**United Educators of San Francisco**

**Executive Board**

Wednesday May 1, 2019 4:15 pm

**Minutes**

***Call to Order & Quorum 4:38pm***

***Minutes and Financial Report***

1. Roll Call A.J. Frazier, Sergeant at Arms
2. M/S/C Minutes Katie Waller-O’Connor
3. M/S/C Financial Report VanCedric Williams

In process of completing audit and on horizon on bringing mortgage interest rate down.

Reports

1. Elementary School Report Darcie Chan Blackburn

**Elementary Committee Meeting - Wednesday, April 24, 2019 4:30 pm**

Darcie Chan Blackburn, Cathy Sullivan, Beatrice Montenegro, Carolyn Gencarella, Steve Firestone

**Agenda Items:**

1. Buildings and Grounds Check in- members should come with outstanding repair issues for us to present to LEAD.  Best if they can give specifics and also find out what the work order number is.

2. SPED check in

3. Current Issues/Concerns

4. Questions/Concerns about Amplify Science.

**Next Elementary Committee Meeting - Wednesday, May 29, 2019, 4:30 at Rosa Parks Elementary Committee.**

**Agenda for Supe Meeting, Tuesday, May 14, 2019 at 555 Franklin, 3rd floor Room 307:**

1. Building and Grounds
2. Special Ed

Buildings and Grounds:

1. We agreed the protocol for addressing outstanding building issues (ones that are not addressed within 2 weeks). Members should ask their site’s secretary for the Work Order number and date and send this info along with the name of the school site to Darcie or Beatrice. We will then share this info (and provide the school’s cohort name) with LEAD so they can follow up on this.

2. David will send cohort list of schools to me.

3. We still need follow up about the lead reports regarding drinking water. David will send the report on to me.

Nothing reported.

Special Ed Check In:

Feinstein – concerns that came up. Allocation for paras have been cut back for next year. No student’s minutes are met except those who’s parents are litigious. K-2 RSP teacher with cancer and out but no replacement hired until February and is not credentialed. Want appropriate allocations of paras for next year’s needs and a credentialed RSP teacher.

Speech Pathologist left the district and no one has been hired to replace.

Para Educator allocations for the next year always fall short of what is needed. Sites receive new students with special needs either in the Kinder/TK classes or other grades. These students may or may not have ieps but since they are new to the school, there frequently is no Para Educator available to provide support.

New Issues/Concerns:

1. Sunnyside – evaluation cycle of people on sabbatical

2. People feeling that they don’t have enough time to plan in elementary. They want a prep time built into the instructional day.

3. Schools and Communities first initiative – Schools being underfunded. Initiative on the 2020 ballot. Will raise the taxes of corporations only to the current level. Money would go towards public schools and community mental health services.

4. Feinstein – concerns that came up. Allocation for paras have been cut back for next year. No student’s minutes are met except those who’s parents are litigious. K-2 RSP teacher with cancer and out but no replacement hired until February and is not credentialed. Want appropriate allocations of paras for next year’s needs and a credentialed RSP teacher. Speech Pathologist left the district and no one has been hired to replace.

Questions/Concerns about Amplify Science.  Elementary members are welcome to attend the March 12 meeting with LEAD where they will have staff who are helping roll out the new curriculum share what strategies they've developed.  For those who can't attend, I will take notes and bring them to the March 12 lead meeting.

1. Concerns about prep for this program. Extra time is needed to pull out the materials and set them up. First grade team at a site had to spend hours preparing these lessons. Carolyn recognized that since these are new materials and it’s science that there is always a great deal of preparation needed to have a hands on curriculum.

a. Principals were encouraged to have Science Prep included in Grade level planning time

b. To have Principals tell teachers they can use Prop G hours for preparation.

c. Concerns about PD last year being at a different site so next year the PD will be at the individual sites and will be during one of the PD days before school starts.

d. UBCs will need to make sure that their site admistrators communicate the ability to be paid through Prop G funds for preparation time.

e. UBCs will also need to make sure their site administrators put Science materials preparation time into the Grade Level Planning times.

2. Hold off adding more units next year so teachers can have more time to physically and mentally prepare themselves for this unit.

We need to buy the kits when we have the money for them.

Could we have the 2nd kits and hold off on a requirement to implement them?

Pilot teachers found that spreading the units out over a longer period of time,

3. PD should be followed up by Teachers on Special Assignment like they did for the Math Curriculum.

a. One day of PD to prep is not sufficient

b. Only 2.5 TSAs to represent the Science department for Elementary school. They initially went out to sites to go to sites and do an afternoon PD but as piloting and implementation rolled out, they have not had enough staff to do this.

c. This year they worked with Science Teacher leaders who had 3.5 release days and would bring it back to their sites. Had almost 2 reps to almost all 72 schools but not all were attending their PDs.

d. If your site leader does not know an answer about the curriculum, the Science department has a person who specializes in each grade so you can contact them with questions. Science department has a site sfusdscience.org where you can contact them. Look at the “Educators” tab and scroll down to “Elementary” to see the TSAPS and their contact information.

e. Clearly need more staff at the Science Department.

f. Need to create a list of how the different curricula overlap so that we don’t have to do ELA separate from the science if it’s covered through science. Need also to develop lists of titles to provide at sites that the students can read at different reading levels.

4. Concerns about large amount of sitting required. Not developmentally appropriate, especially in K.

a. They agree about the lack of DAP in kinder curriculum. The intention was to have information for teachers to pull from for their lessons. Not that teachers have to present all that information at once.

b. Amplify is coming out with slide decks for next year that have the key points addressed so the teachers can use that for a slimmed down lesson. This will start to come out in July for all grade levels.

5. For future, curriculum needs to consider the needs of Kindergarten students to move and less pencil and paper.

Questions/Concerns about ELD Implementation and New ELD Curriculum – From March Meeting. Darcie will try to have a rep from Mulitlingual come to the May 29 meeting.

1. Is Wonders the newly adopted district ELD curriculum?

2. One site was given a presentation with resources about Wonders but no training about how to implement it.

3. We need clarification about grouping students. We’ve heard things like:

a. 1s and 2s can be grouped together, b. If you only have 3s and 4s in a class, they can be taught with the English Proficient students via a whole class lesson.

. What we do when a site has an uneven number of students in the different levels. For example, when there are only 12 students at level 1 and 2, 20 students at levels 3-4, and 60 students who are Fluent/English Proficient. This configuration calls for 1 teacher to have a class of 12 1-2 levels, another teacher to have 20 students at levels 3-4, and the remaining 2 teachers to have 30 students which is over the class size limit for K-3.

5. How we can implement the curriculum?

6. What do we do with our English Proficient students?

7. Are these changes in implementation requirements District or State mandated?

8. What plans does the district have to train teachers about the ELD curriculum and what the requirements are for implementation? Showing us how to get to the website is not sufficient.

Has every site received Wonders? Are we expected to implement it this year?

**Other:**

Feinstein UBC. All these people need to have notes emailed out to them: Aaron Neimark, Naomi Berman, Michelle See, Tricia Moriarty, Steve Firestone, James Zucchi, Rene Mitsui.

Contacts for SFUSD:

David Wong [wongd4@sfusd.edu](mailto:wongd4@sfusd.edu) Cohort 2  
Richard Curci [curcir@sfusd.edu](mailto:curcir@sfusd.edu) Cohort 5

E’leva Hughes Gibson [hughese@sfusd.edu](mailto:hughese@sfusd.edu) Cohort 5

Regina Piper [piperr@sfusd.edu](mailto:piperr@sfusd.edu) Cohort 1 schools (panhandle Richmond)

Anakarita Allen, [allena1@sfusd.edu](mailto:allena1@sfusd.edu) Cohort 4

Ana deArce Cohort 1 dearcea1sfusd.edu

415-241-6310 Receptionist for Assistant Superintendents’ office

Enikia Ford-Morthel Cohort 3 [fordmorthele@sfusd.edu](mailto:fordmorthele@sfusd.edu)

Tony Payne Cohort 6 [paynec1@sfusd.edu](mailto:paynec1@sfusd.edu)

Lizzie Hull Barnes, Math Department

RPA office – 415-241-6400

Buildings and Grounds – Kevin Connolly at [connolyk@sfusd.edu](mailto:connolyk@sfusd.edu) 641-3540

**LEAD** – Leadership, Equity, Achievement, Development – Supervising 6 cohorts K-8 and 1 for High School.

Ritu Khanna [khannar@sfusd.edu](mailto:khannar@sfusd.edu)

David Wong provided the link to access all report card information: <https://sites.google.com/sfusd.edu/aao/elementary-tk-5/report-cards>

1. High School Committee Report Kevin Hartzog, Kathy Melvin, et al

**Present:** Davina Goldwasser (Lead Middle School), Jean Robertson (Lead Special Education), Kevin Hartzog (Balboa H.S.), Kathy Melvin (Lowell H.S.), Britney O’Connor (UESF Special Education Division Co-Chair), William Patterson (UESF Special Education Co-Chair), Julian Quinonez (UESF High School Representative), Alysse Castro (Alternative High Schools), Matt Lavoie (Special Education), Elaine Merriweather (UESF), Margaret Farruggio (Special Education)

Notes:

What are we seeing at sites?

I gave my student’s perspective of a positive situation where one co-teacher did not know how to answer anything and directed him to the other teacher, while in another situation he had a positive experience where both teachers worked collaboratively.

Jean brought up her experience in the 1990s in co-teaching, winging after reading a few articles. She feels that we should have evolved.

From AC, Civic Center and Woodside has 100% co-teacher (grant funded). Has structures, norms, and training.

Notes to the Agenda written in italic blue, while original agenda items written in black.

**Notes: Model for co-teaching**

1. Foster an inclusive mentality where kids don’t know one teacher is a special education teacher, (as per SFUSD-UESF contract section
   1. 18.7.1 (Professional Development) and
   2. 29.8 (Inclusive Practices: General Education teachers should treat sped teachers as their co-teacher and not a Para-Educator: both should be planning lessons?
      1. How can leadership support co-teaching environments. Woodside and Civic Center have co-teaching models in place. We can share their guidelines with other sites as a district model.
2. Can both special education teacher and general education teacher be teachers of record for students in their co-taught classes?
   1. If not, can special education teachers be the teachers of record for the students they are serving in those classes?
      1. Admin signs off on these IEPs and can arbitrate.
         1. LEAD agrees there should be guidelines in place for this. Chief of Special Education will look at what other districts do, and will provide rubrics, models, structures via a working group or committee to address this.
   2. Direct administrators and Special Education teachers to write in comments of IEP’s services grid notes box “final grade will be determined in consultation with special education teacher. In case of conflict, the administration will mediate between the parties.”
      1. Can both co-teachers be the “Teacher of Record”?
         1. The term “Teacher of Record” is specific to SFUSD.
         2. But who can legally give the grade? Can both co-teachers legally give the grade?
      2. Math example:
         1. SOTA Special Education teacher provided student(s) an index card with multi-steps for solving a problem as an accommodation
         2. The index card helped, since there was not enough class time given for review to memorize the steps.
         3. Some math teachers at SOTA felt this was excessive, and was cheating. They viewed using the index card as evidence of cheating.
            1. Also, some math teachers at site felt there are no math disabilities.
         4. Similar thing happened at Washington in Social Studies.
      3. Having two “Teachers of Record” is a Synergy issue, but Ms Castro believes that we can code Synergy to recognize two “Teachers of Record”.
         1. Sites across the district may not be aware how to code this in Synergy.
         2. Can this be an option.
         3. We have not heard clarification as to who is legally responsible for attendance, or who is legally responsible for grades?
      4. Ms Goldwasser said that the above sounds like a structural issue at the Sites. From the Site Leader’s view, the challenge that there is not a consistent plan year to year. Maybe students have a co-taught math class in Middle School, but High School does not have co-teaching in place.
         1. Important considerations for paring co-teachers:
            1. Who is willing to work together,
            2. Who are the best matches.
            3. Don’t put brand new teachers put into a co-teaching situation
         2. Not clear cut. Different models, and different levels of PDs over the year.
         3. Impacted by who is at the sites.
         4. Retention/hiring issues:
            1. One year a site may have a Special Education Teacher who is great at math. But when that person leaves, the site doesn’t have someone else who has the capability of teaching math.

This is especially true for teaching Algebra II

* + - 1. Which classes are best for this co-teaching model.
         1. Due to lack of capacity, some sites are scheduling co-teaching in only Math and English.
  1. Can we table the Synergy until the next meeting?
  2. What are the guidelines if there is a disagreement with grades?
     1. Nothing is in place.
  3. For RSP students, Special Education teachers do not have a say in grades.
     1. But this may not be happening.

1. One suggestion is to form a committee of Special Educators and General Educators to collaborate to clear up these best practices guidelines.
   1. Ms Robertson will go back to Stetson articles, and see what the best practices are.
   2. Mr. Hartzog stated that for four Special Education workshops this year, he was only General Education teacher at the training; Mr. Patterson also stated that he was only Special Education teacher at the NGSS Physics training.
   3. Appreciation for teachers who tapped into how accommodations were done in Math and English classes. Set accommodations and supports to assist GEnEd teacher.
   4. Perhaps district could provide a co-teaching district led PD on the Thursday prior to start of school?
      1. Would the district’s High School and Special Education divisions support this?
         1. Mr. Patterson would want to investigate how this might look first.
   5. Principals shall begin master plan scheduling with IEP co-teaching and planning periods for sped teachers and general education teachers.
      1. Leads realize that first year teachers aren’t the best matches for co-teaching partners. Site leaders are looking at the best way. Some years there are people who do well but then teachers leave. Should we survey our members? LEADs agree that principals do get trained in this area but this can be a very hard issue to solve.
   6. Principals should work with the UBC for recruiting
      1. look for new/consolidated teachers who fit in a co-teaching community.
   7. Is there a way to express to the Leads that sites must take into consideration programing Special Education first?
      1. Does Leadership or Lead have the conversation to prioritize, and content of IEP should drive Master Schedule?
         1. Schools are organized differently.
            1. But does that mean that for co-teaching, this should be a higher priority?
         2. Is this a goal of site administration?
      2. If you start with the IEP content, many other things fall into place.
   8. Can we agree that providing a common planning time for co-teaching should be a priority?
      1. In the spirit that these are the guidelines, there are many subsets driving the Master Schedule. We can’t guarantee that co-teachers would have a common prep, because the Master Schedule is a puzzle piece.
   9. We need to build a community where people want to stay at the site.
      1. Turn over is a major inhibitor to building co-teaching relationships.
   10. The timeline for the Master Schedule and the Special Allocations are not aligned.
       1. Site Master Schedules have gotten derailed, when the Special Education allocations could not be confirmed. The allocation timeline is critical to scheduling common preps and other aspects of co-teaching.
          1. While at SOTA, SpEd’s allocation delays often lasted so long that the master schedule had to go ahead with no firm SpEd allocation commitments. This was a big problem for administrators who tried to plan for co-teaching but based on historical data, were afraid to commit.
   11. Mr. Patterson says Middle Schools can have most transition IEPs to High School in place as early as October, giving High Schools more planning time.
   12. Can we give priority registration of kids with IEP? We run the same type of formula, but either do all placements earlier, or run SpEd kids earlier.
       1. This is a hard question to answer when it is brought up, because the argument can be made for many demographics to be given priority for scheduling.
2. Leaders (administrators) should help foster relationships for co-teachers?
   1. Must be a good match to be effective:
      1. We need interactive PD’s throughout the year where people can explore their strengths and weaknesses and find “compatible alignments” so they can co-teach/co-exist and build a personal relationship with their counterparts.
      2. Social justice oriented pathway/curriculum/ice breaker activities in professional development would help build these teams.
   2. What kind of PDs are being done at sites or district around co-teaching?
      1. Ms. Castro states county funding at Civic Center who was doing a major redesign. Hill Top tagged along, but went in different direction.
   3. Is there a standard, District co-teaching PD?
      1. Common planning
      2. Accomodations
      3. D does not have landscape across HS. What are check-mark skill set that Administrators can use. Had not checked in, but this puts it on her to-do list. How do schools feel about PD they need?
         1. B states that sites are dying to PDs.
         2. WP states he knows someone who wants to construct a PD for co-teaching.
   4. Mr. Patterson stated he did not have time to meet before the end of the school year, but he can outreach to C&I and those who develop the content based PDs.
3. Have an optional PD for co-teachers at the beginning of the school year?
   1. Provide a centralized co-teaching training on Thursday during report back week.
   2. Half-day, full-day?
   3. We would be amazed at the number of best practices if pull all co-teachers.
   4. Would Principals give sub days for additional training?
   5. UESF wants SFUSD Leadership to make a commitment that supporting co-teaching is valuable.
   6. Jennifer Steiner is creating a master plan to address PD’s coming back. UESF can reach out to her to identify how this could be implemented.
4. **Next steps**
   1. Continue this next meeting
   2. Bring Synergy to explore two teachers as equal teacher
      1. May be able to provide guidance, documentation could benefit the discussion
   3. Guidelines of best practices
   4. Good person to involve if we can hold a PD.
      1. Up to SpEd department if they can provide, and what it might look like, since site leaders are not planning it. D does not see it as a barrier.
      2. We need this type of PD to come from voice of Gen Ed. If it is always coming from SpEd, it may not bear fruit.
5. Best Practices Worksheet shared with all
6. Ms. Robertson has a meeting in D.C, so she cannot attend on May 9th. But Mr. Lavioie can attend for Special Education Lead. Ms. Robertson loves that we provided this proposal, and she will look at inclusive school’s website, revisit, to help inform next steps.
   1. If we have a PD, less is better than more, and want it useful and impactful.
   2. Ms. Castro has a good model to share from alternative HS and Civic.
   3. EM CTC website has resources on co-teaching too.
7. Requested to create a [shared folder](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/11ZIPqHi8fiTdU-bwRbLKX56a8g9pyk3p?usp=sharing) where common documents can be placed.
   1. Viewable Link: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/11ZIPqHi8fiTdU-bwRbLKX56a8g9pyk3p?usp=sharing

**Goals:**

**Short term goals:**

1. Solving teacher of record issue
2. Thursday centralized PD for co-teaching partners

**Long term goals:**

1. On going PD’s to support special education and general education co-teachers
2. How are people grading?
3. Creating better system for transitioning middle school IEP’s to HS settings with co-teaching?
4. Middle School Committee Report Lisa-Beth Watkins

Middle School/K-8 division meeting April 24, 2019

Rosa Parks Elementary 4:30- 5:45

Agenda

1. Intro and additions to agenda

Present at today’s meeting were Lisa-Beth Watkins, Jake Stookey, and Julia Fung.

1. MSR questions
2. From Hoover. What about the “Unconference Schedules”?,And is the redesign monies in jeopardy?

WE discussed that conferences held between Middle schools that are both Pilots and schools that are curious about the impact of pilot models would be beneficial for all but we are unclear about the process by which these conferences are set up.

Also, the impact of Single Subject credential requirement and the “disparate Impact” it may place on longer term employees. . Hoover suggests that the district impose the requirements on new hires and allowed current staff to be grandfathered in or given exception to new requirements.

We as a middle school team expect the district to show respect to current staff and to uphold our contractual rights.

There is to be an open house at Hoover with Han Phung, at 5pm this Friday to discuss Middle School Redesign. Who will be there from the Union? Do we know what they are presenting?

1. Denman wants us to bring up the request that they have made of their admin to not involuntary transfer any teacher of a multiple subject credential to make space for a teacher with a single subject credential.
2. AP Giannini has a question regarding whether or not an administrator can block a para who has been given another job at another school site during the school year from leaving the current site.

This issue was brought to the paraeducator meeting for clarification and the issue will be addressed by our para educator leadership.

1. Vis Valley has a question about the UESF MSR presentation regarding the pilot schools. In the presentation that is being shared regarding MSR, Hoover and Roosevelt are listed as Pilot schools. It is the understanding of this committee that Francisco and Roosevelt are the two pilot schools that are receiving extra monies and support. We also want to reiterate that those schools that are pilot schools are not setting precedence that other middle schools must follow. They are pilots and trying things that may or may not make gains in our schools
2. Day of Action May 22
3. Other questions or concerns.
4. Lawton brought up a concern regarding pressure from their administration to push forward with a “comprehensive Approach to Literacy” without district backing of funds or materials. Our question is where do the district want schools to go regarding Language Arts and Social Studies and are there funds and materials to back it up. We would like something in writing that each school can use as a resource. The “workshop model” needs actual support.
5. Presidio brought up the question of balanced classes in our middle schools. Our contract in section 9.4.1 and 9.5.2-9.5.18 speaks to numbers of students in various classes. Unified Arts classes in this school are being disproportionally populated with students and SPED students are being excluded from some classes.
6. Do all schools have a discipline policy and what is happening with restorative practices. How is the district supporting these issues
7. A new concern has arisen regarding the number of non- district employees that are working in some of our sites. Some para-eduators, a speech therapist and a SPED teacher for examples at Presidio are not district employees. Are they covered by our contract? Can an administrator at a given site fire them? Our members are being asked for help. Are union jobs being given away in our district? Do we have a record of how many positions are being filled with this type of employee?
8. Positions are now being posted in Oasis for jobs next year. We expect there to be transparency at various school sites and expect all positions to be posted in a timely fashion. We also want our school sites to be allowed to create and serve on hiring committees as stated in our contract
9. Next meeting with the District Administration is May 8th at 555 Franklin St. 4;30 pm.
10. Spec. Education Committee Report Brittny O’Connor

UESF Special Education Committee

Meeting at Ida B. Wells

4/15/19 @ 4:30 - 6:00 pm

Attendance:

Brittny O’Conner-Roland, William Patterson, Julian Quinonez, Steve O’Reilly (Jefferson), Megan Caluza (SHP 504), Logan Crawford (Sanchez), Claire Davenport (JJSE), Emily Patterson (RL Stevenson), Smita Teotia (Cleveland), Raquel Huerta (Gateway MS), Jodi Beeman (West Portal), Elizabeth Ross (RL Stevenson)

Prepared Notes

1. Roles/Norms
2. Leading site concerns
   1. Sherman Elementary recap
   2. C. Chavez - DHH Interpreter issues
   3. Other:
      1. Sanchez Elementary: Why is the Mod/Severe SDC being moved?
      2. Stevenson Elementary:
         1. Similar concerns about eligibility and types of students being referred - mod/severe type students referred for mild/mod and gen ed placements.
      3. Cleveland Gen Ed Teacher requesting a site concern followup
         1. Elementary sites are seeing more students moved into gen ed classes. Students from bilingual strands are being moved into the English only strand, and there is an effort to cut services during IEPs. SPED teacher is not tenured.
3. Spring Workshop follow-up (15)
   1. Oakland Teachers talked about “Structure Tests” leading into negotiations. UESF has been in discussion since 2017/2018 about the possibility of creating a Case Coordinator. Structure tests with better results would give us power at the bargaining table. Many members are not aware about the Case Coordinator position, or believe it is a pipe dream. This is a large factor in why we don’t have the Case Coordinator position. What structure tests can we do *now*? How can our committee replicate a structure test based on communications from SPED committee to SPED unit members: verifying case loads with SEIS data, UESF data and member input based on a survey, etc.
   2. Allocation verification email:
      * 1. Do we have personpower/resources for being proactive here?
      1. Follow-up survey? (Steve’s survey)
         1. Agreed to send electronic version to all known Case Managers
            1. Steve reported on paper survey version findings. Survey about case coordinator: 22 respondents: 82% want case coordinator 18% wanted more information: unit members felt discussions around responsibilities of case coordinator was helpful: Gateway has an admin doing something similar to a case coordinator. Next meeting is April 22 with uesf/labor relations.
            2. June Jordan 30% students with IEPs. Teacher points out that paperwork is not her best skill, whereas she is good with students. Given the option of serving student or doing paperwork, always serve students first. Concerns about level of training people would be getting. Could paras be promoted to a position like this?
            3. Case Coordinator position in another district: (Special Education Compliance Specialist at Shoreline outside of Seattle)
      2. Has UESF created the “work order” google form for email blasts, proposed two months ago by Julian.
         1. If there were a BOE vote or presentation about the Case Coordinator position (or any SPED concern), how would we mobilize? Are we ready?
      3. We have some willing speakers for events - should start prepping talking points for when it’s needed.
         1. Gen Ed Teacher from conference
         2. A Balboa High teacher who had a Case Coordinator at previous school on the peninsula.
4. [Research Questions to Support Case Coordinator Support Position](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Nt4dGhnwvV4f8V243l8NXjqKx3s064mzwmIxwSDfofQ/edit?usp=sharing):
   1. The linked document has questions for SPED, HR, LEAD, and District old-timers.
      1. Should plan how to present questions for answers: How do we stop wasting money? Case coordinator position will help with recruiting special education teachers
      2. Case coordinator will save district: reduced dropout rates, better IEP compliance, better test scores due to teachers being in classroom, etc.
      3. Case coordinator committee would like to request information (information request) Can UESF staff work on some of these questions with year-round SFUSD staff during the summer?
5. Letter in Support of Jean (2)
   1. From previous minutes:
      1. Publish in our Committee Minutes.
         1. Will be sent to Superintendent and BOE - per Julian
      2. Send out in email blast from Nguyen
         1. To members, and select administrators / BOE
            1. Julian says UESF will not forward the letter as previously discussed, but, once it’s published anyone can forward it?
6. Bargaining Rule Changes - proposal
   1. Support for a rule that prior to using any contractor for a position that is on file within UESF, SFUSD must list the position through EDJoin or similar HR platforms, and, hold interviews of qualified candidates in a timely manner; and, once a qualified candidate is found, the contract position will be terminated and replaced within 90 days.
      1. If the rule exists it needs to be enforced. This is grievable (do this for DHH Interpreter and the Registered Behavior Technician positions).
   2. After 30 calendar days, if an administrator has not attempted to fill a vacant paraeducator position (by holding a minimum of three interviews), The Special Education Cohort Supervisor will be required to fill the vacancy with a qualified candidate from the HR pool.
      1. Needs Board Approval. Have already met with HR, Labor Relations and High School Division. Still need to meet with SPED and Middle School position. There are 13 schools with this specific issue active.
7. Executive Committee Resolution - proposal from Brittny and Will
   1. UESF fully supports the development of NPS programs within SFUSD, owned, operated and staffed by SFUSD (and, with community and family engagement in the operations of the schools). (McAuley as an example but without the hospital)
8. SPED Committee request for a UESF Executive Committee evaluation for the possibility of a full-time SPED staff rep:
   1. Position can be funded by tracking new UESF membership from SPED
      1. Less contractors, more bargaining member staff - 25 @ $600-1,200 each
         1. SFUSD contracts for interpreters, paraeducators, transportation staff, etc. and *does not list* these positions, denying the union revenue, and weakening our bargaining power.
      2. NPS schools with SFUSD staff 25 @ $600-1,200 each
         * 1. SFUSD spending $12 million on transportation alone for NPS schools.
           2. SFUSD spending $18 million on NPA/NPS services (13% of SPED budget)
           3. Juvenile Justice System spending \_\_\_ on incarceration.
      3. Case Coordinator Support Position staff as bargaining unit members 100 @ $600-1,200 each
   2. Total in new revenues is 100 @ $600 and 50 @ $1,200 = $120,000.
9. Medi-Cal billing update:
   1. Requesting Marcy James to present about Medi-Cal billables at next meeting with Jean. Requested a full list of billable services, and conditions for billing. (5)
   2. SLP UBC willing to survey members to see if billable time is being lost during IEP prep time.
      1. [The survey is here](https://forms.gle/YuhAUKn8BvYFoHhF8)
10. Trial site concern roll-out:
    1. Three Schools Selected:
       1. John O’Connell, Paul Revere k-8, Buena Vista Horace Mann k-8
          1. Julian requests holding off until next school year.
          2. Using Site concern form with UESF staff reps
11. Inclusive School Week planning update:
    1. Tom and Brittny to “thought partner” on this.
       1. Brittny keeping a brainstorm doc. Goal is to reach out to CAC.
       2. Have a theme/color, 3-5 goals, materials/activities for everyone to try
       3. Have serious plan in place at least 2 months prior to the inclusive schools week
       4. Ask Jean who on CAC is in charge of inclusive schools week collaboration/planning: SPED committee would like to support and help spread the message to school sites
12. Previous contract Bargaining Win - Meeting requirements infographic
    1. Can Nguyen prepare an informational graphic highlighting the language around meeting times: 8 hours total, 4 are Admin choice, next 4 are priority for SPED first, then Principal discretion, any SPED meetings over 8 hours are still required by federal law.
       1. Julian asked for a reminder to request this.

UESF SpEd Committee & SFUSD SpEd Dept.

Agenda: 4/25/19

1. Introductions: Introductions: Will Patterson, (co-chair- SPED, Elaine Merriwether, (Vice President of UESF), Julian Quinonez (UESF SPED Committee Rep), Jean Robertson (Chief of SPED), Jenny Jimenez-Payne (SPED Director), Brian Borsos (Content Specialist, UESF member), Margaret Farruggio (SpEd Director), Brittny Roeland (UESF Co-Chair)
2. Chavez DHH Site Concern - Jean is addressing this and trying to work with DHH teachers so that the kids are not harmed by working with poor interpreters.
   1. Job listing for district hired interpreter
      1. S20-D couldn’t be hired so an NPA was hired to support a specific child at Presidio. May be an option for Chavez?
   2. Change of agency for needs beyond a 1.0 position
      1. Other concerns have been raised to Jean, and Jean and Anacorina are looking into it.
3. George Washington H.S./Wallenberg High School Allocations for Mod/Severe inclusion
   1. Change allocation category for student from 22 to 10.
      1. SpEd would not guarantee the change in caseload, but did say they are not disturbing the mod/severe inclusive schools program at Washington.
   2. Add a SEIS pathway that allows a 50%+ general education Mod/Severe (EPC).
      1. Jean was interested, but, it was not something she could address right now. She expressed wanting a time to retreat with her staff over the summer to work on some of these issues.
      2. Jean did understand that the current pathways were not enough to properly move students through EPC.
      3. Expressed some frustration with process of trying to work through EPC.
      4. Technical problem had to do with synching Synergy and SEIS - ok to change SEIS and add pathways, but, only if Synergy has the same change so data can transfer.
4. Data Reports for SPED Caseloads/Class sizes
   1. Any way to work out the kinks so all schools show up?
   2. Can two versions of reports be blended (RSP type and SDC type)?
      1. This was successfully accomplished. Beautiful report by DJ!
      2. Will to follow up to verify Caseload report.
5. Coding Paraeducator Minutes -
   1. Jean announced a delay/change course because other districts are putting para-educator support/time into supp aides and services. Jean is thinking SFUSD should be doing the same as other districts for consistency. Jean reports they have done a better job at considering the needs of sites when determining para allocations. She believes that this ideally will not be a concern because para allocations will be done with careful consideration. But, it’s still something she is concerned about because of CAC brining it as a parent concern. Jean wants to discuss further with her team and have a better plan to roll out.
   2. Jean said she is open to having a meeting with UESF in July 2019 to discuss the beginning of the year roll out.
   3. Jean highlighted improvements to TED (Transportation Eligibility Determination)
   4. Jean is adding videos in SEIS to provide updates.
6. Medi-Cal billing/funding update: -
   * 1. Jean suggests UESF set up an additional meeting to discuss this.
   1. Complete list of billable services
      1. Jean said SLP’s are pushing back on submitting field notes. SLP’s are doing better about submitting minutes. Jean said the bus drivers are submitting bussing services every Friday. District can also submit these minutes 2 years retroactive.
         * 1. Brittny and/or Will to follow up with SLPs to see what concerns they have and make sure the concerns are supported/addressed.
   2. % of IEPs without consent box checked
   3. Estimated total revenue to district from Medi-Cal billing yearly (past 5 years)
   4. Is this the correct statement: “Most students with IEPs become eligible for Medi-Cal regardless of income. The disability itself is a determining eligibility. Checking this box will not result in Medi-Cal pulling any family or individual medical or income files. The checked box simply allows the district to seek reimbursement for any billable services based on the eligibility and type of services provided.”
      1. If the above is not true, what personal information may be pulled? How would the district communicate individual information with Medi-Cal?
         1. Item not addressed, Will to request follow-up by email.
7. Inclusive Schools Week - who will UESF and CAC work with while waiting for new Ombudsman? Jean said there are a lot of applicants. Jean is off for two weeks in May. They should have someone identified within a couple of months. Whole table shared frustration that last year’s program saw such a dip, and expressed interest in contributing to improvement next year.
8. SDC Classroom closures:
   1. Numbers of SDC classrooms for Mild/Mod and Mod/Severe across district with change from last year: growing concern among elementary case managers that “inclusive practices” are going faster than supports for general education teachers and SPED staff divided between classrooms.
      1. Over last 3 years IEP teams have been making less recommendations for mod/severe. More mod students are ending up in mild/mod SDC’s. How do we utilize mod/severe credentialed teachers who may have been consolidated? Ideally people being consolidated will be helped by UESF. Chief, directors and supervisors all recognize mod/severe teachers are important and we do not want to loose them.
9. Rule change: After 30 calendar days, if an administrator has not attempted to fill a vacant paraeducator position (by holding a minimum of three interviews), The Special Education Cohort Supervisor will be required to fill the vacancy with a qualified candidate from the HR pool.
   1. Jean said this should instead be addressed by the LEADs.
   2. Jean and her team felt strongly they could not do this because more schools would stop bothering with hiring paraeducators and it would become a job for her and her team; which they think is inappropriate. When asked if it should go to HR instead, she replied simply that it could not be SPED’s responsibility.
10. Is the August PD being planned by logical subdivisions w/ relevant PD?
    1. Can we include a site with an optional PD for both SPED and Gen Ed teachers to focus on co-teaching?

As the meeting rose, Brian Borsos reported that he believed the co-teaching PD-Site was totally doable and there would be interested Content Specialists to contribute from SpEd.

1. Vice-President for Paraeducators Report Carolyn Samoa

74 Para’s will be been consolidated this year. Principals should have gone around and ask para’s for voluntary consolidations. District should have been notified today/May 1 of those Para’s that will be consolidated. Para’s are given vacancy list of school that have openings and they are allowed to go visit schools. May 29th will be the last Para division meeting.

1. Chairperson for Retired Division Report Rudi Faltus

Heron’s head park & Presidio fieldtrip. Attended lobby day April 10th, gearing up for May 22 lobby event. Sent out more retirement forms. Very few people retiring 35 teachers, 10 para’s. Next meeting May 23rd. CTA, NEA both have life long memberships that retired members can buy into.

1. Calendar Committee Report Lisa-Beth Watkins

|  |
| --- |
| **UESF Calendar Advisory Committee Meeting**  **Location**: Thurgood Marshall Academic High School (45 Conkling St.)  **Time**: 4:30 - 6:30pm  **Attendees**: Lisa Beth Watkins (Visitacion Valley MS), Kenyatta Scott (Lincoln HS), Elena Allen (Marshall HS), Emily Forbes (Marshall HS), Alexis Beglinger (Marshall HS), Anne Ryan (Marshall HS), Reynaldo Dulaney (Marshall HS) |
| **Other stakeholders:** Parks and Rec, UESF (Susan, Elaine, Carolyn) SFUSD, Coleman Advocates, PTA, Carmelo Scarlato?, other parent groups  **Goal of this Advisory Committee:** Give input for 2020-21 |
| Issues with Current Proposal:   * Imbalanced semesters: inequity. Affects semester courses, testing in the spring   + Used to end semester 1 after winter break, that was changed   + Spring break used to move with Easter, that was changed   + Cesar Chavez used to be an extra day off * Imbalanced semester can actually be okay because of all the testing that happens in the Spring - the extra time has been helpful for scheduling testing (High School IRF) * 2 day week to end the school year (impossible to create a functional finals schedule)(finals Monday, graduation Tuesday)   + 8th graders get two more days off school because middle schools’ graduation is the Friday before * Week off for thanksgiving is a hardship for paras * Work day for teachers after winter break (no kids) or staff work day a the end of the semester * Students want half days for the first day or 2 of school to acclimate back into school * Kids don’t show up for first couple days of school if they don’t want to go to the school they’re assigned to; they’ll show up to the school they want * 10 day count can affect the fall semester even more (class sizes changing constantly in the first x number of days of fall semester) * Impact on family travel - costs are higher the later in June you need to leave (FS Key Elementary teacher reported) * SBAC Testing: 7 days of lost instruction (reported by Lincoln HS teacher) |
| Ideas for fixes proposal:   * Ts report without students the last day to get grades in and clean/set up for following year * In August: Tuesday-Wednesday: teachers, Thursday-Friday: half days with students (teacher work time in the morning, second half with kids?)(or switch that?)(idea came from students) * SurveyMonkey for union to send out for people to weigh in   + 1: kids start on Monday or 2: modified start time   + Do we want the first day after winter break to be a work day without kids and last day of school without kids (these are the 2 spring semester PD days) * Wednesday becomes teacher work day - might need contract language around this to ensure it doesn’t vary from site to site   Proposal ideas:   * Students start on a Monday - teachers report the week before |
| Materials:   * [Emailed symmetrical schedule proposal - Kevin Doherty](https://drive.google.com/open?id=1sPCw9D-drJXqy4-mtPHmMcrqOKW9VRBf) * [2019-20 Jefferson Union High School District Calendar](https://www.juhsd.net/Page/2#calendar1/20190430/month) * [2019-20 Pacifica School District Calendar](https://www.pacificasd.org/files/user/1/file/School%20Year%20Calendar%202019-2020(1).pdf) * [SFUSD 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21 calendars](http://www.sfusd.edu/en/news/calendars/academic-calendar.html) * [Notes from 2007-2010 Calendar suggestions from Kenyatta Scott](https://drive.google.com/open?id=17G1vJk-zjCTeN3GbIZVS5C09IZiAD8pl) |
| **Questions for survey:**  Would you want to move teacher PD days (the 4 currently at the beginning of the year) to the second semester?   * First day of 2nd semester * Last day of 2nd semester * Both * Neither (keep them both in the first semester before school starts)   Start day for students:   * Wednesday (half day), Thursday, Friday * Thursday, Friday (both half days) * Thursday (half day), Friday (full day) * Monday - full week   3 proposals for start and end date (using 2020-21 as example):   * [Proposal #1](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1A53krzyrNy1MSjBZpFatqXuIfmD_0zvf/view?usp=sharing): start first week of August, end May 21, 2021 (2 week winter break)   + First semester: 89 instructional days   + Second semester: 91 instructional days   + First day of school: August 6th, last day of school: August 21st   + Teacher PD/work days: 8/3, 8/4, 8/5, and 1/4 * [Proposal #2](https://drive.google.com/file/d/11jXnbiya5_1i7mA60PNxNN0S3VCKCUW5/view?usp=sharing): start 2nd week of August, end May 28th (2 week winter break)   + First semester: 84 instructional days   + Second semester: 96 instructional days   + First day of school: August 13th, last day of school: August 28st   + Teacher PD/work days: 8/10, 8/11, 8/12, and 1/4 * [Proposal #3](https://drive.google.com/open?id=1K5lIQgwSAacm5Zl-b6YTSweYb8YxGnIB): start 1st week of August, end May 28th (3 week winter break, 9 week summer)   + First semester: 89 instructional days   + Second semester: 91 instructional days   + First day of school: August 6th, last day of school: August 28th   + Teacher PD/work days: 8/3, 8/4, 8/5, and 1/11 |

Officers’ Reports

1. President’s Report Susan Solomon

* Idea to have para’s for deaf and hard of hearing.
* Dependent coverage extra support should have been put in Jan 2019 $50 if you have one dependent and $125 if you have more than one dependant about 900 members affected by this. District saying that they are not going to have significant money when we come to the bargaining table.
* Idea for the Executive board to get together in June to get input for bargaining.
* May day of solidarity today, Susan was asked to speak.

M/S/C President’s Recommendations for Expenditures Susan Solomon

COPE Report Anabel Ibañez

* M/S/C COPE budget review
* Almost all of the candidates that we supported won their elections
* Review of bill fact sheet - AB 1505, 1506, 1507
* May 22 members will lobby in Sacramento
* Legislative breakfast this past weekend
* Affordable housing issues: Housing bond 5 million for affordable housing including teacher housing concerns around these developments being made by union workers. Rezoning of affordable housing, measure K, Mayor made comments to the press that teachers are happy about this. Mayor made statements about creating housing 100% for teachers when in reality when looking at the language the reality is that only 44% of the housing would be designated for teachers.
* DNC depends on donations for sustainability and they requested $10,000 dollars to keep the doors open, money to come out of the COPE funds, to pay for the rent, suggestion to gather more information and report back in June.

M/S/C Unanimous Resolution

1. Resolution on Special Education Plan (Hand-out) Brittny O’Connor

Whereas, SFUSD is the seventh largest school district in California educating over 55,000 students; and,

Whereas, SFUSD students, families, educators and staff rely on all modes of financial resources to educate our most vulnerable populations; and,

Whereas, UESF is committed to the SFUSD “Stable, Safe and Supportive Schools Policy” designed to serve all SFUSD students as approved by the Board of Education; and,

Whereas, countless studies have proven that students are best served at school sites near to their homes and within their communities; and,

Whereas, SFUSD currently spends more than $17,000,000 per year on non-public schools (including transportation costs) to support the needs of students needing intensive services; and,

Whereas, St. Mary’s McAuley Counseling Enriched Education Program (CEEP) is a successful school setting providing those intensive services to our students with the highest degree of need within SFUSD; and,

Therefore, be it resolved that UESF be an active partner in the exploration and implementation of innovative school models staffed by UESF members for our highest need students.

*Submitted to the May 1 Meeting of the UESF Executive Board by Brittny O’Connor, William Patterson, Susan Kitchell, Elaine Merriwheather, Carolyn Samoa, Susan Soloman, Diane Thompson, Darcie Blackburn*

Sergeant at Arms Report A.J. Frazier

31 present

4 excused

6 unexcused

New Business/Good of the Order

Substitute & Middle School meeting May 29th

Close the Gap - Friday May 17th townhall - how to become a community school

High School meeting May 6th Lowell High School

Asian Art Museum friday night/tomorrow free

End of the year event May 21st @ John O’Connell 4-6:30

Adjournment in remembrance of Holocaust