

# Professional Council Meeting

5.6.26— 4:45-6:15 p.m. — Ed Center BOE Room

In attendance: Clint Albers, Megan Bricks, Chris Pittman, Angie Powers, Trisha Putthoff, Lachelle Sigg, Eric Skoglund, Rick Sola, Julia Wenzel, Laura Wiltanger, Justin Howe (from Appraisal Committee)

Meeting begins at 4:53pm

## *Agenda:*

**Meeting begins at 4:45pm**

### **Committee Updates**

- Appraisal
  - At the last meeting the committee worked through final details for the proposal; looking at the technical aspects of the KEEP goal, how it will work in Frontline; committee came to agreement that having the educator select a goal is the best practice
- Calendar
  - At the last meeting, worked on the grading and reporting calendar for the next year – more time was spent on this calendar than in years past, worked to align the wording on the document to what is current practice
    - Example – there was a deadline for printing report cards, this does not happen with the use of online gradebooks/reporting
    - Also looked at the mandatory trainings that are required for the beginning of the year
- Conference Variance
  - Distribution of the Mill Creek and 2 Year Academies at OATC/OPSIC language that they would like to be added to the agreement; this was written by those in those locations that reflect what they have been doing for the past 2 or 3 years
  - The amount of time educators are putting in the 12 hours beyond the contract time at different times throughout each quarter rather than once per semester
  - Will need to consider the placement and final wording to add to the negotiated agreement – potentially page 95 with the conference/scheduling information, may fit best after the description for special education
  - Language will need some clean-up to maintain consistency before being published

### **Appraisal Proposal**

- Kansas Educator Evaluation Protocol – Used by other districts within Johnson County as well; decided on this after analysis of current practice and examining the practices around Olathe as well
- The pilot program included schools/buildings at each level
- Surveys given to new educators and educators with experience

- KEEP Evaluation at a Glance
  - Online tracking system, currently Frontline, but purposely named so if the system changes, it will still apply
  - The performance levels are the same: highly effective, effective, developing, needs improvement
  - Summative Evaluations consist of 2 main components: The Instructional Practices Protocol (IPP) and the Student Performance Summary
    - The IPP is the rubric
  - There are 4 constructs (standards) as part of the IPP: learner and learning, content knowledge, instructional practice, professional responsibility
  - Educators should have 3 Student Performance Measures for Construct 5, formerly Standard 6
  - Combination of both IPPP and Student Performance Measures will be used to determine the final summative ratings
  - New additional components include:
    - Educator self-assessment done in Frontline, completed by September 15
    - A minimum 1 educator goal for the year as identified from the Instructional Practice Protocol rubric completed in the outline tracking system no later than September 15
    - The self-assessment is not part of the formal evaluation score, used as a conversation opener and a way for educators to better understand the rubric
    - The goal is also not part of the final formal evaluation score, used to help focus the evaluation process/conversations
  - Required steps and deadlines are now fully in compliance with the state requirements – some of the dates are general/vague in the state requirement, other areas have specific deadlines

Q: Why can't we get rid of Standard 6 during the appraisal process?

A: It is Kansas state statute; it's a requirement by law that student data is part of the appraisal process.

- This has been 3 years in the making, which provided time to look at the rubrics and have the rubrics be updated for unique positions, such as OT or PT, and the rubrics are able to be customized to their role; the specialized rubrics were part of the pilot
- There are additional changes that need to be made, but they could not be changed in Frontline in "real time"
  - Building Support Plan – will continue, the change that will happen – it is an updated template that is more collaborative component, requires the appraiser to have more steps to complete; there is currently a prescribed timeline to a 60-day minimum; the proposed change would be to have it be more flexible based on the needs of those working on the plan – the amount of time can be reduced or increased based on the observations or changes that are made and documented
  - District Support – will continue, change from the panel size from 10 (5 district + 5 ONEA selected members) to 4 (2 district administrators + 2 ONEA selected members) – those selected would have content/grade-level knowledge; the

timeline language change as well to a “reasonable amount of time” determined by the team

- Educator Support Plan – Plan would be completed to determine and document the supports that have already been implemented
  - o Both of these support plans are available to New Educator Year 4 and beyond
- Handbook still needs some editing, the section regarding the support plans and process has been pulled out of the handbook and has been updated
  - o Out of Cycle Evaluation – Educators that may have a transition to different content area or level; educator could change where they are in the evaluation cycle to provide support and feedback

Q: Is the level change moving from elementary to middle for example or does it include a grade level?

A: Yes, it could be grade level to grade level, content, or elementary/middle/high changes.

- Presentation of updated policy language, GBZCB, currently page 22 of the 2025-2026 negotiated agreement
  - o 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph updates to correct statues; minor changes still need to be made
- Our current language includes the six educator standards. The goal with the the proposed appraisal process is to keep consistency with formatting and number of constructx, but there are 16 different rubrics, xo there may be a change in verbiage depending on the educator’s role.

Q: Is there a general number of educators and/or evaluators that approved of this new system?

A: On each survey there was overall a positive response to this new system; the biggest feedback area was about the goal setting and the consistency of information that is shared in buildings; voice-over PowerPoints/videos helped to provide consistent information and additional administrator training to help provide clarity

- o Feedback about current practice is that it felt much more 1-way, that educators didn’t have a voice in the process, the work on this pilot was to have this be a more 2-way conversation/process
- o Everyone establishes a goal – they are not punitive or meant to be set “low,” but to be something to help educators grow in their practice and to have something to reflect on

Q: The new policy language does not include the same definitions and details, and there has been a handbook that is referenced. Is there a way to indicate where an educator can find the handbook?

A: Yes, we could add a link to the policy; it can also be saved in the files within Frontline. The current appraisal files will be removed; the new documents can be added. The handbook does not include all of the rubrics, but information about the process – including the Building and District support process.

## **District Counters to ONEA Counters**

- GBZCC (Professional Day)

- SPED Paperwork – Kept most of the language the same, adding the phrase “Unless no other alternative exists,” regarding cancellations due to substitute availability will be avoided; striking “unless no other operational alternative exists.”
  - Discussion: Did have discussion about Mondays and Fridays, they may have some restrictions based on availability of subs, but there is no blanket statement about Mondays and Fridays as of now; The earlier these days can be added to the substitute services, the easier it is to make sure that positions will be filled and will reduce the likelihood of them being canceled the day of
- This could cost up to \$250,000 if everyone does use these days, it is a financial commitment- this estimate does include those who typically don’t have/require subs; days do not have to be used, but they are available
- GBZCDA (Leaves)
  - Blackout Days – District agrees with the latest Olathe NEA counter: Draft consensus

### **District Response/Questions/Counters to ONEA Proposals**

- GBZEB (Salary Schedule Conditions)
  - Advanced Degrees: Need to have further conversation to have time to look at how many positions it would affect. Since it is connected to compensation, will return with questions or further discussion in the Fall and ready to discuss compensation.
- GBZEA (Professional Learning) & Scheduling Documents
  - PLCs: A lot of questions still remain about the updates to the language; trying to figure out what the problem is and the why this language is being proposed; what is currently happening that inspired this language; get more clarity about the why and what problem is being addressed
  - Open to changes in the language, will need more time address the questions/situations, possibly move a discussion in the Fall
  - A lot of PLC meetings have started to morph into meetings rather than what a true PLC is meant to be, which is student learning driven, such as data analysis
  - Discussion about what is currently happening – agendas are being developed by administrators or coordinators with good intentions, but tasks are moving away from student-focused to learning how to use new resources or programs, rather than focusing on the student work/data
- GBZCA (Assignment & Transfer)
  - Yellow highlighted on the language distributed are the proposed changes
    - Section 1: C – definition of seniority – district agrees to language and wording
    - Section IV: Transfer A1C – Clarification that there is not an automatic notification to principal when employee initiates a transfer so original language can remain
    - Section IV: Step 6b – Strike proposed language, retain the original language
      - This happens often in buildings as they reduce sections

- The proposed language had references that were not clear to those in the HR department
- Section IV: D 1 – Proposed language includes Olathe NEA language with additional statement, “ADD LANGUAGE”
  - Concern is heard and understood, this language reflects what is happening now with closing or consolidating schools
  - Consider educator preference- whether it is that they would like to stay in the same position or if they would like to change; stay within the same feeder pattern or if they would like to change to a different pattern or geographic area; any other special circumstances that they would like to be in as well; educators are worked with individually with someone in HR
- Section V: Bc – Keep this language for callback: “Teaching experience in the available position within the last 5 years.”
  - This process starts with seniority, want to have educators who have the most experience in that particular to serve the students

Q: What is the current practice with educators who are being transferred for "other reasons" in terms of interviewing?

A: Educator and administrator meets so they can meet one another; it's not a formal interview, but an opportunity to get to know each other to ensure that there is an appropriate match. If there are multiple educators that want the same position, there are conversations that occur. Allow educators to see the building, meet colleagues, etc. In the cases where there is 1 candidate for multiple openings OR Multiple candidates for 1 opening – HR makes the decision after a conversation with the employee

Break for Caucus – 20 minutes (6:10pm – 6:30pm; Caucus extended to 6:55pm)

### **MOU Discussion**

- Olathe NEA opens discussion regarding MOU creation; the challenge we're facing is that the handbook and the policy language for appraisal is not complete – cannot add documents that is not complete to the MOU
- What changes need to be made – formatting, changes to verbiage to ensure that consistency is there
- Discussed options of how to address this
- Draft Consensus Items: Calendars, Elementary Plan Time, Blackout Days
  - Potential Item: Middle School Cheer & Dance stipend request from the EC/AS

Next meeting will be Tuesday, May 12<sup>th</sup> at 4:45pm in the Board of Education Center Room (usual meeting place); only agenda items will be the review of the appraisal proposal documents and creation of MOU

**Meeting ends at 7:06pm**

### ***Upcoming Meetings:***

- Tuesday, May 12<sup>th</sup> at 4:45pm – Pending final scheduling, will be sent out ASAP

### *How We Will Work:*

- Quick communication between Council members
  - Listen to understand
  - We all have and should use our voice
  - Consider the scope of our impact as a Council
  - Not shying away from difficult conversations or topics
  - If someone feels that communication norms have been broken, we need to feel comfortable respectfully pointing this out.
    - The Council considers this important to deal with at the time and as a group.
  - Have an open mind, being good listeners, treating each other with respect

### *Processes We Will Use:*

- Note taker (Julia) will send out minutes to all Professional Council members for review within a week, OR prior to the next meeting, whichever is sooner.
- Final minutes are submitted to communications department to be both added to the Professional Council website and included in the “In The Know”
- Meetings are noticed in the “In The Know”
- Agenda will be set by Clint and Angie
- Draft Consensus Folder