

From: [Terinna Hartnett](#)
To: [SLegislation](#)
Cc: [Sen. Zurier, Samuel](#)
Subject: Legislation S 2934
Date: Tuesday, May 19, 2026 10:48:44 AM
Attachments: [S2934.pdf](#)

You don't often get email from terinna.hartnett@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Good morning

My name is Terinna Hartnett. I am a teacher in the Providence School District (almost 30 years teaching in Providence). I also grew up in Providence and attended Providence Public Schools. I am a lifelong resident of RI and even attended Rhode Island College. I am a Rhode Islander through and through. I am writing in reference to the Legislation S 2934 that was introduced on March 4, 2026. I have attached the document that I am referring to. I have many concerns about the wording and requests for changes to current legal methods regarding the Providence Public School District.

1. Why is Providence being the school district named? Why are changes, seemingly directed at the Providence Public School Teachers, trying to be forced through before the change over on June 30, 2026. It seems like shady changes are being attempted to be forced through under the wire for Providence Schools under the guise of a State Legislature change.

In the beginning lines it says "Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, every municipality and regional school district..." to make it sound like this is legislature that equally affects all school districts but then as you read it it targets Providence School Teachers. I question if State Legislature should be targeting one specific district. Changes from the state should be equal across the board.

2. Providence School Teachers are Union members. On Pg 1 Lines 13-16 discusses alternative salary schedules like bonuses for teachers willing to take on greater responsibilities. I question the word "bonuses". Providence teachers all have the same salary schedule. We do get paid for extra work we do like class coverages, breakfast duty and coaching jobs. As union employees we can not accept "bonuses". And again I note that this is directed at the Providence public school district and is not written as a general rule for all state teachers.

3. Principals should not have the power to dismiss or demote any teacher assigned full-time to the school as stated on Pg 2 Lines 13-19. This should be done by evaluations and working with the union. By giving principals this power they will be able to dismiss or demote for personal reasons. This section is also too vague as it just gives across the board power to the principals.

4. The teachers in the Providence School District are placed in positions by interview and Criterion Hiring Practices. We no longer do the Job fair. On Pg 4 Lines 9-17 the legislature talks about layoffs and displacements of tenured teachers. The wording of this section sounds like it is referencing 'bumping' teachers of lower seniority? Pg 4 Lines 14-17 says that teachers can not be "bumped" by a senior teacher "unless the more senior teacher is certified and is at least as qualified for the position as the junior teacher holding the position." I feel that this wording is irrelevant to the Providence Teachers that the bill is targeting because we get hired and placed in positions we actually apply to through criterion hiring rules.

If you are displaced or laid off you then go and apply to the open positions on School Spring

which is the hiring platform the Providence School Department uses. If you then do not find a position you are assigned to an available role by the school district. Usually this is a one year placement and then you have to apply to open positions when the postings for open positions are placed on School Spring.

This section of the proposal is irrelevant.

By these three concerns alone I feel this proposal should be rejected. Under no circumstances should one district be targeted over all 36 traditional public school districts.

Thank you for your time.

Terinna Hartnett
Math Teacher - Providence School District
Terinna.hartnett@gmail.com