

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

- Dr. Dale Fisher – Co-Chairperson
- Mrs. Michelle Comitor – Co-Chairperson

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

- None

**1. Call to Order**

- The meeting was called to order at 3:57 pm

**2. Approval of Agenda**

- Dr. Fisher moved and Mrs. Comitor seconded the motion to approve the meeting agenda. Upon a voice vote, the meeting agenda was approved.

**3. School Code 24-12(c)** - Each school district and special education joint agreement must use a joint committee composed of equal representation selected by the school board and its teachers or, if applicable, the exclusive bargaining representative of its teachers, to address the matters described in paragraphs (1) through (5) of this subsection (c) pertaining to honorable dismissals under subsection (b) of this Section.

- 3.1. The joint committee must consider and may agree to criteria for excluding from grouping 2 and placing into grouping 3 a teacher whose last 2 performance evaluations include a Needs Improvement and either a Proficient or Excellent.

*Considered. Dr. Fisher moved and Mrs. Comitor seconded the motion that a decision be made to not create criteria for excluding from grouping 2 and placing into grouping 3 a teacher whose last 2 performance evaluations include a Needs Improvement and either a Proficient or Excellent. Upon a voice vote the motion carried with 2 yeas – 0 nays*

- 3.2. The joint committee must consider and may agree to an alternative definition for grouping 4, which definition must take into account prior performance evaluation ratings and may take into account other factors that relate to the school district's or program's educational objectives. An alternative definition for grouping 4 may not permit the inclusion of a teacher in the grouping with a Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory performance evaluation rating on either of the teacher's last 2 performance evaluation ratings.

*Considered. Dr. Fisher moved and Mrs. Comitor seconded the motion that we consider DPS109 performance ratings prior to 2012 that were based on a now defunct three tier system of Excellent, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory in conjunction with attached plan developed by December 1, 2012. Upon a voice vote the motion carried with 2 yeas – 0 nays*

- 3.3. The joint committee may agree to including within the definition of a performance evaluation rating a performance evaluation rating administered by a school district or joint agreement other than the school district or joint agreement determining the sequence of dismissal.

*Considered. Dr. Fisher moved and Mrs. Comitor seconded the motion that we do not consider evaluations administered by a district other than Deerfield Public Schools District 109 using the agreed upon Successor Teacher Evaluation Plan. Upon a voice vote the motion carried with 2 yeas – 0 nays*

- 3.4. For each school district or joint agreement that administers performance evaluation ratings that are inconsistent with either of the rating category systems specified in subsection (d) of Section 24A-5 of this Code, the school district or joint agreement must consult with the joint committee on the basis for assigning a rating that complies with subsection (d) of Section 24A-5 of this Code to each performance evaluation rating that will be used in a sequence of dismissal.

*Not Considered.*

**4. Community Participation**

- None

**5. Other**

- None

**6. Adjournment**

- Dr. Fisher moved and Mrs. Comitor seconded the motion to adjourn the meeting. Upon a voice vote, the meeting was adjourned at 4:05 pm.