increased teacher pay by increasing its board levy, which resulted in a 12% increase in its property tax.

**POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES FOR PAY**

As some districts find ways to increase pay, the pressure builds among other districts to follow suit to remain competitive. It could also act as a signal to people considering beginning a teaching career or returning to the profession that such a move might work financially.

If in fact Utah’s elected officials want to fund a further increase in teacher salaries, there are two primary sources. One is the Utah Legislature. Over the past 20 years, the Legislature has overseen an overall decrease in funding “effort,” despite dollar-amount increases in funding in recent years (see Utah Foundation’s 2018 report *Simple Arithmetic? K-12 Education Spending in Utah*). The key mechanism for funding teacher salaries is through the state’s Weighted Pupil Unit (WPU) program – though it also uses tools such as the Teacher Supplement Salary program (both of which are funded from the state’s income tax). Through these programs, the Utah Legislature can have a large impact on teacher pay – particularly given that the state funds more than half of Utah’s public school system. In Wyoming, the legislature responded to a Wyoming Supreme Court directive to increase funding for schools in the mid-
JOB SECURITY

One of the more intangible benefits of teaching is that teachers enjoy better job security than many private sector jobs offer. In terms of unemployment rates in 2017 nationally and in Utah, teachers’ occupational category — “professional and related” — fared well compared to the other five primary occupational categories. The unemployment rate for the teachers’ subcategory is lower than its overall occupational category. (See the figure, below.) Low unemployment rates for teachers are also seen in the rest of the Mountain States — as low as 1.5% in Idaho.

Note: As included in this narrative, the Pre-K through 12th grade school teachers’ category within “Professional and related” occupations include preschool and kindergarten teachers, elementary and middle school teachers, secondary school teachers, and special education teachers.


The unemployment rate for teachers is lower than for other professions.

Unemployment Rates by Profession, U.S. and Utah, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
<th>Utah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management, business and financial</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and related (includes teachers)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-K through 12th grade school teachers</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and office</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resources, construction and maintenance</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, transportation and material moving</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2000s, ultimately resulting in a large boost in pay. Wyoming teachers now earn 20% more than Utah teachers.

Another primary source of funding for pay is individual school districts. As noted, a number of them have funded large increases in recent years. But there is more room for increases in funding – and commensurate increases in teacher pay. As part of the Voted Local Levy that is approved by voters and the Board Local Levy approved by school district boards, there is enough room on a statewide basis to increase property taxes to a level that would yield a combined average of $13,000 more per teacher. Of course, the potential for such increases varies from district to district. Furthermore, increases of such a large proportion could run afoul of other district needs or the willingness of citizens to absorb the requisite tax increases.

In addition, Senate Bill 149 – The Teacher and Student Success Act – passed during the 2019 Utah General Legislative Session, allows district and charter boards to direct up to 25% (and up to 40% under certain circumstances) of the funds from the Teacher and Student Success Account toward teacher salaries – which could total over $1,000 per teacher in some districts and charter schools.
CHANGES TO TEACHER RETIREMENT

Before 2010, the Utah Retirement System (URS), which supplies retirement and insurance benefits for all public employees, had one option for employees: a pension plan with a fixed monthly pay out in retirement. In 2010, the Utah State Legislature passed Senate Bill 63, changing retirement plans for employees based on hire date. These changes in the URS came after a $6.5 billion investment loss due in part to the Great Recession. The change cuts costs and reduces risk to the system but results in a somewhat lower benefit for retirees.

Public employees hired before July 1, 2011, were deemed to be Tier I employees. Utah’s Tier I public sector employees are on a traditional defined-benefit pension plan.

New hires beginning on July 1, 2011 were deemed Tier II employees. Tier II employees have two choices for retirement plans: 1) a hybrid of a defined-benefit pension and 401(k) or 2) a defined-contribution plan. For the hybrid plan, the employer contributes to the pension plan based on the yearly pension contribution rate. The difference between the yearly pension contribution rate and 10% is the paid into the employee’s 401(k). The contribution rates for the 2018-19 year are 8.85% to the pension and 1.15% to a 401(k). For the defined-contribution plan, an amount equal to 10% of the employee’s salary is paid directly into the employee’s 401(k). In Utah, there is no required employee match to receive this retirement benefit. This equates to an enhanced benefit over governmental retirement systems in many other states, which typically require employee matches of 6% to 8% for traditional pension plans.

In both plans, 401(k)s are vested – or available to be paid out – at four years, and employees are free to contribute additional amounts as they would like, which are then vested immediately.

According to the Office of Legislative Research and General Counsel, Tier I Utah state employees receive a higher benefit in retirement than their Tier II counterparts – just over $3,500 on average, or 14% more per year.

In Utah, part of retirement costs for teachers also include a 10% amortization payment that will be paid by the employer until about 2030. This was implemented at the time of the switch to Tier II in order to make up for the substantial loss that URS funds took during the Great Recession. This means that the total retirement package for teachers and Utah employees is actually more than 20%. It is approximately 10% for the regular contribution plus 10% for the amortization payment. Including Social Security, the total percentage is 22%. While these costs are high, the structure means that Utah is on track to have the retirement fund fully funded – a level of security many retirement plans across the nation do not enjoy.

Also in 2010, the Utah Legislature passed Senate Bill 43, a bill that put an end to immediate “double-dipping” by employees who had already retired with the state but were then rehired, meaning they received a pension benefit and a paycheck from the state. Now, retired employees must wait to be rehired for one year after their retirement date in order to keep receiving pension payments.

Note: The URS calculates retirement benefit for Tier I employees by taking an employee’s number of years of service, multiplying that by 2%, and averaging the employee’s using their three highest-paid years. For a Tier I employee who worked for the state for 30 years and had an average highest salary of $47,684, their annual retirement benefit would be $28,611. For a Tier II employee opting for the hybrid retirement plan, the formula is similar, using a 1.5% multiplier for years of service and averaging their highest salary over their five highest-paid years. For a Tier II employee in the hybrid plan who has worked for the state for 35 years, with the same five-year average salary of $47,684, their annual retirement benefit would be $25,034.

It is important to remember that teacher pay is largely a matter of priorities. At the state level, teacher pay and K-12 funding in general is in competition with other budget items. There are also priorities at play in districts. Even though capital spending and debt service appear on a different part of the local spending ledger than teacher pay, indirectly the $600 million spent on those necessities represent spending capacity that is not going toward teacher pay.

Within the compensation picture alone, there are choices made as to the balance of spending between salary and benefits. As this report notes, it appears that potential new recruits to the teaching profession in Utah may be more interested in pay than benefits. Ensuring that the total compensation picture is well-calibrated to attract and retain the best employees should be a key concern of both district employers and state policymakers.

**BENEFITS**

In addition to considering teachers’ salaries, it is important to consider teachers’ workplace benefits, which tend to be a significant portion of compensation costs. Teacher benefits typically include paid leave, insurance plans, retirement and savings, among other benefits.

These benefits are complex and difficult to compare across states. However, in terms of spending, it is notable that nationally, teachers’ benefits alone make up 15.3% of “current education spending,” while in Utah the number is 18.7% — so more than one-in-six of Utah’s education dollars (not including capital projects) goes to benefits. (Just over 38% and 39% are spent on salaries and wages in the U.S. and Utah, respectively.) These higher Utah percentages are due primarily to Utah’s lowest-in-the-nation per-pupil spending; a larger share of education spending is directed at benefits (and salaries) in lower-funded states since teaching is inherently a high-employee industry. Per-pupil amounts spent on benefits in the U.S. are $1,785 compared to $1,239 in Utah.

In seeking out potential teachers, the salary/benefit ratio is an important aspect of compensation to consider. According to one Utah survey, college students “believe they are generally familiar with potential salary in their career field, but significantly less knowledgeable about potential health and retirement benefits.” (See Figure 16.) The question is whether compensation priorities are appropriately aligned with the concerns of new recruits — though districts hold limited discretion over the mix of salary and benefits since all of Utah’s governmental employees are in the same retirement system (see the sidebar on page 17).

In terms of governmental jobs, benefits packages for teachers nationally account for a lower percentage of total compensation than for other state and local government
Teacher benefits are higher than private firms, but lower than government employees in general.

Figure 17: Cost of benefits as a percentage of wages of teachers, government staff, and employees of large firms, United States

|                                | Primary, secondary, and special education school teachers | State and local government | Private workers in large establishments (100+)
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------
| Paid leave                     | 5%                                                       | 8%                         | 8%                                               |
| Insurance plans                | 12%                                                      | 12%                        | 9%                                               |
| Retirement                     | 13%                                                      | 12%                        | 5%                                               |
| Legally required benefits      | 5%                                                       | 6%                         | 7%                                               |
| Total benefits                 | 34%                                                      | 36%                        | 29%                                              |


employees overall – 34% of wages total compensation compared to 36%. However, teacher benefits account for a greater percentage of total compensation than do benefits for workers in large private establishments in the U.S. – 29%.

The difference in benefits between teachers and other governmental workers is due to paid leave. Teachers have less paid leave, due in large part to teaching contracts that include days off for holidays and typically include time off for a summer break.

The largest difference between teacher benefits and those of private workers in large establishments is with respect to retirement. For teachers, the cost of retirement benefits average nearly 13% of teachers’ wages, but only 5% for private workers.

While these are national percentages (Utah-specific data for comparison are not available), they give some indication of Utah teachers’ benefit packages. They also emphasize the potential need to examine prospective teachers’ total compensation package.

BEYOND PAY

This report outlines teacher compensation in Utah in the face of an apparent teacher shortage. But the subject of pay is not a silver bullet to the issues of teacher quality and supply. Instead, it is one of a number of approaches – albeit a critical one – that could help make a difference.

Envision Utah recently convened a teacher initiative task force to address the teacher shortage. The task force grouped numerous strategies into four approaches. These align with many of the recommendations from prominent think tanks on the topic, such as the Education Commission on the States (ECS).

- **Recruit:**
  - Promote teaching to high school and middle school students.
  - Leverage Career and Technical Education pathways in high schools to help students become teachers more efficiently. (Schools around the nation are beginning to focus on this approach.)


• Provide teaching scholarships and financial aid, as well as loan forgiveness. (Some districts and states are doing this; for instance, Arizona offers free college to successful teachers.76)
• Give districts the flexibility to design their own recruitment strategies (ECS). (Utah created the Academic Pathway to Teaching program in 2016, giving non-teachers an additional route into the classroom – though some suggest that this path does not come with some of the retention advantages that the Alternative Route to Licensure does.)

• **Retain:**
  o Improve induction, professional development, mentorship, and support. (Research suggests that pre-service teacher preparation has a big effect on whether teachers will be staying in the profession.77)
  o Provide more resources for teachers.
  o Alter teacher preparation and licensure requirements (ECS).

• **Recover:**
  o Create a shared database of former teachers from which districts could recruit.
  o Create more part-time career options for teachers.
  o Allow teachers to return to teaching immediately after retirement.
  o Provide other incentives for retired teachers to return to the profession (ECS).

• **Elevate the profession:**
  o Promote the image of teachers.
  o Compensate teachers commensurate with similarly credentialed careers.

The Utah State Board of Education, school districts and others suggest that many of the “recruit” approaches are now being used in earnest. However, many suggest that there is much work to be done in terms of retention, recovery and elevating the profession, such as a recent effort toward recovery in the form of a call by Utah Governor Herbert in 2018 for retired teachers to re-join the workforce.78

**CONCLUSION**

In Utah, as in other states, there is much discussion around teacher shortages. Needless to say, ensuring that there are highly effective teachers in the classroom is critical to improving educational outcomes for children. And an importation component of both recruiting and retaining effective teachers is to offer an appropriate level of compensation.

This report does not indicate what the appropriate level is. It does, however, show that Utah’s average teacher pay is far lower than the national average. It is also the lowest among the Mountain States – states which struggle to staff classrooms in the face of rapid student population growth. But it is important to look beyond average pay.

The report also finds that pay varies greatly between Utah’s districts. This raises the stakes in terms of competition for teachers between districts, which were particularly evident in the scramble for teacher pay increases before the beginning of the 2017-18 school year.

Recruitment and retention challenges are compounded by the fact that Utah’s teachers earn less than their peers in other states and significantly less than their peers in the private sector with equivalent levels of education.

But teacher pay is bolstered by generous benefits. The question for state and district policymakers is whether the right compensation balance is in place to attract new teachers to the profession and retain highly effective teachers. And, at the end of the day, with Utah’s low per-pupil spending there are real questions about whether additional dollars will be needed to attract and retain a strong teaching force.
APPENDIX A – ADDITIONAL DISTRICT SALARIES

District difference in starting salaries between the lowest and highest is nearly 40%.

Figure A: Base Salaries for Teachers with Master’s Degrees by District, 2017-18

Base to maximum salaries vary by district, as do averages.

Figure B: Salary Range, and Average Salary, 2017-18

Source: Utah Education Association.
APPENDIX B – TEACHER PAY INCREASES, MASTER’S DEGREES

Teachers in Utah’s large school districts have seen significant increases in pay since 2015-16.

Figure C: Base Salary and Increases for Teachers with Master’s Degrees, by District (of more than 20,000 students), 2015-16 through 2017-18, with percentage increase.

APPENDIX C – ADDITIONAL PAY

Teachers earn compensation for their work beyond what is included in teacher pay schedules. Many school districts and states provide incentives and supplements to teacher salaries. In addition, teachers play additional roles in their schools and perform services after school or on the weekends. This added up to an additional $2,000 on average for Utah teachers during the 2011-12 school year. This is equal to the national average for additional earnings that year. During the 2015-16 school-year, the national average increased to $2,400 – growing faster than inflation over the period (Utah data are not available for that year). Utah teachers earned an extra 4.4% of their pay from additional school-year earnings in 2011-12.

Utah teachers’ earnings beyond salary averaged $2,000 per year

Figure D: Average Total Salary, Additional School-Year Earnings and Total from all Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Base teaching salary of regular full-time teachers</th>
<th>Additional school year earnings from all sources</th>
<th>School year earnings from all sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 2015-16</td>
<td>$55,100</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>$57,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 2011-12</td>
<td>$53,100</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$55,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah 2011-12</td>
<td>$43,900</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$45,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Department of Education, NCES, SASS.
Incentive and Supplemental Pay

As part of teachers’ additional pay, individual school districts tend to offer income incentives to attract high quality applicants and improve teacher quality. Teacher quality is often recognized through the completion of the National Board Certification.\(^8^0\) In the U.S., 25% of districts provide National Board Certification incentives, compared to 36% of Utah’s districts.\(^8^1\)

Incentives are also provided to teachers in areas that are hard to staff – such as schools in less desirable locations. These might include more rural or more urban locations. However, districts rarely provide incentives based upon desirability of location; only 6% of districts in both the U.S. and Utah incentivize location.\(^8^2\)

Districts are more likely to provide incentive pay in fields facing shortages. Only 14% of districts in the U.S. supplement for fields of shortage, compared to 38% in Utah.\(^8^3\)

The Utah Legislature incentivizes all three categories of pay. For a National Board Certification, teachers earn an additional $750 per year from the state.\(^8^4\) Utah provides an annual salary incentive of $1,500 for teachers in lower-income Title I schools. Teachers in high-demand positions earn an additional $4,100 per year. The positions considered high demand are secondary school level mathematics courses, integrated science in seventh and eighth grade, chemistry, physics, computer science and special education.

In 2015-16, about 8% of teachers nationally received supplemental pay from school system sources such as state programs – averaging $2,700 per teacher.\(^8^5\) In Utah, during the 2011-12 school year, 13% of Utah teachers reported earning supplementary salary from other school sources.\(^8^6\) In addition, about 6% of teachers in the U.S. (2015-16) and in Utah (2011-12) earned additional compensation based on students’ performance – averaging around $1,500 and $1,000 per teacher, respectively.

A small percentage of Utah teachers receive supplemental and performance pay.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other school system sources (state, supplement, etc.)</th>
<th>Additional compensation based on students’ performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of teachers</td>
<td>Average amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 2015-16</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 2011-12</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah 2011-12</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Interpret data with caution. See source note for details.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, NCES, SASS.
Other Jobs

In addition to these various salary incentives, many teachers earn salary supplements for extra work they complete both within and outside the school system. Most of these jobs are related to extracurricular activities in teachers’ schools: 45% of teachers in the U.S. are coaching, tutoring, running clubs and otherwise. These teachers earn an additional $2,600 on average. During the 2011-12 school year, 38% of Utah teachers reported earning supplementary salary for extracurricular activities – averaging $2,200 each.

Nationally in the 2015-16 school year, 18% of full-time teachers worked outside of their school systems before or after work and on weekends and holidays. Of that percentage, about a quarter taught or tutored students, a quarter did not teach but were in a teaching field, and half were in different fields entirely. These teachers earned an additional $5,100 per year, on average. During the 2011-12 school year, 17% of Utah teachers reported earning supplementary salary for a job outside of the school system. Utah’s percentages do not seem to significantly differ either nationally or regionally for these categories of supplemental income.

A large percentage of teachers earn additional pay from in-school and out-of-school jobs.

Figure F: Percent of Teacher and Amount of In-school and Outside Job Pay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extracurricular or additional activities in same school system</th>
<th>Job outside the school system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of teachers</td>
<td>Average amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 2015-16</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 2011-12</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah 2011-12</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Department of Education, NCES, SASS.

Summer Jobs

In addition to jobs during the school year, nearly one-third (32%) of full-time teachers indicated that they worked during the summer of 2015. Many taught summer school or had other non-teaching summer jobs in schools, and about half had non-school jobs – with some teachers holding more than one summer job. The average pay of their summer work added $3,700 to their annual income.

Lastly, more teachers have second jobs than do non-teaching professions – during the school year and over the summer. This is particularly the case for men; men in the teaching profession are much more likely to have a second job than men who are not teachers – 19% compared to 11%.
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55 See Frank Adamson and Linda Darling-Hammond, “Funding Disparities and the Inequitable Distribution of Teachers: Evaluating Sources and Solutions,” Education Policy Analysis Archives 20, no. 7 (2012): 1-46, www.redalyc.org/html/2750/275022797037/; Nicole S. Simon and Susan Moore Johnson, “Teacher Turnover in High-Poverty Schools: What We Know and Can Do,” Teachers College Record 117 (2015): 1-36. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/6210/6fb22387ad72a41d26403ec6851b2f0fd71c.pdf. “While some financial bonuses have increased the number of teachers in high-poverty schools or decreased turnover during the period the financial incentive was provided, these bonuses have been largely unsuccessful in improving the long-term stability and talent of teachers in such schools.” P.294.
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