

**Bargaining Minutes**  
**SEPTEMBER 28, 2017**  
**CTA OFFICE**

**Attending:**

Maribel Aponte	CTA	Bill Floyd	District	Megan Oates	CTA
Ian Gesundheit	District	Farrah Hawkins	CTA	Clay Phillips	CTA
LeighAnn Blackmore	District	Alex Heidelberg	District	Kenrick Pratt	CTA
David Cintron	CTA	Myrlene Jackson-Kimble	District	Krista Russell	District
Doreen Concolino	District	Joshua Katz	CTA	Mary Grace Surrena	CTA
Albert Davies	CTA	Michael Marzano	CTA	Patricia Walker	District
Wendy Doromal	CTA	Phyllis Mills	CTA	Wendy Wing	CTA
Gloria Fernandez	District	Clinton McCracken	CTA	Tom Winters	CTA
Kelly Paduano	District	Jason Duke	District	Stephanie Wyka	District

Guests: Brandon McKelvey, Jennifer Sasser, Rob Bixler, Mary Bridges

**Agenda**

- Student Learning Growth - Brandon McKelvey
- Lesson plan requirements
- Summer Employment: Digital Course Recovery – Mary Bridges
- Targeted school discrepancies
- Teachers being used as long-term subs

**Student Learning Growth**

There were two changes that occurred during the 2017 legislative session (HB 7069):

- 1) Districts are no longer required to use the State Board of Education rules
- 2) Districts are permitted to choose to not use the statewide value-added model (VAM)

With these changes, we now have these decision points to make:

- 1) Since we are no longer required to use the State Board of Education rule
  - Decision Point 1: Do we use 3 year or 1 year scores
  - Decision Point 2: What cut points do we use
- 2) Value-added model not required
  - Decision Point 3: Do we use the VAM for 2017-18?

Dr. McKelvey has spoken with DOE administrators, Jason Graham and Jason Guytanis concerning the hold harmless provision that we used to have. He was told that a hold harmless provision would be denied.

For SLG scores for 2016-17

--3 year scores vs. 1 year scores

Three year scores are more differentiated meaning that there will be more Highly Effective, Needs Improvement and Unsatisfactory ratings. However, there is still a reasonable amount of differentiation when using one year scores. And three year scores may include data from other districts who would use the statewide value-added model.

--Cut points

With the three year scores, we use the set of cut scores that uses 2 and 1 standard errors and has a 95% and 68% confidence levels

With the one year scores, we use the 3 and 2 standard errors and confidence levels of 99% and 95%

This would result in 82.19% of teachers at Highly Effective, 16.94% of teachers at Effective, .86% at Needs Improvement and .01% at Unsatisfactory.

This would meet the DOE measure of differentiation with scores in all 4 categories.

VAM scores for 2017-18: We have the option to eliminate the use of the statewide VAM. We would need to communicate this quickly to teachers to make the needed changes on the crosswalk. Some teachers would have two VAM scores, the state and the local. How will the state score be used locally?  
[See Document 1.](#)

The District and CTA agreed to use the 1 year score for the 16-17 school year, and to use the local cut scores for the 16-17 school year with the 3 and 2 standard errors, and the 99% and 95% confidence levels. TA #1/MOU #1. [See Document 2](#)

## **Lesson Plan Requirements**

CTA stated:

- CRM's are mandatory in many schools and teachers are being evaluated on how well they coordinate with the CRM. There are checklists and reflections teachers must complete which would require work past planning time.
- Teacher autonomy does not exist anymore, with this evaluation system that celebrates innovation, if we have a standardized lesson plan and mandated instruction, where is the innovation?
- Observers go from classroom to classroom in same level/subject to make sure teachers are all at the same point in the day's lesson
- A teacher on the team says his school, East River HS is requiring teachers to use the CRM
- There was a settlement agreement concerning lesson plans. It seems it is being ignored.
- Need to clarify that the CRM is optional not mandatory and that common assessments tied to CRMs are optional. Teachers reported to CTA that administrators told them the mandatory use of CRMs came from the District.

- The CTA President stated that when she met with District administrators about CRMs she asked if they would be mandatory and was told that they were created to assist teachers and were available to use as a teacher tool.
- Teachers are being required to post and/or upload lesson plans, complete lesson plan reflections, answer lists of questions and complete checklists. CTA states there is no contract language that requires these mandates. In fact, the requirements that CTA is seeing look more like lesson plan reflections than lesson plans. CTA states that teachers are not required to submit lesson plan reflections.
- Common lesson planning may encourage collaboration but it is not always the best practice for a teacher's individual class. It often goes against best practices by disregarding individual students' academic needs and learning styles. The practice of mandated use of CRMs and forced common lesson plans disregards the teacher as a professional who knows how to select curriculum and create a lesson plan that best advance student achievement for his/her particular students. If a template is required, and teachers are told not to veer from the lesson, students suffer. It should be a choice not a mandate.

The District agreed to distribute a communication to all administrators conveying the message that CRM's are to be used as a tool and are not mandatory.

### **Summer Employment**

The District stated: Summer school for high school now is exclusively course recovery. We are using Edgenuity software for the course recovery program. Teachers monitor the classes. Most classes are around 25 student. Teacher have no lesson planning, no grading of tests or home work. Students work on their subjects and take unit tests to keep the completion going. Seat time is not a requirement any longer and since teachers do not plan or grade, the extra time of 9 hours and 22 minutes is no longer needed. The District is proposing that teachers work a 7.5 hour day which includes duty free lunch.

CTA had these concerns:

- CTA encourages individual course work where students are immersed in the subject area and can learn it so they have success in advancing to the next level
- CTA requested to see the results of tests using Edgenuity lessons—pass/fail rate
- Concern that teachers have 50 to 60 students in the class. Teachers had to set up and break down the classroom and it took time, 7.5 hours might not be enough
- How many hours are the teachers in the classroom during the summer during the course recovery Edgenuity classes? Are teachers reviewing students' work and compiling data on what questions are typically missed?
- Concerns that this type of instruction is focused more on completion than actual learning
- Concerns that students are being put in a computer lab where multiple subjects are being taught. The teacher may or may not have knowledge about every subject and the ability to help the student understand.
- Concern that students merely make multiple attempts at finding the correct answer and they can pass by default rather than actually learning the subject material.

## **Targeted Schools Discrepancies**

CTA discussed concerns that there appeared to be no set criteria for determining which schools would be on the targeted schools list. Some schools on the list had higher grades and lower poverty rates than schools that were cut from the list, for instance Cypress Park, which was struck from the 2017-2018 targeted school list and had lower school grades and a higher poverty rate than some schools that were on the list. The scores and poverty levels were compared, and the state policy was discussed. CTA expressed the belief that the selection was subjective and perhaps politically motivated. CTA cited the fact that the District offered to put certain schools on the list in exchange for agreeing to settling disputes suggests they are using students as bargaining chips. CTA requested that the District provide the criteria in writing and provide any District reports that were sent to the state concerning targeted schools, so we could understand the selection process.

The District will provide the decision criteria for the Targeted Schools at the next meeting

## **Teachers being used as Long Term Subs**

CTA has heard from many teachers/instructional coaches that they are being used as long term subs. CTA says this is taking away from their specific job duties. Principals responded that with the vacancies the District has, and hiring of temporary contract teachers is difficult, they are forced to make a decision to use a coach in the classroom. It is not what they want either, they budgeted for a coach because they felt a coach was very necessary for their school. Principals are calling their retirees, subs that they use frequently to try and these temporary positions. CTA requested the number of permanent subs.

**Next Meeting: Tuesday, October 17, 2017 at Mid Florida Tech**

## **Document 1**

# **Orange County Public Schools**

## **Background**

- Two changes occurred in 2017
  - (1) Districts are no longer required to use the State Board of Education rules
  - (2) Districts are permitted to choose to not use the statewide value-added model
- These lead to decision points for 16-17 and 17-18 scores

## Agenda

- 2016 -17 Decision Points: State Board Rules eliminated
  - 3 Year or 1 Year Scores
  - Cut points
- 2017-18 Decision Point: Value-added model not required
  - Use of statewide value-added model
- Release and Future Meeting Timelines

## Decision Point #1: 3yr v. 1yr Scores

- Three year scores are more differentiated
  - There are more Highly Effective, Needs Improvement and Unsatisfactory ratings
  - There is still a reasonable amount of differentiation in 1yr scores
- Three year scores require more complexity in rules and create more detailed appeals
  - May include data from other districts depending on use of state VAM

## Supporting Data: 3yr v. 1yr Scores

SLG Rating	3 Year Score	1 Year Score
Highly Effective	19.5%	16.9%
Effective	48.4%	58.0%
Needs Improvement	13.9%	14.7%
Unsatisfactory	18.3%	10.4%

## Decision Point #2: Cut Scores

- We have two general sets of cut scores
  - One set uses 2 and 1 standard error(s) and is associated with 95% and 68% confidence intervals
  - The other set uses 3 and 2 standard errors and is associated with 99% and 95% confidence intervals
- Request for how moving to the use of the local cut scores for statewide courses would impact the results

## Supporting Data: State v. Local Cut Scores

Summative Rating	All Teachers (State Cut Scores for Statewide Teachers)	All Teachers (Local Cut Scores for <u>All</u> Teachers)
Highly Effective	79.63%	82.19%
Effective	19.32%	16.94%
Needs Improvement	1.04%	0.86%
Unsatisfactory	0.01%	0.01%

## Decision Point #3: Statewide VAM

- We have the option to eliminate the use of the statewide VAM model and use local growth models instead
- If we choose to do this for 2017-18, we need to communicate quickly in order to make needed changes on the crosswalk
- Local growth models provide flexibility on certain rules

## Timelines

### Assessment Scores

- Early June: FSA and Common Final Exams
- Mid July: AP
- Mid August: International Baccalaureate

### Value-added Models

- Early August: Statewide VAM
- Early October: Local growth models

### Student Learning Growth and Summative Scores/Ratings

- Late October: Instructional and Administrative

## Future Items

- Discussion about additional items
  - Superintendent direction to examine elementary and selected secondary assessment (CTE and ESE)
  - Required use of statewide assessment scores and intervention rules
  - Informing the bargaining group about impact year-to-year
- Appeal committee meetings



## Document 2:

### Student Learning Growth Decisions

September 28, 2017

TA #1/MOU #1

#### Decision Point #1: 3yr v. 1yr Scores

- CTA and the District agree to 1 year score for 16-17 school year

#### Decision Point #2: Cut Scores

- CTA ~~and~~ and the District agree to use the local cut scores for 16-17 calculation
- We will be using 3 and 2 standard errors and is associated with the 99% and the 95% confidence levels

Lynda Russell	Alt <del>_____</del> Jason Dike
Ron Daniels	Megan Oates
Cheryl Blackman	Cheryl _____
Mr. Forsberg	Mylene Kimble
W. J.	Patricia _____
Albee	Wendy King
Michael Mai 3 and	Tom Stutts
Jim Hultt	Henrick A. Ball
Clinton Michale	_____
M-G Serrano	W. S. Doranuel
Jack Hark	Maikel Aponte Stephen V. Hyl