

<p>Location: ZOOM Meeting</p>	<p>SELM</p> <p>Special education labor management</p>		<p>ROLES: Facilitator: Caroline and Matt Notetaker: Jodi Timekeeper: Summer</p>
		<p>Contract Language to review:</p> <p>12.3 Special Education Labor Management Committee:</p> <p>12.3.1 Purpose: A joint committee shall meet on a monthly basis to develop and review policies and practices related to the delivery of student and Special Education services in the District and be proactive in resolving issues of concern to both parties.</p> <p>12.3.2 Membership: The committee shall consist of an equal number of members appointed by the President of the Federation of teachers, Local 59 and the Superintendent.</p> <p>12.3.3 Scope: Topics that the committee shall address include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Workloads b. Paperwork reduction, duplication, data collection and information management c. Support for IEP due process requirements d. Selection and use of funds for curriculum and materials e. Facilities and working conditions f. Professional development g. Support for schools to deliver focused interventions for students with special needs h. Preparation time i. Residency Program for Special Education J. Loss of prep K. Building sub/ loss of prep <p>Attendees 4/10/2025 Matt Pellowski, Caroline Long, Meaghan Harvey, Andrew Meierding, Kaley Czech, Carissa Tebben, Aria Campbell, Rob Purple, Jose Rodriguez, Michelle Lee -Reid, Treasure Thoreson, Alecia Sanders, Emma Peterson, Deeqa Hussein, Christina Branter, Hai-Yen Vo, Jodi Dezale, Almas Merchant, Jennifer Frisbie, Courtney Holmes, Julie Payne-McCullum</p>	<p>Date:4/10/25</p> <p>Time: 4:30 to 5:30</p> <p>Location: MFT - ZOOM</p>
<p>Agenda Topic</p>	<p>Topic Leader-time</p>	<p>Discussion/Information Notes</p>	<p>Actions to take</p>
<p>Check in</p>	<p>2 min</p>	<p>Name, title, location</p>	<p>Note color for 4/10/25</p>

<p>Updates</p>	<p>10 min</p>	<p>Discussion of meeting norms and concern that last meeting did not abide by stated norms and was felt to not be solution oriented or respectful</p> <p>Any updates since our last meeting?·</p> <p>No specific updates but leadership has been asked to look at each site and students to determine whether adequate resources are available in each school to meet needs. Data is being pulled from EdPlan and information is being gathered to be considered related to allocations for next school year. Reference was made to the finance committee meeting. 3 things happened in special ed - increased student ratio, cut setting 3 specialist funding, and additional adult assistance was cut. Guidelines of MN revisor was followed. They will be looking at sites that had significant cues and determining whether needs can be met. Data will be examined and may result in reallocation for sites that have other needs that may not have been considered such as enhanced health services. Work in this area is ongoing.</p> <p>Did you engage with staff to understand their unique roles and the direct impact they have on students with IEPs?</p> <p>Examples were given that identified unique roles such as non public, contract alternatives, and assuring roles were understood. It was indicated that this did not take place with specific roles or tasks. Decisions were based on directives, the MN Revisor guidelines and dependent on leaders being familiar with their departments. While historically there was not a formal arrangement for this type of conversation at times managers had the opportunity to advocate for their programs and explain staffing rationale and unique needs. Specific discussion of contract alternative program allocations, unique needs at Rverbend, and how cuts were implemented at Transition Plus followed.</p> <p>· Was this decision based solely on data without considering the real needs of our students and educators?</p> <p>Resource and staffing allocations were kept front and center in the decision making. Reference was made to comments at the finance meeting related to adjusted allocation and average number of students and how the numbers would impact teachers. Current data suggests that the average resource</p>	
----------------	---------------	---	--

		<p>caseload is between 14 and 16 and that changing the number should not have a significant impact on those averages. Consideration was given that at the end of the year numbers may be higher as students were added. The impact of reduced number of SEAs on providing inclusion with grade level peers was discussed. Follow up meetings are still coming up for one site mentioned. Then the discussion returned to inclusion opportunities being a system wide issue. Support was voiced for providing inclusion opportunities but that the current reality considering numerous factors including nearby districts and required staffing minimums goes on which will include use of data and listening to staff to assure that resources are aligned to the needs of each site. An example was given of a student that qualifies for SLD for literacy might need para support in math and explanation of support needs. Comments related to evaluating why and older student might have significant support and how to promote student independence. Reference to the MN revisor guidance around deafblind, SMI, DCD severe profound ratio and students in the category with larger number of students per teacher impact when the group is a mix of student types. Reference to case law and looking at models to meet needs occurred and referenced interpretation and guidelines and how needs can be met in real world scenarios. Variables related to mixed groups and additional</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>staffing and opportunity to request a review for a particular site. Concern was expressed about the length of time a review might take and assuring student safety. Questions were raised over what the review process could look like. Currently MPS is at about twice the rate of student segregation/restricted setting over what is desired by the state. Review process requires understanding of the overall staffing at the site.</p> <p>Are due process clerks cut?</p> <p>Monitoring and compliance budgeting has not yet been finalized. There has been a request for a proposed budget that involves cuts to positions/FTE.</p>	
<p>Workload Formula</p>	<p>All</p>	<p>Share the data collected - Report shared in SELM folder 3525.2340 CASE LOADS.</p> <p><i>(B. For pupils who receive direct special education 60 percent or less of the instructional day, the school district must establish a board-approved policy for determining workload limits for special education staff based on student contact minutes, evaluation and reevaluation time, indirect services, IEPs managed, travel time, and other services required in the IEPs of eligible students.)</i></p> <p>Policy 5701: Special Education Workload Limitations</p> <p>(b. Workload limits for special education teachers subject to this policy shall be determined by the appropriate special education administrator, in consultation with the principal of the building to which the teacher is assigned and the Superintendent, or Superintendent’s designee.</p> <p>c. The factors that must be considered in establishing workload limits under this policy are:</p>	<p>Deeqa will talk to IT about where this data can be stored/preserved. The group will be informed of the location.</p>

		<p>Student contact minutes; Evaluation and reevaluation time; Indirect services time; Management of Individual Educational Programs (IEPs), Travel time required for provision of services or management of IEPs; and Other services required by the IEPs of eligible students.)</p> <p>Did anyone find any information about workload formulas from other districts? This has not been a priority secondary to the need to attend to budgets. Some examination of nearby districts and how resources have been allocated has taken place more related to program models than specific workload formulas. A report that St Paul CASELOAD typically ranged between 18-20, higher at secondary level and that they are not using a workload model. Emma and Treasure share the workload formula of their caseloads.</p>	
<p>Workload Formula</p>		<p>Next steps?</p> <p>We need a workload formula. It is state statute and we need to retain the SPED teachers we have and attract new ones. This will not be possible without changing the way we assign work to teachers and ESPs. No SPED teacher is able to do their job duties in a 40 hour week.</p> <p>MFT will proceed with generating a workload formula and we will present it at a later date. We would love your help. This is timely.</p> <p>We also need a workload formula because we have tried to reduce workload in this group, but we are not seeing it.</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1p1h4UX-Rcsk04j3Cx2lZfVq_NHSozWeKb51UXVvAkKQ/edit?tab=t.0</p>	

	<p>All–Matt starts</p>	<p>Process for e-mails to SELM Process for labeling our collaboration together</p> <p>(Collaboration is defined as the process of two or more individuals or groups working together to achieve a common goal or objective. It involves sharing knowledge, skills, and resources to accomplish tasks more effectively than individuals working alone.</p> <p>Components of Collaboration:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Communication: Open and clear exchange of ideas, information, and feedback among team members. 2. Trust: Building mutual respect and trust to create a safe environment for sharing thoughts and opinions. 3. Coordination: Organizing tasks, roles, and responsibilities to ensure efficient workflow and avoid duplication of efforts. 4. Commitment: Dedication and willingness of team members to contribute and stay engaged in the collaborative process. 5. Flexibility: Adaptability to changing circumstances, ideas, and approaches to achieve the best possible outcome. 6. Shared Goals: Common objectives that all team members are working towards, ensuring alignment and focus. 7. Problem-Solving: Collaborative approach to identifying, analyzing, and resolving issues that arise during the process. 8. Diversity: Valuing different perspectives, skills, and backgrounds to enhance creativity and innovation. 9. Leadership: Guidance and direction provided by a leader or shared leadership among team members to keep the team on track. 10. Technology: Tools and platforms that facilitate communication, coordination, and information sharing among team members.) 	
--	------------------------	--	--

	All		
Next Steps		Next Year- 2024 - 2025 –Next year we will work on the MOA between MFT and MPS -SB one-pager –Writing curriculum and CBMs Workload Formulas Progress Reports What issues would you like to discuss next year? Further discussion of logging academic services	
Norms: 1. Problem Solving Mindset 2. Meeting with a Purpose 3. Safe, multi-modal communication 4. Non-judgemental, all voices heard in a safe environment 5. Be present- limit technology, multitasking, side conversations 6. Be aware of your participation 7. Civil and Respectful Engagement			Parking Lot: Upcoming Dates: 5/8/25 6/5/25???

