



Darren Kermes &lt;dkermes@swmetro.k12.mn.us&gt;

---

**RE: Teacher Development and Evaluation Revenue**

1 message

**Melcher, Tom (MDE)** <tom.melcher@state.mn.us>

Tue, Jul 29, 2014 at 1:02 PM

To: Darren Kermes &lt;dkermes@swmetro.k12.mn.us&gt;

Cc: "Cassellius, Brenda (MDE)" &lt;brenda.cassellius@state.mn.us&gt;, "Livingston, Tyler (MDE)" &lt;Tyler.Livingston@state.mn.us&gt;

Darren,

We've had this issue come up both with Q Comp (which has similar language) and teacher development and evaluation and have consulted with legislative staff on both areas, and they have made it clear this was what was intended. A law change would be needed to include coops in either program.....

Best,

Tom

Tom Melcher  
School Finance Director

Minnesota Department of  
**Education**

(651) 582-8828  
tom.melcher@state.mn.us

**From:** Darren Kermes [mailto:[dkermes@swmetro.k12.mn.us](mailto:dkermes@swmetro.k12.mn.us)]**Sent:** Tuesday, July 29, 2014 12:58 PM**To:** Melcher, Tom (MDE)**Cc:** Cassellius, Brenda (MDE); Livingston, Tyler (MDE)**Subject:** Re: Teacher Development and Evaluation Revenue

Thanks for replying so quickly Tom. I certainly see where the language in the law lends itself to that interpretation and frankly that is what I was afraid you were going to say.

That said, and I do not mean this in a flippant or facetious manner, are Cooperatives and Education Districts then similarly not held to the same teacher evaluation standards as traditional districts, intermediate districts, and charter schools? Would not the same interpretation apply?

Frankly, we want to be held to the same standard for teacher development and evaluation. But it seems patently unfair and lacking any form of equity if Cooperatives and Education Districts are held to the evaluation standard but are denied access to any money for development and training implementation. Our teachers hold the same licenses and have the same representation from Education Minnesota. They serve the same (frankly more at risk and needy) students than traditional districts or charter schools.

Is there any room to consider alternative interpretations of this standard?

I know I probably sound a little, maybe a lot, flippant or sarcastic or something else. I want you to know I truly see where the interpretation you noted comes from. On the plain language of the law, I would likely wind up in the same place. But, when the law has the potential for more than one interpretation and when a sense of equity and fairness points clearly to one interpretation over another, I have to at least raise the concern.

Thanks again for the fast initial response and for the ongoing dialog.

Darren

On Tue, Jul 29, 2014 at 12:46 PM, Melcher, Tom (MDE) <[tom.melcher@state.mn.us](mailto:tom.melcher@state.mn.us)> wrote:

Coops and ed districts are excluded. The law only includes a school district, intermediate school district, or charter school. This parallels Q Comp.

Thanks,

Tom

Tom Melcher  
School Finance Director

Minnesota Department of  
**Education**

(651) 582-8828  
[tom.melcher@state.mn.us](mailto:tom.melcher@state.mn.us)

**From:** Darren Kermes [mailto:[dkermes@swmetro.k12.mn.us](mailto:dkermes@swmetro.k12.mn.us)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 29, 2014 12:17 PM  
**To:** Livingston, Tyler (MDE); Cassellius, Brenda (MDE); Melcher, Tom (MDE)  
**Subject:** Teacher Development and Evaluation Revenue

Greetings!

I am writing today with regard to the new legislative initiative that allows for \$302 per licensed FTE for teacher development and evaluation. Is MDE interpreting this to include or exclude Cooperatives and/or Education Districts?

Sec. 15. **TEACHER DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION REVENUE.**

226.20 (a) For fiscal year 2015 only, teacher development and evaluation revenue for a school district, intermediate school district, or charter school that does not have an alternative professional pay system agreement under Minnesota Statutes, section 122A.414, subdivision 2, equals \$302 times the number of full-time equivalent teachers employed on October 1 of the previous school year. Revenue under this section must be reserved for teacher development and evaluation activities consistent with Minnesota Statutes, section 122A.40, subdivision 8, or Minnesota Statutes, section 122A.41, subdivision 5. For the purposes of this section, "teacher" has the meaning given it in Minnesota Statutes, section 122A.40, subdivision 1, or Minnesota Statutes, section 122A.41, subdivision 1.

226.29 (b) Notwithstanding paragraph (a), the state total teacher development and evaluation revenue entitlement must not exceed \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2015. The commissioner must limit the amount of revenue under this section so as not to exceed this limit.

Darren

—  
Darren G. Kermes

Executive Director  
SouthWest Metro Education Cooperative

[dkermes@swmetro.k12.mn.us](mailto:dkermes@swmetro.k12.mn.us)  
952-567-8102

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS EMAIL MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE CONFIDENTIAL USE OF THE DESIGNATED RECIPIENT(S). This e-mail message and/or any attachments thereto may be confidential, legally privileged, and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, use, disclosure, dissemination, forwarding or copying of this email message and/or attachments or taking of any action in reliance on the contents therein is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and remove the original message and all attachments from your