

the largest tax base and had the strongest ability to pay their teachers, they just weren't paying their teachers. We found school systems with tax burdens of 50 cents a hundred paying teachers \$9,500 a year, and we found school systems that were having tax bases of \$3, near \$3, having to be competitive because they were in larger communities. I happen to represent a community in South Sioux who has to be competitive with Iowa, because the teacher doesn't even have to change their residence and can go across the river for a \$5,000 increase when an opening shows up there. And so they have to be competitive with that particular geographical region they are in. And yet they didn't have the tax base to do it, but in order to be competitive, they were wrestling with that problem. So what we did is we put in and said, okay, we are not going to subsidize or we are not going to reinforce school districts for paying low salaries, and so, therefore, we were going to have a threshold, and we had that marching forward. I think it was 16,000 the first year, then 17,000 the second year, and for every teacher that you had in that category, we would give you a weight of .6. Then if you paid between, and ultimately last year we got down to the point if you paid between 17 and 19 for a full-time teacher, we would give you a weight of 1.0, and then having our incentives for advanced degrees, we had a 1.2 level for people with a master's degree. Like I say, under LB 91, if you will notice in the green copy, that aspect was stricken from the bill, and what my amendment does is reinstates that stricken language. It says we need to develop a scheme by which we are going to direct these funds out to the various schools, and that scheme, and I left the threshold at 17,000. I didn't even try to move that up. It probably should be moved up another 1,000 this year, but it wasn't. So what it, basically, says is if you are paying 17,000, we are going to give you some points for that. If you are paying more than 17, or excuse me, more than 19, we are going to give you a 1.0 weight, and for a master's, we are going to give you a 1.2, the same way we had it before. Now some people will argue that wasn't working. Well, it wasn't in place long enough to ever actually work. If it was going to be a two-year deal and it was simply a bonus, that is all there was to it. So, like I say, basically, the amendment reinstates those so we can differentiate those schools that were teachers who fell out from underneath and didn't get the bonus. But the bonus was not designed to be a bonus simply for the teachers. There was a justification for those bonuses, and that was to create a system where people would be enticed, where there would be incentives to come in to that profession, function in that