EA Council/Superintendent Meetings

1.	**EA Council/Superintendent Meeting** **02/08/2022 at Administrative Building** **Union Leadership in Attendance:** Jeffrey Mleczko, Jennifer Gentile, Rhondra Bass, Sandra Williams, Judy Durham,and Alan Scott **District Leadership in Attendance:** Dr. Jennifer Norrell + Steve Meggazini At the board Meeting 02/07/22, rank-and-file members gave a proposal regarding "unequal distribution of ESSER funds" to board members. Dr. Norrell wanted to discuss the situation. Dr. Norrell is open to other public data but does not feel the community or board would support it. There are no requirements for ESSER II. If we up-pay elementary and middle for Year 1, what do we propose to do to make-up the cost? If it must get paid out of local funds, $1,000,000 and it would put us out of the incentive game. Dr. Norrell wants members to speak with her, as opposed to starting by going public. OPTIONz: Upay the elementary and middle, then done. Or, status quo. ——- Ideas #0: Accept year one. Continue to discuss year #2 and #3. Make section 3 equal to Section 4 and Section 5. #2: Student attendance equal and based on district-wide attendance (get it or not: $240, 500, 750 #1: Raise retention up to $750 Get rid of sick days #3: Freshman – 9th grade on track (6-12): 88% 12th (9-12), and early college, pre-K to 8 kicker ? 80 - 85% of high, get it Pre-K to 5 kicker ? 80 - 85% of high, get it ——- Seek An equitable distribution for years 2 and 3. — We need to come up with a plan to report at next board meeting — On 02/08/2022, our union's Executive Council met with Dr. Norrell and Steve Megazzini to discuss the inequity in regards to ESSER incentive bonuses. The meeting

	was called by Dr. Norrell in response to speeches given at the 02/07/2022 board meeting. She stated a concern that the Board of Education might decide to eliminate the bonuses altogether. She started the meeting by handing out copies of a memo/proposal which had been written by a union member and given to each board member, after which she took time to rebut some of the claims in the proposal, and to explain the logic for why the administration believed the difference in pay was justified, which in sum relates to work done by high school staff during the pandemic. Initially, Dr. Norrell's offer was either: [1] Status Quo - Keep the incentive bonuses as they are, or [2] Up-pay the middle and elementary staff the difference that the high school received for Year 1, but then drop the bonuses for Year 2 and Year 3. After a few hours of private discussion, our Executive Council stated that we wanted neither of those options [in particular, because if we'd accepted Option 2, all levels would ultimately lose money, potentially thousands, due to the losses of Year 2 and Year 3]. What we did want was to rework the incentive allocations for Year 2 and Year 3. We pressed the point that our House of Delegates had voted to accept the bonuses for Year 1 *based on the idea that we'd push to revise the allocation formulas for Year 2 and Year 3.* Dr. Norrell accepted this and we spent the rest of the meeting brainstorming how best to retool the formulas. The general consensus of our Executive Committee upon leaving the meeting is that we'd made substantial progress. We have a second meeting arranged for Monday 02/14/2022 to finalize the details. Some of the revisions decided at the meeting include: • Raising the retention up to $750 • Eliminating an incentive based on staff attendance • Making all incentive categories inclusive of all membership, thereby all incentive bonuses will be equal districtwide We value the work and contributions of ***all*** staff throughout the district, and we look forward to continuing to negotiate with the administration so that our staff can see those values reflected in the ESSER allocations. In unity, The Executive Council
2.	**EA Council/Superintendent Meeting** **02/14/2022 at Administrative Building** **Union Leadership in Attendance**: Jeffrey Mleczko, Jennifer Gentile, Rhondra Bass, Sandra Williams, Judy Durham, and Alan Scott **District Leadership in Attendance**: Dr. Jennifer Norrell, Steve Meggazini, Dr. Lisa Dallacqua Admin Goal for Incentive Bonus: To create motivation where energy is lagging When we get the proposal, we'll (admin and union) present at the board meeting on 02/22. What will the thresholds be?

	The max retention is $1000 but without other money. First years will only get retention. Student Attendance: current 89.92% [maybe say 85-88, 88-92, 93+]. This would be district wide. $250, $500, $750 MAP Reading: current 80.5 district average (a couple dragging it down)(K-1 is carrying the district)(4 and 5th struggling) = met more than 1 point growth k-5 25% - 45%, whole district 1 point 90%, district K-5. Elementary reading 81 Allen, Gates 74, Johnson 77, O'Donnell 79, 84 Bardwell, 250 = 80-81, 500 = 82-83, 750 = 84+ By building? Some get nothing (Gates, Hermis, O'Donnell, etc), or by a district? Early College + Grad = 500 80-82, 750 83-85, 1000 86 9th Grade = 85-88 250, 89-92 500, 93+ 750 Retention $250, $500, $750 Elementary Piece: MAP Reading High School: Grad and Early College Readiness When the incentives get paid, the percentages and scores can then be explained. Elevate the schools which are the pockets "lifting" the district. If we maxed everything, it would be $4000. December 15th payouts. Do it on this year's MAP. Only variables right now are middle and high schools. Who in the community would complain about reading? It is a good datapoint. And there is more money in the plan. Most people will feel good about this. —-- Dr. Norrell does not want to give back the sick day for the snow day. — If we are forced to go into local funds, the bonuses can't be extended Year 2 and Year 3 — MASKING PLAN (potential) Continuum = required, recommended, optional [based on data] — HOUSE OF DELEGATES Dr. Norrell to meet and be open to questions. Plan made for meeting on 02/16.
3.	**EA Council/Superintendent Meeting** **02/16/2022** Cowherd Library **Union Leadership in Attendance**: Arlette Gomez, Aviva Pollack Paradise, Amy Van Cura, Alan Scott, Beth Cotter, Cin Citro, Francisco Zafra, Gerry Mestek, Jon Kuehl,

Julie Schmale, Judy Durham, Jennifer Gentile, Jeffrey Mleczko, Joyce Ladewig, Karen Mueller, Lorraine Garciacano, Michelle Taylor, Mary Taylor, Stephanie Paul

District Leadership in Attendance: Dr. Jennifer Norrell, Steve Meggazini, Dr. Lisa Dallacqua

Jennifer Norrell:
History about incentive stipend. Normally, I'd come out to talk with all the reps but this time I talked with leadership because we were preparing to talk with the board and we needed to make sure we got it approved by the grant. One of the things we did was identify things that happened in the past two years, march 2020, incentives. Everyone gets a retention bonus but anything else higher needs to be connected to learning renewal and thus data. Connect to data we had that people could say was real data and data was obvious from the last two years.

The intent was to celebrate the high spikes in data. We are judged based upon what's in our report card. The intent was not to disavalue our colleague.

Michelle Taylor: When you refer to grant money, is that from ESSER 2?

Norrell: Yes. This is built into ESSER 2. This is the one grant that operates like this. One fiscal year. Entitlement Grants like Titles A, 3, etc., those are based on our demographic and scores. Those are time sensitives. ESSER comes from the same buckets as Title 1 (low income status, etc) but not by the year. So they released ESSER 1, 2, and 3, but 2 and 3 are more and are allowed to go back to March 2020. ESSER 3 needs to plan. ESSER 3's 53 million is yet to be written. Learning renewal, HVAC, the purpose is to get us over the hurdle of COVID times. Construction projects bills come in next year but the point is that ESSER 3 is tied to the equity plan. Part of ESSER APR expects it to be spent on an equity framework for children but it wasn't released until recently. We can use it for children.

Michelle Taylor: When would we expect ESSER 3 funds to come in and how are teachers and stakeholders working on where it is going? State Board of Education highlighter SEL and learning loss so with ESSER 3, where are our money going towards the students? Interventions? Do we have a committee of people looking at this?

Norrell: A lot of what you are asking could be answered on the Curriculum Council or the committees are a good place to shore up those issues. What we do when we go through plans, we go through those committees or union leadership. I sat on a lot of those committees.

One example: REC center. The old Mcknight is being turned into a REC center. We own the land and let's expand upon it. We had groups of stakeholders who met five different times. It'll cost 5 million, and will hold 3 thousand students. We can have fieldstrips there. We met with presidents of parent organizations, union leadership, and aldermen.

Michelle Taylor: 900 kids on interventions. This is a curriculum conversation. Where are our interventions for learning loss for Covid?

Norrell: One of the things, we have tons of interventionists. Interventions, do you mean Tier 2 or Tier 3?

Michelle Taylor: Math interventions. Tutors. We have kids in Kindergarten thru 2nd grade who have learning loss.

Norrell: I am a data person. I can talk about every classroom, every building and their growth. I hear what you are saying. Our district compared to nationally. So based on real live data, our K - 2 is knocking it out. I'd love to further the conversation, however we need to use our real data. We have four different curriculums up so we said let's prioritize, we made math a priority. The Curriculum Council is doing a great job, math pilots. Elementary and middle are just rolling out. We just hired (?) with math credentials. A lot of people know these things are happening. Not everyone might know about these items but those on the committees know more. Those interested in the money should join a committee. Anyone can join. And people can see what is coming. But we need the data to justify. Interventionists, Tier 2 and Tier 3, staff shortages have been huge. We've had things posted all year. At the high school, we offered work for those after school, but no-one wants to work it. We need to restructure our priorities. No-one is coming after school and no-one wants to come in the summers. Then we have the data, we can see who had growth and we can compare each classroom across the district.

It is coming to the board. The percentage of teachers out due to Covid, and the percentage of students in and out, because we need to be prepared to show it to the board.

MAP is by student.

Michelle Taylor: Little students took it at home and thus have elevated scores.

Norrell: The high school had the largest number. The high school is the reason we started to look at who was out for Covid.

Michelle Taylor: Are you triangulating your data?

Norrell: For what point? It sounds like you are asking very deep curriculum questions?

Michelle Taylor: We used to get bulletins.

Norrell: There is so much to this. It feels like we are all over the place. Between Dr. Lisa Dallacqua and I, this is our thing. We can talk about…

Michelle Taylor: I've been involved in various committees. How do we know how to get involved?

Jeff: Teaching and Learning Committee.

Michelle Taylor: I wasn't aware you had to apply in those committees (Curriculum Council).

Norrell: We've been funding interventions through Title funds.

Michelle Taylor: Please start telling us about it. Nobody knows.

Norrell: We will talk more about it. Our colleagues did a lot of work setting a lot of things but then the floor fell out. We took four more elementary schools off the list. That was a lot of work, then we had to learn how to live remote, and now we need to reset the adults.

Let's talk about ESSER. Let's talk about this year and going forward. This year, the BOE said let's look at other pieces of data we can go on. What are some other data points? We don't want to tempt people to cheat so we didn't want to use ACCESS, IAR, so we tried to use something else, MAP. It is protected because we use it for evaluations, teachers can't get into the system. To bring Elementary into the fold, MAP. If we pulled growth by building, it would not be fair. To not break up the union, pit building against building, so we went district-wide. We can share the building numbers. District-wide won't pit people against people or building against building.

Cotter: I'm glad you are saying you won't pit school against school. I hope you realize the (hurt and disunity which resulted from the original incentive formula)? Didn't anyone say that this would happen?

Norrell: Union leadership.

Cotter: Then why?

Norrell: We were just excited to celebrate. We thought everyone would join in, what I did twelve years ago paid off. Us at the district, we didn't take the stipends. But we were excited. The true answer is, no. No-one dropped the ball. And after it went out, people felt they were not valued. But we went back, we didn't have any additional data points. But going forward, but we'll have data. The data was carried by East High, the attendance. When you look at the data, the ADA, Pre-K is the foundation, but I couldn't connect it to march 2020, but I will be connecting Pre-k to all of these scores, attendance and MAP. Pre-K and Kindergarten are not counted for attendance because they are not compulsory, but they are included. Attendance is 1st thru 12. But Pre-K and K included.

MAP is Elementaries' to own. Middle = Ninth Grade on Track. High school has graduation and College and Career Readiness.

Everyone will get it.

Michelle Taylor: When it was tied to the incentive, you wanted to go further than this?

Norrell: Beyond just retention. I really want people who are at their wits end, to have enough motivation to knock it out these last three months. This should serve until we get back on our feet. This is just a little something extra to incentivize. Yes, we love children. But we might need something to help create a little extra energy. I wanted to create extra motivation.

Amy Van Cura: So everyone is getting the same amount?

Norrell: Yes. Everyone has a piece so everyone is responsible for being paid.

Michelle Taylor: This sounds more like One Team, One Plan.

Norrell: We have enough money in Title 1 for interventions. We are a 80%/20% budget. Most districts are 20%/80%.

We are moving as one but it is taking a little while so it isn't rushed.

Jon Kuehl: What was ?? (NOTE: I missed the question)

Norrell: In 2018, it was 60 something percent. We were losing 30% of our kids. We moved up to 70%. Then 80%. We made the curriculum harder. It has been moving up.

Our number of kids passing AP is spiking.

I don't know if we can deliver on any of these numbers this year. This year was a total hot mess. Admin in and out. Staff in and out. Students in and out.

K-2 is holding it down. I am going to tell the board, we win. We didn't have mask walkouts. Tuesday night. The other thing real quick: MASKS.

	I am going to the board Tuesday, as of 02/22, we'll be the only district in (?) that still has masks. I want to have a continuum. Three buckets. 1st, required. 2nd: strongly recommended. 3rd: optional. Tied to certain requirements. 1, by site. Otherwise, off/on. School or office building. If an outbreak, masks back on. If the positivity rate goes 5% or higher, masks back on. If another variant and we get a spike, masks back on. 3% - 5, strongly recommended. Lower and 3%, options. Everyday, I receive a text that has every single building, positivity rate, close contacts, etc. Pre-K would still wear masks because they are too young to get vaccinated.