**ETA SB7 Joint Committee report**

Public Act 97-8 (Senate Bill 7) required the formation of a Joint Committee composed of equal representation selected by the school board and its teachers or, if applicable, the exclusive bargaining representative of its teachers, to address the matters described in paragraphs (1) through (5) of Section 24-12(c) of the School Code. The School Code establishes the following requirements of the joint committee:

“**Agreement by the joint committee as to a matter requires the majority vote of all committee members, and if the joint committee does not reach agreement on a matter, then the otherwise applicable requirements of subsection (b) of this Section shall apply. Except as explicitly set forth in this subsection (c), a joint committee has no authority to agree to any further modifications to the requirements for honorable dismissals set forth in subsection (a) of this Section. The joint committee must be established and the first meeting of the joint committee must occur on or before December 1, 2011 . . . .**

**The joint committee must reach agreement on a matter on or before February 1 of a school year in order for the agreement of the joint committee to apply to the sequence of dismissal determined during that school year. Subject to the February 1 deadline for agreements, the agreement of a joint committee on a matter shall apply to the sequence of dismissal until the agreement is amended or terminated by the joint committee.”**

 The Joint Committee consisted of the following representatives

ETA: Kathryn Castle, Reyna DeLaMora, Sue Venegas, Chris Zugel, and Jack Janezic as alternate.

U-46 Administration: Carmen Rodriquez, Miguel Rodriquez, Greg Walker, Deb Zelinski, and Amelia Gavina as alternate.

The Committee met on the following date(s): December 1, 9, and January 31

The Joint Committee has addressed the following matters as set forth in the statute:

**(1) The joint committee must consider and may agree to criteria for excluding from grouping 2 and placing into grouping 3 a teacher whose last 2 performance evaluations include a Needs Improvement and either a Proficient or Excellent.**

Place an “X” by one of the following:

\_\_X\_\_ The Committee considered the foregoing and either 1) agreed not to deviate from the statutory criteria for placement in groupings 2 and 3 or 2) did not reach agreement on the matter. Therefore, the otherwise applicable requirements of Section 24-12(b) of the School Code apply.

\_\_\_\_\_ The Committee considered the foregoing and agreed to the following criteria for excluding certain teachers from grouping 2 and placing them into grouping 3:

**(2) The joint committee must consider and may agree to an alternative definition for grouping 4, which definition must take into account prior performance evaluation ratings and may take into account other factors that relate to the school district’s or program’s educational objectives. An alternative definition for grouping 4 may not permit the inclusion of a teacher in the grouping with a Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory performance evaluation rating on either of the teacher’s last 2 performance evaluation ratings.**

Place an “X” by one of the following:

\_X\_\_\_ The Committee considered the foregoing and either 1) agreed not to deviate from the statutory criteria for placement in grouping 4 or 2) did not reach agreement on the matter. Therefore, the otherwise applicable requirements of Section 24-12(b) of the School Code apply.

\_\_\_\_\_ The Committee considered the foregoing and agreed to an alternative definition for grouping 4, to include the following:

**(3) The joint committee may agree to include within the definition of a performance evaluation rating a performance evaluation rating administered by a school district or joint agreement other than the school district or joint agreement determining the sequence of dismissal.**

Place an “X” by one of the following:

\_\_\_\_\_ The Committee agreed to include within the definition of a performance evaluation rating a performance evaluation rating administered by a school district or joint agreement other than the school district or joint agreement determining the sequence of dismissal.

 \_X\_\_\_ The Committee did not agree to include within the definition of a performance evaluation rating a performance evaluation rating administered by a school district or joint agreement other than the school district or joint agreement determining the sequence of dismissal.

 **(4) For each school district or joint agreement that administers performance evaluation ratings that are inconsistent with either of the rating category systems . . . the school district or joint agreement must consult with the joint committee on the basis for assigning a rating that complies with [the four categories required by law] to each performance evaluation rating that will be used in a sequence of dismissal.**

Place an “X” by one of the following:

\_\_\_\_\_ The School District’s performance evaluation ratings are consistent with the rating category system(s) in the School Code, and this provision does not apply.

\_\_X\_\_ The School District’s performance evaluation ratings are inconsistent with the rating category system(s) in the School Code, and the Committee recommends the following basis for assigning a rating that complies with the School Code:

*It was agreed that for the purpose of the historical ratings, (applied prior to SB7/PERA) and only for the 2012 RIF list ranking, the rating of “Basic” will be used as “Proficient.”*

**(5) Upon request by a joint committee member submitted to the employing board by no later than 10 days after the distribution of the sequence of honorable dismissal list, a representative of the employing board shall, within 5 days after the request, provide to members of the joint committee a list showing the most recent and prior performance evaluation ratings of each teacher identified only by length of continuing service in the district or joint agreement and not by name.**

**If, after review of this list, a member of the joint committee has a good faith belief that a disproportionate number of teachers with greater length of continuing service with the district or joint agreement have received a recent performance evaluation rating lower than the prior rating, the member may request that the joint committee review the list to assess whether such a trend may exist.**

**Following the joint committee’s review, but by no later than the end of the applicable school term, the joint committee or any member or members of the joint committee may submit a report of the review to the employing board and exclusive bargaining representative, if any.**

\_\_X\_\_ The Committee considered this provision, and Committee members are aware of their right to request such a list.

***This report was prepared by the ETA for the purpose of reporting the current work of the SB7 Joint Committee to its membership.***