



*THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF LEE COUNTY and
THE TEACHERS ASSOCIATION OF LEE COUNTY*

**TALC Bargaining Committee
Monday, July 9, 2018
Agenda**

Items

1. Check-In
2. Minutes
3. Article 6
4. Article 7
5. Check-Out

Mission: To ensure that each student achieves his/her highest personal potential
Vision: To be a world-class school system

TALC Bargaining Committee
FY19 (2018-2019 School Year)



**THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF LEE COUNTY and
THE TEACHERS ASSOCIATION OF LEE COUNTY
TALC Contract Negotiations
FY19 (2018-2019 school year)**

July 9, 2018

Agenda

Check-In
Minutes
Article 6
Article 7
Check Out

Check-In

Time Constraints: 5:00 PM
Missing: ~~Carl Burnside~~, Bonnie McFarland
Elephants: None

Minutes

- Correction to
 - Story in Article 2, 3rd item should be its own bullet
 - Story 2.036, 4th bullet from bottom “period” needed in middle of the second line after 7. Hours
 - Page 3 of 11 2nd bullet from bottom after comma who” replaced with “will”
 - Page of 11 caucus report 2nd line add “of” for “retention of employees”
 - Page 8 of 11 2nd bullet above caucus “contract cannot be used to transfer an administrator”
- Approved as modified

Story - Article 6 (continued)

- At our last session on June 25th we left off with two options on the table. They are:
 1. Copy the language from the SPALC Contract article on Workplace Civility, which states that “Employees shall not engage in speech, conduct, behavior (verbal or nonverbal), or commit any act of any type which is reasonably interpreted as abusive, profane, intolerant, menacing, intimidating, threatening, or harassing against any person in the workplace. Bargaining unit employees may address alleged violations of this article through the grievance procedures as outlined in Article 4 of this agreement. The resolution of a complaint under this article may result in the involuntary, temporary transfer of an employee of employees pursuant to Article 5.03(2) of this agreement. Such transfer may become permanent when deemed necessary by the Superintendent or the Superintendent's designee. Insert language at Article 6.02 (Protection of Person).

2. (a) Employees shall not be subjected to harassment, inappropriate behavior, or interference by a parent or any other person in the performance of the employee's duties. Employees shall not be expected to remain in any meeting in which prohibitive behavior occurs.
(b) Inappropriate behavior includes chronic and continuous badgering, as well as verbal abuse. Verbal abuse includes abusive language, screaming yelling, insults, profanity and upbraiding.

Option

3. There is still more discussion to be had about Workplace Civility. Discussion to take place in TALC Labor/Management Committee meetings.

Straw Design - CONSENSUS

- A. Option 3

Story - Article 6.01 (District Safety and Security Committee)

- As part of some ongoing conversation in the TALC Labor/Management Committee, we think it's important that all references to bargaining related committees be in the same article there has been discussion about moving all these references to Article 13 (Participatory Decision Making)
- There are several bargaining related committees referenced in the TALC Contract and they're all over the place
- Article 13 (Participatory Decision Making) seems like a better place for references to bargaining related committees
- The District has been working to track the work of these committees, so that information can be communicated to all employees
- Placing all references to bargaining related committees in Article 13 will allow the TALC Labor/Management Committee the ability to better define the purpose, makeup, membership, and reporting structure for all of these committees, so that they can provide better oversight
- We can also distinguish between district-based and school-based committees, since there are committees that are both district-based and school-based
- For example, there is a district-based calendar committee that determines the District's instructional calendar and there is a school-based calendar committee that determines the school calendar including scheduling of faculty meetings and school-wide events
- There is also a district-based safety and security committee and school-based safety and security committees not all schools are having regularly scheduled meetings for these committees
- Can we make that decision to move all bargaining related committees now instead of waiting until later and trying to go through the TALC Contract article by article? Let's move all references to bargaining related committees to Article 13 (Participatory Decision Making) now

Option

1. Move Safety & Security Committee language to Article 13
2. Move any references of bargaining related committees to Article 13

Straw Design - CONSENSUS

- A. Option 2

Story - 6.01 (continued)

- Is there a district student discipline committee? It's TALC's understanding that there's a committee that makes decisions about what goes in the Student Code of Conduct
- There is an ad hoc committee that is formed by Student Services which discusses hot button issues issued each spring
- We need a formal, structured committee with equal representation by different employee groups and people working in different schools, at different levels, and in different roles, including people in Student Services and Exceptional Student Education (ESE)
- The District is open to the idea of creating a Student Discipline Committee is the idea that the structure would be similar to the District Safety and Security Committee or the District Calendar Committee? Yes
- All employee groups have reported high stress levels due to the inconsistent roll out of Restorative Justice; TALC, SPALC, and administrators have inconsistent views about Restorative Justice
- The Superintendent attends a TALC Representative Assembly meeting each year to hear the concerns of TALC Representatives and for the past few years, TALC Representatives have brought forward concerns about student discipline; fewer concerns have been reported each year, but there's still common themes like Restorative Justice and Inclusion
- Restorative Justice and Inclusion, which involved the mainstreaming of a number of ESE students, have both impacted teachers' stress levels; many teachers were not ready for the types of student behaviors they began to see on a regular basis
- The District Safety & Security Committee and District Calendar Committee both have sixteen (16) members, eight (8) appointed by the Superintendent, and eight (8) appointed by the associations representing all affected bargaining units; so there are four (4) appointees from TALC and four (4) appointees from SPALC
- There are other committees that do not have a set number of committee members; the make-up of these committees is determined by the TALC Labor/Management Committee or the SPALC Labor/Management Committee, typically in the spring of each year for the following year
- Committees with more than sixteen (16) members are difficult to manage
- We've learned that lesson the hard way with the Career Ladder Committee;; when you have 32 members, it's hard to schedule meetings, because it's harder to find a meeting space and people are less likely to participate on a consistent basis; large committees tend to not get as much work done, because it's often not clear who is responsible for doing what and by when
- Smaller committees don't limit participation, because they can still form subcommittees that will bring subject matter experts into the conversation
- Do we need to involve SPALC in the conversation, since it seems like we would want to involve paraprofessionals in the conversation about student discipline?
- TALC will reach out to SPALC but we're confident that they will be in support
- Is there a need to have a joint bargaining session to discuss this? It would not be required as long as we're not making a decision that impacts or otherwise obligates SPALC to participate, but at some point we might want to discuss it as a larger group
- We can discuss it with SPALC and TALC if there's a joint bargaining session to discuss Article 11 ((Benefits); there may be some sort of a recommendation or update from the Insurance Task Force at some point

Option

1. Discuss the formation of a Student Discipline Committee along with the recommendation of the Insurance Task Force at a joint bargaining session with SPALC
2. Use the same language used for the District Safety & Security Committee, in the TALC Contract on pages 20 and 21, except replace lines 41 and 44 on page 20 and lines 1 to 3 on page 21 with language that references the District Student Discipline Committee
3. TALC will consult with SPALC about the addition of language that will create a District Student Discipline Committee
4. Include “review Student Code of Conduct” in new language

Story - Article 6.01 (continued)

- There were a number of concerns about the implementation of Restorative Justice
- Restorative Justice is great if executed properly, however there was not fidelity in the way it was implemented district-wide
- The lack of training and support caused frustration, because teachers feel that students are not being held accountable for disruptive or inappropriate behavior
- Restorative Justice and Inclusion should have been phased in, but they were rolled out at the every school at the same time
- [prior to implementation of any new program there should be buy-in from teachers
- Teachers were never surveyed or asked if Restorative Justice was a program they wanted to implement; there was just a change in the way we’re doing student discipline and all of the key stakeholders had to adjust
- Teachers support staff, and administrators should have all been on the same page and onboard with the new idea; there would no opportunities for training and this created problems, because not everyone understood what Restorative Justice should look like, if done properly
- It’s important to note that the timing of these changes were related to the Dear Colleague letter and other guidance documents put out by the US Department of Education and the US Department of Justice, which noted the impact that student suspension has on student achievement; many people began to see this as an effort to stop the “Classroom to Prison Pipeline”

Caucus

District Report out: School-based administrators share TALC’s frustration with the situations discussed. We talked about these frustrations and the concern on both sides relative to the issues we face as a district relative to student discipline. We agree that having a thoughtful conversation about where to go from here requires having the right people at the table. A joint committee sounds like a good option to make sure all key stakeholders are involved in that conversation.

Story - Article 6.01 (continued)

- Implementation of Inclusion was done with fidelity, which caused behavior issues in co-taught classrooms
- TALC believes that ESE units are not evenly assigned throughout all schools; some schools have very high numbers of ESE student
- It’s our understanding that there are state regulations that allows for only seven (7) percent of students to be assigned to self-contained classrooms; many students are being mainstreamed when they are not ready, because of legislation

Straw Design - CONSENSUS

A. Options 2 & 4

Story - Article 6.01 (continued)

- Since we last met, the District has done a considerable amount of research regarding TALC interest in discussing breast milk pumping; this includes a review of US Department of Labor guidance documents, Centers for Disease Control research, and a number of other reports regarding the legal requirements relative to this issue
- It's important to note that the Affordable Care Act amended portions of the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA); the District is an employer covered by the FLSA so these changes in the law apply to the District
- The law required that reasonable accommodations be provided to a mother for the first calendar year following the birth of the child; these accommodations include a private place for expression for breast milk, which cannot be a restroom
- Compensation & Labor Relations has only received two (2) calls in the past three (3) years regarding pumping; both calls were from principals and were ultimately resolved at the school level
- The call were about what qualifies as "reasonable"; for example, what is a reasonable amount of time for pumping or what is a reasonable number of breaks each day
- In these cases, the principals were concerned that the requests being made by the employees were unreasonable; for example, it's not reasonable to request a two(2) hour lunch break to pump, it's not reasonable to request that a Pre-K child be removed from their class ignored to nurse, in most cases it's not reasonable to request three (3) or four (4) breaks throughout the day to pump
- People often have very strong personal views around this subject and obviously there are a number of biological functions related to this issue that we probably do not need to discuss in order to have a conversation about what's reasonable in an educational/workplace setting
- What recourse does an employee have if they feel like they have made a reasonable request and it is not being honored? Would they need to request an ADA accommodation?
- The process for determining the reasonableness of the accommodation would be similar, since they both rely on reasonable person standard, but a request for an ADA accommodation might not be appropriate; it would require some additional research, the thought is we would want to be careful in how we present that information, since most mothers would be offended if you suggested that being a mother is somehow a disability
- For the two phone calls we received, reasonable accommodations were provided without a formal hearing
- We work in a child and family centered environment, most principals are accommodating
- The Center for Disease Control (CDC) reported that approximately 75% of mothers nurse within the first few months of birth and after 6 months that number drops to about 16% of mothers
- There are obvious health benefits to nursing, for both baby and mother, however this is again a very personal matter and people often have very strong opinions
- It seems surprising that there's only protections for one year, since doctors often advise mothers to consider nursing for up to two years, if they are able to
- There's a number of online resources, including examples of the accommodations provided by different school districts throughout the US
- In Philadelphia and several other districts, employees are provided space in the teacher's lounges or clinic to express breast milk

- Special refrigerators are not required for storage of milk, milk can be stored in an already available refrigerator; there are districts that ask that it be stored in a lunch box with ice packs
- Are employees compensated for the time that they spend pumping each day?
- Based on the research we conducted, which again includes the US Department of Labor guidance documents, CDC reports, and a survey of school districts that are in compliance, it is appropriate for the District to require that pumping take place during planning periods, or for that time, no
- We should keep in mind that other major local employers, like Lee health, may have a different set-up, so a direct comparison isn't always possible or helpful
- Lee Health often has access to different medical equipment and they can provide a room on every floor for nursing mothers
- Each school has a different design and it may not be feasible or prudent to have someone walk all the way across campus to go to a designated area for pumping, when another secure and private area is closer to a mother's classroom or office
- Whatever room is being used, there should be consideration given to making sure that there's a lock and shades for privacy; among the other school districts, there was no standard location for pumping, each district and each school is different
- What about mothers who choose to nurse beyond one year? Can reasonable accommodations be made for them?
- If a principal would like to extend the time period for reasonable accommodations, they can do so; there's nothing that prohibits them from doing so but at the same time they are not required to
- We're not aware of any issues with accommodations ending after one year, other than the Pre-K student example, which was more about disrupting the student's day
- In every situation, the reasonableness of the request and accommodations available should be considered; every person and every pregnancy is unique and should be looked at independently
- There's some disagreement about the use of planning time for pumping; from a practical perspective, TALC does not believe that it is fair for a new mother to be asked to choose between planning and the expression of milk
- There are other practical concerns like what is a teacher supposed to do if they have first period planning
- The District is reluctant to set a standard one way or the other in regard to the use of planning periods
- The Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) does not prevent the District from allowing for additional time to express breast milk
- Florida allows mothers to breastfeed any place, any time without retribution and it's our understanding that state statutes can extend additional protections to mothers; do you know if any research has been done regarding Florida statutes?
- Yes, there are five (5) or six (6) Florida statutes that reference nursing and the FLSA allows states to provide broader protections
- Each state is a little bit different and some do provide broader protections, Florida however does not
- Florida Statutes protect mothers from convictions for violations of the laws regarding lewd and lascivious acts or exhibitionism when breastfeeding in public
- There are also Florida Statutes that define the requirements for designation as a baby friendly facility, based on the requirements of the Department of Health and UNICEF

- The protection offered to mothers apply to both public and private accommodations, but it's important to note that there's difference between a public accommodation and protection and one that applies to the work place
- It's also important to note that the laws all reference breastfeeding, not the expression of breastmilk
- TALC would like to note that although there have been few cases reported to the district, there were five prospective employees at the job fair who asked about protections for mothers who are nursing
- Principals are sensitive to the needs of employees that are mothers, schools do everything they can to promote a family friendly environment; we want our employees to be healthy and we want their kids to be healthy and successful

Caucus

TALC Report out: We talked about the law and the protections that are provided and not provided. We would like to include a reference to FLSA in the contract and perhaps have a reference to what District shared about break time and what type of facility is to be provided also, we would like to mention a hearing panel mentions similar to ADS, we find it important to have an actual panel to hear these cases.

Story - Article 6.01 (continued)

- If an employee provides coverage for someone who is pumping, are the procedures the same as elsewhere in the contract in terms of who provided the coverage? In other words, is someone assigned by administration to provide coverage and are they compensated?
- Not sure what the question is, but the District will follow the contract and there is language in the contract in terms of instructional coverage during planning
- If a teacher provides instructional coverage during planning, they would be compensated in accordance with the contract
- There's also language about asking for volunteers to provide coverage or assigning coverage involuntarily and on a rotating basis, to make sure that the distribution of additional duties and any associated compensation is done equitably
- It might be helpful to get some input from the school administrators in the room; it's difficult to provide a single answer that fits all of the unique situations that arise in terms of what reasonable accommodations are being provided to an employee
- Every situation is different, because every mother is different and every pregnancy is different
- Twenty (20) years ago there was much talk about this topic at schools, but about seven (7) or eight (8) years ago we began having more conversations with employees and it was obvious that we needed to adapt to the meet people's individual needs
- Principals are very responsive to the needs of their staff, we need to make sure we are not setting a precedent that creates issues other places
- The hope of every school administrator is to create a culture where people are willing to help out their colleagues
- Trying to put something in the contract that covers every issue that might arise will without a doubt create more issues and in some ways tie the hands of school administrators
- School culture is important and administrators do their best to be mindful of individual employee needs when planning schedules
- Adjustments can be made to account for the needs of mothers who need time to pump; for example, schedules can be set so that someone has their later planning period later in the day

- It's also important to mention that this might not be as big an issue for elementary school teachers who have specials or know that there's daily planning periods
- Trying to come up with new language that will apply to all situations is an issue, because it might put principals in a position where they are asked to make promises that cannot be kept; we need to keep in mind that schedules are set based around the needs of students first and need to support student achievement
- If there is a principal that is not being reasonable and is not taking the individual needs of employees into consideration, we can address those concerns in the TALC Labor/Management Committee meetings
- Administrators work with teachers to determine the best locations for privacy, and make sure that there are locks and shades for the window; most schools even find a way to put discreetly worded notes on the door or other ways to signal that the room is in use
- If there are administrators that are not being flexible enough, they can be coached; there are plenty of best practices in place right now
- Adding restrictions and formal processes makes it more cumbersome, which might ultimately have a negative impact on employees
- It's the word "reasonable" that causes the concern; TALC is ultimately interested in making sure the same person is not being asked to cover during his or her planning
- We don't necessarily need the complete wording of the statute in the contract
- We can decide in the TALC Labor/Management Committee how to best word the new language in the contract

Option - CONSENSUS

1. Reference relevant statutes in the contract; Section 7 of the FLSA (1938); to be added to Article 6.02

Story Article 6.02

- When can a student be removed from a class? Can we add a reference to Florida Statute to Article 6.02?
- The Student Code of Conduct states the expectations for student behavior and says when and how a student can be removed from class
- Putting a reference to Florida Statute in Article 6.02 will help spell out teachers' rights, since there has been some confusion about these rights with the implementation of Restorative Justice
- There is already a citation to Florida Statute 1003.32(j), but the citation to a specific subsection is confusing
- Article 6.02(2) references 1003.32(j), which covers a number of things including statutory authority of teachers in respect to student discipline; subsection (j) is about the use of reasonable force
- What is the District's expectations regarding breaking up fights? Has any directive been given on how teachers are supposed to respond?
- A major concern is that teachers have not been trained on how to respond to students when they become physical, create disruptions, or are otherwise unruly
- Teachers should tell students to "stop", it is not expected that a teacher who has not been trained jump in to break up a fight; you should use voice commands and call for administration or security specialists

- It's also important to note that 90% of the almost 50 pages of the TEACH training manual are about de-escalation, there are maybe two(2) pages about the use of physical force and they focus on defensive tactics
- The District no longer uses CPI and other trainings that involve takedowns and other more aggressive tactics or restraints due to the risk of injury to both employees and students

Option

1. Pursuant to 1003.32(4), Florida Statutes, a teacher may remove from class a student whose behavior the teacher determines interferes with the teacher's ability to communicate effectively with the students in class or with the ability of the student's classmates to learn.

Caucus

District Report out: There is no issue with the reference to Florida Statute. There is an issue with the additional language, since it is not representative of the statutory language in its entirety. The statute includes references to the following:

- The student code of conduct and the role of authority of all District staff relative to student discipline
- That teachers shall set and enforce reasonable classroom rules in an equitable manner
- That teachers shall seek out professional development to improve classroom management skills when data shows that they are not effectively handling minor classroom disruptions
- That teachers shall maintain a positive and effective learning environment that maximizes learning and minimizes disruption
- Placement review committees
- Reporting requirements for principals, the District, and all staff to FL DOE and others regarding discipline and suspected threats
- That a teacher who removes twenty five (25) percent of their class shall be required to complete professional development in order to improve classroom management skills
- Obligations to protect students from harmful situations

The District does not believe that copying the language of the statute in its entirety is necessary, but we're not comfortable with the representation of the statute in the option presented. WE also discussed the potential impact of this language on our ESE students, who cannot be removed from class as easily because of their legal protections.

TALC Report out: We talked about the language in the statute; many members of the TALC bargaining team did not know that this statute existed. TALC discussed stories from teachers who have been in the situation where they feel that student removal is necessary.

Story - Article 6.02 (continued)

- There are many situations that occur in a school setting where administrators have to balance the legal rights of students and/teachers to ensure school safety
- Teachers often say that they want a student removed and are told what they need to do in order to ensure that the student has the due process required by the law
- For example, there are situations where teachers are informed that they may press charges against a student, if the student has harmed the teacher, but teachers often choose not to press charges
- School Resource Officers are often involved if a student is violent and harms an employee
- Violence is mentioned in the statute, but the option does not mention violence
- Most employees are already aware that they can press charges if a student behaves violently

- The option doesn't reference a teacher's responsibilities, it just mentions their rights and it doesn't mention all of them; can we include a reference to the statute in its entirety?
- The reference to the specific subsection will let teachers know they can have a child removed from their class; teachers need to know that they have the authority to do this, because there are days when as a teacher you're told by another teacher that a student is having a bad day and you need to be able to respond to the disruption
- As a school administrator, there is an issue if a teacher is telling another teacher that a student is having a bad day, so that the teacher can do something about the student; it's not fair to the student to try to influence another teacher's opinion in that way
- The concern is that by referencing the subsection we're sending the message that the statute is a "gotcha" and we're not giving people a complete picture of what it says
- It's important to note that this is not just a teacher issue, schools are also limited in terms of what they can do relative to the removal of students
- There are due process requirements and for ESE students you have to consider whether their behavior is a manifestation of their disability
- The contract currently references Florida Statute 1003.32(j); why to give teachers and administrators the ability to look at the statute for themselves?
- There is a difference between the student who is disrupting other students and the one that puts their head down and falls asleep in class; a student not being engaged is different from the disruptions we're talking about
- We already have a reference in statutory language in the statute, so we're not doing anything different from what's already been done; letting teachers know they have the ability to remove a student and putting this in as a reference to the specific subsection gives teachers the ability to tell administration that they want to remove a student from class; the option is about updating the language
- As a teacher, my rule is that if I am limited to doing my job and behavior is getting in the way of the other learning, then there are grounds for removal from the classroom
- The statutory language referenced does not necessarily say that negative behavior has to be consistently exhibited, but it helps if there is a recognized problem; the students we are referencing are the outliers.
- The statute refers to those students who are most disruptive to the process of instruction
- First year teachers are the ones who are most likely to be unaware of these statutory protections, so it's helpful to have contract language; it will help us retain new teachers
- The Multi-tiered System of Support (MTSS) process already exists for those students who are most disruptive
- MTSS students can take up an exorbitant amount of time to remove, in some cases it's up to 16 weeks before teachers get relief and there's assistance with the student
- The statute is lengthy and contains comprehensive language; referencing sub-sections does not provide a full picture
- Referencing subsections is similar to referencing the last two pages of the TEACH training materials; we would never hand out just the pages that address situations where you have to go hands-on with a student, without any reference to the de-escalation pieces found in the rest of the almost 50 page training manual
- ESE student behavior is sometimes a manifestation of their disability; placing this language in the contract may have a negative impact on students, because it may encourage implicit bias, since student may be labeled as "bad kids", because of their poor behavior
- The Principles of Professional Conduct of Educators (formerly Code of Ethics) says that teachers in Florida have the obligation to their students that they not unreasonably restrain a

student from independent learning; this has to be balanced with the need for student safety, since removal from a classroom is almost certainly a restraint on independent learning

- In most schools, you can ask, “Who is your worst kid?” and teachers will be able to answer and provide a student’s name, that’s not right
- The goal is to keep students engaged and to continue to make improvement in their behavior, instead of looking for ways to send a student out of a classroom or a school
- There is a serious danger in limiting the statutory language referenced to one subsection when the statute has much more depth
- We keep going to the worst case scenario situation and we’re getting off-track; we need to identify behaviors early and get students the help they need
- Not to dwell on the impact to ESE, but students are entitled to a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) and part of that means that they are entitled to certain protection, including rights to remain in their current placement until certain due process checkpoints are met; it’s part of providing a Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)
- We can look at the steps that we as a District are taking to remove a student, but whenever we are considering removing a student we need to be sure that this does not result in an automatic change in a student’s placement
- Our conversation demonstrates how desperately teachers and administration need to have conversations about what is in the statute and what can or cannot happen in the classroom and what the schools responsibilities are in terms of student discipline
- For example, the statute states that a placement review committee is to be formed and describes the process for determining who is on that committee
- We need to be clear that this is not for the situations where a teacher decides that , “I’m tired of dealing with a certain student”, it’s for the worst case scenario situations where a student exhibits violent or very disruptive behavior
- Forming a placement review committee at each school would help teachers , students, and administrators; it might help address behavior before a student is referred for MTSS
- We’re not opposed to teachers knowing their rights, the concern is the there could be a perception that the process for removing a student is a lot easier than it really is
- The placement review committee isn’t a standing committee, and these are not easy processes to navigate; students still have rights and if the process is not administered with fidelity, then there’s the opportunity for people to use it to the detriment of student achievement
- The District is not comfortable with the current wording of the option
- We talk about the retention of teachers and that it’s a high priority for the District; when we look at the language relative to protection of the person, we’re talking about mental and physical protections
- If new teachers know they have even a little bit of leeway, it will make them feel more comfortable in the classroom
- Establishing appropriate boundaries and classroom discipline are discussed every year at the New Teacher Orientation (NTO), but the teachers who are just out of college will be more willing to stay if it’s obvious that we are willing to support them when it comes to student discipline; the same can be said for retention of experienced teachers
- As a teacher, I think it’s important that people know that this exists for the student who is disruptive on a daily basis, not just the extreme cases
- A student who consistently exhibits negative behavior may need to be moved to a classroom or a school that can provided more support for students with challenging behavior; this language would help if a teacher feels like they need to have a student picked up and taken out of class for the day or period

- To clarify, the statute is referring to the removal of a student from your class roster, not their removal for the day or for the period
- There are other ways to show teachers that we support them that do not include the removal of a student, including providing them training on classroom management and how to address difficult student behaviors; we can support teachers by making more student services and ESE staff available for assessments of student behaviors; right now we rely on paraprofessionals a lot
- I taught ESE Lifeskills and received threats from student and was once cussed out by the same student for thirty (30) days straight; I know this because I had to document this student's behaviors and my efforts to address it; removing that student from my class would not have made me feel like I was being supported, it would have had the opposite effect, since I felt like it was my job to help the student learn socially appropriate behavior
- We're out of time, let's table the conversation until next time

Check out