

**PCTA/PCSB Bargaining Meeting  
Minutes  
9-18-18**

Meeting was called to order at 5:40. PCTA caucused first. Introductions were made.

Kevin Smith proposed a 2% salary increase retroactive to July 1<sup>st</sup>. He explained we received 2.3 million from the state with many mandates attached, i.e. school security. We have tentatively agreed on our new Health package which will have a modest \$2-\$13 increase depending on which insurance package the employee chooses. The Board will contribute 4.9 million towards the healthcare. Laurie Dart stated that the Board would like to have raises and health care taken to the October 23<sup>rd</sup> school board meeting and suggested that if we can't agree on all the language for the new contract, that we should separate the issues and approve salary and health care first so employees can get raises sooner rather than later. We could continue the work on updating and revising contract language without holding up raises for our teachers. Mike Gandolfo stated that the contract language is important and we can see how far we get.

**Article 27** – PCSB presented a proposal for revisions to Article 27 which took into account many of the suggestions made by the Union. In the first paragraph, PCSB added language noting that “professional development is essential to continuous quality improvement necessary to improve student achievement”.

Under “hours of work” the parties agreed to delete all of the language after the first sentence on a “waiver” of the section and converting the school from a 7.5 hour day. Colleen Parker explained the history of the section and that it came about when block schedules were implemented. The Board’s proposal eliminated the (8:30 to 3:30) in the last sentence stating that the language provided for a 7 hour day on non-student days so really did not need the exact hours listed. The Union stated that in high school, they appreciate not coming in until 8:30 a.m. and would not want to delete that section if a principal wanted them to come earlier. Discussion by the union on voting to determine the hours. Board said to just leave the language as is.

The parties agreed that the term “structured planning” should be added to include all of the types of planning currently in 2 A 4-9, so could delete those sections.

The Union had proposed changing the current definition of “Uninterrupted Planning” to say

This is time reserved for the teacher “to use at their professional discretion.”

The Board countered that planning time is to be used to plan so could agree that the time had to be for “work related activities” not personal matters. The Union stated that the time should be used at the discretion of the teachers who are professionals.

The Board stated that they took many of the suggestions made by the Union under “Daily Schedules” where the teachers and administrators at the school try and determine an agreed to schedule. The Board agreed that the subcommittee’s plan could be voted on by the faculty by secret ballot but added that the vote should be by the majority of the instructional staff voting.

The board agreed that the plan should be sent to the area office and PCTA by the end of the first week of school instead of October 15 as stated in the CBA which made no sense.

The Board agreed to add that there needed to be a voluntary monthly union meeting on the calendar and at least one monthly meeting between the principal and union representative on the calendar. The principal and Union members discussed that they regularly meet and they are not all formal.

The Board stated that they tried to simplify the default provision for the school schedule in cases where the school and the staff did not agree to a schedule. It was stated that Laurie Dart and Paula Texel had met with all the principals from two of the areas and were told that all of the schools except one had agreed to the schedule to be used at the school.

They did not think this was as much an issue as the Union was making it out to be. The Board's proposal was to clearly separate elementary and secondary. In elementary, the daily planning period would be increased from 30 minutes during the student day to 45 minutes but would retain the language that one day each week the administration could use the daily planning inside the student day to conduct "structured planning". For the teachers who teach "specials" they would receive 30 minutes every day except one. The difference would be made up with the planning time provided outside the student day—2 hours for most teachers and 3 hours 15 minutes for the "specials". Mike Gandolfo said this isn't really planning time because they have too much to do when students aren't there that they don't get to plan. He said teachers are stressed, they are working at night and weekends. The Board took their planning during the day with meetings. Paula Texel said that you need to do PLC's in elementary during the day because that is the only time you can get the elementary teachers at a grade level together and that is when coaches can be there. A fifth grade teacher does not want to sit through a plc with second grade teachers because it does not pertain to them. It is efficient for everyone to plan during the day. That is when the coaches are available and for schools that don't have coaches, it allows the principal to participate. The Board's proposal is to keep it the same—one structured planning during the student day and one outside the student day for elementary each week.

In secondary, the proposal is to have two structured planning sessions outside the student day. The contract currently allows for two meeting each week outside the student day—one structured planning and one business meeting. The Union disagreed and said there can only be one. Laurie Dart stated the Union already challenged this and the arbitrator ruled that the contract allows for two each week.

The Board's proposal includes up to three faculty meetings each month. The Union said that would mean there could be 11 meetings every month? The Board said that is the proposal and if the Union has another proposal they should present it but currently the contract allows for 2 structured planning each week for elementary plus a business meeting and in secondary, there can be 2 meetings each week. It was stated that the Board is fine to leave it as is and live with the arbitrator's decision. There was a lengthy discussion.

**Article 32 – Teacher Evaluation** – PCSB proposed deleting most of the evaluation section except to recite the language from the statute that the superintendent will establish procedures for the evaluation and to keep the current language allowing for an appeal if the process was not followed. Mike Gandolfo said this proposal would be the shortest in the state. Laurie Dart stated that the parties have had meetings multiple, multiple times on the evaluation procedures since June of 2017. The appraisal advisory committee met multiple times, the data working group met multiple times and we decided to go with the Marzano Focused model. This entire group went through the proposal this past May line-by-line and all of the suggested language from the group was added. Everybody agreed to it. Then Mike Gandolfo asked for more changes and the Board made all those changes. Then the line went dead so the Board's proposal now is to just use the statutory language, keep recommendations from the appraisal advisory committee and the current appeal process.

The Union stated that the lesson plans required by some schools are too long and require too much and teachers are being dinged on their evaluation for not including everything. It is wrong so they need to put something in here. The Board said that effective planning is important and several administrators said that effective planning is evident from the observation; it is not what is on the piece of paper. Dwayne Hinds questioned why we were talking about lesson plans. It is not in article 32 for evaluations. Mike Feeney said that the rubric for the Marzano focused model had three sections for planning and distinct items that could be observed. Some administrators needed to do a better job and we could fix that through training. There needed to be some trust in the system. Mike Gandolfo said they need more than trust. The Board suggested that some of the principals at the recent area meetings stated that their schools jointly developed lesson plans and that seemed to work as there was buy in. The Board asked whether that would work? Nancy Vellardi said teachers are professionals and all good teachers plan but do it their own way. Lesson plans are the teacher's intellectual property and should not be turned in. Raquel Giles said lesson plans are for the benefit of the student's education. Rita Vasquez said that we really need to connect this discussion to the students and their learning and

quoted statistics showing Pinellas County having low student growth for L25 and ELL. Further discussion on lesson planning.

Mike Gandolfo said there is a problem when administrators don't rate anyone as highly effective, this causes them to lose money. The Board noted that most of our teachers are effective or highly effective and virtually none are unsatisfactory. We worked hard on switching to the Focused Model and think it will solve many of the concerns. The teacher will get the highest rating in the elements, there will be more conversation, no conjunctive scoring a targeted observation, lets see how it works. Union members expressed concern over the new Focus Model 's manual and trainings. Not all have been trained and they are unaware of where the manual may be. Where is this manual? Said can't rely on something where nobody know where it. Laurie Dart/Paula Texel stated they will give Professional Development this information and get the manual posted online. Mike Gandolfo said teachers should be highly effective and some principals think nobody is highly effective and that is a problem. Laurie Dart said the law requires the supervisor to evaluate teachers so cannot have an arbitrator or someone else determine a rating. Said they had talked about creating a review process if there was an anomaly at a school as an interim measure because the Focus model is new. It would have to sunset but could be re-opened as we continue to refine the process and see how the Focus model works. We have been waiting for a proposal from the union, we don't want to negotiate against ourselves. Mike Gandolfo asked who is on the Appraisal Advisory Committee. Paula will get him that information. Mike also stated he will come back with a counter proposal.

**Article 34 – Teacher Contracts** – PCS proposed changes to A. – add definition of Professional Service Contract and Continuing Contract. Under C. remove D and E –Violation of Annual Contract. Add D. – Appeal of Non-Renewal of Annual Contract or Decision not to Grant Annual Contract which was just moved from the current Article 32. Union asked why a teacher wouldn't be renewed if they were effective and asked for a list of reasons. The Board said an annual contract can be renewed or not renewed because that is what the law says. There does not need to be a list of reasons. Most teachers are renewed and if they are not renewed they can always reapply. They can also appeal the principal's decision not to renew them and then the principal has to explain at a meeting with the area superintendent and asst. superintendent of HR and others, gives it a second set of eyes. Many districts adopted our procedure. Union asked what happens after two times, they can't get a job? Board said no, that was a process that we don't do anymore. Can always re-apply. Mike asked for the number of teachers that are non-renewed. Paula stated she will supply that information. Union will supply a counter offer to this proposal.

Meeting adjourned at 7:40.