REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

TO CHANGE SCHEDULING AND USE OF TIME
REGARDING TEACHER DUTY DAY AND TEACHING
HOURS AS PRESCRIBED BY THE MEMORANDUM OF
UNDERSTANDING (MOU) FOR ARTICLE 13 OF THE
MASTER AGREEMENT

July 2014 (updated)
Please review the MOU that is part of this document to ensure compliance.

All proposals must be submitted to the Pilot Schools Joint Steering Committee (via the Deputy Superintendent) using the format provided here. The JSC will review the proposal for compliance with the provisions of the MOU and adherence with the steps outlined below. Consideration will be given to the development and description of specific processes and activities designed to increase student achievement; improve professional practice and ability to produce measurable outcomes of increased student achievement that are directly tied to the request submitted.

All questions below must be answered (boxes expand to accept content):

1. State proposed use of time and scheduling variance requested.

2. Attach a copy of the proposed calendar.

3. Show that the proposed time and scheduling maintains the accreditation minimum required student contact hours of:
   - 1000 hours at the elementary/K-8 level
   - 1088 hours at the middle/high school level

4. Confirm that the Department of Transportation has been consulted as well as any other affected departments and that this request is cost neutral to the district.
5. Summarize process used to reach consensus (to begin process, 100% of those impacted must agree to move forward).

6. Provide names and positions of members of the design team.

7. Provide the results of the written, secret ballot vote for the final decision to demonstrate “overwhelming agreement with the proposal.” The ballot question should ask: agree, neutral, disagree.

8. Outline specific processes and activities requested that are designed to:
   • Increase student achievement
   • Improve professional practice
   • Produce measurable outcomes of increased student achievement

9. Explain the shared decision making process for schedule planning, use of time and allocated amount of individual planning and professional learning time.
10. Describe the process used to gather parent input for the proposal and your plan to engage parents in the process if your request is approved.

11. Which of these considerations did you apply when developing your proposal:
   - A minimum amount of guaranteed planning time for instructional staff, but not when or how that time is used;
   - An amount of non-contact time, but not when or how that time is used;
   - A ratio between contact time (including duty), activities and time designed to improve professional practice;
   - The need to develop schedules that create common planning time among grade level teams and/or content teams;
   - A clearly defined schedule for, and use of, collaborative planning time between and among grade level teams, content areas, specials/electives teachers, etc.;
   - A clearly delineated connection between collaborative time and professional development needs based upon data review.

APPLICATION, SELECTION PROCESS AND TIMELINE

To submit proposals for approval for the 2015-2016 school year, applications must be received NO LATER THAN DECEMBER 10, 2014. The completed proposal must be sent electronically via email to the Chief Personnel Officer. Once an application is submitted, the Pilot Schools Joint Steering Committee (JSC) will meet with representatives from the school on December 15 or February 9 to present the proposal (between 4:30 and 5:30 – specific time will be provided to each school submitting proposals).

For questions about this process, please contact the Aurora Education Association (AEA) President or the Chief Personnel Officer.

NOTE: If a school has formed a design team and intends to submit an application for 2015-2016, please inform the Chief Personnel Officer or the AEA President as soon as possible.
Completed RFPs will be reviewed by the Pilot Schools Joint Steering Committee (JSC) on December 15, 2014 or February 9, 2015 and information on approval sent to the submitting school as soon as possible. The JSC is the final approver and no further action is needed.

The approval is only for 2015-2016 (through the duration of the current MOU). In December 2015, representatives of each variance site will present a review of the results to the AEA and the district negotiation teams. Input will be considered in deliberations regarding adjustments to Article 13 upon the conclusion of the MOU.

In the event that a proposal is declined, the JSC will provide, in writing, the reasons for rejection, and if possible, provide opportunity to amend the proposal. Depending upon the nature of the reasons, it is possible that the school could provide the requested information in time for 2015-2016 implementation. However, it may also require that significant changes must be made and the implementation date would be delayed.

Memorandum of Understanding between Aurora Public School District and Aurora Education Association Regarding Article 13—Teacher Duty Day and Teaching Hours

Introduction

In June 2011, the Aurora Public Schools and Aurora Education Association developed a Memorandum of Understanding to form a task force to examine potential amendments to Article 13 – Teacher Duty Day and Teaching Hours in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Under the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding, the task force met over the course of the 2011-12 school year and reported its final conclusions and recommendations to the bargaining teams for consideration during the spring 2012 negotiations session. While the work and recommendations of the task force were considered, the bargaining teams were unable to mutually agree on language and processes to further the work of the task force.

As the Association’s and Board’s Team value the work and recommendations of the Article 13 Task Force and share an interest in revising Article 13, pursuant to this Memorandum of Understanding, the parties agree to the following for the 2013-14 - 2015-16 school years.
Agreement

Using the work of the Article 13 Task Force as a guide, the Parties agree to provide individual schools with flexibility related to specific provisions of Article 13 in order to increase student achievement through the development of a proposal to change their scheduling and use of time.

To submit a proposal to the Joint Steering Committee (JSC), the school will establish a design team which includes the building administration and staff members who mutually agree on and are interested in submitting a proposal.

To begin the process, the design team will first seek consensus agreement from staff affected by the proposal, and then discuss the proposal with the entire staff. Consensus as used here means those impacted by the proposed variance are in agreement with or at least agree to support the proposal. Final consensus will be verified through a written ballot vote that should demonstrate overwhelming agreement with the proposal. The ballot vote will be conducted jointly by an administrative and association representative.

The proposal will then be reviewed by the JSC, for compliance with the provisions of this MOU. The JSC review process will focus primarily on the individual school’s adherence to the procedures and parameters outlined in this memorandum. Consideration will be given to the development and description of specific processes and activities designed to increase student achievement; improve professional practice and ability to produce measurable outcomes of increased student achievement that are directly tied to the allowed flexibility from Article 13 and the changes made to their schedules/use of time. If the proposal is believed to be out of compliance, the proposal will be remanded to the school with suggested modifications. An amended proposal may then be resubmitted for review.

All proposals for flexibility or waivers to Article 13 must be aligned with the following parameters:

1. Maintain the accreditation minimum required student contact hours of:
   - 1000 hours at the elementary/K-8 level
   - 1088 hours at the middle/high school level
2. Establish a clearly defined shared decision making process, particularly related to schedule planning and the use of time, which results in an allocated amount of individual planning and professional learning time. Proposals should consider:
   - A minimum amount of guaranteed planning time for instructional staff, but not when or how that time is used;
   - An amount of non-contact time, but not when or how that time is used;
   - A ratio between contact time (including duty), activities and time designed to improve professional practice;
   - The need to develop schedules that create common plan time among grade level teams and/or content teams;
   - A clearly defined schedule for, and use of, collaborative planning time between and among grade level teams, content areas, specials/electives teachers etc.;
   - A clearly delineated connection between collaborative time and professional development needs based upon data review.
3. Establish a process to measure the impact the Article 13 variance(s) had on student achievement.

4. The variance is cost neutral in terms of the impact on APS systems/operations, i.e. transportation, nutrition services.

5. The proposal will not result in a reduction in force or the displacement of personnel out of the building.

The parties also acknowledge all remaining provisions of Article 13 not included in the accepted proposals will remain unchanged during the 2013-14, 2014-15 and 2015-16 school years, and that implemented variances will not be precedent setting.

In December 2015, representatives of each variance site will present a review of the results of the variance to the association and district negotiation teams. Such input will be considered in deliberations regarding adjustments to Article 13 upon the conclusion of this MOU.

Date of agreement, July 1, 2013 by:

Aurora Public School District
Rico Munn, Superintendent

Aurora Education Association
Amy Nichols, President

Approved by:

Aurora Board of Education
JulieMarie Shepherd, President

Jane Barber, Secretary