

Professional Council Meeting

5.12.26— 4:45-6:15 p.m. — Ed Center BOE Room

In attendance: Clint Albers, Megan Bricks, Angie Powers, Trisha Putthoff, Eric Skoglund, Julia Wenzel, Laura Wiltanger, Justin Howe (from Appraisal Committee), John Hutchison

Agenda:

ONEA MOU Proposal

- In Draft Consensus:
 - GBZCC (Professional Day)
 - Elementary Plan Time & SPED Paperwork Days
 - GBZCDA (Leaves)
 - Blackout Days
- GBZCB: Appraisal and O-KEEP Handbook (Appendix C)
 - GBZCB: Appraisal
 - ONEA Counter: Accept most of the district proposal
 - Corrected statute number
 - Moved “Educators and administrators jointly developed the process” up to the first paragraph
 - Strike out “KSDE Statutes” in bullets (unnecessary)
 - Add “Appraisal is an ongoing, collaborative process, based on open communication and rooted in standards of excellence” back from current language under bulleted list. It was not in district the proposal, but we think the original language still stands.
 - Add this language before the last paragraph: “All appraisal outcomes shall reflect the independent professional judgment of a trained, licensed evaluator and shall not be made solely on the basis of artificial intelligence-generated data, metrics, or analytics.”
 - This language is not intended to bar educators and administrators from using AI to assist in completing appraisal tasks (i.e. educator using AI to assist with data analysis, administrator using AI to assist with synthesizing notes”.
- O-KEEP Handbook (Appendix C)
 - Table of Contents: Rubrics have traditionally not been part of the agreement, so this will be excluded.
 - Clarified a smoother reading of introductory sentences:
 - “Rigorous evaluation systems provide multiple opportunities for educator or leader observation and data collection.”
 - “The instruments mandate evidence-based performance decisions described in rubrics, including observations, valid/reliable student growth data, artifacts and evidence of teaching and learning.”
 - Replace “evalutee” or “appraisee” with “educator”

Question: The handbook says that educators in their fourth year who are developing or ineffective are subject to “subject to intensive supervision.” Do we have “intensive supervision” plan defined somewhere?

Answer: This should say “educator support plan” because we have a building support plan and a district support plan. This should be changed to align with our language.

- o Out-of-Cycle dates are not included on the deadlines list, so add it to go along with NE1 and NE2 since it has the same dates.
- o Construct mismatch: In the graphic, the language “Student Learning” is used but we use “Learner and Learning”

Question: The handbook mentions a district list of student performance measures. Is that referring to the student performance measures included in the rubric?

Answer: This is currently available in the Frontline MyFileLibrary. It needs to be updated at some point.

Question: The deadlines are very tight, especially between the overview and student performance or observation for NE1s and NE2s. The state statute on evaluation references 60 school days. Could we adjust the timeline?

Answer: The committee has already adjusted the dates from the pilot. Justin Howe also reminded the group that there is no consequence if somebody doesn’t get their student performance data in on that exact day. They need to get it done in time for the 60-day limit, and those who have to complete the student performance data twice in one year can use the same data to show growth.

Question: There is the post-formal observation feedback meeting and the final conference meeting. Are they the same or different?

Answer: The post-observation meeting is about just the observation, which will include some of the constructs but not all. The final conference is the summative over all of the constructs. They are a little different. For example, the final conference may include information from informal observations.

Question: Is there an opportunity for educator response to informal observations?

Answer: Absolutely.

Question: Is there a deadline for the self-assessment?

Answer: September 15 (along with the goal)

Question: Wouldn’t career educator student performance data be due 1/15 to give the appraiser time to review for the summative on 2/15? As well as NE3/4?

Answer: Yes.

Question: What constructs are the formal observation focused on?

Answer: Learner/Learning, Content Knowledge, Instructional Practice

Question: In the section about educator support plans and district support plans, it says that appraisers can increase the number of observations. Is there a limit to how many?

Answer: The committee did not talk about this because it’s collaborative. Adding formal observations is now easier on Frontline so that the educator can see them as well (and acknowledge it).

Question: The district support plan process references a “reasonable length of time.” How long is that?

Answer: The committee talked about this, and our current language says 60 days. We wanted to make sure that there was flexibility because 30 days might be enough. Normally, 30-60 days.

- o Noted observations about district support plan process: It requires 8 “events”: 2 pre-observation conferences, 2 formal observations, 2 post-observation conferences, and 2 monthly meetings.

Question: It's noted that the building and district support plans are retained in the HR file. Is there a limit to how long these are retained?

Answer: There is no limit. When other districts request transcripts/records, we do not share the HR file. Other districts can see the appraisal files, but these also include educator responses.

Question: With the pilot program, the Appraisal committee met about once a month and reviewed feedback on surveys. Will the committee continue to meet to review feedback?

Answer: We will meet to review feedback because we will need to continue to make adjustments.

Question: Will the voice-over PPT the pilot buildings watched be updated for the changes?

Answer: There will be a new, updated voice-over PPT that all educators will watch for the appraisal overview next year.

- Conference Guidelines for Mill Creek & Two-Year Academies
 - o No substantial changes made but the word “pilot” was taken out since this would become part of the agreement and the introductory paragraph was shortened

Question: If this information will go in Appendix B, do we need the last bullet that states “[Mill Creek/Two-Year Academies] educators will abide by the best practices suggested in Appendix B of the Negotiated Agreement when scheduling conferences”?

Answer: That bullet does not need to be included, as the practices will be in the appendix.

- 26-27 Professional Learning Calendar (Appendix B)
 - o We updated the “Standard 6” language to “Construct 5” (student performance data time in January)
- 26-27 Grade & Reporting (Appendix B)
 - o Distributed hard copy to review
- 26-27 Employment & 27-28 District Calendars (Appendix B)
 - o Not reprinted because we reviewed previously

Question: Will the Employment calendar be updated with the correct black out days?

Answer: Yes.

- MS Cheer & Dance Head: Group 7 to 4; Assistant Group 17 to 15 (Appendix A)
 - o ONEA is bringing forth just this recommendation from the EC/AS committee for the MOU because the middle school dance/cheer coaches' job descriptions have changed significantly enough to warrant an adjustment to pay
 - \$36,680 is the total cost
 - o We anticipate that the rest of the EC/AS recommendations to be discussed as negotiations continue for the 26-27 school year in the Fall 2026
- OPS and ONEA agree on a tentative Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).
 - o Next step is ratification by the bargaining unit and BOE

How We Will Work:

- Quick communication between Council members
 - o Listen to understand
 - o We all have and should use our voice
 - o Consider the scope of our impact as a Council
 - o 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