



Collaborative Bargaining Session
Pinellas County Schools
301 4th Street SW, Largo, FL



August 4, 2015 – 10 a.m.
War Room

Agenda

In attendance: Bruce Proud, Mike Gandolfo, Lou Cerreta, Kevin Smith, Bill Corbett, Laurie Dart, Ron Ciranna, Pamela Kasardo

Definition Section; Evaluation Process; Non-Reappointment Appeal Process: A draft of “Article XXXIII Teacher Evaluation and Files was shared with the group for review.

The district shared that they wanted to make the information easy and capture all of the content discussed. Under definitions, Item C – Formal Observation – PCTA stated they understood observations were to be 30 minutes minimum, not approximately 30 minutes – the definition needs to say minimum. The district put approximately as iObservation tracks the time the principal enters and leaves. The time will be changed to 30 minutes.

PCTA questioned why one document says that the observation should be completed within 35 days and one says it is to be completed in 60 days. It was explained that one is for observation and one is for evaluation – administrators still have to do a formal observation, then an evaluation. Both have to be done within 60 days – observation with a preconference; most administrators combine evaluation and post observation - two acts that may be at the same time.

Evaluating Teachers on a Probationary Contract – Section B, Item 4; PCTA indicated that the information was not clear. The same process is followed for both probationary and contract teachers. A self-evaluation form is completed in connection with any cycle and is needed for the formal evaluation. The self-evaluation form is completed prior to the summative. The district will work on clarifying Item 4.

Under definitions, Item E, Informal Evaluations – it states an observation is approximately 10-15 minutes, but PCTA thought an observation was to be 20 minutes, not 10-15 minutes. After discussion, Item E will be changed for an observation to be approximately 10-20 minutes.

Under definitions, Item K, Walkthrough – indicates the visit may or may not be evaluative. It is not scored in iObservation. Mr. Cerreta stated that administrators are always evaluating a teacher, even walking down the hall. Bruce Proud stated that there is a need to have more language about evaluation as well as documentation so there is no surprise. Dr. Corbett discussed that there are 41 elements in iObservation, Domain 1. There are two informal observations and one to two formal evaluations. The current system has the ability to note issues in the classroom that should not be happening. There are 63 total elements – 22 provide the opportunity to address issues that have happened in or out of the

class. Mr. Proud said teachers need to be provided information about the walkthrough – such as conference notes of issues to include in the evaluation. The district said that we can't reduce every interaction to documentation; some is verbal and there has to be room for it. PCTA stated that there needs to be some communication provided if someone needs to be improved.

Ron Ciranna shared that all elements are not all inclusive in iObservation. Each principal has their own system to provide feedback to the teachers. Some level administrators evaluate teachers and everything is not always tracked back to documentation. PCTA stated that if a teacher continually does something that is not appropriate, that needs to be documented.

If you are going to pick something other than effective, there has to be a reason. PCTA wants it documented. Mr. Ciranna suggested that some administrators currently send an email, provide a note in the mailbox, etc. It is only evaluative if they receive feedback.

The definition of Walkthrough will be changed to say – A brief visit to the classroom which will not be used for evaluation purposes in Domain 1, but may be used in other domains.

Section B, Item 4 – It was suggested by PCTA that the sentence end after principal in the third sentence to read “Within three workdays after the post-observation conference, a teacher may submit additional evidence to be considered by the principal.” Based on the discussion, the language will be revised as recommended.

Section C, Item 2 – It was suggested that the language be revised to read the same as the recommended change in Section B, Item 4. That language will also be revised.

Discussion took place regarding Section D. It was agreed that the teacher's remedy if an evaluation process was not followed a teacher can file a grievance 16 weeks before the end of the school year. Bruce Proud agrees to expedite the process. Take each step and if the grievance isn't grieved within a specific number of days, then there is no grievance. It was agreed that any deadlines missed have to be grieved within 5 days. Anything filed regarding the formal evaluation after May 1 goes directly to HR for step 2. Section C will be clarified including one formal and three informal evaluations; three of which must occur by the end of the third grading period. The formative/summative language will be updated. The formal evaluation must be completed prior to non-renewal recommendations.

Discussed the Right to Appeal the Non-Renewal of the Contract – Laurie Dart reviewed the annual/probationary contract appeal rights. As revised, probationary contract teachers can now appeal if they finished their probationary contract but were not renewed. The current process was discussed. This district has heard appeals where experienced teachers were not given support and the decision was overturned since they didn't receive the support. There also have been appeals from teachers who think they are great teachers and why they feel the principal was wrong and appeal their case.

Bruce is concerned that teachers who have had a history of several years of effective or highly effective evaluations but for some reason are now rated low, also get an opportunity to appeal. Current

language would exclude them. The language should include those who have up to three years of effective or highly effective evaluations.

Mike Gandolfo wants to avoid after the first evaluation that the new teacher doesn't feel doom and gloom and that they will be provided support. They want a system that provides and supports our teachers to be effective and highly effective.

Planning Period - Dr. Corbett stated that the district understands the concern about planning period time – there is not enough time in the day – option could be to increase the day. We don't have money to do that, but we could do it incrementally. It is important to add time over the next three years, 30 minutes per day, for uninterrupted planning time that belongs to the teachers. The uninterrupted planning time would need to be defined and put limits on all of it - PLC, common planning, etc. so we make sure teachers have enough time to plan. We don't have it in our budget but it could be part of the raise and implemented incrementally.

We have to look at the way we bargain insurance – plan design and employee contribution – remove 80/20. It's in the contract and would like to package everything together to give the largest raises possible. Just like planning, health care is important also.

Mike Gandolfo is concerned about planning time as teachers have more coaching during school and then they have to do the planning at home.

The district is suggesting adding 15-20 minutes in 16/17 for planning time. 30 minutes of time that can absolutely not be touched. Take existing planning and design – PLCs once a week; common planning – coaching cycles – once a semester maybe. The parties agreed that this is something to bring back to the big group after we lay it out. PLCs have a place in developing teachers helping them reflect on their teaching.

Elementary level – time – teachers have to take care of students before and after school because they are accepted prior to the start time, plus extra duty assignments that other levels don't have. Everybody is squeezed at what planning is and in agreement that it needs to be defined.

It was agreed that the following need to be defined – what a PLC is and isn't, coaching by district, by school; collaborative planning; team meetings; staff development what is and isn't training – when it should occur; – what impacts their time and how much time are they to be meeting with other people.

Both parties will work on definitions for planning time.

Assignments -

- Laurie Dart will rewrite the language on evaluations based on the recommendations.
- Both parties will develop language on planning periods and definitions – unions and district.
- 80/20 – what is the goal? How do we want to proceed with this? Some of the plans could pay all of employee costs, some provide a money factor that can be used for employee and other benefits. Where do you see the balance? We don't want the 80/20 option to drive the plan.