

# C.B.C.

2007 – 2008

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING COMMITTEE



O.E.C.T.A. HALTON ELEMENTARY TEACHERS

# FLYER

# 6

DATE: **OCT. 21, 2008**

**Labour Management Meeting OF September 29<sup>th</sup>**

*Halton Catholic District School Board*

Elementary Labour Management Meeting

Monday, September 29, 2008

3:00 p.m.

*in the Director's Meeting Room  
of the Catholic Education Centre*

Chair: Michael Pautler

AGENDA

1. Opening Prayer

2. Additions to Agenda

3. Business Arising

4. New Business

- |   |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| a) Annual Professional Development Plan                 | <i>R. Brock</i> |
| b) P.D. for Principals/Vice Principals                  | <i>R. Brock</i> |
| c) System Support for Ministry of Education Initiatives | <i>R. Brock</i> |
| d) Job Embedded Professional Development                | <i>R. Brock</i> |
| e) Who/When Will the Dots Be Connected                  | <i>R. Brock</i> |
| f) Consultants  | <i>R. Brock</i> |

Adjournment

NEXT ELEMENTARY LABOUR MANAGEMENT MEETING

November 24, 2008

# **LABOUR MANAGEMENT MEETING #1**

Monday, September 29, 2008

3:00 p.m.

Board Office

## **A G E N D A**

### **#1. ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

- The landscape in the teaching profession has changed dramatically under the charge of Mike Harris and his P.C. party.
- Today, even with a new government, the treadmill of constant change is still moving at full speed.
- To follow, are a series of issues being brought to Labour Management that centre around the following statement:

**ARE OUR TEACHERS BEING SUPPORTED TO DO THE JOB THAT OUR BOARD AND THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION IS EXPECTING THEM TO DO AND IS A WELL ARTICULATED SYSTEM PLAN OR ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN BEEN CREATED AND IN EFFECT AND HAVE YOU CREATED A FORMAL PROCESS FOR OUR TEACHERS TO EXPRESS THEIR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT NEEDS TO MOVE OUR STUDENTS FORWARD?**

### **#2. P.D. FOR PRINCIPALS/VICE PRINCIPALS**

- What types of in-services have our principals/vice principals received in order to assist them to support our teachers?

### **#3. SYSTEM SUPPORT FOR MINISTRY OF EDUCATION INITIATIVES**

- There appears to be a growing dis-proportion of system wide teacher support.
- In the recent past, we had E.L.O.T.'s distributed on a ratio of 0.5 E.L.O.T./school.
- Most recently, we had Itinerants deployed on a 0.25 Itinerant/school or one (1) Itinerant/4 schools.
- Currently, we have Itinerant distribution on everything from 4 schools: 1 Itinerant, to 1 school: 1 Itinerant.
- What consideration is being given to pupil population in schools from 1,000 pupils vs. 250 pupils, when our Itinerants are being deployed?
- How has the distribution/deployment of itinerant teacher support been determined?

### **#4. JOB EMBEDDED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

- Can you please layout how this is going to roll out for 2008-2009 period?
- At this time, why does it appear to be "vastly" different at each of our thirty-nine (39) sites?
- Have there been any new Principal/Vice Principal Best Practice sessions/opportunities since we first brought up this item at Labour Management #4 on Monday, March 31, 2008?
- What is the role of the eleven (11) Itinerants?
- Are teacher needs, vis-à-vis A.L.P.'s, being considered and work into the job embedded P.D. and how?

### **#5. WHO/WHEN WILL THE DOTS BE CONNECTED?**

- In isolation, every new program, initiative, assessment tool etc. etc. has merit and hopefully, all will have a positive impact on our pupils.
- To sketch but a wee bit of the current landscape, we have:
  - Job embedded P.D.
  - S.E.F. ~ D.R.T.'s
  - Assessment tools and the appropriate use of the data collected to support our pupils.....
  - A.L.P.'s

- The Board Improvement Plan and school S.I.P.'s aside, who and how will the Board ensure the D.O.T.'s are being connected or in the vernacular of the L.N.S.; how have the critical pathways been established for teachers?

#6.

#### **CONSULTANTS**

- We are the first to recognize that the Co-ordinator work is essential however there was a commitment on the Board's part in June 2008, during negotiations, to ensure this would be removed from the Consultant's portfolio because it was the Board's opinion that the supervising principals in the curriculum and Special Education portfolio's were to be performing the responsibilities of the Co-ordinators.
- Can you please ensure that the transition of responsibilities has commenced and that in fact that the supervising principals performing these co-ordinator responsibilities, and not our Consultants.

**MINUTES of Elementary Labour/Management Meeting**

Monday, September 29, 2008

3:00 p.m.

Director's Meeting Room  
802 Drury Lane, Burlington

**For the Association:**

R. Brock  
B. MacDonald  
M. Mahler  
R. Oliver  
V. Volak-McLaughlin

**For the Board:**

L. Clifford  
J. Langill  
R. MacDonald  
J. O'Hara  
J. Rowles  
S. Rossini  
J. Susi  
C. Tobin

**Chair:**

M. Pautler

**Recording Secretary:**

A. Swinden

---

**1. OPENING PRAYER**

The meeting opened with a prayer led by Michael Pautler, Director of Education.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

The members of the 2008-2009 Elementary Labour Management Committee introduced themselves to one another.

**2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

The following item was added to the agenda:

4. g) *Process for Seeking Union Representation on Board Committees* – R. Brock

The agenda was accepted as amended.

**3. BUSINESS ARISING**

There were no items.

**4. NEW BUSINESS**

a) **Annual Professional Development Plan**

*R. Brock*

R. Brock suggested that it would be helpful if teachers were provided with the overall objective/"big picture" at the root of the various Ministry-mandated programs and initiatives, in order to better assist teachers to understand the rationale behind the curriculum and school effectiveness initiatives.

R. MacDonald provided the Unit President with a copy of a document received that morning from the Literacy and Numeracy Secretariat (LNS), outlining a conceptual framework of the LNS initiatives. He noted that the Board has had a coordinated plan in place for a number of years, and it is communicated to all stakeholders through the Board Improvement Plan (BIP). Teachers should be familiar with the BIP since each individual School Improvement Plan (SIP) emanates from the BIP.

M. Pautler noted that while the LNS framework provides a visual and more tangible overview of the interconnection between the various initiatives, it does not explicitly identify the system-wide strategies and mechanisms that are in place at our Board to address each program/ initiative.

J. Susi indicated that the principal's role should be to ensure that all teachers have an understanding of the School Improvement Plan through professional development.

b) **P.D. for Principals/Vice Principals**

*R. Brock*

R. Brock asked what in-servicing school administrators have received on the methodologies requisite to support teachers in meeting the various expectations.

L. Clifford explained that principals have received in-servicing through School Effectiveness; and principals and teachers are well supported by Curriculum Services Consultants and Itinerant Teachers.

J. Susi noted that while principals should be the curriculum leaders in their respective school, to a great degree they must rely on the expertise of staff; principals are primarily responsible for the process.

In response to a concern raised by the Unit President regarding Developmental Reading Assessments (DRAs), R. MacDonald clarified that it is the expectation of Curriculum Services that DRAs must be administered to each student (Grades 1, 2, and 3) at least once each year in January/February. L. Clifford noted that he would review the matter with principals at their meeting on October 14<sup>th</sup> in order to promote consistency.

c) **System Support for Ministry of Education Initiatives**

*R. Brock*

The Unit President addressed a concern regarding the seemingly disproportionate distribution of Itinerant Teachers deployed to the 39 elementary school sites. He asked if any consideration is given to the size of a school's population (i.e. larger schools are not receiving additional support). He noted that while in most instances an Itinerant Teacher is responsible for providing support to four schools; in one situation, a full-time Itinerant Teacher has been assigned to one school.

R. MacDonald responded that while he agrees that increasing the number of Itinerant Teachers would be of great benefit to providing additional support for students, budgetary considerations would not make this option feasible at this point. He noted that the salaries of most of the Board's Itinerants are financed through additional Ministry funds rather than through the Board's budget.

L. Clifford clarified that the level of support was intensified at St. James School through additional funding that was secured to address the unique set of circumstances that are present in that school population. One full-time site-based Itinerant Teacher has been assigned to St. James.

R. MacDonald added that a component of the model in place at St. James provides opportunities for teachers to visit the demonstration classroom to view the supports in place by the Itinerant Teacher.

M. Pautler indicated that the model in place at St. James School provides a good opportunity for staff to learn and gather data on the degree of impact this heightened level of support would provide.

d) **Job Embedded Professional Development**

*R. Brock*

R. MacDonald provided an overview of the professional development planned for teachers for the 2008-2009 school year. He noted that each school has been allocated a budget for professional development (PD). In response to feedback received from teachers, opportunities will be provided for teachers to congregate in small group format. Support will be provided on assessment tools; Developmental Reading Assessments (DRA); Quick Comprehension Assessment (QCA); Ontario Comprehension Assessment (OCA); and Ontario Writing Assessment (OWA). C. Tobin noted that in-servicing will be provided to beginner teachers through the New Teacher Induction Program (NTIP).

L. Clifford indicated that a substantial amount of PD is embedded with the School Improvement Plan, and to large extent it is driven by the teachers. He noted that while the aim is to align PD as much as possible, principals have some latitude in organizing PD sessions at their respective school sites. Since the demands of each school community are unique, the approaches will often vary.

M. Pautler indicated that a heightened consistency of approach to professional development will continue to evolve. He noted that while the goal is to build a structure that provides the appropriate supports, ultimately one

of the benefits of job embedded learning is in the fact that professional development can be different at 39 different sites.

In response to a request from the Association for an update on the provision of best practice sharing opportunities for principals, J. Susi indicated that St. Mark, St. Raphael, and St. Timothy schools teamed up for the *Schools on the Move* initiative.

e) **Who/When will the Dots be Connected**

*R. Brock*

R. Brock initiated discussion regarding the portfolio of the School Effectiveness Framework, which will eventually be transferred to Principals. He noted that currently the SEF is implemented through the District Review Team (DRT), and therefore may not be viewed by teachers as evaluative in nature. He noted that once the portfolio is transferred to Principals, it could be perceived by some teachers that the implementation of the two, Teacher Performance Appraisal and School Effectiveness Framework, may overlap.

The Director expressed his appreciation for the concerns raised by the Association; noting that the principal will most successfully assume the SEF duties in settings where a strong collaborative working relationship, based on a mutual level of trust and understanding between principals and teachers has been established. He indicated that he is confident that principals and teachers will continue to build on the effective relationship building strategies that are already in evidence in schools across the Board.

f) **Consultants**

*R. Brock*

The Unit President requested that every effort be made to ensure that the role of the Consultant does not include any responsibilities as were previously assigned to the role of Coordinator, as this will increase the workload of the Consultant.

J. O'Hara clarified that the role of Coordinator, which existed within the Board years ago, was in fact comparable to the position of Principal in that it encompassed various management functions such as performance appraisal and supervision. He noted that the role of Coordinating Principal has been replaced by the role of Supervising Principal. The Board currently has two Supervising Principals: Kathy Lowicki, Supervising Principal in Curriculum Services; and Janet Foster, Supervising Principal of Alternate Programs Expelled/Suspended Students and Special Education Services. R. MacDonald assured the Committee that the role and function of the Consultant is in not intended to be supervisory in nature, and accordingly they should not be performing any managerial duties.

g) **Process for Seeking OECTA Representation on Board Committees**

*R. Brock*

R. Brock requested clarification regarding the Board's process for seeking OECTA representation on Board committees. J. O'Hara indicated that in accordance with Articles 1.01 and 1.03 of the current collective agreement, OECTA is recognized as the exclusive bargaining agent for its members, and on occasions when the Board is seeking OECTA representation on a Board committee, the appointment of the OECTA member to said committee would be at the discretion and under the authority of the Association.

**Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 4:28 p.m.

*NEXT ELEMENTARY LABOUR MANAGEMENT MEETING – November 24, 2008*