|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Location:  ZOOM Meeting | **SELM**  **Special education labor management** | | ROLES:  Facilitator: Gina  Notetaker: Jodi  Timekeeper: |
|  | Contract Language to review:  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:  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  **Members Present:**  Absent: | | **Date:**10/13/22  **Time:**  4:30 to 5:30  **Location:**  MFT - ZOOM  [https://us06web.zoom.us/j/88979907904?pwd=eGJlL3ZaVjk2UWtJOUhKdnVESHlKUT09](https://urldefense.com/v3/__https://us06web.zoom.us/j/88979907904?pwd=eGJlL3ZaVjk2UWtJOUhKdnVESHlKUT09__;!!MxD8lHs9xPYQ!Lz2IbFcU47XewwUkdMyr20JJueDV6PU3n-4S71v8RclSvS9k3DNDVNSbq8iOu0lVesrFVHA40WV_NynLnNMVs5YzimTH$) |
| **Agenda Topic** | **Topic Leader-time** | **Discussion/Information Notes** | **Actions to take** |
| Check in | 2 min | Introductions ( name, role and site in MPS,). Caroline Long, contract alternatives, Jodi Dezale, SLP, Deeqa Hussein, Executive Director, Hai Yen Vo, Director, Gina Forman, DPF, Katie Megan Harvey seting 4,, Cathy Dalnes,SSW./related service Andrew Meierding intern, Katie Cruz Hanza, due process, Nolan Murphy, Angie McCracken, Julie Payne-McCullum, Rob Purple, school psych, Liza Tinkham, Michelle Lee-Reid, Valerie Crawford, Almas Merchant, Kris Geiger |  |
| Updates |  | - Update on progress reports per year.  \*Not the recommendation to lower the amount of progress reports. Nolan will share the MDE documentation around this before next meeting\* If there was an error in a PR (a progress report citation) as part of IEP it would require another meeting and increase complexity of auditing. Under present system the correction would be another progress report. Current recommendation is to do the last PR right before the current IEP. It may work well for some individuals to imbed in IEP but it is not recommended system wide, It is felt that this would not serve to truly reduce due process requirements. It is felt that the progress report is more family friendly and would help cover for situations where parents do not attend IEP. Additional consensus from other nearby districts is to continue with written PR with same frequency as report cards. Discussed the need to be both comprehensive and brief/parent friendly. Re evaluations tend to be lengthy and are working toward decreasing the testing and demands in the areas that make sense. Progress reports are the main communication to family about IEP goals. It is felt that requiring meetings be redone if a progress report error was an issue would be more stressful and problematic than the current progress report arrangement. Progress reports are based on matching the number of general education report cards student receives. A question was raised regarding decreasing the clerical aspect of getting PRs out. Currently it is possible to get parent permission to send documents electronically which may help to decrease the paperwork. Form allowing electronic documents needs to be signed only once. Sending electronic documents may also make it easier to document parent contacts. Discussion was raised as to whether it could be made easier to send documents from EdPlan. This will be explored. Issues were raised regarding safety and security related to electronic documents. Discussion continued about systems for saving documents and attaching them in order to get them to parents. It is possible to download, send from adobe suite and then delete - which is one step less.  -Update on CEU for SELM members.  It is possible to get CEus as this is a leadership meeting. Further information forthcoming on how to be sure CEUs can be entered into the system. | 1.Nolan to share the MDE documentation/regulations on PR with the group.  2. Look into how to send documents to parents through Edplan. |
| Workload |  | Workload Presentation from Directors of Special Education.  This information is not yet available, This item will stay on the agenda for the next meeting. The MOA is around SERTs/resource support. Potentially start with this and then move to additional programming and consider building-wide use of resources. |  |
| Workload MOA |  | How are workloads determined now? Can we have a presentation on the criteria?  [Teacher Chapter Contract Reached March 25, 2022](https://www.mft59.org/_files/ugd/7a4db8_322ee8a7e471408c92cce0c8e3763d7f.pdf) - MOA on page 32 -33  [Workload Considerations for Effective Special Education](https://www.mnase.org/uploads/4/7/7/9/47793163/bullard_workload_manual.pdf) |  |
| Preps (GMF) |  | \*How are we compensating for loss of prep with our shortages? If it is not extended pay is there a conversation around longer days or 1.2 (Anoka) for covering the continued loss of prep for case managers? \*  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.  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  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 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.  3. How is that time supposed to be covered? Is it hourly or for the day? NOT ANSWERED  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 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.  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.  5. Is there a limit of a time frame for the coverage ( hour or all day)? NOT ANSWERED  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 | Answers to questions 5  1. The one pager link needs to be added.  2. The prep/ due process issue within the teacher contract on page 13. |
| Next Steps |  | Clarification on due process time vs prep time and how this plays out at different sites.  Begin workload discussion with resource/SERT service and move to workload discussion for other providers. |  |
| **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:**  11/10/22  12/8/22  1/12/23  2/9/23  3/9/23  4/13/23  5/11/23 |