

**EVALUATION OF THE
JOB SHARING PILOT PROJECT
IN THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

A Report to the Legislature of the State of Hawaii

**Submitted by the
Legislative Auditor of the State of Hawaii**

**Report No. 80-10
March 1980**

FOREWORD

Through the passage of Act 150 in 1978, the Legislature authorized the establishment of a three-year job sharing pilot project in the Department of Education (DOE). The Legislature's purpose was to test and examine the feasibility of job sharing as an employment alternative for classroom teachers. In addition, it was viewed as an opportunity to provide jobs for the unemployed teachers in the State.

Under the job sharing act, our office is responsible for monitoring and evaluating the pilot project and for reporting our findings and recommendations in a series of status reports. This report is the second of the required reports. The first report dealt with the progress made in implementing the pilot project, the various demographic characteristics of the participants, and some of the problems and issues which had emerged. This report evaluates the implementation of the pilot project by DOE during the 1979 spring semester and the 1979-80 school year.

We wish to acknowledge the excellent cooperation and assistance extended to our staff by the teachers, principals, and other personnel of the Department of Education, especially its Office of Personnel Services; the students taught by job sharers; the parents of students in job sharing classes; representatives of the collective bargaining units; Dr. Susan Meives of the University of Wisconsin, who reviewed our evaluation design; and the many other public officials and private parties who were contacted during the course of our evaluation.

Clinton T. Tanimura
Legislative Auditor
State of Hawaii

March 1980

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Chapter</i>		<i>Page</i>
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	Objectives of the Evaluation	1
	Scope of the Evaluation	1
	Evaluation Methodology	1
	Organization of the Report	2
	Terminology	2
2	SOME BACKGROUND	3
	Present Size of the Pilot Project	3
	Demographic Characteristics of Job Sharers	3
	Manner in Which Job Is Shared	4
3	PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS	7
	Summary of Findings	7
	Alternative Employment Option	7
	Employment Opportunities for Unemployed Teachers	14
	Stimulating Environments for Tenured Teachers	16
	Impact on Quality of Education	20
	Summary	23
4	PROGRAM COSTS	25
	Summary of Findings	25
	Direct Operating Costs	25
	Administrative Costs	29
	Summary	30
5	PROGRAM ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS	31
	Summary of Findings	31
	Eligibility Restrictions	31
	Teaching Conditions and Requirements	34
	Recommendations	39

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Job sharing is the sharing of a permanent, full-time position by two or more persons on a regular basis. In 1978, the Hawaii State Legislature, through the passage of Act 150, established a three-year pilot project in the Department of Education (DOE) to determine the feasibility of job sharing among classroom teachers.

Section 4 of Act 150 requires the Office of the Legislative Auditor to monitor and evaluate the pilot project and to report to the 1979, 1980, and 1981 legislative sessions. This report is the second of the required reports. It presents the results of our evaluation of the pilot project as implemented by DOE during the 1979 spring semester and the 1979–80 school year.

Objectives of the Evaluation

The objectives of the evaluation are as follows:

- . To assess the effectiveness of the job sharing pilot project.
- . To determine the cost of the program.
- . To identify issues and problems related to the pilot project and, where appropriate, to recommend improvements to the project.

Scope of the Evaluation

The evaluation focused on the extent to which program objectives have been attained by the job sharing pilot project. It also includes an examination of the manner in which DOE has managed and implemented the project, the costs incurred by the project, and the effects of certain eligibility restrictions on participation in the project.

Evaluation Methodology

To gather data for the evaluation, we interviewed 120 teachers who have participated in the pilot project. Also interviewed were the respective principals of the participating teachers and DOE state and district personnel involved in the administration of the project and representatives from the bargaining units of the employees involved.

In addition, we randomly selected and interviewed a sample of elementary students who were being taught by job sharers. The parents of these students were surveyed as to their reactions to the project.

We also interviewed a number of full-time, tenured teachers who were not participating in the project. This was done to determine whether teachers generally, albeit nonparticipating, believed that there was some

value to the pilot project and whether there would be a potential for broader participation if job sharing were to be established as a permanent employment option.

Basic data on the job sharing pilot project were compiled from the initial implementation of the project in January 1979 through February of the 1979–80 school year. Personnel and fiscal data were obtained from the DOE Office of Personnel Services. Information relating to employment taxes and fringe benefits was provided by other appropriate state agencies.

Organization of the Report

This report is presented in five chapters. Chapter 1 consists of this introduction. Chapter 2 presents some background on the establishment and implementation of the pilot project and, as specifically required by Act 150, data on the demographic characteristics of the job sharers. Chapter 3 evaluates the effectiveness of the pilot project in achieving program

objectives. Chapter 4 presents an estimate of program costs. Chapter 5 identifies problems and issues which have emerged and includes our recommendations.

Terminology

Throughout this report, we use the term “job sharers” to mean collectively all teachers participating in the pilot project, i.e., the tenured teachers as well as their newly hired counterparts.

The term “tenured teacher,” unless otherwise noted, refers to the classroom tenured teacher who is participating in the pilot project.

The term “new hire” refers to the non-tenured, new teacher who is participating in the pilot project.

The term “nonparticipating teachers” refers to those tenured teachers who are in the same schools as job sharers but who are not participating in the pilot project.

CHAPTER 2

SOME BACKGROUND

The concept of job sharing originated in Europe as a way of allowing mothers to hold jobs and rear their children. It spread to the United States where interest grew in the 1960s as more people started to seek alternatives to the regular 5-day, 40-hour work week. The first large-scale testing of the concept in the United States took place in 1965 when 120 pairs of teachers were matched and placed in schools in Framingham, Massachusetts. Since then, programs, demonstration projects, and legislation relating to job sharing have been initiated across the nation.

In Hawaii, the State Legislature introduced job sharing to the public sector in 1978 with the passage of Act 150, Session Laws of Hawaii. Section 3(5) of the act defines job sharing as “the voluntary sharing of a full-time permanent employee’s position with another employee, with each working one-half of the total number of hours of work required per week, and with each receiving half of the salary to which each is respectively entitled and at least half of each employee benefit afforded to full-time employees.” This act established a three-year pilot project in the Department of Education and provided for the conversion of a maximum of 100 full-time positions to job sharing positions.

This chapter reviews the development and implementation of the pilot project in DOE and reports on the demographic characteristics of the project participants and the manner in which jobs have been shared.

Present Size of the Pilot Project

The pilot project is now in its second year. DOE spent the summer and fall of 1978 in planning for the pilot project and launched it at the beginning of the second semester of the 1978–1979 school year. At that time, the first group of 20 tenured teachers and their 20 newly hired counterparts began work as job sharers.

Before the 1979–80 school year, job sharing applications had been approved for 55 tenured teachers, including 11 who participated in the 1979 spring semester. By the start of the school year in September, new hires were found for all but seven positions. DOE kept the recruitment period open beyond the beginning of the school year since not all of the 100 authorized job sharing positions had been utilized. By October 31, 1979, two more tenured teacher applicants had been approved, three new hire counterparts had been selected, and one job sharing team had dissolved, thereby bringing the total number of job sharing teams to 50 positions, an increase of 30 positions over the previous semester’s total.

Demographic Characteristics of Job Sharers

As required by Act 150, we report in this section on the demographic characteristics of the 100 teachers participating in the pilot project for the 1979–80 school year:

Geographic distribution. As in the 1979 second semester job sharing group, all seven DOE administrative districts are again represented in the second group of 50 job sharing teams. Table 2.1 shows their location by district and school. The number of schools involved in the pilot project increased from 17 to 42. Only two of the first group of 17 schools no longer have any job sharing teams.

Grade level and subject matter distribution. As shown in Table 2.1, of the 50 job sharing positions, 26 (52 percent) are at the elementary level; 20 (40 percent) at the high school level; and four (8 percent) at the intermediate level. The distribution pattern is similar to that of the first group of job sharers where 60 percent of the positions were at the elementary level and 40 percent at the high school level. At the secondary level, the distribution of subject areas is widely dispersed with no discipline showing a predominance of participants.

Distribution by sex. Of the 50 tenured teachers, 46 are female and four are male. Their new hire counterparts are 47 females and three males.

Distribution by age. The age levels of both groups of job sharers, the tenured teachers and the new hires, participating in the 1979–80 school year fell into definite patterns as shown in Table 2.1. The tenured teachers are heavily grouped in the 30–39 year old bracket, while 21 (42 percent) and 24 (48 percent) of the new hires, respectively, fall into the 20–29 year old and 30–39 year old brackets. These patterns are essentially the same as those of the 1979 spring semester group of job sharers. There are no participants in the 60-plus age bracket although it was initially believed that tenured teachers close to retirement would be interested in job sharing.

Distribution by length of service. Table 2.1 also shows the number of years of DOE employment of the tenured teachers. The teachers were concentrated in two groups of years, 6–10 years and 11–15 years. There were two

tenured teachers with less than 6 years of service, two with 16–20 years of service, and four with 21–25 years of service.

Distribution by ethnic background. DOE is required to record the ethnic background of all applicants for employment. Table 2.1 displays the distribution by ethnic background of both the tenured teachers and the new hires.

Manner in Which Job Is Shared

The tenured teacher is responsible for proposing how a job is to be shared. A proposed work schedule outlining times, teaching responsibilities, and other school-related responsibilities is submitted to the principal for approval. Upon approval, the full-time position is converted to a job sharing position and a new hire is recruited. The following is a summary of the work schedules which have been submitted and approved for the 1979–80 school year.

Teaching duties. As shown by Table 2.2, the division of the full-time teaching schedule falls into two categories: (1) those where both job sharers work five days a week, splitting the time the same way every day or with slight variations; and (2) those where each participant teaches full days but less than five days per week. As it was with the 1979 spring semester job sharers, the preponderance was in the first category. Of the 50 tenured teachers, 38 proposed the five-days-a-week schedule, generally splitting the time by a half day apiece.

Grading. At the secondary level, each member of the job sharing teams is responsible for grading only the students that the member teaches. The job sharing teams at the elementary level have different kinds of arrangements depending on the type of teaching schedule. The predominant arrangement is a self-contained class where both partners teach the same group of students for a half day but each teacher is responsible for only some of the subjects. In about 58 percent of the teams, each teacher

TABLE 2.1
CHARACTERISTICS OF JOB SHARING PARTICIPANTS
1979-80 SCHOOL YEAR

Location of Participants by District and Schools			Grade Level and Subject Matter		
	<u>No. of positions</u>				<u>No. of participants</u>
	<u>School total</u>	<u>District total</u>			
Honolulu District		9	Elementary		26
Farrington High	1		Kindergarten		4
Fern Elem.	1		Grade 1		4
Hokulani Elem.	1		Grade 2		3
Kaiser High	4		Grade 3		4
Kapalama Elem.	1		Grade 4		1
Washington Inter.	1		Grade 5		1
			Grade 6		1
Central District		12	Reading/Special Projects		7
Aiea High	2		Special Education		1
Aliamanu Elem.	1		Intermediate		4
Hickam Elem.	1		Cultural Heritage		1
Kipapa Elem.	1		English		1
Leilehua High	1		Japanese/English		1
Mokulele Elem.	1		Mathematics		1
Moanalua High	1		High School		20
Pearl Harbor Elem.	1		American History		1
Radford High	2		Business		2
Red Hill Elem.	1		English		1
			English/News Writing		1
Leeward District		10	English, Personal Development, Science, Mathematics, Arts and Crafts		1
Campbell High	1		English/Social Studies		1
Ewa Beach Elem.	1		Geometry/Trigonometry/Algebra		1
Honowai Elem.	1		German/World History		1
Ilima Inter.	1		Home Economics		2
Kaimiloa Elem.	1		Japanese		1
Makaha Elem.	1		Language Arts		1
Pearl City High	1		Physical Education		1
Waianae Inter.	1		Social Studies		2
Waipahu High	1		Social Studies/Japanese		1
Waipahu Inter.	1		Social Studies/Psychology		1
			Spanish		1
Windward District		7	US History/General Psychology/Humanities		1
Ahuimanu Elem.	1				
Aikahi Elem.	1				
Castle High	1				
Kainalu Elem.	1				
Kalaheo High/Inter.	2				
Special Secondary Class lodged Kaneohe Elem.	1				
Hawaii District		5			
De Silva Elem.	1				
Kealakehe Elem.	3				
Keaukaha Elem.	1				
Maui District		5			
Baldwin High	1				
Kahului Elem.	1				
Lanai High/Elem.	1				
Pukalani Elem.	1				
Wailuku Elem.	1				
Kauai District		2			
Kapaa Elem.	1				
Kauai High/Inter.	1				

Job Sharing, Tenured Teachers
Length of Service in DOE

<u>No. of years</u>	<u>No. of participants</u>
0 - 5	2
6 - 10	23
11 - 15	19
16 - 20	2
21 - 25	4
26 - 30	0

Age of Participants

<u>Age groups</u>	<u>Tenured teachers</u>	<u>New hires</u>
20-29	0	21
30-39	38	24
40-49	8	3
50-59	4	2
60+	0	0

Ethnic Background

<u>Ethnic groups</u>	<u>Tenured teachers</u>	<u>New hires</u>
Chinese	3	2
Filipino	1	3
Japanese	29	26
Mixed	0	1
Part-Hawaiian	4	1
White	13	17

grades all students in the class for only the subject areas for which the teacher is responsible. Some of these teams jointly evaluate behavior, work habits, and attitude of the students. In 23 percent of the elementary teams, both teachers consult each other and evaluate the students for all subject areas. In these cases, coordination is necessary because both teachers work a full day on certain days of the week and teach all subject areas. For the remainder of the elementary level job sharing teams, each teacher either has different groups of students and grades the respective students, or no grading is required for the particular program.

in their respective classes. The elementary level teachers share the responsibility of parent-teacher conferences. In 77 percent of the teams, where the teachers share a class, both or either one of the teachers are available for conferences with the parents of all students. In other cases, where the teachers are responsible for different groups of students, they confer with only parents of students in their respective groups.

Extracurricular activities. Generally, the teachers share the responsibilities for extracurricular activities. A few tenured teachers (four at the elementary level and two at the secondary level) indicated that they assume responsibility for the extracurricular activities.

Campus supervision and lesson plans. Campus supervision responsibilities are shared by both teachers on the team. Whoever is on duty at the particular day and time assumes the assigned responsibility.

Generally, lesson planning for the classes is the responsibility of each individual job sharer at the elementary as well as at the secondary level. However, a greater percentage of the elementary teachers than secondary teachers indicated that they coordinate their lesson plans with their partners.

Faculty meetings and committee assignments. Attendance at faculty meetings in some of the job sharing teams is the responsibility of both teachers. In other teams, the person who is at work in the afternoon attends the faculty meetings. The teams which work on alternate days have arranged for whoever is working on the day of the scheduled meeting to attend the meeting. Some tenured teachers have provided that they will attend the faculty meetings regardless of whether they work in the morning or afternoon. There are also some tenured teachers who assume the responsibility for all committee assignments. However, more teachers share the responsibilities for work on committees.

Table 2.2

Division of Teaching Duties Between Job Sharers

<u>Schedules</u>	<u>Elementary</u>	<u>Secondary</u>
<i>Five days per week:</i>		
Tenured teacher in a.m.; new hire in p.m.; no overlap	3	10
Tenured teacher in a.m.; new hire in p.m.; with overlap	10	6
Tenured teacher in a.m. four days per week and p.m. on Wednesday; new hire in reverse	1	
Tenured teacher in a.m. four days per week and all day on Wednesday; new hire in p.m. four days per week	1	
Tenured teacher in p.m.; new hire in a.m.	4	2
Both tenured teacher and new hire in a.m.	1	
<i>Less than five days per week:</i>		
Each teacher teaches two full days one week; three days the next		4
Tenured teacher in a.m. four days per week; new hire in p.m. four days per week; alternate Wednesdays	1	
Each teacher teaches two and one-half days per week	3	2
Tenured teacher on Thursday and Friday, new hire on Monday and Tuesday, alternate Wednesdays; vice versa	2	

Parent-teacher conferences. The secondary teachers confer with only parents of students

CHAPTER 3

PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

The effectiveness of the job sharing program may be determined by assessing the extent to which the objectives of the program have been achieved. As summarized from Act 150, the objectives of the job sharing program are as follows:

- . To offer an alternative employment option to teachers.
- . To provide more employment opportunities for the disproportionate numbers of unemployed teachers in the State.
- . To create more stimulating environments for tenured teachers in their professional capacities.
- . To provide additional educational stimulus for students.

This chapter presents our findings with regard to the effectiveness of the pilot project in achieving these program objectives.

Summary of Findings

Our overall finding is that the pilot project has been generally effective in achieving program objectives thus far. Specifically, we find that:

1. Job sharing is a feasible and desired employment option for teachers.
2. Job sharing increases the number of available teaching positions for unemployed

teachers, but its actual impact in reducing the large number of unemployed teachers is minimal. The pilot test nature of the project, with its restrictions on program size, precludes it from having any significant effect on unemployment, but for those new hires participating in the project, job sharing has provided meaningful employment opportunities.

3. Job sharing has generally created a more stimulating environment for the tenured teachers in their professional capacities. Tenured teachers report an increase in job satisfaction, work productivity, and quality of work.

4. While conclusive evidence is lacking on whether job sharing provided additional educational stimulus for students, responses from students, parents, job sharers, and principals indicate that, generally, the pilot project has had a positive effect on the quality of education provided.

Alternative Employment Option

When the job sharing pilot project was established in 1978, it was expected to increase the available employment options so that people would be able to work according to their financial or other needs rather than being restricted by the full-time requirements of a position. This section examines the extent to which the pilot project has met the objective of providing an alternate employment option for teachers. In making this determination, we assess the following aspects: (1) the extent to which there

is a need for an alternative employment option; (2) the feasibility of sharing classroom teaching positions; (3) the limited number of project participants; and (4) the desirability of job sharing as an alternative employment option.

Need for alternative employment option.

Participation in job sharing is strictly voluntary. The tenured teachers as well as the new hires have specific reasons for choosing to participate in the pilot project. Therefore, to determine whether there is a need for such an employment option for teachers, we first review the reasons expressed by the job sharers for their participation in the pilot project. These areas are listed in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1
Reasons for Participation in Pilot Project
Tenured Teachers and New Hires

	Tenured teacher		New hire	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Opportunity to teach			47	77%
More time for family	30	51%	5	8
Health reasons; physical and mental	7	12	—	
Explore other jobs	7	12	—	
More time for personal needs	6	10		
Time for professional improvements	6	10		
Want part-time job	2	3	9	15
Provide opportunity for another teacher	1	2	—	
Total	59	100%	61	100%

An examination of Table 3.1 shows a distinct difference between the motivations of tenured teachers and new hires for participation in the pilot project. The majority of tenured teachers want to spend more time with their families while the vast majority of new hires elect to job share because it is generally the only way they are able to obtain a regular teaching position.

The question, then, is whether these tenured teachers would have been able to

fulfill their needs without participating in the pilot project. In most situations, this would have been unlikely. For example, tenured teachers who wish to pursue professional improvement may apply for sabbatical leaves. However, several teachers said that they had applied for such leaves but their requests were denied because of the limited number of leaves granted. In some cases where a certain number of course credits had to be earned within a specific length of time, the teachers would have had to take professional leave without pay or lose credits already earned.

For the majority of tenured teachers who wanted to have more time with their families, job sharing provided an opportunity for them to do so without relinquishing any tenure or seniority rights or having to take leave without pay. Many of these teachers felt that they would not be able to afford giving up their jobs completely but could manage on half a salary. One teacher commented that she had been looking for such an innovation for a long time, as she felt it was ideal for mothers with young children. She noted that many excellent teachers had sacrificed their jobs and tenure because they felt that they were unable to give enough to both their students and their families, something which may be possible under job sharing.

There were also some tenured teachers who were described by their principals as being excellent teachers who gave so much of themselves to their students that they were “burned out” and in need of some time for themselves. In these cases, the teachers would have had to take leaves without pay or decide whether they really wanted to stay in teaching, either of which, in the opinions of their principals, would have been a real loss to the school and their students. Job sharing afforded them the opportunity to stay in teaching and yet gave them enough time for rest and rejuvenation.

One of the concerns of the evaluation is whether job sharing actually increased the employment options available to the new hires. Although initially it appears that job

sharing would offer unemployed teachers more options, for most of the new hires in the pilot project job sharing was more of a necessity rather than an employment option. For many, it was the only opportunity they had to teach on a regular basis. In a few cases, however, job sharing proved to be an ideal employment option for the new hires who were specifically seeking a part-time teaching position. Like the majority of tenured teachers participating in the pilot project, these new hires did not want to work full time because of family commitments.

It would appear, then, that job sharing as an alternative employment option for teachers in DOE fulfills a definite need. While this need is greater for tenured teachers than for new hires, it does offer new hires an alternate employment option in some cases. Even in those situations where the new hires regard job sharing as a necessity rather than as an employment option they would choose, it is viewed as being better than substitute teaching or tutoring.

Feasibility of sharing classroom positions.

The general guideline used in dividing the full-time position between job sharers is that each job sharer works one half of the total number of hours required per week of the full-time position and performs one half of the work responsibilities. The tenured teacher is responsible for proposing a work schedule to the principal. Upon approval of the work schedule, a new hire is recruited for the vacant half position.

In general, most tenured teachers did not experience any difficulty in developing a work schedule which allotted 3-1/2 hours of school for each teacher. The most common problem centered around scheduling classes or specific subjects without interfering with the school's master schedule. In a few cases, the tenured teachers who wished to job share were restricted to certain types of teaching positions. In one situation, a tenured teacher was allowed to apply for a job sharing position only if she became a resource teacher, while in another

case some reservations were expressed because the teacher was a project teacher. About a third of the tenured teachers did revise their originally proposed work schedules either at the request of the principal or to accommodate the new hire selected. At the elementary level, these revisions included changing teaching assignments to effect a more even split of "heavy" and "light" subjects, while on the secondary level they consisted primarily of the addition of another teaching period to effect a 3-3 split in classes taught.

The majority of principals agreed that the conversion of the full-time position to job sharing did not prove to be too difficult. In fact, for many, it was easier than they had anticipated. The most common problem in the conversion process proved to be accommodating the teachers' needs and time schedules within the school's work schedule. This was especially true when the principals thought that attendance at faculty meetings should be required of both job sharers or when the individual school's schedule was not particularly conducive to even splits.

Table 3.2
Equality of the Division of Responsibilities
Between Job Sharers

Response	Tenured teachers		New hires	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Equal	52	88%	54	89%
Not equal	7	12	7	11
Total . . .	<u>59</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>100%</u>

While there were some individual problems in achieving an equal division of workload, a large majority of the tenured teachers (88 percent) as well as new hires (89 percent) felt that the division of responsibilities was equal, as shown by Table 3.2. Of the seven tenured teachers who believed that workload was unequal, five indicated that they had more

responsibilities because their responsibilities included "heavier" subjects, more extra-curricular activities, or no time for a preparation period, while two tenured teachers felt that their new hire counterparts actually carried heavier workloads. Six of the seven new hires felt that they definitely had more responsibilities, while the one remaining felt that the inequity was due to the tenured teacher having the responsibilities for a homeroom.

The responses of the principals regarding the equality of the division of responsibilities between job sharers revealed similar patterns. Of the 45 principals, 38 (85 percent) felt that the division was equal, 6 (13 percent) felt that the division was unequal, and the one remaining did not feel that he could measure workload, as it was relative to the individual involved. Three of the six principals who felt that the division of responsibilities was not equal attributed the inequality to the tenured teacher wanting to teach specific subjects which required more time. Two principals on the secondary level definitely felt that there was an inequity because the new hire taught three periods while the tenured teacher had two periods to teach and a preparation period. One elementary school principal noted that the new hire taught all morning, while the tenured teacher had a preparation period in the afternoon and, consequently, had less pupil contact time.

Generally, the representatives from the two bargaining units involved (teachers and DOE administrators) feel that job sharing is feasible for the classroom teaching positions. Although the teachers' bargaining unit does have some concerns about the workloads of secondary teachers and the absence of certain benefits in specific teaching situations, it is generally satisfied with the manner in which most of the positions have been divided.

Limited number of project participants.

Another measure of teacher reaction to job sharing as an alternate employment option is the extent to which maximum use has been

made of the 100 positions allotted to the pilot project. Although there were many who thought that more than 100 full-time teachers would want to job share, thus far this has not proven to be true. For both the 1979 spring semester and the 1979-80 school year, the number of participating, tenured teachers has been far less than 100.

To determine the reasons for the limited participation in the pilot project, 50 non-participating, tenured teachers were interviewed. As anticipated, the primary reason for teachers not participating in the pilot project is because of economic considerations. Of the 50 non-participating teachers, 29 (58 percent) cannot afford to job share. The loss of half of their salary would be too much of a financial sacrifice for them. Another 8 (16 percent) have no particular need to job share at this time. Five teachers either feel that their particular positions are too difficult to convert to job sharing or simply do not want to share their teaching responsibilities with another person. A complete listing of the reasons for the nonparticipation of these teachers in the pilot project is presented in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3 also shows that 10 percent of this group of teachers chose not to participate in the pilot project because they are too close to retirement. They are discouraged from job sharing for several reasons. *First*, under job

Table 3.3
Reasons for Not Participating in Job Sharing

	No. of teachers	Percent
Economic considerations	29	58%
No need to; wanted full-time job	8	16
Position too difficult to convert; did not want to share teaching responsibilities	5	10
Too close to retirement	5	10
5 percent school quota filled	1	2
No tenure in present position	1	2
Uncertain about pilot project	1	2
Total	50	100%

sharing, retirement service credits are accumulated on a proportionate basis. Thus, a job sharing teacher who serves a full year earns six months of retirement service credit. In this respect, job sharing may actually prolong the number of years until retirement for some teachers. *Second*, the retirement benefits are calculated on a basis of 2 percent for every year of service. As such, the job sharing teacher who would be credited with only a half year rather than a full year would accrue only 1 percent a year rather than the usual 2 percent. *Third*, the retirement benefits are based on the highest three years of an individual's earnings. Consequently, a decrease in the salaries of near retirees, who are at the peak of their earning power, may also affect the highest three years of earnings on which they would want to base their retirement benefits.

The reasons cited by the near retirees for not participating are particularly significant since, at the time of its establishment, job sharing was viewed as being beneficial for them. It was believed that the decrease in workload resulting under job sharing would be less traumatic than the total loss of work a teacher faces upon retirement. Moreover, the extra time available under job sharing would enable the near retiree to develop other interests and make future plans. It appears, then, that further exploration of the effects of job sharing on retirement benefits is needed before any increase in the number of near retirees participating in the pilot project can be expected.

Despite the limited number of project participants at this time, there is a possibility that the number of tenured teachers wanting to job share may increase if the program is made permanent. Although they chose not to participate in the pilot project, 21 out of the 50 nonparticipating teachers (42 percent) indicate that they would apply for job sharing later on if the program were made permanent. In addition, 13 more nonparticipating teachers (26 percent) feel that there is a possibility of their applying for job sharing positions in the future.

Job sharing as a desired alternate employment option. In this section, we examine the desirability of job sharing as an alternate employment option for teachers, i.e., whether it is worth implementing because of certain resultant benefits or advantages. In making this determination, we initially secured the overall impressions of the pilot project of the individuals who are either involved with job sharing at the school, district, or state levels, or are aware of it because of participating colleagues. Asked to rate job sharing as "excellent," "good," "fair," or "poor," in terms of providing an alternate employment option, approximately 95 percent of the individuals interviewed gave job sharing "excellent" or "good" ratings.

Tenured teachers. As previously discussed, the tenured teachers who elect to job share do so for specific reasons. It is not surprising then that the largest percentage of "excellent" ratings given to job sharing as an alternate employment option comes from them. In fact, all 59 tenured teachers report that participation in the pilot project enabled them to fulfill certain needs. Many of them feel that they are better teachers because of job sharing. Since they have less students and/or subjects to teach, they are able to spend more time concentrating on and preparing for lessons. Another important benefit resulting from job sharing for these teachers is the extra time they are able to spend with their families or to fulfill family responsibilities. In addition, many teachers specifically feel that their mental and/or physical health has improved as a result of their participation in the pilot project. They report feeling happier, more relaxed, and more personally and professionally fulfilled. Their improved attitudes have also given them a new outlook or perspective on teaching. Physically, the tenured teachers report that they feel healthier, less fatigued, and much more energetic. In Table 3.4, a complete listing of the benefits received by the tenured teachers is provided and ranked according to the number of times they were mentioned by different teachers.

New hires. As the majority of new hires

Table 3.4
Benefits from Job Sharing
Reported by Tenured Teachers

Benefits	No. of times cited
Becoming a better teacher because of the decrease in workload — more time for lesson preparation and individualization	26
More time for family and/or family needs	23
Improved mental health	18
Improved physical health; time for health treatments	12
More time for personal needs, other interests	11
Time for professional improvement courses	7
More time for outside job	4
Opportunity to share ideas with another teacher	1

prefer full-time positions and elect to job share for reasons other than those of the tenured teachers, it is not expected that they would rate job sharing as highly as the tenured teachers. However, all but one of the 61 new hires report that job sharing has provided them with what they wanted. Foremost on their list of resulting benefits is the opportunity to teach and gain teaching experience and skills. For many, the decrease in workload provides an increase in time for lesson preparation and is viewed as being a particularly good way of introducing first-time teachers to teaching or providing teachers returning after an absence from teaching with a gradual reentry into teaching. As with the tenured teachers, a considerable number of new hires specifically credit job sharing for mental and physical health benefits. They feel personally and professionally fulfilled and find that they have more energy and really enjoy what they are doing. A complete list of all the benefits reported by the new hires and ranked according to the number of times cited is provided in Table 3.5.

Nonparticipating teachers. Most nonparticipating teachers feel that job sharing has resulted in definite benefits for the tenured teachers. While they are less definite in concluding that any benefits accrue to the students or the schools, they do note that the job sharing teachers are happy with the working arrange-

ments and, for the most part, in their respective schools, job sharing appears to be working well.

There are, however, a number of disadvantages of job sharing which have been cited by nonparticipating teachers. Perhaps, significantly, all of these nonparticipating teachers work closely with the job sharers. Some nonparticipating teachers who share an open classroom or responsibilities for a specific program with job sharers definitely are affected by the addition of a third teacher. They are sometimes placed in the position of being a coordinator or used to relay messages between the job sharers. In other situations, department chairpersons report that additional staff also mean an increase in demands made on such department resources as supplies and equipment. Moreover, in situations where there is more than one job sharing team in a department, extra efforts have to be made to accommodate all of the various teaching schedules before departmental meetings can be scheduled.

Principals. Most principals base their feelings about the desirability of job sharing as an alternate employment option for teachers on the success or failure of job sharing teams in their own schools. Accordingly, they stress that the advantages gained from the pilot project

Table 3.5
Benefits from Job Sharing
Reported by New Hires

Benefits	No. of times cited
Opportunity to teach; gain teaching experience and skills	28
Less workload; more time for lesson preparation and good introduction to teaching and DOE	15
Mental and physical health benefits	12
More time for personal needs, other interests	11
More time for family and/or family needs	10
Regular, steady employment	8
Fringe benefits	5
Share ideas with, learn from tenured teacher partner	5
Time for professional improvement courses	3

thus far are attributable to the dedication, strengths, and professionalism of the individual job sharers.

Generally, most principals feel that the pilot project has resulted in specific benefits for the job sharers and the schools. The principals reaffirm the job sharers' contention that they are more energetic and better prepared for their lessons. The principals particularly support the voluntary nature of the program and the flexibility of establishing teaching schedules to meet the needs of the students and schools as well as those of the job sharers. Secondary school principals are more willing to assume the additional administrative and supervisory responsibilities generated by job sharing if they are able to gain an extra class section for their students.

Another advantage of job sharing is the potential use of job sharing as a counseling tool for weak teachers. One principal feels that a weak teacher may be counseled to participate in job sharing so that the extra time could be spent for professional improvement courses or for looking for other types of employment.

While there are a number of advantages to be gained by job sharing, many principals also cite a number of disadvantages and potential problems, particularly if the job sharers either do not get along and are inflexible about hours and responsibilities. There have been some difficulties because demands made by the teachers are perceived by the principals as being for the teachers' convenience and not necessarily benefiting the students or the school. Other principals have experienced some problems in finding qualified new hires.

DOE administrators. The general feeling among DOE administrators at the district and state levels is that job sharing has resulted in certain advantages for the job sharers and schools. It has enabled DOE to employ more teachers and has allowed tenured teachers to meet whatever needs they have. Furthermore, schools are able to utilize the talents and skills of additional staff.

Of some concern are the difficulties experienced in some districts in finding qualified applicants for the new hire positions. Some administrators note that the morale of the tenured teacher may be negatively affected if a new hire is not found for the counterpart position. On the other hand, if an applicant is hired just to accommodate the tenured teacher, it may adversely affect the students and schools. Generally, however, the administrators feel that the implementation of the pilot project has been easier than anticipated.

Return rate of job sharers. The contracts for job sharing positions do not extend beyond a single school year. Teachers who wish to continue in the pilot project must reapply for the job sharing positions. Therefore, another measure which can be used to test the desirability of job sharing as an alternate employment option for teachers is the return rate of job sharers. The return rate for the 1979 spring semester job sharers is an overall 50 percent. A breakdown of the returning job sharers by tenured teachers and new hires is presented in Table 3.6.

Table 3.6
Status of 1979 Spring Semester Job Sharers
in the Pilot Project

	Tenured teachers		New hires		Total	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Continuation in 1979-80 school year . . .	11	55%	9	45%	20	50%
Termination of participation in pilot project . . .	9	45	11	55	20	50
Total	20	100%	20	100%	40	100%

As presented in Table 3.7, there are many reasons for the job sharer's decision to terminate participation in the pilot project. Table 3.7 also shows that there are some differences between the reasons given by the tenured teachers and

Table 3.7

Reasons for Termination
of Participation in Pilot Project

Reason	Tenured teachers	New hires
Economically not feasible	3	1
Received a full-time position	—	4
Partner decided to discontinue	—	3
Staying at home because of family	1	1
Another business	1	—
Completed academic study, wanted full time	1	—
Not satisfied with job sharing	1	—
Difficulties with partner	—	1
School quota filled	1	—
Scheduling difficulties	1	—
Not offered position	—	1
Total	9	11

the new hires. The foremost reason cited by the new hires for their leaving the pilot project is that they have been offered a full-time position, while the reason cited most by the tenured teachers for not job sharing is that they are unable to afford the reduction in salary. Only one tenured teacher discontinued job sharing because of dissatisfaction with the pilot project itself. She explains that the reduction in salary under job sharing was not justified by the work required. She feels that teaching full time does not really require much more work, and the salary would be doubled. Several new hires indicate that the choice to terminate participation in the pilot project was really their partners' decision and they were subsequently unable to find a job sharing position.

Most of the teachers participating in the pilot project for the 1979–80 school year indicate that they are planning to reapply for job sharing for the next school year. Of the 50 tenured teachers, 41 (82 percent) intend to resubmit their applications, 8 (16 percent) are as yet undecided, and 1 (2 percent) has decided to terminate participation in the pilot project. A survey of the new hires reveals similar results. Of the 50 new hires, 42

(84 percent) indicate that they would be willing to job share again, 4 (8 percent) are uncertain, and the remaining 4 (8 percent) do not intend to job share again. It should be noted, however, that a number of new hires who express their willingness to job share have indicated that they will continue with the pilot project only if they are again unable to secure a full-time position. If the actual return of the 1979–80 job sharers approaches the number of job sharers who have expressed their intention to continue, there will be a significantly larger proportion of returnees next fall than the 50 percent who returned from the 1979 spring semester.

Employment Opportunities
for Unemployed Teachers

Since the 1972–73 school year, Hawaii has experienced a decline in student enrollment in the public schools. This trend has resulted in a large surplus of teachers in the State. For the 1979–80 school year alone, there are 3135 teacher applicants who are seeking employment in DOE.¹ Moreover, it is not expected that the surplus will diminish in the near future. Therefore, one of the reasons for the Legislature's selection of DOE as the agency to test the concept of job sharing was to provide more employment opportunities for the large number of unemployed teachers in the State.

Impact on teacher surplus in the State.

The pilot project has, thus far, provided jobs for 20 new hires for the 1979 spring semester and 50 new hires for the 1979–80 school year. As nine new hires who participated in the pilot project in the 1979 spring semester continued to job share, a total of 61 teachers has been recruited by the pilot project. In view of the huge teacher surplus in the State, the hiring of 61 individuals is not significant in the aggregate. However, for many of the new hires, job sharing appeared to be the only way of obtaining a regular teaching position in DOE.

1. Department of Education, *A Status Report on the Situation of Teachers Who Are Unemployed or Engaged in Occupations Other Than Teaching*, December 1979, p. 1.

Employment status of new hires. Until they are able to find full-time teaching positions, most teacher applicants are forced to seek other means of employment. DOE's survey shows that 81 percent of the respondents are employed, and 19 percent are unemployed.² Our survey of the 61 new hires revealed a similar pattern in employment status prior to their participation in job sharing. Of the 61 new hires, 51 (84 percent) had been employed prior to their participation in the pilot project and 10 (16 percent) were either unemployed or not in the labor force. Of those employed, 68 percent were actually employed in teaching positions. However, these teachers were primarily working on special projects, tutoring, or substituting either daily or on a long-term basis. These teachers felt that job sharing enabled them to have their own classrooms and experience the total school environment and, in that sense, improved the quality of employment opportunities available to them. They appreciated the regularity of the hours, the fringe benefits, and the chance to use their professional training.

Interest in job sharing. Although it is generally recognized that most new hires would prefer full-time positions, the evaluation also tried to determine whether there was any interest in job sharing. The new hires were specifically asked for their preference of teaching positions. Of the 61 new hires, 22 (36 percent), when given the choice of a full-time or a part-time position, stated that they would prefer to teach on a part-time basis.

Several new hires stated that they were specifically looking for a part-time job. Many of them had previously taught on a full-time basis but had left DOE and were now looking for an opportunity to return on a part-time basis. As with the tenured teachers, most of these new hires stated that they wanted to have more time for their families and would not take a full-time position for that reason. One new hire related that she had taught at the same school before but had been overwhelmed by a full-time workload. For her, job sharing provided a way to stay in teaching, which she

really enjoyed. Having had the experience as a full-time teacher, a few felt that they were better teachers because of their part-time status.

Considerable interest in job sharing is also reflected by the results of a survey conducted by DOE of teacher applicants actively seeking employment in DOE. The respondents were asked to indicate from among six different employment categories the type or types of employment they would be willing to accept. The category listed as "job sharing or other one-half time positions" received 907 of 4187 responses. This represents 22 percent of the total number of responses and, in ranking, placed second only to the employment category listed as "full-time probationary contract."³

Lead to full-time employment. The pilot project does not offer tenure or probationary status to the new hire or even any guarantee of a job sharing position for the next school year. However, it appears that many new hires are willing to take the position because they feel that it may lead to a full-time job. The evaluation disclosed that, of the 61 new hires, 43 (71 percent) felt that job sharing might lead to a full-time teaching position. Some commented that job sharing offered them a chance to gain teaching experience and familiarity with the school and the DOE system. They also thought that if they did a good job the school administrators would be more likely to remember them when new openings became available.

There appears to be some validity that the participation in the pilot project may lead to better employment opportunities. A review of the 20 new hires who job shared during the 1979 spring semester showed that seven of them found full-time teaching positions for the 1979-80 school year, with six of the seven being employed by DOE. It appears that the

2. *Ibid.*, p. 33.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 30.

pilot project may have directly assisted at least three of them in securing employment as they were offered positions at the same schools. Another teacher who received a position at a different school credited the experience she received under the project with getting her the new position. In addition, recent reports from DOE indicate that at least three new hires who had started the 1979–80 school year job sharing have since been hired on a full-time basis after their tenured teacher partners either resigned from DOE or left on leave.

Stimulating Environments for Tenured Teachers

An expressed objective of Act 150 is for job sharing to create more stimulating environments for tenured teachers. This section examines data drawn from interviews with job sharers and their principals to determine the extent to which such measures as job satisfaction, work productivity, and quality of work of the tenured teachers were increased by changes in the teachers' environments as a result of the pilot project. In addition, the frequency of absenteeism is compared between job sharing tenured teachers and non-participating teachers. This section also reports on the effects of job sharing on the tenured teachers' environments as expressed by their principals.

Job satisfaction. It appears reasonable to assume that someone who works in a stimulating environment is apt to be happier and more fulfilled professionally than someone whose working conditions have become routine or stressful. Thus, one way of assessing the effects of job sharing on the teaching environment is to measure the extent to which tenured teachers express satisfaction with their jobs. To determine job satisfaction of these teachers, we examined certain indices: compatibility between job sharers, the attitudes of other school personnel toward job sharing, and the support extended to job sharers by other school personnel.

Compatibility between job sharers. The extent to which compatibility between job sharers affects job satisfaction depends on the particular teaching assignment and, more specifically, on the amount of interaction and coordination it demands of the job sharers. We surveyed all job sharers to determine whether or not compatibility between partners was a major factor in their particular teaching situation.

In general, we find very little difference between the distribution of responses of the tenured teachers and those of the new hires on the question of importance of compatibility. A majority of teachers in both groups felt that compatibility was important, especially those teaching at the elementary level. The greatest percentage of participants who discounted the importance of compatibility is at the high school level. These results are not unexpected when the teaching situations are reviewed. Since most teachers at the elementary level share the same group of students, compatibility is especially important in such aspects as teaching philosophies, classroom management, and learning goals. Thus, close coordination and much communication, often on a day-to-day basis, are required between partners. At the intermediate and high school levels, each partner generally has a different group of students and, in some cases, even teach different subjects. Therefore, there is very little need for day-to-day interaction.

The job sharers were also asked to rate their working relationship. The vast majority of tenured teachers (98 percent) described their working relationship with their new hire counterparts as either excellent or good. The validity of their ratings is also confirmed by similar ratings given by the new hires, 98 percent of whom likewise rated their working relationship as excellent or good. Thus, it appears that almost all job sharers are compatible and enjoy excellent working relationships.

Attitudes of other school personnel.
How the job sharers think that their school

Table 3.8

Attitudes of School Administrators and Colleagues
Toward Job Sharing as Perceived by Job Sharing Teachers

Perceived attitudes	School administrators				Colleagues			
	Tenured teacher responses	New hire responses	Total	Percent	Tenured teacher responses	New hire responses	Total	Percent
Positive	43	52	95	79%	45	51	96	80%
Negative . . .	2	1	3	2	—	1	1	1
Neutral	9	4	13	11	6	4	10	8
Uncertain . .	5	4	9	8	8	5	13	11
Total . . .	<u>59</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>120</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>120</u>	<u>100%</u>

administrators and colleagues feel about job sharing may also affect their satisfaction with their jobs. For example, if a teacher felt that school administrators were against job sharing, that person would be less likely to approach them with any difficulties encountered. Similarly, if the job sharer's colleagues expressed very negative attitudes about job sharing, the work environment could become uncomfortable and difficult. We surveyed the job sharers to determine their perceptions of the attitudes of their school administrators and colleagues. The results of the survey are presented in Table 3.8.

The majority of tenured teachers thought that the school administrators had positive attitudes toward job sharing. A few commented that the principals were very receptive to the idea when the tenured teachers approached them with their applications. Their perceptions were shared by their new hire counterparts. The two tenured teachers who thought that their school administrators felt negatively toward the concept of job sharing said that they knew that the principals preferred full-time teachers. One tenured teacher, who had started in the pilot project in January 1979 and continued to participate this school year, reported that the principal had not been very encouraging initially but had now developed a very positive attitude.

Again, as shown in Table 3.8, the majority of tenured teachers felt that their colleagues had positive attitudes about job sharing. These feelings are also held by the majority of new hires. Some job sharers commented that other teachers not participating in the pilot project have expressed an interest in it and have asked them about their experiences. Only one job sharer thought that her colleagues felt negatively about job sharing. In this particular case, the other teachers expressed doubts about the success of the pilot project because it had been started in the middle of the school year.

Support of other school personnel. The quality of the support extended to the job sharers by school administrators and their colleagues is especially important in a pilot project such as this where school schedules and activities may conflict with the availability of the job sharers. The job sharers were asked to rate the support of school administrators and colleagues of their participation in the pilot project. The results of this survey are presented in Table 3.9, and they correlate with the results of the survey on attitudes.

The vast majority of tenured teachers and new hires indicated that they received considerable support for their participation in the pilot project. A high 93 percent of the job

Table 3.9

**Support Extended by School Administrators and Colleagues
as Rated by Job Sharing Teachers**

Rating of support received	School administrators				Colleagues			
	Tenured teacher responses	New hire responses	Total	Percent	Tenured teacher responses	New hire responses	Total	Percent
Excellent . . .	31	35	66	55%	30	36	66	55%
Good	23	22	45	38	27	25	52	43
Fair	4	—	4	3	—	—	—	—
Poor	1	3	4	3	—	—	—	—
Neutral/ uncertain . . .	—	—	1	1	2	—	2	2
Total . . .	<u>59</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>120</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>120</u>	<u>100%</u>

sharers felt that the support they received from administrators was either excellent or good. Both the tenured teachers and new hires also rated the support they received from their colleagues very highly, with 98 percent of the job sharers believing that the support from their colleagues was either excellent or good.

Increased job satisfaction. The increase in job satisfaction of all tenured teachers participating in the pilot project is further reflected by the results of a survey on the effects of job sharing on job satisfaction. As shown in Table 3.10, of the 59 tenured teachers, 82 percent of them reported an increase in job satisfaction and only 4 percent felt there was a decrease.

Table 3.10
Change in Job Satisfaction of
Tenured Teachers Participating in the Pilot Project

Change in job satisfaction	No.	Percent
Increase	48	81%
Decrease	2	4
No change	6	10
Uncertain	3	5
Total	<u>59</u>	<u>100%</u>

The increase of job satisfaction experienced by tenured teachers in the pilot project is also confirmed by their principals. When asked whether there had been any changes in the morale of the tenured teacher since his participation in the pilot project, nearly half of the principals felt that the tenured teacher seemed happier and even more satisfied with teaching. About a third of the principals did not notice any change in morale, but many of them remarked that even before the pilot project the tenured teacher had always been a good, happy teacher. The remaining principals were uncertain of any changes, particularly since several of them were new to the schools and had no prior knowledge of the morale of the tenured teachers.

In summary, then, excellent working relationships, positive attitudes of other school personnel, and excellent support of other school personnel have all helped to contribute to an increase in job satisfaction for the tenured teachers. Moreover, as discussed earlier, these tenured teachers chose to participate in the pilot project for various reasons. In some cases, it was to spend more time with the families, while in other cases the teachers were “burned out” and wanted more time for their personal needs. In these situations, working full time would have added pressures and demands which

could have negatively affected job satisfaction. The decrease in working hours and responsibilities resulting from the pilot project enabled these teachers to meet their needs and, consequently, lessened the stress and fatigue associated with their jobs. Thus, job sharing contributed to the improvement of working conditions for them and in that sense also helped to increase job satisfaction.

Work productivity. Because work productivity in teaching is difficult to measure, efforts to determine changes in work productivity as a result of job sharing were limited to an assessment of the subjective responses of the tenured teachers and their principals. The tenured teachers were asked to rate their work productivity under the pilot project. As shown by Table 3.11, 78 percent said they were more productive, while 20 percent reported no change in work productivity. The tenured teachers who said that they were more productive cited more energy and time for preparation as reasons for the increase in productivity. The sole teacher who felt that work productivity decreased under the pilot project felt that it was not because of job sharing per se, but because of family responsibilities.

Table 3.11 shows that, of the 44 principals who rated the work productivity of the tenured

Table 3.11

**Productivity of Tenured Teachers
as Described by Tenured Teachers and Their Principals**

Change in productivity	Tenured teachers		Principals	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
More productive	46	78%	21	48%
No change	12	20	11	25
Less productive	1	2	—	—
Uncertain	—	—	12	27
Total	<u>59</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>44*</u>	<u>100%</u>

*While all 45 principals were surveyed, only 44 responded to the question.

teachers, 21 (48 percent) noted greater productivity. Although this is substantially less than the percentage of tenured teachers who felt that they were more productive under the pilot project, it is largely because a number of principals (27 percent) are uncertain. This is particularly true of those principals who are experiencing job sharing in their schools for the first time this school year. However, it should be noted that none of the principals felt that there was any decrease in work productivity. Of those principals reporting no change in work productivity, most noted that, while there was no increase in work productivity, the tenured teachers had always been very productive and continued to do well under the pilot project. Generally, many principals felt that the tenured teachers were putting more time into lesson preparation and accommodating the needs of the students and were actually giving more than the time required of them. In that sense, the tenured teachers were thought to be more productive under the pilot project.

Quality of work. Although change in the quality of work is somewhat difficult to measure, most teachers were able to respond to the question of whether or not job sharing had affected their quality of work. Of the 59 tenured teachers, 41 (70 percent) felt that job sharing had improved the quality of their work, 15 (25 percent) did not think that there was any effect on the quality of their work, and 3 (5 percent) were uncertain of any changes. The tenured teachers who felt that job sharing improved the quality of their work attributed the change to less pressures and reduced student load and more time to concentrate on fewer subjects. They felt that they had more freedom to work with children on an individual basis and were thus able to do a more thorough job of teaching.

Frequency of absenteeism. A comparison was made of the number of times the 50 job sharing, tenured teachers in the current school year and the number of times the same number of nonparticipating teachers were absent during a three-month period. Nineteen job

sharers recorded one or more absences during the period as against 21 nonparticipating teachers. The data are inconclusive that job sharing affects absenteeism in any significant way.

Principal's perception of the effects of job sharing on teacher's environment. The principal has usually been in a position to observe the tenured teacher's environment under regular teaching conditions as well as under the pilot project. Thus, another measure utilized to determine the effectiveness of job sharing in increasing more stimulating environments for tenured teachers is the principal's perception of the effects of the pilot project on the tenured teacher's environment. Interviews with the principals revealed that 31 of 44 principals (70 percent) felt that job sharing contributed to a more stimulating environment for the tenured teacher, 10 (23 percent) were uncertain, and 3 (7 percent) did not feel that any change was effected. Principals generally felt that the increase in stimulation of the tenured teacher's environment was due to the interchange of ideas between job sharers and the freshness and new outlook on teaching brought to the team by the new hire.

Impact on Quality of Education

This section discusses the extent to which the pilot project has met the objective of providing additional stimulus for students. The data drawn to make this determination come from a number of sources. A sample of elementary students taught by job sharers during the 1979–80 school year were interviewed and their parents were surveyed. In addition, interviews relating to the pilot project's impact on education of students were conducted with the job sharers and their principals. Although the interviews and survey did not yield conclusive data to state that the pilot project provided additional education stimulus for students, the subjective responses of the students, parents, job sharers, and principals indicate that, generally, job sharing

has had a positive effect on the quality of education.

One of the difficulties encountered in determining the effects of job sharing on the quality of education was the lack of any direct and objective measures of effectiveness. The use of standardized achievement test scores of the students being taught by job sharers was discounted as a valid indicator of student progress under the pilot project because of the many other variables affecting the results. Moreover, as the period of evaluation was primarily limited to the first semester of the 1979–80 school year, it was not possible to conduct any longitudinal study of student progress or lack of progress.

Student satisfaction. Because job sharers in intermediate and high schools do not have common classes, job sharing is expected to have minimal, if any, effect on the quality of education of secondary school students. The primary concern about any changes in the quality of education of students is centered at the elementary level where, in most cases, two teachers share the responsibilities for a single class. Thus, the evaluation was focused on 16 self-contained elementary classes which were being taught by job sharers during the 1979–80 school year.⁴

A random sample of 89 students representing 20 percent of the students in the 16 self-contained classrooms was interviewed. As 74 percent of the 89 students interviewed were in the second grade or below, there was some doubt that they would be able to discern any changes in the quality of education provided. Thus, they were asked instead to state their feelings about having two teachers. Of the 89

4. Although there were 26 job sharing teams at the elementary level, 10 of the teams were either involved in team teaching situations, resource or special projects, or special education. As the students of these teams were exposed to a number of different teachers, any changes in the quality of education would also have to take into account other variables as well. Thus, it was decided to restrict the sample to only self-contained, regular classes.

students in the sample, 85 (96 percent) said they liked having two teachers, 3 did not know whether or not they liked having two teachers, and 1 student stated that he liked having two teachers "sometimes." None of the students interviewed disliked being in a classroom shared by two teachers. Furthermore, the majority of students indicated their satisfaction with the program by expressing a preference for having two teachers again the next school year. Eighty-three percent of the students definitely wanted to have two teachers again, while 9 percent felt that they would rather have only one teacher. The remaining 8 percent either did not care one way or the other or had not made up their minds.

Comments from parents. To secure a sample of parental feelings relating to the quality of education provided under the pilot project, a survey was conducted of the parents or guardians of the 89 students interviewed. Most parents or guardians did not feel that job sharing had any adverse effect on their children's education. When asked whether having two teachers for their children affected the quality of the children's education, 58 percent felt that the quality of their children's education either remained the same or improved under the pilot project; 30 percent were uncertain of any effects; 8 percent felt that the quality of education worsened; and 5 percent did not answer the question. The majority of parents responding felt that there were definite advantages to having their children taught by job sharers. Many parents felt that their children benefited from being exposed to two teachers with different personalities, skills, and strengths.

As to the views of parents on the disadvantages of job sharing, 85 percent either did not feel that there were disadvantages, or left the question unanswered. Only six parents felt that job sharing resulted in definite disadvantages for their children. Four complained about the lack of interest shown by the job sharers in the overall development or learning progress of the children. One mother thought

that her son was not being taught as much under the pilot project, especially in comparison with his summer school experience and with students in other classrooms. Another parent noted that his daughter favored one of the teachers over the other and did not try as hard in the subjects being taught by the less favored teacher. In this case, however, the parent remained supportive of job sharing and indicated that he would want to have his daughter placed in a job sharing class situation again.

The extent to which parents are satisfied with the job sharing program is probably best reflected in their preference for having their children being taught by job sharers again. Of the respondents, 50 percent indicated that they would want their children to be taught by job sharers next year, 33 percent said that it did not matter whether their children were in a job sharing class, 12 percent did not want their children to be taught by job sharers again, and 5 percent did not answer the question.

Several parents commented on various aspects of the pilot project. Some concern was expressed about the need for communication between job sharers to ensure that each is aware of a child's strengths, weaknesses, and interests. One parent stated that neither of his daughter's teachers had spent the effort necessary to make the program effective. However, it should be noted that this parent was also under the impression that the job sharing teachers were receiving full salaries for part-time work. Another suggested that in the lower elementary grades it would be less confusing for the child to have one teacher. Most of the favorable comments centered around the benefits the children would receive from teachers who had more time to prepare for less subject areas and would have skills in specialized areas. The feelings relating to job sharing is probably best summarized by one parent who wrote: "I'm not really sure of any clear-cut advantages or disadvantages but do know that my child has learned a lot and has received any special attention needed either because she was ahead or behind others. It seems to me tho [sic], that having 2 teachers would

enhance the learning atmosphere by both teachers arriving fresh, relaxed and ready to teach. I believe they would have an advantage over the teachers who had to 'endure' the classroom all day long."

Perceptions of job sharers and their principals. The effectiveness of job sharing in providing additional educational stimulus for students may also be measured by the number and ratio of job sharers and their principals who report that the pilot project raised the quality of education for students. All job sharers and their principals were specifically asked if they felt that job sharing had affected the quality of education for students. Approximately 70 percent of the job sharers and 51 percent of their principals felt that job sharing raised the quality of education for students. Reporting no change in quality or expressing uncertainty were 30 percent of the job sharers and 45 percent of the principals.

There were only two principals, one at the elementary level and the other at the secondary level, who felt that job sharing lowered the quality of education for students. The elementary school principal felt that the job sharers were unable to see the whole child and had asked for schedule changes which may have accommodated their needs but did not meet the students' needs. The secondary school principal experienced some problems with a new hire who needed some assistance and guidance in teaching her class. In both cases, however, the difficulties encountered by the principals appeared to be directly related to the teachers involved rather than to job sharing itself.

Generally, most principals offered positive comments about the quality of education under the pilot project. They felt that the job sharers were enthusiastic and happy and had good attitudes toward teaching. They also noted that more time was being spent in lesson preparation. All of these factors resulted in definite improvement in the students' performance. At the elementary level, many principals felt that the students benefited from being exposed to two

teachers with different personalities, backgrounds, and strengths. One principal remarked that even such persons outside the classroom as the school librarian noticed a definite improvement in the performance of students in a class taught by job sharers. In this particular case, the principal felt that the job sharers' skills were complementary and added to the educational experience of the students. Nearly all of the principals cautioned, however, that any increase in educational stimulus for the students appears to depend not only on job sharing itself but also on the individual teachers involved.

The consensus of opinion expressed by most job sharers was that sharing students' and teachers' responsibilities at the elementary level and the lower teacher-pupil ratio at the secondary level greatly improved the teachers' attitudes and how they taught. In that sense, one teacher noted that job sharing could not help but affect the students' education. The tenured teachers reported that the new hires contributed much in terms of new ideas, skills, and enthusiasm, and in that respect helped to improve the quality of education for students.

The job sharers were also asked if they were able to provide anything different in the classroom that could not have been provided if they were working full time. Nearly half of all job sharers said that they were able to provide more for the students in the classroom under the pilot project. Several teachers specifically felt that the decrease in workload and especially paperwork enabled them to develop and present new program materials, establish learning centers, and provide more supervision and attention to the individual needs of students. One teacher instituted journal writing in her classroom in addition to the regular assignments and said that this wouldn't have been possible if she were working full time, while another used the time to organize games and other fun activities to motivate students. Some teachers appreciated having the opportunity to do research or seek out resources in the community to enrich their classroom activities.

Summary

In summary, the pilot project has been effective in achieving the objectives of the job sharing program. The evaluation finds that the vast majority of people involved with the pilot project feel that job sharing is a feasible and desirable employment option for teachers. It has increased the number and quality of employment positions available for teachers who have been unable to secure full-time positions in DOE. The tenured teachers report an increase in

job satisfaction, work productivity, and quality of work because of their participation in the pilot project. Although evidence to support the contention that job sharing has had a positive effect on the quality of education for students is not conclusive, the general consensus among those involved is that the project has been good for education. It is not surprising then that the vast majority of people interviewed already feel that job sharing should be made a permanent employment option for teachers in DOE.

CHAPTER 4

PROGRAM COSTS

An evaluation of any new program should include an examination of the total costs of the program. In the job sharing pilot project, these costs include direct operating and administrative costs as well as nonrecurring investment costs. This chapter identifies and discusses these costs.

Summary of Findings

Generally, we find that:

1. Direct operating costs of the pilot project are less than the costs that would have been incurred by DOE without it. This is primarily due to the difference in salaries between the tenured teachers and the new hires.
2. The administrative costs assignable to the pilot project are costs which would have been incurred by DOE regardless of the project. Moreover, a substantial amount of these costs is attributable to nonrecurring investment costs.

Direct Operating Costs

Direct operating costs of the pilot project include the salaries earned by the job sharers and the State's contributions to the retirement system, social security, health fund, and unemployment compensation fund. This section presents data on these costs.

The cost data reported for the 1979 spring semester are based on costs actually incurred over a seven-month period. As cost data for the 1979–80 school year are, as yet, incomplete, the costs for this year have been projected.¹ The projections are based on the assumption that the teachers job sharing at the beginning of the school year would continue to participate in the project for the remainder of the school year. While a few second semester changes have occurred, the projections provide reasonably accurate estimates of project costs for the 1979–80 school year.

Salaries. Job sharers earn one half of the salaries to which they would ordinarily be entitled. The salaries earned by the 40 job sharers for the 1979 spring semester amounted to \$178,842. For the 1979–80 school year, the projected annual payroll for the 100 job sharers totals \$741,336. If the tenured teachers had not participated in the pilot project, the cost for their full-time salaries would have amounted to \$220,627 and \$892,128 for the two time periods. Therefore, as shown in Table 4.1 below, by the end of the 1979–80 school year, the pilot project is expected to result in salary savings totaling \$192,577.

The reduction in salary costs is directly related to the differences between salary levels of the two teachers comprising the respective

1. Cost data were calculated before the new collective bargaining contract for teachers was approved.

job sharing team. If the combined salaries of the two job sharers is less than the full-time salary of the tenured teacher, job sharing results in salary savings. The actual comparison on a team-by-team basis showed that in only one case did the combined salaries of the job sharers exceed the full-time salary of the tenured teacher. For this particular team, job sharing resulted in an increase of \$1088 in annual salary costs. In all other cases, the combined salaries of the job sharing team were considerably less than the full-time salary of the tenured teacher.

Table 4.1
Comparison of Salary Costs

	Pilot project costs	Costs without the project	Difference
1979 Spring semester . .	\$178,842	\$ 220,627	\$ 41,785
1979-80 School year . .	741,336	892,128	150,792
Total	<u>\$920,178</u>	<u>\$1,112,755</u>	<u>\$192,577</u>

In DOE, the teacher's salary is based on teacher classification and length of service. As the new hires have generally been at the lower ranges in terms of teacher classification and service time, their salaries have also been at the lower end of the teacher salary schedule. The average monthly salaries for new hires for the 1979 spring semester and the 1979-80 school year were \$481 and \$495, respectively, while the average monthly salaries for the tenured teachers for the same periods were \$744 and \$743. The pattern of savings in salary costs will continue as long as the job sharing team consists of a tenured teacher and a new hire.

Retirement system. Membership in the Employees Retirement System of the State of Hawaii is mandatory for all job sharers who are at least half-time employees. The State's contribution to the retirement system is based on the individual employee's salary at a percentage

rate actuarially determined each fiscal year. For FY 1978-79, the State's share was set at 8.2 percent of the employee's salary for regular retirement contributions and 2.5 percent for post retirement contributions. For FY 1979-80, the rates were changed to 7.6 percent and 2.3 percent, respectively. Based on these rates, the State contributed \$18,723 toward the retirement funds of the job sharers for the 1979 spring semester and is projected to pay an estimated \$73,392 for the job sharers during the 1979-80 school year, a total of \$92,115. If the tenured teachers had been employed full time, the State's contributions would have totaled \$111,419. Thus, as Table 4.2 shows, the pilot project is expected to result in savings of \$19,304 in retirement system contributions.

Table 4.2
**A Comparison of Costs of
State Contributions to the Retirement System**

	Pilot project costs	Costs without the project	Difference
1979 Spring semester . .	\$18,723	\$ 23,098	\$ 4,375
1979-80 School year . .	73,392	88,321	14,929
Total	<u>\$92,115</u>	<u>\$111,419</u>	<u>\$19,304</u>

Social security. The State's share of social security contributions is based on a percentage of the individual employee's salary, up to the salary base established by federal law. For 1979, this percentage rate was set at 6.13 percent of the employee's salary up to a maximum of \$22,900. Computed at this rate, the cost to the State of the social security contributions for the job sharers for the 1979 spring semester totaled \$10,963. The maximum taxable salary ceiling has since been raised to \$25,900 for 1980, but the percentage rate remains fixed at 6.13 percent. At this rate, it is estimated that the State will incur a cost of approximately \$45,444 for the social security contributions

for the job sharers in the pilot project during the 1979–80 school year. For the two pilot project periods, the total social security contributions by the State is estimated to be \$56,407.

The actual and estimated costs of the State's social security contributions for the two groups of job sharers have been compared with the costs that would have resulted had the tenured teachers not participated in the project. As shown by Table 4.3, the pilot project has actually resulted in a savings to the State of \$2,561 for the 1979 spring semester and is expected to result in additional savings of \$9,243 at the end of the 1979–80 school year. Thus, the conversion of full-time positions to job sharing positions under the pilot project is estimated to result in \$11,804 in savings of employer social security contributions by the end of this school year. As with salaries and retirement system contributions, this pattern of savings is expected to continue.

Table 4.3
A Comparison of Costs of
State Contributions for Social Security

	Pilot project costs	Costs without the project	Difference
1979 Spring semester . .	\$10,963	\$13,524	\$ 2,561
1979–80 School year . .	45,444	54,687	9,243
Total	<u>\$56,407</u>	<u>\$68,211</u>	<u>\$11,804</u>

Health fund benefit plans. Eligibility for enrollment in the medical, dental, and group life insurance plans is extended to all job sharers. The State's share of health fund contributions is independent of the earned salary of job sharers and based instead on fixed amounts. However, as enrollment in the various health fund benefit plans is optional, the cost to the State is dependent on which plan, if any, is selected, and whether dependents are included for coverage under the particular plan.

Medical plan. Job sharers have the option of enrolling in one of three medical plans. Although the employee's share of the contribution differs according to the plan selected, the State's share is fixed at \$11.00 per month for self only enrollment and \$34.50 for family enrollment. As shown in Table 4.4, under the pilot project, the State's contribution for medical plans selected during the 1979 spring semester totaled \$3,976 and is estimated at \$12,522 for the 1979–80 school year. Thus, the pilot project has resulted in increases of state contributions for medical plans of \$1340 for the 1979 spring semester and \$3768 for the 1979–80 school year.

Table 4.4
A Comparison of Costs of
State Contributions for Medical Plans

	Pilot project costs	Costs without the project	Difference
1979 Spring semester . .	\$ 3,976	\$ 2,636	[\$1,340]
1979–80 School year . .	12,522	8,754	[3,768]
Total	<u>\$16,498</u>	<u>\$11,390</u>	<u>[\$5,108]</u>

Dental plan. Job sharers may enroll their unmarried, dependent children who are under 19 years of age in the health fund's children's dental plan. The State contributes \$3.74 per month for each child enrolled. Thus, the cost to the State is dependent not on the number of employees but on the number of children enrolled. Under the pilot project, the State contributed \$602 toward the dental plan during the 1979 spring semester and is projected to pay \$4694 for the 1979–80 school year. Any costs for dental benefits for children of the new hires automatically become additional costs incurred by the State. As shown by Table 4.5, these costs amounted to \$157 for the 1979 spring semester and \$1167 for the 1979–80 school year.

Table 4.5
A Comparison of Costs of
State Contributions for Dental Plans

	Pilot project costs	Costs without the project	Difference
1979 Spring semester . .	\$ 602	\$ 445	[\$ 157]
1979-80 School year . .	4,694	3,527	[1,167]
Total	<u>\$5,296</u>	<u>\$3,972</u>	<u>[\$1,324]</u>

Group life insurance plan. The State makes a \$2.25 monthly contribution per employee for payment of life insurance premiums to either the health fund life insurance plan or the employee's organization if the employee is enrolled in its group life insurance plan. No distinction is made by the State in its treatment of job sharers and full-time teachers. Therefore, as job sharing doubles the number of employees, the cost to the State for this benefit would also be expected to double. As shown in Table 4.6, the State contributed \$614 for life insurance benefits during the 1979 spring semester and is projected to contribute \$2565 for the 1979-80 school year. This represents an increase of \$299 and \$1269, respectively.

Table 4.6
A Comparison of Costs of
State Contributions for Group Life Insurance Plans

	Pilot project costs	Costs without the project	Difference
1979 Spring semester . .	\$ 614	\$ 315	[\$ 299]
1979-80 School year . .	2,565	1,296	[1,269]
Total	<u>\$3,179</u>	<u>\$1,611</u>	<u>[\$1,568]</u>

Unemployment insurance and worker's compensation. Job sharers may also qualify for unemployment insurance benefits and

worker's compensation benefits upon the filing of valid claims. In these cases, the State reimburses the unemployment compensation fund and the special compensation fund for the actual costs of valid claim payments and compensable injury payments, respectively. However, as these costs are variable and contingent upon events which may or may not occur, reasonable estimates cannot be made. Thus, except for costs which have actually been incurred by the State, these cost factors have been excluded from the determination of the overall cost of the project.

Two new hires who participated in the pilot project during the 1979 spring semester did apply for and receive unemployment insurance benefits. The cost to the State for these benefits totaled \$331. No claims for worker's compensation benefits have been filed.

The individuals most likely to file for unemployment insurance benefits would be the new hires who may not renew their job sharing contracts or be offered other employment. Theoretically, if all the new hires presently participating in the pilot project applied for unemployment insurance benefits after the termination of their contracts in August 1980, they may be eligible for a maximum of \$77,688 in benefits. However, this seems highly unlikely for several reasons. *First*, 84 percent of the present new hires indicated that they would like to continue participating in the pilot project either because they prefer part-time work or would be unable to obtain a full-time teaching position. *Second*, even if they were unable to obtain job sharing positions, previous employment records indicate that they would probably seek other employment. *Third*, as stated previously, only two of the 20 new hires in the first group of job sharing participants actually filed unemployment claims. As such, it is anticipated that the actual cost to the State for unemployment insurance benefits would continue to be minimal.

Program cost savings. In summary, the direct operating costs incurred by the pilot

project are less than the costs DOE would have incurred without the project. As shown by Table 4.7, savings in direct operating costs amounting to approximately \$215,354 would accrue to the State as a result of the job sharing pilot project by the end of the 1979–80 school year. The primary reason for this is the salary differential between the job sharers and the tenured teachers. As the State's contributions to the retirement system and social security are based on wages earned, the salary differential also resulted in savings in these cost areas. The additional costs incurred by the pilot project were in the areas of health fund benefits and unemployment compensation benefits. In total, however, cost savings in salaries, retirement system contributions, and social security contributions offset by a wide margin the increased costs for health fund benefits and unemployment compensation benefits.

Administrative Costs

Administrative costs assignable to the pilot project include nonrecurring costs which are related to the initial development and implementation of the program, and costs incurred by the maintenance of ongoing program operations. A review of these cost areas revealed that DOE did not expend any additional funds for the

pilot project except for the cost of a few over-time hours by clerical staff to process new hires. In fact, the administrative costs assignable to the pilot project are really "fixed costs," i.e., costs which would be incurred by DOE regardless of whether the pilot project had been initiated.

Ordinarily, administrative costs would be calculated based on time spent by personnel on administrative tasks for the project. However, as time records were not kept, the actual administrative costs could not be determined. Moreover, it was not possible to accurately separate any nonrecurring investment costs from other administrative costs.

DOE's Office of Personnel Services did, however, conduct a survey of in-kind salary contributions of personnel involved with the administration of the pilot project. DOE's state and district personnel officers, principals, and their respective staffs were requested to estimate the total number of hours spent on the pilot project from February 1978 to October 1979. Based on these responses and the average hourly wages for the personnel involved, administrative costs totaling \$26,937 have been estimated. A breakdown of this cost by administrative level and personnel classification is presented in Table 4.8.

Table 4.7
Direct Operating Costs
Job Sharing Pilot Project Costs vs. Costs Without Project

	1979 Spring semester		1979–80 School year		Total		Difference
	Pilot project costs	Costs without the project	Pilot project costs	Costs without the project	Pilot project costs	Costs without the project	
Salaries	\$178,842	\$220,627	\$741,336	\$ 892,128	\$ 920,178	\$1,112,755	\$192,577
Retirement system. . . .	18,723	23,098	73,392	88,321	92,115	111,419	19,304
Social security	10,963	13,524	45,444	54,687	56,407	68,211	11,804
Health benefits.	5,192	3,396	19,781	13,577	24,973	16,973	[8,000]
Actual unemployment benefits	331	--	--	--	331	--	[331]
Total direct operating costs . . .	\$214,051	\$260,645	\$879,953	\$1,048,713	\$1,094,004	\$1,309,358	\$215,354

Table 4.8
Estimated Administrative Costs
Job Sharing In-Kind Salary Contribution
February 1978 to October 1979

	Schools	District	State office	Total
Principals and vice principals . .	\$ 7,662	\$	\$	\$ 7,662
Teachers	2,273			2,273
Educational officers		4,488	9,312	13,800
Secretaries and stenographers . .	1,025		228	1,253
Personnel clerks . .	37	417	1,495	1,949
Total	<u>\$10,997</u>	<u>\$4,905</u>	<u>\$11,035</u>	<u>\$26,937</u>

Source: DOE Office of Personnel Services.

Table 4.8 shows that \$11,035 or 41 percent of the total cost is centered at the state level. It should be noted, however, that most of this cost are nonrecurring investment costs for tasks such as the development and presentation of project guidelines, discussions with unions about the pilot project, and preparation of implementation procedures. Also included is the cost for the time spent by DOE in preparing testimony and background material for the Legislature before the act establishing the pilot project was passed. State level personnel indicate that the work involved in project coordination has decreased and that much of the time now spent on the pilot project is expended on more routine tasks, such as, the recruitment of new hires and the processing of personnel action forms for the job sharers.

The primary cost of maintaining the pilot project is concentrated at the school level where the actual selection, supervision, and evaluation of the job sharing team occur. According to the DOE survey, estimated costs assignable to the principals and vice-principals performing these tasks amount to \$7,662. As much of this cost

is directly related to the establishment of work schedules and selection of the new hire, whether or not this cost area increases depends heavily on the number of first-time job sharers, (both tenured teachers and new hires) participating in the pilot project. Interviews with principals who have returning job sharing teams indicate there has been a decrease in the amount of time spent on the pilot project. The rest of the cost is attributed to the time spent by the school secretaries and/or clerks who have the responsibility of maintaining individual personnel records.

At the district level, the cost of the pilot project is estimated to be \$4,905. However, interviews with the district personnel disclose that most of the time spent on the project was during the initial implementation period when many questions were received from the schools and individual teachers. The time they spend in coordinating the pilot project is expected to decrease as school administrators and teachers become more familiar with job sharing rules and procedures.

Summary

There has been considerable savings in direct operating costs as a result of the job sharing pilot project and minimal administrative expenditures. At this time, no significant changes in cost patterns of the program are foreseen. As long as there is a salary differential with the new hire earning less than the tenured teacher, savings should continue to accrue in salary costs and retirement system and social security contributions. The cost savings in these areas should more than offset the additional costs in health fund benefits and other costs incurred by the pilot project. Therefore, the pilot project is expected to continue to result in substantial overall cost savings to the State, although this was not established as an objective of the project.

CHAPTER 5

PROGRAM ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The evaluation of the pilot project reported in Chapter 3 indicates that it has generally been effective in achieving the objectives of the job sharing program. However, there are some issues and problems which have emerged during the implementation of the pilot project. This chapter identifies and discusses these issues and problems and presents our recommendations.

Summary of Findings

In general we find that:

1. The eligibility restrictions imposed by Act 150, SLH 1978, on the pilot project have had varying effects on project participation. Restricting the pilot project to 100 positions, statewide, has not prevented any tenured teacher from participating in the pilot project. However, the restrictions limiting project participation to (a) no more than 5 percent of the school faculty, (b) classroom teachers, and (c) tenured teacher/new hire pairings, appear to be arbitrary and unduly constraining.

2. Variances among teaching conditions and requirements in the different schools have resulted in inconsistent and, sometimes, inequitable treatment of job sharers. In addition, the inability of new hires to earn probationary credit and tenure status under these conditions and requirements may be a disincentive for them to participate.

Eligibility Restrictions

Act 150, SLH 1978, currently imposes certain eligibility restrictions on participation in the pilot project. These restrictions include limiting participation in the pilot project to: (1) 100 full-time positions, statewide; (2) 5 percent of any school faculty; (3) classroom teachers; and (4) tenured teacher/new hire pairings. In this section, we assess the effects of each of these restrictions on project participation.

Restriction to 100 positions, statewide.

Section 2 of Act 150 restricts the pilot project to a maximum of 100 full-time positions, statewide. As tenured teacher applicants for the 1979 spring semester and the 1979–80 school year have numbered far less than 100 each time, this restriction has not prevented any tenured teacher from participating in the pilot project. No substantial change is expected for the duration of the test period. Forty-one of the present participating, tenured teachers intend to reapply for job sharing positions. However, even if the number of tenured teachers were to double, all of the allotted positions will not be filled. Under present conditions, DOE officials estimate no more than 80 filled positions for the 1980–81 school year.

The majority of DOE administrators support the retention of this restriction during the test period. They do note, however, that 100 is

an arbitrary number which may need to be reevaluated and changed if the program is made permanent. The teachers' bargaining unit favors the restriction as long as the new hires are not eligible for union membership, while the educational officers' bargaining unit is not averse to increasing the number of allotted positions. The strongest support for changing the restriction comes from the principals. Of the 45 principals interviewed, 19 (42 percent) feel that job sharing should not be limited to 100 positions; 9 (20 percent) feel that the restriction should be maintained; and 17 (38 percent) have no opinion at this time.

In view of the expected underutilization of the allotted positions, the removal of this restriction at this time would serve no purpose. However, considerable interest in future participation in the program has been expressed by the nonparticipating teachers in our evaluation. Of the 50 nonparticipating teachers interviewed, 21 (42 percent) said that they would apply for a job sharing position if the project became a permanent program in DOE, and an additional 13 (26 percent) felt that they might also apply for such positions. If this is indicative of feelings held by tenured teachers in general, this restriction may need to be revised or removed if job sharing is established as a permanent program.

Restriction to 5 percent of school faculty. Section 3(2) of Act 150 further restricts participation in the pilot project to no more than 5 percent of the eligible faculty at any school. As some concern was expressed about the effect a sizable increase in school faculty would have on school administrative operations, the restriction was included to ensure that the number of job sharers in each school would be kept within manageable limits during the pilot test period. In actuality, however, there has been only one job sharing team in nearly 90 percent of the participating schools. Generally, the addition of one more teacher to the school faculty has not resulted in a substantial increase in administrative and clerical responsibilities. One administrator volunteered that at the start of

the pilot project, he believed in the need for the 5 percent school quota but, after two semesters of job sharing without any adverse effects, he would support the removal of the restriction.

Our evaluation finds that this restriction prevents adequate consideration to be given to the needs and preferences of the individual schools. One of the effects of the restriction is that it discriminates against teachers in smaller schools. The approval of just one position in schools with less than 20 eligible personnel would exceed the 5 percent school quota. This means that tenured, full-time teachers in 35 of the 225 schools in DOE are currently ineligible to participate in the pilot project.

The restriction resulted in the rejection of at least eight job sharing applications of tenured teachers for the 1979–80 school year. In one high school, 11 teachers applied for the pilot project, but the 5 percent school quota limited the school to only four positions. In this situation, the principal, who already had a semester's experience with the pilot project, was willing to assume the additional responsibilities for at least one other position. She felt strongly that both the school and the tenured teacher would benefit from the pilot project and, as the district's quota of positions was not filled, she filed a request for an exception to the school quota. However, DOE could not grant the exception since it would have violated the school quota established by Act 150.

Generally, the majority of DOE administrators favor the removal of the 5 percent school quota, particularly if the immediate supervisors retain the authority to approve or reject any job sharing requests. They feel that the school quota should be based instead on the principal's assessment of the needs, programs, workloads, and preferences of the school.

Restriction to classroom teachers. Both DOE and bargaining unit officials have received inquiries about participation in the pilot project from nonclassroom personnel. However, Section 3(1) of Act 150 clearly states that

participation in the pilot project is restricted to "all full-time, tenured, certificated personnel of the department excluding educational officers and persons not actually engaged in classroom teaching." The effect, then, of this restriction is that it denies the option of job sharing to such other school personnel as librarians, counselors, registrars, and district resource teachers, who are certified as teachers and belong in the same employee bargaining unit. Our evaluation of the pilot project revealed no valid reason for excluding these other certificated personnel.

It appears that the primary reason for the inclusion of this restriction is to maximize the utilization of the 100 convertible positions by classroom teachers and, thus, effect a reduction in the numbers of unemployed classroom teachers in the State. However, as cited previously, classroom teachers have not made full use of the 100 allotted positions, and it is highly unlikely that it would be any different for the remainder of the test period. It seems unreasonable, then, to allow the positions to go unused when there are others who may wish to participate in the pilot project.

Generally, DOE administrators are in favor of allowing participation of nonclassroom, certificated personnel in the pilot project. Officials of the teachers' as well as the educational officers' bargaining units are in favor of expanding the participation base. At the school level, the principals interviewed are narrowly divided on this issue, with 22 feeling that participation in the pilot project should be widened, 20 maintaining that it should be limited to classroom teachers, and 3 declining to offer any opinion at this time.

Reservations were expressed by some principals about the amenability of certain positions for job sharing. Some felt that a new hire who was not fully aware of a school's programs and requirements may have some difficulty in sharing a registrar's responsibilities for scheduling classes and compiling a master schedule. Concerns raised about the sharing of a counselor's position centered on the possible

effects on stability and continuity of the counseling program. It should be noted, however, that there already are situations where a counselor's time is divided between two schools and, in these cases, job sharing may be particularly feasible.

On the other hand, some view the pilot test period as the ideal opportunity to see if other kinds of positions could be effectively shared. One administrator felt that the sharing of the librarian's position may possibly result in additional benefits and service for the students if the working hours could be staggered to provide extended coverage. Others felt that the authority retained by the immediate supervisor to approve or reject any job sharing request would ensure that a position would be converted only after the needs of the school and students were fully considered. From a legislative perspective, the advantage of extending job sharing to other kinds of positions is that it might yield data to indicate whether job sharing would be feasible for other government positions and departments and enable legislative policy to be formulated accordingly.

Restriction to tenured teacher/new hire pairings. Section 3(4) of Act 150 restricts the second half position created by job sharing to new hires only, thereby disqualifying other tenured or probationary teachers from filling these positions. This restriction appears to have been included to ensure more employment opportunities for unemployed teachers. However, it appears that it may have also precluded the possibility of other benefits which may result from different pairing combinations. For example, there may be some merit in allowing two tenured teachers to share positions.

The evaluation revealed widespread support for allowing two tenured teachers to share a position. The vast majority of DOE administrators favored the removal of the restriction limiting the job sharing team to the tenured teacher/new hire combination. In fact, only one administrator disagreed with the need for any change to the restriction, while three others

were unable to make any judgment at this time. Both bargaining units saw no reason for not allowing the tenured teachers to share a position. Furthermore, of the 45 principals interviewed, 33 (74 percent) agreed that two tenured teachers should be able to job share; 6 (13 percent) favored retention of the tenured teacher/new hire pairing only; and 6 (13 percent) had no opinion at this time.

One of the benefits for allowing the pairing of two tenured teachers would be the creation of a vacant full-time position. If the full-time vacancies created by tenured teacher pairings were then made available, there may be an increase in the number of applicants and, consequently, a rise in the quality of applicants; an increase in the number of employment opportunities available to them; and a greater impact on the number of unemployed teachers.

However, the problem involving the retention rights to a specific position would have to be resolved. Under the present situation, the tenured teacher retains the right to the converted position. If two tenured teachers job share, then there is a question as to which teacher retains the right to which position, or whether both of them do. If tenured teachers are allowed to job share for an indefinite period of time and still retain their rights to their original teaching positions, this means that the teacher occupying the vacated position would never be able to gain rights to the position since it would be obligated to one of the job sharing, tenured teachers.

Some concerns are also expressed about the legislative intent of the program. As there is no guarantee that the full-time vacancies would be filled by new teachers, enabling two tenured teachers to job share may defeat the purposes of providing more employment opportunities for unemployed teachers and getting "new blood in the system." In addition, one administrator felt that a good balance would be achieved by the tenured teacher/new hire pairing, and that the benefits gained might

be lost by the two tenured teachers pairing. However, a principal urged that consideration be given to an amendment as "two tenured teachers can offer as much as one tenured teacher and one new hire."

Although the tenured teachers were not specifically polled on this issue, several of them recommended the pairing of two tenured teachers as one way of improving the program. At least two teachers expressed some doubts about working with someone who is inexperienced and thought that it would be easier to work with someone in whom they had confidence. Another teacher felt that two tenured teachers should be permitted to job share provided that they retained their rights to their positions.

There may be certain situations where job sharing by two tenured teachers seems to be especially feasible. One principal suggested that two tenured teachers be allowed to job share if new hires are not available to fill the second half position. The evaluation uncovered a situation where such an allowance might have resolved a recruitment problem. In this particular situation, two tenured teachers in the same school were unable to participate in the pilot project because the distant location of the school did not attract any new hire, job sharing applicants. It would have been easier to recruit a new hire for a full-time vacancy.

On balance, there appear to be merits in allowing tenured teachers to pair as job sharers. However, the issue of the rights of tenured teachers to their old positions versus the rights of the new, full-time teacher would first have to be resolved before allowing tenured teacher pairings.

Teaching Conditions and Requirements

Other than the general guideline that each job sharer should work one half of the total hours required of the full-time position and perform one half of the work responsibilities,

Act 150 does not outline any specific teaching conditions or requirements. Although DOE has agreed to comply with certain teaching conditions and requirements outlined in the contract between DOE and the teachers' bargaining unit, it generally has some flexibility in determining how the job and related responsibilities are to be assumed under the pilot project. While the flexible nature of the program draws widespread support among DOE administrators, principals, and job sharers alike, it has contributed to differences in teaching conditions and requirements. As a result, from the viewpoint of some job sharers, treatment has been inconsistent and inequitable. The concerns relate to workload and compensation; the duty-free lunch and preparation periods; the assignment, compensation, and arrangements of job sharers doing substitute teaching; and probation and tenure for new hires.

Workload and compensation. Under the pilot project, the principal retains the authority to approve or reject job sharing proposals and to assign responsibilities for teaching and school-related functions and activities. In some cases, principals have requested that work schedules be revised to provide for a more equitable division of workload. In other situations, they have required that certain conditions be accepted by the teachers if they want to job share.

To illustrate, at some secondary schools where full-time teachers have five teaching periods daily, it is often difficult to achieve a 50–50 division of teaching time. In most cases, principals have added another class section and have assigned each job sharer three teaching periods. Twenty of the 24 job sharing teams in secondary schools in the 1979–80 school year have been assigned teaching responsibilities in this manner. In three other teams, the tenured teachers teach two periods while the new hires teach three periods. In one other situation, the principal has allowed a split whereby the tenured teacher has two teaching periods and the new hire has three teaching periods for the first semester with the teaching load being

reversed for the second semester. There appear to be advantages and disadvantages for each type of arrangement.

While the 3–3 split ensures the equity of the job sharers' workloads, several job sharers feel that this has resulted in a 60 percent workload for 50 percent of the pay. Although they do not feel that the workload creates a serious hardship, they maintain that as a matter of principle the compensation rate should be adjusted to 60 percent. This solution has a number of ramifications. The most obvious is that resultant costs may be more than that which would have been incurred by the State without job sharing. Also, if each job sharer were paid at 60 percent of the full-time equivalency (FTE) instead of 50 percent, the FTE would then total 120 percent and, as such, would not meet the definition of job sharing. Moreover, any change in the rate of compensation may also affect the permanent part-time teachers in DOE who currently carry three teaching periods.

If the rate of compensation were to be adjusted to reflect the actual workload, then it would appear that the 2–3 splits would also need to be adjusted accordingly. This would then mean that one job sharer would be paid at a 60 percent rate while the other would be paid at a 40 percent rate. However, there may be difficulties in finding teachers who would be willing to work for less than half pay.

The 2–3 teaching load for one semester reversed to 3–2 for the second semester appears to be equitable over the period of a year. However, there may be a problem if one of the job sharers, for some reason, is unable to finish the school year or if the job sharing arrangement is terminated before the end of the contract period. Another problem may arise if the third period, for which teaching assignments are switched after the first semester, is a full-year course rather than a semester course. There could be a break in teaching continuity and a need for some adjustments on the part of the students.

The majority of the secondary school principals feel that the addition of another section is justified on the basis that the school should receive some benefit from the increase in administrative and clerical workload resulting from the pilot project. They also note that a $2\frac{1}{2}$ – $2\frac{1}{2}$ division is not practical, and a 3–2 division may be demoralizing and unfair to the job sharer who has the heavier workload. Some principals have tried to balance the addition of the $\frac{1}{2}$ period by reducing the job sharer's responsibilities in other nonteaching areas.

Some principals have had a difficult time in assigning equally the responsibilities for extracurricular activities. Other principals do not consider that the two job sharers actually occupy only one position and assign more responsibilities than those which would normally be required for a full-time teacher. One tenured teacher is especially concerned that her new hire counterpart is being asked to take on nonteaching responsibilities which do not seem to be fair in terms of her half-time position and pay.

Some confusion also exists as to whether job sharers should be treated differently under certain circumstances. For example, when the school hours were reduced during a public workers' strike, the full-time teachers' hours were adjusted accordingly. However, there was no direction as to how the job sharers were to be treated. Thus, some job sharers worked the same hours as the full-time teachers, and in some cases actually put in more than the required $3\frac{1}{2}$ hours. Many felt that, on principle, their work hours should have been proportionately reduced.

The duty-free lunch and preparation periods. As discussed in the first report on job sharing, the sharing of the duty-free lunch and preparation periods has emerged as an issue in the implementation of the pilot project. At present, the tenured teacher is entitled to 35 minutes a day of duty-free time (15 minutes for lunch and 20 minutes for preparation). However, DOE maintains that it is not obligated

to include the other halves of the two duty-free periods in the new hire's work day. As new hires are not eligible for union membership, the teachers' bargaining unit is unable to insist that they be granted the same privileges accorded the tenured teachers under the teachers' contract. Therefore, DOE allows the principals to decide how the 35 minutes of duty-free time are to be utilized.

Our survey on this issue reveals that the majority of DOE administrators, principals, tenured teachers, and new hires agree that the new hire should be able to have the remaining halves of the two duty-free periods. However, this is not always possible because of the school schedules. Usually, the duty-free lunch and preparation periods are already scheduled at specific times. Thus, whether or not the new hire has duty-free periods depends on when the person teaches. As the tenured teacher has first choice on teaching times, the teacher may end up with both, none, or only one of the two duty-free periods. Whether or not the new hire has any duty-free time depends on the remaining work schedule.

For the 1979–80 school year, 43 of the 50 tenured teachers (86 percent) have both duty-free lunch and preparation periods as compared to 24 of the 50 new hires (48 percent). Four tenured teachers do not have any duty-free periods as compared to 15 new hires. Three tenured teachers and 11 new hires have at least one of the two periods.

Further analysis of the results of a survey of new hires on this issue reveals that there are some differences among the various grade levels. As shown in Table 5.1, more new hires at the elementary level have both duty-free periods than the new hires at the intermediate and high school levels. It appears, then, that class scheduling, particularly at the high school level, may not be amenable to providing both job sharers with duty-free periods. In these cases, the new hires who do not have any duty-free periods spend their time in classroom teaching.

Table 5.1

**Duty-Free Lunch and Preparation Periods for New Hires
During the 1979-80 School Year, by Grade Levels**

	Elementary		Intermediate		High school		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Both duty-free and lunch periods . .	14	53%	2	50%	8	40%	24	48%
One duty-free period	4	15	--	--	7	35	11	22
No duty-free period	8	32	2	50	5	25	15	30
Total	26	100%	4	100%	20	100%	50	100%

It should also be noted that there are approximately 200 other permanent half-time teachers in DOE who are ineligible for membership in the teachers' bargaining unit and consequently do not receive time for duty-free lunch or class preparation time. Therefore, the issue of granting these benefits to new hires is also related to the issue of benefits for the permanent, part-time teachers.

Substitutes. As discussed in the first status report on job sharing, two problems relating to substitutes emerged during the 1979 spring semester. One related to assignment procedures and the other concerned the rate of compensation for a job sharer who substitutes for the other teacher on the team. While DOE has made efforts to resolve these problems, other procedural difficulties have surfaced, and there are still a number of concerns about the compensation rate for job sharers who choose to substitute. In addition, another potential problem area involves the arrangements made by job sharers for substitutes.

Assignment procedures. DOE policy is for all personnel interested in substituting to be placed on district lists. Teachers who are ill contact code-a-phone operators who then call substitutes on the district lists. Although some job sharers in the 1979 spring semester were not aware of the additional paperwork required for them to be placed on the district lists, this has not been a problem for the

1979-80 school year. However, there have been some difficulties at the district level, where some staff and code-a-phone operators have not been fully informed of the pilot project or the special considerations established for job sharers who are willing to substitute only for their counterparts. As a result, in the beginning of the school year, a few job sharers were being called to substitute at schools all over the district. In another case, when the job sharer was ill, the counterpart was not contacted although she was on the substitute list. Consequently, this particular team has decided to contact each other and then inform the school secretary rather than work through the established system.

Compensation rate. During the 1979 spring semester, a grievance was filed by a tenured teacher who substituted for her new hire counterpart and subsequently was compensated at the rate established for substitutes. The decision rendered denied the tenured teacher's claim to be compensated for the substitute work at the daily rate of her own salary. As such, job sharers who substitute for each other continue to be paid at the per diem rates established for substitutes rather than at the daily rates of their own salaries. For the tenured teachers, especially, this results in a considerable difference in remuneration.

Despite the difference in remuneration, 29 of the 50 tenured teachers job sharing in the

1979–80 school year do substitute for their new hire counterparts. In fact, the rate of compensation is not a particular deterrent in the tenured teacher's decision against substituting. Only three of the 17 tenured teachers who do not substitute for their counterparts cite the difference in pay as the reason for their not substituting. Most of the other teachers do not substitute because of the inconvenience it would be for themselves or their families.

To alleviate some of the difficulties experienced by DOE in securing substitutes for less than a full day's work and partly to address the issue of substitute compensation for job sharers, DOE implemented a partial day compensation schedule effective September 1, 1979. As presented in Table 5.2 below, the compensation for a substitute teacher who works less than a full day is calculated on one fourth day increments based on official duty time worked¹ plus 30 minutes granted for work-related activities conducted prior to or following the official duty time worked.

Table 5.2
Partial Day Compensation Schedule
For Substitute Teachers

<i>Official duty time worked plus 30 minutes</i>	<i>¼ day increments</i>
Up to 1 hr. 45 mins.25 day
1 hr. 45 mins. to 3 hrs. 30 mins.50 day
3 hrs. 31 mins. to 5 hrs. 15 mins.75 day
5 hrs. 16 mins. and more	1.00 day

Source: DOE Memo to Substitute Teachers, August 24, 1979.

While this method of calculating compensation obviously benefits the job sharers as well as all other partial day substitutes, there are some concerns about its propriety. For example, the calculation of compensation by one-fourth day increments does not appear to comply with the statutory requirement that compensation be based on a daily rate of pay.² Moreover, there is some question about the inconsistency shown by DOE in granting an extra 30 minutes of time for substitutes when preparation time is not

normally guaranteed to permanent half timers or job sharing new hires. In the case of the job sharer who substitutes, the extra 30 minutes added to the official duty time of 3 hours and 30 minutes credits that teacher with 4 hours and, thus, entitles the teacher to be compensated at .75 day rather than at .50 day.

Arrangements for substituting. A job sharer is given first preference in substituting for a partner. Our survey of the arrangements for substituting indicates that most job sharers, particularly the new hires, have agreed to substitute for their partners. However, a number of job sharers have entered into informal agreements regarding substituting which may result in some difficulties.

Rather than being placed on the district substitute list, many job sharers have agreed to substitute for their partners on a "trade off" or reciprocal basis, i.e., the job sharer covers the partner's assigned teaching hours in return for the same coverage at another time within the duration of the contract. On the surface, it appears that this type of arrangement is advantageous to the students who either know the substitute or, at the secondary level, have to adjust to only one replacement. The job sharer who substitutes is already familiar with the school facilities, procedures, and policies and may more easily follow up with the teacher who is absent, since they already know each other. Also, job sharers do not lose in terms of pay.

Despite the advantages resulting from this type of trading arrangement, some problems may develop if: (1) the communication and/or working relationship between the job sharers are less than satisfactory, (2) a job sharer leaves the project before repaying the partner for the

1. Official duty time worked is defined by DOE as time that the substitute teacher is on duty in accordance with the official work schedule of the regular teacher being replaced.

2. Specifically, Hawaii Revised Statutes 297–33(i) states as follows: "... Per diem rates shall be derived from annual rates in accordance with the following formula: Per Diem Rate = Annual Salary Rate ÷ by 12 months ÷ 21 Average Working Days per Month"

time owed, or (3) one job sharer ends up owing the partner additional time at the end of the contract period. Moreover, as leave credits are not utilized under this type of reciprocal coverage, the potential for abuse exists in that the job sharer may actually take more sick leave or even personal leave than that to which the person is entitled.

Probation and tenure for the new hire.

At the present time, new hires employed under the job sharing program are given temporary teacher contracts. As such, they do not earn probation credit for their teaching time and are not eligible for tenure status. A number of DOE administrators, principals, and tenured teachers feel that the new hires should be able to earn probationary credit and tenure under the pilot project, especially since permanent part-time teachers are accorded these rights. Many feel that the performance of the new hires under the pilot project more than justifies the granting of at least some probationary credit. Additionally, many principals believe that allowing new hires to earn probation credit would be an incentive for better qualified teachers to apply for the job sharing positions. The new hires also want the right to earn probation credit as their job sharing contracts prevent them from being considered for other positions.

Although it appears that probationary credit and tenure status may be desirable, under the present conditions, this may not be realistic or practical. Currently, the tenured teacher retains the rights to the teaching position occupied by the job sharers. Thus, even if the new hire were able to fulfill the required probationary period by job sharing, tenure could not be obtained unless there exists an unobligated teaching position. This may prove to be difficult because: (1) the tenured teacher is not likely to relinquish rights to the teaching position; and (2) the number of unobligated teaching positions in DOE is not expected to increase. Moreover, tenured teachers who have lost positions in particular schools because of reduction in staff situations have first priority on any such positions.

Recommendations

The foregoing issues can be separated into those which are: (1) related to requirements of Act 150 and are thus matters to be considered by the Legislature; and (2) related to the implementation of Act 150 and are thus matters for consideration and resolution by the Department of Education, in consultation with the appropriate collective bargaining unit. Accordingly, we recommend that:

1. The Legislature remove certain eligibility restrictions imposed by Act 150 so that a better assessment of the potential merits of job sharing can be made during the pilot test period. The specific recommended changes involve:

a. Removal of the restriction that only classroom teachers may apply for the pilot project, thereby enabling other certificated school personnel, such as counselors and librarians, to participate in the project.

b. Removal of the restriction that only 5 percent of the eligible personnel at any one school may participate.

2. DOE work with representatives of the appropriate collective bargaining unit to resolve issues related to the following:

a. The position retention rights of tenured teachers if they are allowed to pair as job sharers.

b. How workload can be divided more equitably and compensation provided accordingly.

c. Provision of the duty-free lunch and preparation periods.

d. The assignment, compensation, and arrangement of substitute teaching when it is performed by job sharers.

e. The conditions under which new hires might be granted probation and tenure.