**UFT Attendance Teachers Consultation**

Thursday, November 14th, 2019 - 4:40-5:50pm

UFT

**Attendees**

Kim Suttell, DOE Director of Attendance Policy & Planning

Chris Caruso, DOE Senior Executive Director OCS

Steve Grossman, UFT Attendance Teachers Chapter Leader

Daisy Rodriguez, Attendance Teacher

Debra Poulos, Director UFT Office of Contract Empowerment

Bennett Fischer, UFT Office of Contract Empowerment

**Agenda**

Parking Permits

Payroll Schools

Tenure Framework

Brooklyn North Timekeeping

Consultation with Regional Supervisors

Discharge Requirements

Per Session

Other

**Parking Permits** – Kim received 12 new permits today. Says the number she gave us last meeting was wrong. Doesn’t have 155 permits, only has 104 (+ 12), but promises that “100%” of them are at DOT. Steve asks who she’s getting info from at DOT. Kim says that’s part of the problem – relevant parking permit people are all on vacation, or leave, or something, but promises that 100% of permits are there.

**Payroll Schools** – Steve and Debbie point out that the reassignment of payroll school for a particular AT is still not resolved, despite Kim’s assurances. Kim promises to correct the situation.

**Tenure Framework**

Kim gives us working document. It consists of rubrics based on teacher tenure framework in community schools. She is working on changing the language to fit attendance teachers. Debbie asks who are the rating officers for tenure decisions for AT’s? Document just says recommendations for tenure come from "Supervisor." Kim – Superintendents make final decisions. Debbie – But are the recommendations coming from building principals, attendance supervisors – who? Chris - Let's look at the contents of the rubrics first and worry about the "who" later. Steve says it's an important distinction - it all depends on the supervisor - we need to figure it out - the language mimics irrelevant data lingo. Kim wonders how tenure decisions are handled in Guidance Counselors chapter? Debbie - Doesn't know. Steve - We'll ask. Debbie - But what is the chain of command in tenure recommendations? Chris - Let's look the contents first and worry about the chain of command later. Debbie - We need clarity. Superintendents have been asking for clarity. Chris - We will have more clarity as the Job Description is rolled out to Superintendents. To be continued.

**Brooklyn North Timekeeping**

Steve - Is this signature requirement thing finally fixed? Kim - Yes, it's resolved. Bennett - We haven't seen memo. You said your office had provided text for Brooklyn North to put in memo. May we see it? Kim will send.

**Consultation with Regional Supervisors**

Steve wants to know if we can get Regional Supervisors to come to consultation to address regional issues? Chris doesn't understand. Bennett reminds him that at last consultation we discussed the awkward structure of AT administrative organization, and how it would be helpful to have Regional Supervisors meet with us to resolve issues that Kim and Chris don't have the authority to resolve. Reminds Chris that he was receptive to the idea at the last consultation and said he would talk to Deputy Chancellor about having Regional Supervisors attend consultation when appropriate. Chris remembers - says some people from the Central Office can possibly attend and help resolve regional issues. Debbie wants to know who those people would be. Chris gives us two names and begins to explain the DOE organizational structure. He draws us an organization chart and sends us a link to DOE Organizational Chart .pdf webpage. We will follow-up.

**Discharge Requirements**

Kim jumps right on it. She says that the old discharge forms don't give her all the information she needs to understand the reasons for certain chronic absences. Kim posits that with a more flexible format she can clear the register more effectively. Steve doesn't want ambiguity about discharge requirements. He wants requirements clearly defined. He doesn't want AT's to be in jeopardy because they did or did not follow an undefined protocol. Kim says it is impossible to describe a code for every possible reason for discharge. She has an overriding goal of clearing the register by June 2020. Says she can do that more effectively if process is flexible. Doesn't want discharges delayed at the Principals level because an anecdotic detail didn't fit the discharge form. Wants flexibility to make those decisions herself. Steve understands but still wants clearly defined process; doesn't want AT's to be held responsible at school level for decisions that are or aren't made. Kim says she can provide specific language, but not in the discharge documents themselves. Debbie wants to know how can AT's be required to show documentation for discharge when documentation isn't defined? A discussion ensues about various discharge forms. Kim maintains that she wants flexibility; doesn't want to change the TDG. She wants discharges to be a policy decision from her office, and not be in the hands of individual schools. Steve sys the TDG makes references to documents that are very complicated. This issue remains unresolved.

**Per Session**

Steve floats the idea that discharging open cases can be handled as a per session activity. Kim is skeptical but is open to the idea in certain cases. She says there are 7000 system-wide no-shows, and her priority is to clear them by June 2020. Steve thinks it should be a per session activity, and that Borough Support Centers must help also. Kim says some of that work can be done during the workday. Will continue to discuss.

**Other**

Steve has been made aware that some AT's have been directed by Principals to provide school-based PD. Says that cannot be a requirement. Says that some AT's like giving PD, some do not, but cannot compel. Chris says principals can direct AT's to give PD. Says that DOE is under increased scrutiny regarding student attendance because of ESSA legislation and State regulations. Debbie wants to know what the role of Attendance Supervisors is in giving PD? She says there cannot be an expectation that AT's can be directed to give PD by principals, particularly when AT's work in multiple schools and can therefore be asked by multiple principals to give multiple PDs. There must be a process. Bennett says there is a contractual process for developing PD. Schools have PD committees. Functional chapters have PD committees. Principals cannot direct. Chris says principals can direct; says it's in the AT Job Description [4c?]. Steve says it is not in the Job Description. Says PD was deliberately left out of the AT Job Description. Says he heard from an AT who is not comfortable giving PD - for personal health reasons - that she was directed to give PD, and that isn't right. Chris asks what is inappropriate about AT's giving PD? It is his position that it is not inappropriate for Principals to direct AT's to give PD. Debbie and Steve are concerned with abuse - there must be a process for being asked to give PD. Chris disagrees. This issue remains unresolved.

Meeting adjourned - 5:50pm