

**MCEA Successor Contract Bargaining**

**MCPS Responses to Proposal Questions  
from MCEA Received on January 6, 2023**

Article	Question(s)
1(D)(2)	<p>How would these changes impact the practice differently than what the current practice is?</p> <p><b>Response:</b> Allowing the Board to designate an individual with whom the Association can meet to discuss the need to subcontract work will ensure that the appropriate subject matter experts participate in the discussion and will accelerate the process of engaging with the Association when this need arises.</p>
6(F)(2)(c)	<p>What was the rationale for this deletion? Does this group meet anymore? Why does MCPS not see the need to update the language to the current committees? How does MCPS see this removal relating to the MCEA proposal of the JCMSSR?</p> <p><b>Response:</b> The work of the Staffing Allocation and Budget Review Committee (SABRC) overlaps with the work of the Operating Budget Review Committee. MCPS is not aware of the SABRC meeting.</p>
6(F)(5)	<p>What structure would replace this work if we delete this language?</p> <p><b>Response:</b> The existing language, while referencing the joint work group of all three employee associations, does not appear in all three negotiated Agreements. We feel this has been addressed by the expansion of the EFR program to non-school-based sites.</p>
6(G)(2)(f)	<p>What data does MCPS have to support the belief that the county is complying with the law and no longer needs monitoring?</p> <p><b>Response:</b> The Committee on Assessments in support of the implementation of the <i>More Learning, Less Testing Act of 2017</i> was established in February 2018. The Committee has continued in its work with the most recent report to the Board of Education having been submitted on July 26, 2022. The report can be found at this link:</p>

**MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

*Expanding Opportunity and Unleashing Potential*

**DEPARTMENT OF LABOR RELATIONS**

Article	Question(s)
	<p><a href="https://bit.ly/3HJ8kAx">https://bit.ly/3HJ8kAx</a>. The commitment to complying with this law is demonstrated by the ongoing work of this Committee.</p>
<p>6(G)(5)(a) (6) (iii)(1)</p>	<p>What data does MCPS have that the work of the Quarterly Reports workgroup has been completed?</p> <p><b>Response:</b> The Quarterly Reports workgroup addressed reporting requirements for general education teachers and special education teachers collaboratively resulting in an update to <a href="#">Form 272-5</a>. At this time, MCPS does not anticipate additional work will be required of this workgroup and has agreed with the association to collaboratively resolve any future issues that arise related to the reporting requirements through the Special Education ASLMCC.</p>
<p>6(G)(6)</p>	<p>What does “collaboratively determine” mean? What happens if one party wants to investigate an area and the other does not?</p> <p><b>Response:</b> “Collaboratively determine” means that MCEA and MCPS will work together to identify the focus areas for the LMCC and the ASLMCCs. The parties will have to work together to resolve any disagreements over whether a particular focus area should be included.</p>
<p>6(G)(6)(a)</p>	<p>In absence of this language, how will the LMCC gather data from staff in a timely manner so that it can inform decision making?</p> <p><b>Response:</b> The work of the LMCC will to continue to include gathering information from staff. The removal of this language does not prohibit the LMCC in anyway from determining that data collection is warranted or from identifying the appropriate means for collecting the sought after data.</p>
<p>6(G)(6)(c)</p>	<p>Does MCPS have any ideas on recruiting and retaining highly-qualified teachers in high impact schools other than deleting this language? How will these issues be prioritized?</p> <p><b>Response:</b> MCPS believes the need identified in this section is addressed by the ongoing work of the workgroup established by Article 6(G)(6)(d)(3).</p>
<p>6(G)(6)(d)(1)</p>	<p>What work does MCPS see remains for the salary scale workgroup? Are there further issues that need examining? If so, what are they? Since the</p>

**MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

*Expanding Opportunity and Unleashing Potential*

**DEPARTMENT OF LABOR RELATIONS**

Article	Question(s)
	<p>MCEA salary scale proposal reflects the work this committee has done, does MCPS’ proposal to continue this group signify a rejection of the salary scale redesign proposal?</p> <p><b>Response:</b> The salary scale workgroup made excellent progress in modelling various possible salary schedules. At the point at which the workgroup stopped, there was discussion about how we could work closer together to develop a salary schedule model to consider at the bargaining table. Unfortunately, the workgroup never reconvened for that purpose. MCPS believes that renewing those efforts, with the support of an outside consultant with experience in salary redesign, would result in a salary schedule that is able to address the needs of the system and its employees moving forward.</p> <p>MCPS rejects the statement that “the salary scale proposal reflects the work this committee has done.” The proposal made by MCEA does not reflect the discussions from the workgroup, except insofar as it moves from numerical steps to lettered steps.</p> <p>MCPS expressly responded to the MCEA proposal on compensation, specifically, the salary schedule and wage adjustments, on January 24, 2023.</p>
6(G)(6)(d)(2))	<p>Why does MCPS believe the stipend workgroup has completed their work?</p> <p><b>Response:</b> The ECA stipend workgroup made significant progress during the 2021-2022 school year and has continued its work during the 2022-2023 school year. Given the progress that has been made, MCPS believes that the workgroup will complete its work by the end of this school year and that, accordingly, the reference will no longer be necessary in the successor agreement.</p>
6(G)(6)(d)(3))(ii)	<p>What data does MCPS have to suggest that this proposal would not improve recruiting qualified educators to high impact schools? If so, what is MCPS’ plan to do this?</p> <p><b>Response:</b> The existing language was never implemented. There is no data to support that the program would have any impact on the system’s ability to recruit qualified educators.</p>