

LVR Contracts	
Specific Concerns:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highly effective LVR teachers and counselors are not getting probationary contracts despite principal recommendation, resulting in having to post the positions held by LVR teachers. Highly effective teachers and counselors are placed in LVR contracts for multiple years. Principals spend countless hours of time and extensive resources to support, train, and connect LVR teachers with their site programs and (often) industry partnerships, only to lose them to other districts due to Post/Bid, lengthy timelines and ineffective HR practices.
Questions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What written process/criteria does HR use to determine the offering of an LVR contract? What written process/criteria does HR use to change an LVR contract to Probationary? What is the longitudinal data by subject related to LVR contracts issued versus those that are "recalled?"
Site Scenarios:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highly effective 1st year Physics (AP) LVR teacher at [REDACTED] lost to Post/Bid Highly effective 1st year Latino, Spanish-speaking male LVR counselor at [REDACTED] lost to Post/Bid Highly effective 1st year ELA LVR Linked Learning teacher at [REDACTED] lost to Post/Bid Highly effective 4th year Art LVR teacher at [REDACTED] lost to Post/Bid Highly effective Art/CCTE VAD teacher going into 5th year as LVR at [REDACTED] Highly effective ELA Linked Learning teacher going into 5th year as LVR at [REDACTED] Highly effective Band Director going into 5th year as LVR at [REDACTED] Highly effective ELA teacher who is released each year because he has LVR status at [REDACTED]
Impact:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principals have added work and stress due to the Post/Bid process, which only sometimes results in getting the LVR teacher reassigned. We (the district) are losing highly qualified employees to other districts. Principals spend a year on-boarding new employees only to lose them and then have to start the process all over. LVR teachers are often involved in specialty programs that our district highlights in an effort to increase enrollment. These programs require extensive and expensive training and/or specific certifications. These programs include: AP, IB, Linked Learning, Dual Enrollment, CCTE, AVID, PLTW, Immersion, etc. There are financial and time ramifications when these teachers are replaced.
Suggested Actions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use longitudinal data to make determinations about LVR contracts. If possible, contract the LVR teacher and make them probationary. If we find that his/her teaching area is not needed, allow him/her to teach outside the content area for the year. (Good teachers are worth retaining.) Identify a breakthrough person in the district that can serve to find solutions to common

HR questions for schools.

Placement of Non-Priority Consideration Candidates

Specific Concerns:

- Teachers with no priority consideration were placed in vacancies this June/July, contrary to previous practice.
- Principals had previously been told that only candidates with priority consideration could be placed in vacancies.
- Candidates were offered positions without site administrator input and without previously agreed upon site information provided to assigned candidates.

Questions:

- Why was this contractual language not followed in the past? Why was it followed this year?
- Why were principals told in the past that only candidates with priority consideration could be placed in vacancies?
- Was this change in practice communicated to principals prior to or during Post/Bid?
- Why was this language now followed this year, when the other part of 12.2:1 was not? ("Any vacancy filled by a leave replacement teacher (that is not being held for a unit member returning from a leave of absence) after October 31 shall be posted during the following May posting period.")
- Who determines which parts of the contract will be followed versus those that won't be?

Site Scenarios:

- Sites with long-term principals who have not had non-priority consideration candidates placed in vacancies until this year.
- One site interviewed all five candidates for a 1.0 ELA vacancy and all candidates for 0.8 ELA vacancy. The top two candidates were both from the 0.8 list; however both also applied for the 1.0. Both were priority candidates for the 0.8 only. Instead of being able to offer the 2nd candidate (who happened to be listed as 6th for next consideration of the 1.0 position) the 1.0 position, it was offered by HR to a non-priority consideration candidate who had interviewed and who had already been told she was not qualified according to the needs of the site.
- [redacted] had a non-priority candidate placed in a position for the first time. Bundled M/M position of 0.8 at [redacted] and 0.2 at [redacted] had a non-priority candidate placed in the position without an interview or conversation with principals on site-specific needs. Other HS, MS, and ES school principals were able to interview for their bundles.
- [redacted] had two candidates placed into vacancies. One candidate was placed into a position the candidate did not apply for and who has no recent industry experience. [redacted] The second candidate was not selected in Post & Bid and was placed into the [redacted] position (from [redacted]).

<p>• [REDACTED] had two non-priority candidates bid on an ELA/SS position in [REDACTED] a Linked Learning certified school. Only one agreed to a demo lesson/interview. The panel members, which included a parent, unanimously agreed that the candidate delivered a lesson that was far below standard. The candidate was thereafter offered the position by HR.</p>	
<p>Impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites were assigned teachers who already had positions and who were less than qualified for the positions they bid on. • Principals strategized for Post/Bid based on previous practice. • Principals communicated previous practice to interview panel members, many of whom have served on other interview panels. • Sites are being forced to take staff members after spending time interviewing and determining they are not qualified; yet, principals are charged with improving instruction (reflected as test scores associated with CA School Dashboard). 	
<p>Suggested Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use longitudinal data and principal recommendation to change teachers from LVR to Probationary contracts, which eliminates having to post these positions. • Revert to the previous practice of placing only priority consideration candidates in vacancies. • Since there is no contractual definition of "deemed qualified," define "deemed qualified" to include passing an interview, teaching an effective demo lesson, meeting site criteria/requirements, having experience with specialty programs, etc. so that all vacancies are staffed with student learning and achievement in mind. 	
<p>Definition of "Deemed Qualified" - Article 12.2.6 "The District may interview and will select the unit member to fill the posted vacancy from the five (5) unit members who have the greatest district seniority, have bid for the position and have been deemed qualified by the Human Resource Services Division"</p>	
<p>Specific Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to staff in Labor Relations, there is no contractual definition of "deemed qualified," yet it appears that the Human Resource Services Division defines it strictly as having "the credential required for the assignment." • The term "deemed qualified" is defined by HR to the benefit of SDEA and to the detriment of school sites. • The term "deemed qualified" should include passing an interview, teaching an effective demo lesson, meeting site criteria/requirements, having experience with specialty programs, etc. 	
<p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is the term "deemed qualified" not defined in the SDEA contract, when so many other terms are? 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is the term "deemed qualified" strictly defined as having "the credential required for the assignment." Where is this explicitly written? • Who specifically defines "deemed qualified" in our district?
<p>Site Scenarios:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [REDACTED] was given a list of Spanish teachers for an AVID position. The person initially placed is not AVID certified and has never taught AVID. HR staff informed the principal that while the person had not taught AVID, she had been at a school where AVID was taught. • [REDACTED] wrote all humanities positions for both English and Social Studies credential but had a teacher placed with only Social Studies who was not at all interested in working in the atypical "Big Picture" environment. • [REDACTED] was assigned a teacher for an AVID/Business position who is both not AVID certified nor does the candidate have the recent industry experience needed for the new CTE Business Entrepreneurial Pathway in partnership with UCSD Center for US-Mexican Studies. The need was for a bilingual candidate to work with the CaliBaja Mega Business Region.
<p>Impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When teachers are just placed in positions, sites must newly incur monetary and resource expenses on professional development, specialty programs, certifications and performance documentation. • Sites are unable to meet the expectations of grants or programs when unqualified teachers are placed in key positions. • Instructional programs are compromised and students receive substandard support.
<p>Suggested Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the absence of specific contractual language, HR should define the term "deemed qualified" to include specific requirements, such as passing an interview, teaching an effective demo lesson, meeting site criteria/requirements, having recent experience (last 3 years) teaching in the area and level they are applying to teach in, etc. • Identify a breakthrough person in the district that can serve to find solutions to common HR questions for schools.

<p>Placement of Unqualified "Bumped" Classified Employees Excessive Timeframes for Classified Vacancies</p>	
<p>Specific Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classified staff members are placed at sites with little to no high school experience or training; these employees are unable to perform essential tasks needed for daily site operations. • The burden of training new/under-qualified classified staff falls on the principal, when most do not have the expertise to train a registrar or a finance clerk. • The HR standard line of "see if they can go visit another registrar at a different site for help," is rarely realistic as others are not always available to help and need time to 	

<p>attend to their own workloads instead of training new people in the district.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Classified vacancies regularly take six months or more to fill; principals have to continuously request updates (often unanswered) or wait long periods to have their inquiries answered. 	
<p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can the district bargain for more specific language relative to positions at high schools? Can central office staff create an "emergency" plan for providing immediate service to and for "on-boarding" new classified employees who are under-qualified? Can central office staff create an "emergency" plan for providing immediate service to sites with a critical vacancy, such as senior high financial clerk, registrar, site tech, etc. 	
<p>Site Scenarios:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ██████████ was assigned a Site Tech that has no knowledge of PowerScheduler and who is unable to complete the needs of the master schedule in time for the start of school. The work must be done now to ensure that students are scheduled into classes. The principal had to spend approximately \$2,000 to bring back retired registrars to train the new registrar and to assist her when the workload became overwhelming. Hiring new classified members takes months to accomplish and principals have to justify each time why the position is needed which is timely and feels like a waste of time. ██████████ had a vacancy in Jan. for a library technician and the list to hire was given in May. Sites with financial clerk vacancies had to wait at least six months to get a list of candidates. Applicants on the lists who were from outside the district were not informed that they passed the proficiency tests taken at least six weeks earlier. Therefore, they took employment elsewhere after not hearing back from HR staff. 	
<p>Impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sites are responsible for developing stop gap solutions for training employees who lack knowledge/experience. This slows down productivity, causes extreme frustration, and ultimately negatively affects students. Sites must spend site funds to hire additional help for new employees who have received no training from the district and need assistance. This a huge financial burden that the sites should not have to fund. Holding positions unfilled for months puts extra burden on the sites in meeting the needs of the students, staff and community members. Schools are forced to hire substitutes to fill positions and work is spread to other employees to make do, which is causing higher workloads for everyone. Vacant positions and under-qualified staff put the sites (and ultimately the principals) at risk for auditable offenses. 	
<p>Suggested Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bargain more specific language related to job descriptions at the high school level. Assign a direct district liaison who is authorized to make decisions related to emergency support. This person immediately deploys experienced district personnel to complete urgent tasks and to provide/coordinate site training. 	

- Create a timeline that has urgency to support schools who need new employees hired

Staffing Accommodations for Master Schedule Changes

Specific Concerns:

- Principals had to make adjustments to master schedule (and therefore staffing) due to changes in science sequencing and/or added EL requirements.
- Principals were required to await review from the "Master Schedule Planning Team," while science candidates were being hired by other districts. This process has taken weeks with no definitive direction to sites.

Questions:

- Why are sites required to fill vacancies they no longer need, while the positions they need are not being approved in a timely manner?
- Who is on the Master Schedule Planning Team and when does it meet?

Site Scenarios:

- [REDACTED] no longer need a chemistry teacher due to science resequencing.

Impact:

- Sites are assigned staff that is no longer needed, while needed positions remain vacant and strong new candidates are lost to other districts.

Suggested Actions:

- Inform principals about the role and purpose of the MS Planning Team.
- Immediately convene the MS Planning Team when a time sensitive answer is needed.
- Work with SDEA to allow vacant positions to be filled for other new positions requiring different credentials.
- Identify a breakthrough person in the district that can serve to find solutions to common HR questions for schools.

Mistakes and Lack of Communication

Specific Concerns:

- There is often no response to emails sent to HR staff.
- Many emails to HR staff go unanswered for weeks.
- HR staff often provides incorrect information about classified and certificated staffing.
- Principals are given different information from different HR staff about the same issue.
- There are inconsistencies among HROs and schools regarding LVR teachers moving to Probationary contracts.
- Principals reach out the High School HRO about vacancies, only to be told that "X" HRO is in charge of staffing this content area." There is no support in helping direct inquiries to that HRO, e.g. cc'ing the "HRO in charge of staffing the content vacancy" on this response.

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• HR appears to have suddenly set a higher standard for Ed Specialist credentials than what is mandated by the CTC by requiring additional ED and OHI clearance.	
<p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What is the department policy for the expectations around responding to calls and emails?• Does HR have written procedures for how they handle classified and certificated staffing? If so, what is the process for educating HR staff members in order to ensure consistency in decision making and delivery of information?• How do principals know who is "in charge" of staffing what? Was this information given to principals? Is there an expectation that principals are supposed to contact HROs outside of the one assigned to high schools? Is there an expectation that the HS HRO will help facilitate these answers, even if he is not staffing the requested area?• Why is HR setting a higher standard for Ed Specialists than what is required by the CTC?	
<p>Site Scenarios:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• [REDACTED] Principal informed [REDACTED] that there was no 0.2 math vacancy. [REDACTED] said HR does not post positions below 0.4; Position was thereafter offered to and chosen by an employee during Post/Bid even though the 0.2 no longer existed. Offer had to be retracted.• [REDACTED] given a list of hundreds of SEA candidates for a vacancy that contained outdated information, including names of people who were retired.• [REDACTED] Sent email to [REDACTED] on 6/13; Sent follow-up email on 6/25 after no response; No answer until 7/7 and only to set up a meeting for 7/18 that was then moved to 7/24.• [REDACTED] sent a list of names to many sites (all levels) on 6/26 stating, "Enclosed is a list of candidates hired by HR for you to interview for your mild/moderate vacancy." After conducting interviews (which took significant time), principals discovered that not all candidates had been hired by SDUSD and some candidates had already taken positions in other districts.• The board approved a middle college calendar for the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] meaning teachers must start school Aug 5. The hiring timeline was not adjusted to meet these needs.	
<p>Impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Principals are frustrated because they see inconsistency with the implementation of policy. This leads to thoughts of favoritism or incompetence, which then leads to lack of trust.• Principals are unable to adequately run their sites because they are given incorrect or conflicting information, wait weeks to get answers, or never hear back from HR staff.• When different HROs are staffing different content areas (without principals knowing who does what), there is double work happening for multiple people simply due to lack of communication.• Principals are losing teachers who are unable to meet the additional SPED requirements; Seasoned and experienced teachers are frustrated and stressed by these additional requirements.	
<p>Suggested Actions:</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HR staff should be required to return all calls and emails within two business days. • HR should create a "toolkit" of detailed staffing policies and procedures, to include common scenarios, frequent questions and easy-to follow flow charts. • Principals need transparent communication that includes credentials and hire dates regarding who is being moved from LVR to Probationary. • Identify a breakthrough person in the district that can serve to find solutions to common HR questions for schools.
--

Culture and Climate	
<p>Specific Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our district systems, particularly HR, do not support efficient operations and the prioritization of effective teaching practice. • There is no HR prioritization of issues of urgency that are time-sensitive and require quick action. • HR appears to work at the service of the unions and not in service of school sites. • Principals are told by district leadership that the instructional program is "the priority," but the systems in place do not support the work. • Principals are distrustful of HR staff because incomplete, incorrect, or misleading information is provided to them. • Principals are constantly reminded to provide clear written policies, procedures and expectations to families but HR staff does not appear to have such requirements. • District executive leadership appears to continuously ignore complaints about the ineffectiveness and detrimental behavior of the leadership and staff in the HR department. • When principals complain about HR policies, procedures and practices to executive leadership, they are met with indifference, feigned ignorance, perfunctory concern or disdain. 	
<p>Impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principals feel demoralized due to lack of transparency, communication, and support. • Principals wrestle with the high expectations of district program implementation when they do not feel supported by HR (and other divisions) and often feel undermined in their efforts. 	