

May 1, 2018

To: Brent Lehman

Cindy Engle

Kelly Roby

Randy Hisner

Jaime Macklin

Becky Durnbaugh

Mike Riehm

Re: Minutes from Monthly Discussion Meeting, 5/1/2018

The Monthly Discussion Meeting convened at 7:00 Tuesday morning, May 1, 2018, in the Board Room at the North Adams Administration Building. In attendance were Brent Lehman and Larry Carty, representing North Adams Administration, and Becky Durnbaugh, Randy Hisner, Cindy Engle and Mike Riehm representing the North Adams Teachers Association.

### Revisited Items

**SB 387** – This law addresses additional areas for supplemental payments in excess of salary specified to teachers. North Adams has already made some provisions in this regard in past negotiations. While the law cites special education, science, technology, engineering and mathematics as applicable areas, we have contractually listed specific courses along with dual credit and foreign language general descriptions. No need is seen to pull anything from the contract at this time.

Is there a need to split out specific areas within science, such as biology or earth science?

What about the phrase “teaches in the area”? Is that meaning clear? This stipulation is necessary along with the appropriate license.

What other areas might fall under these specified areas? Construction? CAD? HOE? Computer programming? Some are covered by the dual credit provision.

What about mandated class offerings? Do we have to offer them? What if no teachers are available? What if no students want to take them?

A master’s degree in Elementary Education does not satisfy the law. Must be in one of the specified areas. Historically, few educators chose to pursue those specific courses in graduate studies.

How can we make the Discussions minutes available for historical reference? Can the Discussions decisions be summarized and provided via a link on the North Adams web page? Maybe the minutes themselves should be posted on the web page.

How does this work? [“this” being the determination and granting of supplemental pay to an instructional staff member’s pay] It is pretty straightforward for new-hires; years of service are considered along with the degree and license. For those already employed, it is not quite so clear-cut. Practice has been “Show me that you have another job that will pay you \$XXXX and I will tell you what we can offer to persuade you to stay”.

Where did the \$4000 limit come from? \$4000 is the figure in the contract, and Brent has observed that constraint. The law does not set a figure. When considering what to offer, the need has to be weighed against the district’s financial capability.

What about teachers in the middle school? They don’t exactly fit either set of criteria. Probably have a breakdown of preK – 5 and 6 – 12. Have to interpret the applicability.

To what degree are supplemental compensations provided at a cost to the body of employees? Effort is made to not think that way when defining compensation “buckets”. However, it does put additional drain on district revenues.

The muddling of negotiable items with discussable issues by DOE complicates this matter further. Communication will continue to be critical as we navigate through these concerns and needs.

**New Items from NATA**

Comment made that some elementary teachers do not feel that they are being heard by Special Education staff. That has been addressed to a high degree with some success at Northwest. Aaron Baker will be looped in and made aware of what has been done.

**New Items from Administration**

We have not typically met in either June or July. Superintendent Lehman will be working on a Certified Employee Handbook this summer, so if some pertinent topic occurs to you, email him and he will take that into consideration. It may be that a draft handbook could be issued for review and comment.

With no items remaining on the agenda, the Monthly Discussion Meeting was adjourned.

Submitted by,

Larry G. Carty

Director of Operations