

**METROPOLITAN SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PERRY TOWNSHIP**  
**PEA DISCUSSION MINUTES**  
**Thursday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>**

**Attendance: Rolland Abraham, Bob Bohannon, Barb Brouwer, Sue Buscemi, Vicki Carpenter, Cathee Cullison, Steve Dawson, Frank Giles, Kyle Hanefeld, David Henriott, Neil Linville, Danny Mendez, Leslie Preddy, John Ralston, David Rohl, and Diane Turpen**

**Elementary Spelling**

In the elementary schools, spelling is now embedded in the language arts grade and is 10% of the grade. The teachers are not changing what is done in classroom as far as teaching spelling. The report card review committee will meet again soon.

**District Rater Reliability Checks**

Mr. Bohannon stated that the focus for rater reliability is district wide. Master teachers may ask to have multiple raters visit classrooms, both in their assigned schools and in other district schools, to practice rating for reliability. They score the lesson and then have conversations about the lesson so that they can grow as raters. This process will be ongoing all year, not in just during the 6 week rubric review period.

**Testing security and integrity agreement**

Edison schools expressed concerns about how Acuity assessment questions can be used with students. Acuity diagnostic items can be used to instruct students, but predictive questions never may be used for instruction. Acuity predictive questions can be used for an IEP accommodation, but then they should be immediately shredded when done with the assessment. Originally, signing the Indiana Testing Security and Integrity Agreement was just for ISTEP testing, but now it is also covers Acuity and Mclass as well. The agreement was released before the manual, which clarifies how diagnostic and predictive questions may be used.

**TAP Update**

The new part of the TAP evaluation for the current school year is a Professionalism category which is referred to as "The Responsibility Survey". "The Responsibility Survey" will be weighted 5% of the "Summative Evaluation". Questions were asked as to how this portion of the assessment can be quantitative rather than subjective. Administrators and Master teachers will answer 8 items about teacher preparation in professional development cluster meetings. This part of the TAP evaluation is about teacher willingness to cooperate, learn, and grow in the teaching profession. Master teachers will be evaluated by a survey done by cluster members. Principal Danny Mendez has used this portion of the assessment for the last two years.

**Summative Evaluation Weighting**

- |  |     |
|--|-----|
| 1. Instruction (12 Indicators)                       | 75% |
| 2. The Learning Environment (4 indicators)           | 10% |
| 3. Designing and Planning Instruction (3 indicators) | 10% |
| 4. The Responsibility Survey                         | 5%  |

Rhonda Jones-Jointer stated that teacher signature on evaluation does not indicate agreement with the evaluation.

Mr. Linville surveyed PEA members concerning TAP. 400 responses indicated that PEA members are concerned about reliability and consistency of raters. Neil Linville wanted to communicate this concern of PEA members and publish it in the minutes.

**2013-14 Teachers' Handbook**

The MSDPT Board of Education approved several changes to the Teacher Handbook on August 12:

- Position Postings -- Principals may choose not to post openings in the two weeks before school starts. Principals may have interviewed applicants for other open positions over the course of the summer and may be able to hire from these candidates. The new language does not prevent internal applicants for the openings.
- Maternity and adoption leave – Language was added to clarify how and when Family and Medical Leave Act (FLMA) may be used by a teacher ( Section 8 in 2013-14 Teachers’ Handbook). Language was also changed concerning healthcare during FLMA period: “If a teacher qualifies for FMLA, the district will maintain their financial contribution to healthcare during the 12 week FMLA period.”
- New rating division – See above in **TAP Update**.
- Remediation plan – During any point during the school year, an administrator may place a teacher on a Remediation Plan in order to assist a teacher in remaining in or reaching the “Effective” rating at the end of that current school year. A remediation plan can lead to a corrective plan, not dismissal if a teacher does not improve. A corrective plan can lead to dismissal.
- Reduction in force – Teachers will be identified for RIF, with consideration of licensure, using the following protocol in the consecutive order listed: 1) Overall Summative Score, 2) The Responsibility Score of the Teacher, 3) The academic needs of students in the school corporation, 4) The assignment of instructional leadership roles, and 5) The experience level of the teacher in the corporation.
- Uncompensated leave – Highly effective or effective rated teachers may apply for uncompensated leave not to exceed one year. A formal written request must be submitted to the Director of Human Resources no later than April 1 proceeding the school year in which the leave will be taken. In the case of an emergency, an exception to this April 1 deadline may be requested in writing to the Superintendent.
- Grounds for contract termination – This is a reminder of language change last spring. An employee is required “to report an arrest or filing of criminal charges against an employee and conviction of criminal charges to his/her supervision or the Superintendent within two business days of the occurrence. The Superintendent shall obtain a review of each reported arrest and / or conviction and shall recommend appropriate action to the Board considering risk to members of the school community presented by the continued employment of the employee. Failure to self-report within two business days may lead to a recommendation of termination for insubordination (SB Policy 3121).”
- Reassignment of teacher -
- Requests for change in teaching load – Teacher will interview with principal; language requiring the teacher to meet with personnel director was dropped.
- Appendix changes –  
Effective is one rating. It has been broken down into “Effective (Evaluation Score 3.0-3.99)” and Effective (Evaluation Score 2.26-2.99) for internal clarification only.

The Responsibility Survey Score will factor into the final Summary Score.

### **Technology**

An August Technology Department Newsletter that clarified several technology questions was sent out on August 22, 2013.

The transition from ARK to Skyward classroom management system has consumed a lot of the Technology Department's time this summer. This may be the reason for the lag in updating students and staff in various systems.

Concerns about slow response to finishing work orders were expressed and discussed. Teachers seem to need to diagnose technology problems and anticipate potential technology problems that will occur. Some tech jobs that need to be done require several steps to get to the desired result. The teachers just want the job finished, but sometimes the movement on the work order stops because several technicians are involved in the process. Then, the teacher must determine the next step in the project and resubmit an email to Help Desk to move the project along.

Communicating technology changes, implications of these changes and timeline for these changes will be helpful for building staffs to adjust to future technology changes.

### **Bargaining Update**

The bargaining team has been meeting with administration.

### **Payroll**

Communication sent to teachers on August 23 concerning lump sum check in the amount of \$545.09 to be sent out to Highly Effective and Effective teachers on August 30. Due to the delay in delivery of ISTEP Scores, 1.5 units increase will not be based on academic needs; instead it will be based on leadership and meeting student needs through participation in Cluster. This amount will be added to the base salary and will be prorated for part time Highly Effective and Effective teachers.

Neil Linville reminds teachers that a ladder pay model is no longer being used and that teachers need to know what they are to earn by keeping track of yearly increases.

Next Discussion Meeting will be held on Sept. 19.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Turpen