

# SPALC BARGAINING MINUTES SEPTEMBER 19, 2022 FY23 (2022-2023 school year)

### <u>AGENDA</u>

- Check-In
- Approval of Minutes
- Article 8 (Performance Evaluation)
- Article 12 (Leave)
- Check-Out

### CHECK-IN

Time Constraints: 5:30

#### Missing:

- Luis Rodriguez
- Chris Rasmussen
- David Montane
- Sailyn Perez
- Toni Abrams
- Rob Dodig
- Ami Desamours

•

Elephants: None

#### **Expectations:**

- Make progress\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*
- Get something done\*\*\*\*
- Hope to come to good agreement
- All minds work together

#### **MINUTES**

• 8/22/22 minutes approved as is

### STORY – Article 8 (Performance Evaluation)

- Looking for it to go into effect FY24 (school year 2023-2024)
- Question regarding **8.04(2)** Recommended Employment (Reappointment) Status. That is for employees outside their probationary period which is outside the two years. Do they still need to be reappointed by the board every year? They have property rights to that position.
- In the first year of employment it's probationary. In the second year of employment it is an annual contract. At the end of that year, once they are renewed, they have property rights. It does still need to go to the board every year.
- In regards to the ratings, are you looking to get consensus around the idea and tweak the ratings and what the boxes say throughout the year at Labor Management?
- There are concerns about manageability expecting supervisors to learn a new evaluation system midway through the year and also being asked to implement that evaluation system is not realistic. The ratings right now are Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory, Inconsistent and a box for a focus area. There is some concern on how that works and whether everyone is using it consistently.
- I would like to hear from some administrators regarding their thoughts about how these new ratings would change things in a positive way. Sometimes people don't want to be just satisfactory.
- The current system is maxed out at Satisfactory. Evaluation conversations should include more feedback, but sometimes it comes down to checking boxes.
- •

## <u>Caucus</u>

#### SPALC Report Out:

• We discussed the article and answered a few questions about the procedure and the ratings. There is a lot of support to amend the evaluation instrument to include the Highly Effective rating. Working through Labor/Management would be a great way to do that effective school year 2023-2024.

## STORY – Article 8 (Performance Evaluation)

• Question around the employee acknowledgement. Can we put in a sentence that describes what happens if an employee does not acknowledge the evaluation?

- If the evaluation is not acknowledged by a certain deadline, there is an administrative override.
- It would be good to have an idea what the timeline is for an employee to add comments to their evaluation. How many days from the time the evaluator completes an evaluation does the employee have to acknowledge?
- Discussion for staffing guideline document to include a timeline for the employee to review the evaluation/respond/adjust.
- Can the evaluation be changed by the supervisor/administrator after the April 1 deadline if it has been acknowledged?
- Supervisors/Administrators can not reopen the evaluation without a request to HR.
- If there is a rebuttal, does that show up in the comment section?
- If it is put into the comments, if not, it can be put into the personnel file. Once the evaluation is acknowledged, it is done.
- Discussion of circumstances in which and how/process to re-open evaluations after closing. This will be brought to Labor/Management to discuss the process and circumstances by which this is allowable.

### **Options**

- 1. Use the draft language as presented.
- 2. Discussion about the updated instrument including the Highly Effective rating in SPALC Labor/Management.
- 3. Addition of language of administrative override and addition of timelines to be added to the staffing guidelines including the date by which employees should have their comments submitted.

### <u>Caucus</u>

#### District Report Out:

- Discussed the three options and our expectations.
- The need to capture managerial guidelines so the language allows for consistency

### Straw Design

Options 1, 2 and 3

### STORY - Article 12 (Leave)

• We had a data request of a red line or crosswalk language and statutory language regarding vacation.

- We provided a crosswalk and we are waiting for some feedback on it. We are also doing some of the research on the statue regarding leave/vacation to make the language more readable, clear and concise.
- The crosswalk was received but it has not yet been reviewed/discussed.
- Discussion regarding more alignment in the language of the contracts where possible for TALC and SPALC.

#### <u>Calendar</u>

Next session is a Joint Session with TALC scheduled September 28 at 4:00 p.m.

### <u>Check Out</u>

On a scale of 1-5 were your expectations met?

• 5\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*