

MEA Bargaining 2019-2020

Session #1

Thursday, October 3, 2019

Those present: Pat Barber, Kate Barlaug, Cory Bernaert, Kara Carney, Willie Clark, Jacob Davis, James Horner, Heather Jenkins, Helen King, Brian Kirchberg, Rena Morano, Bruce Proud, John Reichert, Lesli Strickland, Tammy Taylor, David Underhill, Bill Vogel, Doug Wagner, Dawn Walker and Genelle Zoratti-Yost.

Caucus began at 4:33 p.m. Meeting began at 5:11 p.m.

Agenda

Team Introductions ▪ Budget Update ▪ Salary Proposal ▪ Language discussions ▪ Next Session Dates

Bill greeted everyone. Manatee's graduation rates up. Close to an A district. Teachers make the difference. Referendum helped this year with additional dollars. Going in the right directions. Governor going to make teachers a priority. Hope money will be added to base allocation to get money where it needs to go. Good to work with you, Pat and team.

Bruce started with introductions of MEA team. Management introduced the management team.

Budget update

Heather – district received \$15.3 million more than last year. From that allocation some expenses are mandatory including Best and Brightest (B&B) for teachers (\$4.7M), turnaround schools (\$1.7M), increase in safe schools allocation (\$244,000). Increase for growth of \$1.6M., \$573,000 for FRS. Total adds up to \$8.9M. \$6.3 left after that is discretionary.

Unfilled subs is an expense not budgeted for. Last year it was \$50 per unfilled sub paid to schools in October. Last year expense was \$320,000. This year the program was changed so money goes directly to teachers. \$100 in regular school. \$110 if it's a Title I school. Expected to cost \$716,000 this year.

Opening of Parish Charter School. Increased by \$745,000. Leaves with \$4.8M in discretionary funding.

McKay – usually does not show up in calculation in FEFP until the 3rd calc. Listed in 2nd calc. as \$5,598,479.

That's the current estimation of McKay. Next week will submit current counts.

Fund balance – have to have 3% of new revenue in assigned and unassigned. Restricted – state categoricals like instructional materials, grants, federal funds, referendum (left over 50% in instructional category because is spent in supplement per agreement) Had \$34.7M. Only \$12.5M is unassigned. Combination is 4.13%. Prior year was \$15.7M. Dropped by 3.2M. Portion went to district wide salary increases. \$13,295,000 budgeted. That's exactly 3%.

Bruce – Where were those mandates in budget last year?

Heather – B&B – program 5100. It was not listed in FEFP because it was a grant. This year it's in the calculation. Like a categorical. Didn't have turnaround last year. Safe schools was categorical. This year increase was \$244,239. State gave that as extra to cover safe schools. Its part of total FEFP.

Bruce - Trying to get what's coming out of FEFP and what's coming out of categoricals.

Increased enrollment – 226.3 was projection.

Bill – will validate projection after FTE week.

Bruce – categories not budgeted that doesn't match last year. Budgeted as 0, last year a little over \$6M.

Heather – several grants like local grants that not going to receive this year. Did not budget for grants that were not guaranteed.

Bruce – are there positions?

Heather – There are. In those instances they're funded out of general fund. Could be charged back. It depends on the grant terms.

Bruce – some state and local resources that are not budgeted. In some cases attached to positions.

Heather – Yes, I believe 3 positions in total. Can get that number.

Bruce – have there been changes to approved budget? Said \$15.6M more. What you said is \$15.3M. Has it changed that much already?

Heather – it could have to do with beginning fund balance. We had not closed since last year. Been adjusting, small changes based on reconciliation. No change in funding received.

Bruce – In the superintendent message it said there was \$19.2M more in general fund revenue. Different places differ from what you're saying.

Heather – comparing different things. Superintendent compared this year's budget book to last year's budget book. Heather's comparison is from last year's 4th calculation to this year's 2nd calculation.

Bruce – no other questions at this point.

Salary proposal

Teachers

Bill – start with salary proposal to move bargaining along this year. (Handout provided). His team and board believe in putting money on schedule. Offer to give 3 levels to highly effective (HE), 2 levels to effective (E). Includes longevity. Important to teachers and board. Also includes increase in dollars for new MOU for substitutes.

Jacob – Regarding those on the performance pay (PP) schedule who were not rated. Last year they got 2 step movement. Longevity – same as last year. Unfilled subs based on actuals from last year. Add in 406 unfilled positions based on new schools.

Bill – using same methodology as in the past. That helps us. HE and E – not sure if we will have that reconciled. We just received the information. Should not be big fluctuations.

Bruce – you went back to numbers from September?

Jacob – yes. Had actual numbers for final ratings . 75.2% is being congruent with this year's data. Will be some variability. Will do as strong a reconciliation as possible.

Bruce – you used the same number of new employees who would not be rated as last year?

Jacob – yes.

Bruce – that anyone that's new and people who were not rated?

Jacob – 75.2% is eligible on PP schedule based on start date and breakdown is same as was last year. Giving unrated 2 step movement.

Bruce – not rated because have not been here long enough.

Jacob - yessir.

Bruce – why are you using \$608 and \$303 since the difference is \$311 and \$312?

Jacob – used other standard schedule without time adjustment. It was a concern in prior years.

Bruce – it would be the same. I'm concerned underestimating the cost. I can do more with these numbers the way they are that doesn't help with budget then I will hear from Heather and it comes up with next year's bargaining. So I have a future issue. Longevity – used continuing higher number because had people who had not been put on schedule – we were still catching up – probably is not that many people. Should be able to recognize and anticipate how many get longevity.

Jacob - \$255,00 estimated for longevity in past. People petered in in the past. Comes by exception. Pat and I have discussed this. We have card files on them. People raise their hands and we count years of experience. Don't have good way of estimating that.

Bruce – number on performance increasing and number on grandfathered decreasing. Static number going to continue to reduce. So, not sure using previous year's numbers is going to work for us. Get that have to somewhat project E and HE but even that became an issue because more were HE than were projected. Want to get to a better place with numbers.

Jacob – would you prefer to go with actuals on PP?

Bruce – don't know we'll ever get to actuals. Process continues. Want to get to a point where we know. People have their evaluations. Know how many E and HE. Better prediction.

Bill – that benefits all of us. That's what I asked for data. So we would have a sense of what's happening at static point. Gives information about where we were in May. Not perfect either but reasonable place to start to know where we are. How many positions to fill, which don't impact evaluation, but tells us numbers.

Jacob – happy to take snapshot on tentative data we have.

Bill – we want the most accurate numbers.

Jacob – cushion. Adding unrated.

Bruce – I think the number will be reduced. Know it's a statewide issue. Don't expect to get a perfect number. Know it's going to change.

Unfilled sub position – \$715,000? Is that more than budgeted last year?

Jacob – it's a total number

Bruce – this is new number as total number that goes to teachers?

Jacob – \$100 or \$110 and then estimate for new schools

Bruce – Can you provide data?

Jacob – yes

Bruce – Why not push to have subs than to have unfilled positions? Concern is that looks like we're getting charged for solution to problem when real solution is to get subs and to get principals to get subs. Going to want to track carefully - what's happening as far as how many people. Track subs that are being requested since that is the only way to get money.

Bill – that's an estimate for right now. Had to put something in the budget based on last year's actuals.

Bruce – that's in the budget for this year?

Heather – yes.

Bruce – so unless there is an increase in what's happening. Should not go up.

Bill – Doug is working on it. Open to discussion and future discussion.

Bruce – thanks for making proposals and for making it easier to move through process.

Paras

Data based on information presented in early July. Proposed one step movement. 1.86% pay increase. Total cost of \$322,677.66.

Bruce – Are these total numbers?

Jacob – was not captured. Can get that. Apologize.

Bruce – people above step 23?

Jacob – 2%. On average it's 2% per step.

Bruce – yeah don't have a problem with 2%. Average is 2%. That's what we've used in past. We understand proposals.

Language proposals

Bill – what's good is that during year we're in continual discussion. Have done MOUs and we can talk about it for inclusion in contract. It's your pleasure, Bruce.

Bruce – are you talking about MOU or other issues?

Bill – there is health insurance, advertising positions, wellness, talked about possible inclusion in contract. May be an addendum. Not going to say not going to have reopeners.

Bruce – are you anticipating change in MOUs?

Bill – not at this point. What has been nice is that there has been ongoing discussion. Not any big surprises. Had audit criticism about evaluation – going to put that to rest. We dispute that. May want it in contract.

Bruce – that would be new language. Article XII would be appropriate for discussion. Makes sense probably to memorialize it in to contract language.

Bill – that's all we have.

Bruce – (Handout) There has been great misunderstanding in legislature and how they're funding education. Doesn't get to legislators that when they make mandates funding can't go towards employees' pay. They want to take credit for employee pay. Data checking for what's happening with that. Manatee's numbers not terrible but not gaining ground much. Look at Manatee and state data to see what talking about to keep up with inflation. DoE data average and median salaries for teachers in Manatee and state average and experience goes into mix. Although we've made gains from 2011-2012 there have been ups and downs in tough years. Data one year delayed but not most current but what MEA calculated is based on data got from district's May payroll. Reality is 2.9% more from 2011-2012 to 2018-2019. Doesn't keep up with inflation. Not big gains. Not big gains in the number of people either. Haven't created room for growth in salaries along the way. In Manatee or in FL. FL average has gone up more than Manatee's, partially because of experience. Still significant to know that Manatee is lagging compared to the state. State hasn't gained all that much, 4.3% for teachers. Not really impressive. State legislators haven't been that wonderful in the House or Senator or both. Not sure it's not because we didn't bargain for every penny. Not seeing all these big lines of money that aren't going to places not mandated by law. Paras are doing a little better but have been going backward. Paras still below the poverty line so remains a major concern. Not caught up from where we were in 11-12 because of reduction in and freezing in pay. There have been across the board increases of small amounts.

Bill – Does 18-19 data include the referendum?

Bruce – it does not for teachers. Will show a change next year. It will show up in DoE data. DoE data lags behind. Para data – didn't take out referendum. But over time that should have a positive impact but that's not coming from state legislature. Will add column in future as to what referendum is doing.

Bill – so many districts going with referendum. If you could pull referendum money out of all districts I think this would be valuable data. Districts without referendum are falling way behind.

Bruce – We also have proposals. (Handouts). We know there needs to be progress made as it relates to teacher salaries. Some districts have resolved their contracts like St. Johns. It's a comparable district. They were able to increase teacher salary by \$2000 in performance model + Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) + money on salary schedule. Brevard settled as well. Other districts are resolving negotiations. May be historical differences. I know St. Johns salaries are less than Manatee's; Brevard's is higher. Others will resolve as they go through the process. How are they managing to provide for teacher salaries? Proposing COLA of \$500. COLA applies to everyone. Everyone who is in bargaining unit at the time of approval. Proposing a 6/4 model. Calculate at \$311 and \$312 per level +\$2 to ensure complying with statute. COLA complies with statute. COLA has to be half or less of effective teacher increase. 6/4 complies. Grandfathered (GF) numbers based on the number of people on current list we got from May that were on GF at that time. Longevity used 50 and 20 teachers. That is a calculation of new people who would meet those thresholds this year.

Paras

We clearly believe step increase is more valuable to them. Average is below poverty level. Lots of room to grow. Lots making less than \$15/hour is still a concern. Proposing \$250 COLA along with 3 steps. Can make adjustment to 7.74%. That's the current number for benefits attachment. Based on increase in FRS rate (Jacob concurred). Just the FRS increased. So, cost for teachers is \$6.3M without benefits, \$7.4 with benefits. Cost for paras is \$1.1M without benefits

Bill – Talk about the COLA versus adding it to the salary schedule.

Bruce – don't see it any different than changing the schedule. If you want to call it an adjustment to the schedule I'm OK with that.

Bill – That's a different concept. Not sure we've used COLA terminology.

Jacob – per statute does need to meet guidelines.

Bruce – don't know how they would interpret differently. Don't know it's been challenged because of change to schedule. Haven't seen change schedule greater than that amount. Don't know verbiage. Fine with either verbiage.

Bill – Will look at this.

Bruce – Anxious to use same numbers.

Jacob – Difficult to predict the number for longevity.

Bruce – Best to do it on however we can agree.

Bill – We are fortunate to have the referendum. We realize it's important to add money to the schedule. Both districts you mentioned do not have the millage. They have used bonuses to achieve what they want. We want to stay away from that. Hope to refine the data. Information we're hearing is that the governor is looking at a

way to provide teacher salary increases in ways that are not consistent with the base student allocation (BSA). Hopefully we can all emphasize that money goes in BSA so we have flexibility. Concerned about other employee groups. Do know those in Tallahassee haven't finalized plans on that yet. Heard they are open to hearing ideas on how to do that. Your work on B&B has had an impact.

Bruce – as B&B has changed the amount is less and fewer are eligible. Not going to be seen as such a value.

Bill – unfortunately legislature has a poor track record. Each time legislature has tried to do something it has backfired.

Next session

Bill – FTE week is coming up. Would rather hold off setting a date until we get through FTE and get our numbers. A couple of weeks away. Last week of month management not available. Possibly week of 10/21, 10/23 or 10/24.

Want to come to a resolution that we are comfortable with based on our financial condition.

Meeting adjourned at 6:26 p.m.