

<p>Location: ZOOM Meeting</p>	<p>SELM</p> <p>Special education labor management</p>		<p>ROLES: Facilitator: GinaMarie and Caroline Notetaker: Jodi Timekeeper:</p>
		<p>Contract Language to review:</p> <p>12.3 Special Education Labor Management Committee: 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. 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. 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><u>Members Present</u></p> <p>Liza Tinkham, Director, Deeqa, Hussein, Executive Director, Nolan Murphy, M and C, Aria Campbell, SEA, Andrew Meirding K-12 content lead and intern, Julie Payne-McCullum, B-3 Almas Merchant, B-3, Meaghan Harvey, Setting 4, Kris Geiger,, Hai-Yen Vo Director , Gina Foreman DPF, Caroline Long SERT, Jodi Dezale SLP, guest Mackenzie, ASD Keewaydin, Angie McCracken, Director ECSE Jill Rentmeester-Disher SLP manager Michelle Lee-Reid DCD teacher</p> <p><u>Absent:</u></p>	<p>Date: 1/12/23</p> <p>Time: 4:30 to 5:30</p> <p>Location: MFT - ZOOM</p> <p>https://us06.web.zoom.us/j/88979907904?pwd=eGJIL3ZaVjk2UWtJOUhKdnVESHIKUT09</p> <p>January updates in this maroon color</p>
<p>Agenda Topic</p>	<p>Topic Leader-time</p>	<p>Discussion/Information Notes</p>	<p>Actions to take</p>

Check in	2 min		
Updates		<p>PD - Dream Catchers How does this fit with 504s? Referral from doctors, county workers, etc?</p>	
Workload		<p>Workload Presentation from Directors of Special Education.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SERT elementary, middle school, and high school, Federal 3, Federal 4, others <p>What do these mean from the grid?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SERT Caseload Formula <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IEP Student count - Eval student count - IEP service grid mins per week - Eval time per week - Service Grid Formula <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Service min per week total - Site inst (not sure what that word is suppose to be) min per week - workload <p>Does ECSE/Early Childhood have a paper copy of their workload formula they can share with the group?</p>	
Workload MOA		<p>How are workloads determined now? Can we have a presentation on the criteria?</p> <p>Teacher Chapter Contract Reached March 25, 2022 - MOA on page 32 -33</p> <p>Workload Considerations for Effective Special Education</p>	
Preps (GMF)		<p>*How are we compensating for loss of prep with our shortages? If it is not extended pay is there a</p>	<p>Answers to questions 5</p>

		<p>conversation around longer days or 1.2 (Anoka) for covering the continued loss of prep for case managers? *</p> <p>1.What does our contract say about covering an absence vs. cross programming? SPED teachers should not sub for general education teachers, but this would look different for co-teaching a class.</p> <p>2. Is there a set number of students associated with the time being provided during a prep time being covered? Or a set number of students that can be in a space? Is there a set number of kids a teacher can have when subbing in teachers' classrooms? NOT ANSWERED</p> <p>There is a one pager - link will be added when available. It covers the parameters of SEAs working when the teacher is not in class but they are being directed by teacher. Further clarification, is there a limit to how many students a teacher can support if they are covering additional students due to absence of other teaching staff. (e.g. could a teacher have 2 groups of setting 3 students, if so how long?) Nolan's response - caseload is an average over time. If a complaint was lodged they would consider the parameters. MPS is generally within the averages. It may be an issue if it was an ongoing staffing plan such as all setting 3 students together for an hour each day with a prep provider. The numbers depend on the student needs and mixed groups could be at 10-12. Every complaint is case by case and context is considered. Space in classroom would also impact. Other situations were offered and it was indicated that it is not possible to work through hypotheticals. It also depends on how buildings are arranging and allocating staff. Primary resource is based on MDE</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>advisory recommendations. During 2nd budget tie out it was determined that requirement for setting 3 is 1 teacher and SEA with up to 12 students and MPS is normally below this level. Directors should be informed if there is an ongoing issue around building use of resources and staff feeling there is not enough support in order to avoid teacher burnout. Any situation in which IEP services are not being provided over a period of time should be brought to the DPF or director to get assistance/adjustment. It is voluntary for a teacher to provide coverage during their prep. Schools that have been help with this have been assisted and the arrangement is supposed to be on a voluntary basis. Discussed the ramifications and whether providing coverage during prep feels voluntary in all situations. It is expected that if it occurs it would not be a long term practice. First step would be addressing the situation with the building administrator.</p> <p>3. How is that time supposed to be covered? Is it hourly or for the day? NOT ANSWERED</p> <p>Discussion of the fact that within the contract prep time is not a time to do due process. Separate time for due process and prep has been seen at the high school level but is currently not wide spread in middle and elementary sites. This may relate to providing adequate service time for students. In setting 3 situations there is not generally staff available to cover student time when due process time was provided. Discussed the presence of 3 due process days. It is unclear when due process would be completed if not during prep, and this often leads to paperwork being completed at home on nights and weekends. In Wilder building with ECSE the contract provides for 90 minutes a day of non instructional time in addition to prep and duty free</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>lunch. In some situations this is bus duty, late buses, or other student related duty. It was reported that one elementary site has 60 minutes of non instructional time before school and this is often filled with meetings. The related discussion of only 1 meeting a week was raised, some of the additional meeting obligations were explained. Further information gathered by Angie and Deeqa and this issue will be put in updates for next meeting including follow up on due process time for elementary, middle, and secondary.</p> <p>4. If staff are absent what is the difference between covering and program collaboration? SPED teachers should not sub for general education teachers, but this would look different for co-teaching a class.</p> <p>5. Is there a limit of a time frame for the coverage (hour or all day)? NOT ANSWERED</p> <p>6. Do Special Education teachers have sub in General Education classes? Do they have to sub if they aren't even getting their own prep times? SPED teachers should not sub for general education teachers, but this would look different for co-teaching a class. Special Education prep support for students should be received with grade level peers</p> <p>From Rochelle resource goal 1:18 Workload for federal setting 3-4 Goal is 1:8 with 2 SEAs Setting 4 variable based on student needs. Also consider number of re evaluations coming in student group for resource, site based, and setting 3-4 considered but some differences based on how sites deal with evaluation. From Nolan it is expected</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>to meet contractual guidelines which require staffing higher than state minimum levels. This week Nolan and Liza engaged with a policy update event in which they learned about the competing lobbying groups and influence of the challenge of lowering workload in face of attempted other legislation such as adding dyslexia as a categorical label. Also talked about the possibility of non-eval being done that complicates planning and consideration of items like number of evaluations being considered in workload. State guidelines focus on number of students with a teacher at a snapshot in time. Board policy (5701) guides use of workload model that stems from legislation - currently there is not a transparent workload formula or system that helps guide and allow audit of workload as circumstances change during the school year. Some information gathered from Rochelle as to where previous items were with special education workload duties. It seems some items were not clear with how this was moving forward. Discussion of how in setting 4 situation special education is only teacher and therefore responsible for prepping general education content pieces. Presently a lot of information but lack of enforceable rules and laws. Indication that legislation requires a workload formula and each district needs to develop something. Review that MPS is currently below the guidelines for caseload that are considered or enforced when a complaint is filed. Currently at Riverbend (setting 4) allocation is 1 teacher 5 students and 2-3 classroom staff as of yesterday's data. Reiteration of class size as well as lessons for each subject area as well as due process demands for setting 3-4 elementary, possibility that high school programs have more due process time available. Agreed that high school has more time available and it is unclear if they are using time for</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>due process or other duties are being assigned. Indication that discussions during contract negotiations it was indicated that there is movement away from a caseload model and to a workload model. Also contract reads that current teacher prep time is not to be due process time. Special education department does not have control of building schedules or preps. It requires cooperation of administration to provide additional due process time at elementary level. There are additional budget implications to providing more time. Also impacted by difficulty with hiring and finding people to fill positions when funds are allocated. From contract language (p 32)</p> <p>DUE PROCESS TIME: If a special education resource teacher reaches a caseload of 23, an additional 55 minutes of due process time daily will be provided, unless daily due process time is already provided.</p> <p>Discussion of additional due process days and whether that had something to do with no longer getting other time without direct student contact for due process. SERTS have more ability to build own schedule which may allow for daily due process time. Specialized programs it can be more difficult to schedule and also requires significant planning in anticipation of taking a due process day. Some reference to needing to use peers to provide support in order to allow access to due process time and the difficulty with then assuring all student services are provided. Discussion over changes in practice and need for specific contract language needed to support due process time in addition to prep time. Questioned how to get administration to support getting needs met and possibility for DPF to assist with this. One site has been able to schedule student</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>time in general education with ESP support that has allowed teachers to have time for due process or evaluation in addition to prep time. Discussed options for identifying problems without breaking relationships. Whether contact DPF, director, or union should work to compile a list of where problems are occurring or admins are not supporting contract language for special education in order to address concerns about potential lack of equitable access to supports in buildings. Worked toward clarifying questions including whether those with caseload over 23 are getting additional due process and whether due process or evaluations are completed during preparation time which contract language indicates should not be expected or required. Clarification about using due process days to complete evaluations.</p>	
GMF	2 minutes	<p>Elementary Question:</p> <p>1.If a teacher has been consistently missing lunch/prep for the entire school year will they get their loss of prep/lunch at their instructional rate and not just their loss of prep/lunch rate?</p> <p>2. If a teacher is granted their rate of pay at their instructional level from loss of prep/lunch, are they getting that retributed as "back pay" from September?</p>	
What Due Process has been taken off our workload		<p>EI, especially, has had a significant amount of Due Process added to our workload over the last ten years. I can't remember if we have ever had any Due Process reduced. Our workload has expanded alarmingly with Due Process requirements and other workload requirements. what paperwork is absolutely necessary and what can be removed.</p>	

recently (EI/ECSE)			
PR		Review of language in due process notebook.	
Next Steps			
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		Parking Lot:	
		Upcoming Dates: 2/9/23 3/9/23 4/13/23 5/11/23	