

8/23/24

Faculty Association Members,

Many of you have inquired about evaluations this year. We are disappointed to share that our Administration has chosen to go against years of precedent and ignore what was discussed during negotiations. During our latest contract negotiations, we agreed to language that states, "Each teacher in contractual continued service whose performance is rated as either "excellent" or "proficient" shall be formally evaluated at least once in the course of the three (3) school years after receipt of the rating." This mirrors the language in House Bill 0018.

*ARTICLE SEVENTEEN: Evaluation of Professional Certificated Employees*

*B. Professional Evaluation Each staff member in contractual continued service will be evaluated in compliance with PERA. Each teacher not in contractual continued service is to be evaluated at least once every school year. Each teacher in contractual continued service whose performance is rated as either "excellent" or "proficient" shall be formally evaluated at least once in the course of the three (3) school years after receipt of the rating. Each teacher in contractual continued service whose performance is rated as either "excellent" or "proficient" shall be informally observed at least once in the course of the two (2) school years after receipt of the rating. Any teacher in contractual continued service whose performance is rated at either "needs improvement" or "unsatisfactory" must be evaluated at least once in the school year following the receipt of such rating. Each probationary teacher shall be evaluated at least once during each school year.*

On Wednesday, August 7th, Mr. Bearden, Mr. Wendorff and Mr. Danielson met with district administration and their legal counsel to discuss their evaluation plan for the year. We expressed our different viewpoints on the language. In particular, it was discussed in bargaining that the committee would work out the details on how to roll out this 3 year evaluation plan and how to work the informal year that has been added. They stated they believed it to be their management right to evaluate employees at a frequency they see fit. When our old language stated "at least every 2 years", that was followed. This breaks past practice in how the language is applied. It is sad to see a policy that has been endorsed by so many at the state level to be disregarded by our administration.

It is even more frustrating that we left bargaining under the belief that our district would be instituting a 3 year evaluation cycle plan. They stated at the bargaining table that "the committee can work out the details". We left the meeting with the understanding that the

evaluation committee would work on how this system would roll out for the 2024-25 school year and beyond. This didn't happen last year as the Administrative members of the joint evaluation committee refused to discuss the 3 year cycle. Nor did the Superintendent want to entertain discussion about this during District Labor/Management meetings.

In subsequent meetings this summer the Superintendent has remained adamant that they didn't agree to a 3 year cycle as we had believed.

In the meantime, we are seeking additional counsel from IEA and continue to fight for a 3 year cycle evaluation plan.

**At this time, District Administration is acting as if we are still on our 2 year cycle plan. If you have been notified about an evaluation, you are on cycle and are getting evaluated this year.**

Thanks,

Mark Danielson, Ken Wendorff, and Dwayne Bearden  
Chief Negotiator, Exec Director, President