

**MEA Bargaining 2017-2018**  
**Session #5**

Friday, October 6, 2017

Those present: Carl Auckerman, Pat Barber, Sarah Brown, Ron Ciranna, Melissa Cohen, Jacob Davis, James Horner, Helen King, Brian Kirchberg, Angela Lindsey, Steve Motkowicz, Melanie Newhall, Bruce Proud, Rebecca Roberts, Lesli Strickland, Jon Syre, Tammy Taylor and Dawn Walker.

Caucus began at 8:30. Meeting began at 9:28 a.m.

An agenda produced by management was distributed.

Each team's minutes of the 9/27/17 meeting were distributed.

Ron asked if there was any time for breaks to establish and a lunch hour.

Bruce said sure, lunch is good!

Ron asked what time?

Bruce said it probably depends on progress.

Ron said ok; leave it open then.

Bruce asked, do you want to talk about some of these you sent us that you thought might be tentative agreements (TA)? Sarah distributed copies.

Ron asked Pat about the Educational Emergency Schools, did you do language?

Pat replied that Deputy Superintendent Cyndi Saunders is working on things we discussed.

Bruce said that some things clearly we can TA and move on. Some need clarification. Some still not in agreement yet.

Ron started by asking about Article IV, Association Rights, Section 5 Request for dues deduction.

Bruce said we're prepared to TA on that. He stated that the language says HR – need better understanding of process and how that impacts process. MEA has been sending forms to payroll.

Ron said that it's a checks and balances system. Payroll can't do anything unless HR tells them.

Rebecca added that all changes will take place in HR.

Sarah continued by stating that it will be a streamlined process through HR. That's why it's updated language.

Bruce asked how much time is that going to add to the process?

Sarah replied that it should not; it should streamline in to a more efficient process. Instead of person in payroll someone will sit in HR to process to go straight into payroll system. Behind scenes in payroll it is 2 processes. Instead it will be in personnel rather than payroll.

Ron moved on by asking about Article IV, Association Rights Section 6 Uniform Assessment.

Bruce replied that it's Ok to TA.

Ron asked about Article V, Section 8 Notification of Assignment.

Bruce replied that it's Ok to TA.

Sarah asked about non-renomination.

Bruce stated that Article V, Section 16. Procedures for Teachers not Re-nominated. Ok to TA.

Sarah asked about Article V, Section 11 Highly Qualified (HQ) Teachers.

Bruce replied that we are not ready to TA yet because of a combination of other language that existed around certification. Need to review. We may propose something different.

Ron moved on to Article V, Section 26 Elementary Early Release/Elementary Report Card Pick Up

Bruce replied that it's Ok to TA.

Ron asked about Article XII, section 3 Commitment of the Parties.

Bruce stated that MEA has a question about what's stricken. Is it the intent to say benefits offered? Doesn't say voluntary. Is that the start of sentence?

Sarah replied that it should just be capitalized. Use voluntary benefits. Just need capital V. Keep it as voluntary.

Bruce stated that if that's the case, we're fine.

Ron continued with Article XII, Section 5 Plan Design New Teacher Coverage.

Bruce replied that it's Ok to TA.

Ron asked about the name change from MTI to MTC

Bruce stated that regarding Appendix A, MEA wants to wait on salary agreement. Not opposed to appendix A.

Sarah than asked about the name change from MTI to MTC.

Bruce replied, ok with that.

Ron asked if Bruce wants to go back to HQ language or somewhere else.?

Sarah suggested that no, hold off on that language. We need to look at legislation regarding certification.

Ron distributed payroll language that MEA used to counter. He stated that the district simply can't do it because it will break the system. Can't go back and do something like that with this multimillion dollar system.

Bruce stated, so tell me what the problem with the system is with including 8/25 as first payroll?

Ron stated that is to clarify language. So everyone knows what work day being paid. With fluctuation of start date don't lock into a date. Payroll for pay dates based on when you work. 2 weeks.

Sarah said that district wants to eliminate using dates because dates can be an issue. For example the issue of the 10<sup>th</sup> day of work would not be possible in system. We have to pay on 10<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup>.

Bruce stated that it would that also affect end payroll as well.

Sarah replied that no, the end would be June 10<sup>th</sup>. Lump sum receive on 6/10, the last paycheck of contracted year. 24 pays would continue on 10<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> for 6, 7 or 8 as it is today. Move lump sum from May to June.

Bruce stated that my concern if you're moving it later – September 10<sup>th</sup>. It wouldn't be 5 it would be 6 at end. You will be back asking for changes anyway. Under current structure 8/25 fits design. Other stuff won't work.

Sarah stated that she did not understand why it won't work.

Bruce replied that you could change it whenever you want.

Sarah stated that we don't think we can

Brue replied that this language says you can.

Sarah said that we agree that all paydays are 10 and 25.

Bruce said that it doesn't say when first pay will be. Nothing in language. The district could just make a decision to just pay on 25.

Sarah said that people are going to get next pay on pay period. Have to pay people for when they did the work. 8/25 is day set in time. Last year was the first year we started well before 8/15. I understand concern but language may have been relevant many years ago because used to start school at a particular time. Struggling to understand why difficult if 10<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> are 2 pay dates. Why is 8/25 sacred date?

Bruce said that as long as there is one work day between the 16<sup>th</sup> and the 25<sup>th</sup> or the 1<sup>st</sup> through the 15<sup>th</sup> there will be a paycheck.

Rebecca replied, yes.

Rebecca stated that it's in policy. \$14M program is being designed around those dates.

Bruce stated that we will discuss in caucus.

Ron moved on to Article IX, Section 2, Sick Leave Statement.

Sarah stated that regarding the sick leave statement showing accumulated sick leave that there is clearly not a way to do this. She stated that she is baffled by it being agreed to in the first place. It can't be done, and it wouldn't be done in the new system either. There is no report or housing of data in a collective place. When someone retires it is collected in various formats. For someone who retires some info is in personnel file, in hand card, vacation days prior to JDE. JDE came about in 1999. This issue is that those dates of any sick leave earned are kept on a literal file to know when dates were. JDE has information from 1999 to current. Days that were collected are in that system. But there is no way to gather that data because it has to be hand calculated. It is formulated out in pages 47-49 of contract. There is nothing that gives a collective number. What we can do is on the dashboard in PeopleSoft it will give what days are that you currently have. What you have is noted but no history to go back and get. Done on one by one basis as people retire. Not everyone retires. Would love that, but no way to go and get that for 3000 people.

Rebecca said that she heard Bruce's concern and talked to IT. Both individuals said it could not be done within PeopleSoft system. If it could be it would be cost prohibitive. Data is not clean. Marry manual input to JDE. It is not possible.

Bruce stated that this was imposed language because the district negotiators and the board imposed terminal pay language. Calculate different amount and times for terminal leave. It has an impact on terminal leave and terminal pay.

Sarah replied, we understand. Baffled as to how language was placed. Isn't something that system then or now can do.

Bruce replied that we have to consider need for change in terminal pay language.

Sarah stated that we could look at that as well. Would be happy to provide it if we could.

Rebecca stated that we have one person who does nothing but those calculations. That is how complex they are.

Ron moved on to Article X Unpaid Leaves, Section 2 Insurance Coverage.

Sarah stated that last time there was a question about the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph.

Rebecca said the proposal was to eliminate leave other than FMLA. She said that the concern was that the MEA feels we should leave language. She stated that we have discussed this. One objectives many in this room have is that in our health insurance fund that we control costs. Many work hard to control costs. The fund is now in a good position. We don't want and have discussed with leadership to include those in our risk pool who are no longer in the district and are on leave. We feel strongly to not allow on our health insurance plan.

Bruce said that you do recognize FMLA is restrictive to 12 weeks and is often an issue of caring for a spouse or child?

Rebecca replied that those individuals would become eligible for COBRA.

Bruce asked how long on COBRA?

Lesli replied 18 months for normal cobra. If death or divorce can extend for 36 months.

BP said that if an individual is going to continue under COBRA they are still part of the plan.

Rebecca replied, but they are part of a larger risk pool.

Bruce asked what is the larger risk pool? This is a self-insured plan.

Rebecca said that she retracted her statement and that she may have misunderstood.

Lesli said that the person re-elects back on our plan. Premium collected by provider and is handled by a 3<sup>rd</sup> party.

Sarah stated that we can discuss further.

Ron said next, Article XI, Section 8 of the para contract. Employee payday. Never mind.

Ron – Article XII Compensation and Health Insurance. Sections 1 -5.

Sarah said no change to 1. Supplemental salary schedule covered in 2 and 3.

Rebecca said that health insurance committee (HIC) is the next one.

Sarah said that section 4 that district is in agreement with MEA's language on 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph. MEA asked that requests for proposals (RFP) be kept into the language.

Rebecca stated that we as leadership feel strongly that procurement department has experience. Feel strongly in removing language allowing HIC to write RFPs. Procurement attends HIC. The insurance committee, including me, doesn't have the expertise.

Bruce stated that procurement doesn't have the expertise of the committee. They need the expertise of the committee to know how to evaluate or whether provider will provide right service. Others involved in process to drive process. Procurement manages and writes RFP. They need help in evaluation.

Rebecca stated that the language should be developed by procurement department. At some time in past HIC would draft RFPs without procurement. Want to make sure procurement is involved. New language has to be included in RFPs; we want to be sure we're handling procurements properly. Ruth sits through HIC meetings often. She is relatively new.

Bruce stated that the intent is that RFPs are not to be done solely by HIC.

Rebecca stated that the school board makes decisions, not HIC.

Bruce stated that HIC makes recommendations to go to bargaining. We can do so through negotiations. If you are not going to allow HIC to get their minds around the RFP.

Rebecca stated that we are not in complete disagreement.

Bruce said that we are in complete disagreement with bargaining.

Rebecca asked if we can stick to the issue.

Bruce said that health insurance is a mandatory issue of negotiations.

Rebecca said that the objective is to ensure RFP issued that it is written properly and legally sufficient. Have to have expertise involved in writing

Bruce said we don't disagree.

Rebecca stated that we are not opposed to being involved but not written by HIC.

Ron said that we want to have a collaborative relationship. If there is something else you want let me know. Not arguing. Make it clear when someone reads process of how RFP developed so no misunderstanding so if you want to develop language.

Ron then moved on to section 5 – strike box '15-'16. We will wait for counter proposal.

Bruce proposed moving on to section 5, #2 and #3.

Rebecca said that in reference to #2, family members who are terminally ill that the district has no legal basis to document that. District can't verify someone who is not an employee is terminally ill. If it is an employee the district would have documentation. This language puts the district at risk for covering people who may mislead us, so we have a little bit of concern.

Rebecca went on to discuss #3 full year coverage. She said that our objective is to only cover those who are active members of the district. Don't want to include those who are no longer active for one reason or another whether voluntary or involuntary termination. Access to our benefits package should be terminated.

Bruce asked why? The employee has already completed the contract year. They have fulfilled their contract year. You are not interested in fulfilling your part of the bargain.

Rebecca said they will have access until end of June. Then they are no longer on contract. The new year begins in July.

Bruce asked regarding #4, so you want to say board premium?

Rebecca stated that I think your language suggested contribution.

Bruce said OK.

Ron moved on to Article XII, Section 6, Sub 5 Fringe Benefits.

Sarah said that we still have information that we need to check on. Need to talk to Lesli.

Ron proceeded with Article XII, Section 6, Sub 7 Payroll errors.

Rebecca spoke to MEA's counter which proposes to eliminate the line for collecting within current school year. Rebecca said that we are not able to agree because of the number of outstanding collections from former employees is staggering. Risk is that if we extend repayment beyond contract year and can't collect from employees. We have to get board approval to write off. We try to collect back internally, use collection service, and it is very difficult to get it back. Need the ability to collect back before the end of the contract year to recover. Leadership for many reasons believes this is in the district's best interest. The amount due was enough to pay someone's salary. We are writing off large sums of money. We would rather be able to hire a person or benefit the district.

Bruce said that we need to see data that supports that. How many people have paid and not paid? How much has been through collections?

Tammy said that we will get it.

Ron moved on to Article XVI Sick Leave Bank (SLB), Section 3 Replenish contribution. He said that the biggest problem is when SLB runs out during the year.

Sarah asked if it is only replenished at a particular time?

Ron said that the current contract language (CCL) says it is replenished when it reaches 25%.

Rebecca said that it does that on a regular basis but there is resistance from the bargaining group to doing that.

Bruce asked in what way?

Rebecca said she reached out and wanted to replenish the bank last year but she was discouraged from doing so. Was it in March?

Lesli said she was not sure. She thought it was later in the year.

Rebecca repeated that we were discouraged.

Bruce stated that he didn't know that our proposal said anything other than members would be notified a month in advance.

Sarah said that the 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence was stricken from MEA's language. Does the first paragraph handle that? Is it an issue? 25% is what's in question. Doesn't talk about what time will be replenished is the issue.

Bruce said that we will discuss.

Sarah asked about the work year language. She had not received comment back so wasn't sure. 3 record days, ½ day.

Bruce said that our proposal would be to keep CCL. Not sure we received an actual proposal. You mentioned it but I don't see a proposal.

Sarah said that's our error. We will make sure you get it.

Ron asked, do you want to caucus on those to see if we can get some resolution on those?

Sarah referred back to Article XII, Section 3 Commitment of the Parties. The voluntary – I think the original one said any change in voluntary benefits instead of cafeteria. I will bring those changes as well.

Caucus at 10:39 a.m. Reconvened at 1:55 p.m.

Ron stated that Angela had to leave so she won't be here. Where do you want to start?

Sarah distributed voluntary benefits language. It looked like there was some language that got "x"ed out that shouldn't so we added it back in. We apologize the date is not on this one.

Bruce said the date will be on the one we sign. We are OK with that.

During caucus we reviewed all proposals and notes and reviewed the discussion.

Regarding payroll – we will get back to you. Need language about when to work with discrepancies. Might work to include language and make MOU on payroll in general. Otherwise would need 2 different languages – one for this year, one for next. We don't want to delay; payroll language is not applicable to this year.

Ron asked, are you in agreement with this but for adding something about payroll errors?

Bruce said yes.

Ron said that as long as I have your word we can move forward with this. I understand you want a comfort level.

Bruce said that regarding payroll errors the district said it is not going to have any. If so, what's the big deal? Seems like there are an awful lot of errors.

Ron said currently we touch every process. That's not going to happen in the future.

Bruce asked, why would you be opposed if you're not going to have that many? Right now language does not require you to go in future year. It would be rare that you would need to do that. Not sure we need the change.

Ron asked, and that will be same language for teachers as well as for paraprofessionals?

Bruce said that except for pay options and summer school language. That was the difference there. I've got to tell you that the team was amazed with the sick leave statement. We had flashbacks to the board hearing. Back then we raised the issue of keeping track, how are people going to know their record before or after, how will it be applied? That's all part of terminal pay discussion. These two are inextricably linked. Remove statement – we raised that in hearing. It's a cumbersome process. The district still felt compelled to do it. District representatives said they will simply flip a switch and get a statement to get it done. That's a quote. That was



the argument of the admin at the time to get terminal pay changed at the board hearing. We will be proposing change in terminal pay language to revert back to previous language of having singular system for terminal pay. The other proposals around taking benefits from employees is problematic. Seems contradictory to retain and recruit. These are areas where you can actually differentiate yourself from other districts. Having a hard time understanding why you are taking away when you are trying to recruit and retain teachers. Talking about terminal illness leave and insurance benefits, extended leave when you can access benefits – these are differentiations promulgated by being a family friendly place. These are reasons for people to not vote for the contract. We're talking about ratification issues. It becomes more problematic as employees ask the question – what's keeping me here? Arguments are getting cut away. It's going to get down to money and you're going to fail miserably in that comparison. Even with the referendum it will not be sufficient. Even with district's proposal today. Or to come work here. We're struggling with these kinds of proposals. What would be the alternative? In regards to terminal illness language, we get you don't have documentation perhaps. Nothing to keep asking for documentation. That would be legal grounds to collect documentation. Is that what you are looking for as it relates to terminal ill provision?

Rebecca stated that we would be looking for validation that the family member was in fact terminally ill. Right now we are not permitted by law to ask.

Bruce asked if the contract would give grounds if you provide documentation.

Rebecca said that we would entertain that.

Bruce said he would be happy to write that.

Ron asked along the same lines, for my own knowledge, if a person is on leave have up to 2 years and can stay on insurance. If a person goes to work for a charter school they can stay on forever? Do we want to put the same limitation on them as well?

Bruce asked, is that a legal limitation?

Ron said he was just putting it out there.

Sarah said she would have to check. Definitely know that ability to be on leave is continuous. Benefit piece would be separate if on leave from district.

Sarah moved on to health insurance committee and RFP piece. Sarah distributed revised language.

Bruce said that we will discuss.

Bruce moved on to another issue – full year coverage. Challenges with non-renewed individuals. In many cases they are renewed later in this district. To have individuals lose benefits and then wait a month again is not what I think you will want to do to individuals who continue employment. There are many. You can probably give a number. It's significant. It's a considerable number of people. They will lose benefits only to regain later. Just having a hard time understanding that they are employed, they did come with the expectation that they would

pay premiums for the year. Whether you can refund is not the issue. The issue is maintaining benefits. Seems like you want to cut short their contract. We just can't see any reason to accept that.

Sarah distributed new contract language for article X, section 2 insurance coverage. Sarah said we had discussion about insurance coverage. FMLA. COBRA. In further review we understood that might be a difficult process. A lot already captured in language already there. Thought it would be best to leave as is. Suggestion to change language from going through payroll to the benefits office.

Rebecca said this answers question of (inaudible). Oh, no it doesn't.

Bruce asked for clarification - so this is removing 2 paragraphs?

Sarah replied, yes. Go back to CCL.

Bruce asked, wouldn't it have been better to have given me this before my rant?

Sarah said we heard you. How's that?

Rebecca said we carried your words onto the page.

Bruce asked, do you have any more like that?

Ron said, if you give payroll language we might give you something else. I can make my Ciber people happy.

Bruce said, I don't have anything further until we discuss these 2 which should be acceptable.

Sarah distributed new language – Article XVIII, Section 1 Work Year. Sarah said that the district added new language: “The 3 record days will dedicate a half-day of professional development during each record day.” Sarah stated that the heading is written as a proposed agreement because we thought you had it. It is a request to take a look at to dedicate ½ day for PD for teachers within the school. We know that this is a very important day. At the same time we are under the impression that it has been automated. Teachers are not bubbling in things that used to take a lot of time. Teachers have much of their work completed prior to record day. Desire to help add more PD time within a school for their teams. Sarah asked for principals to provide their comments.

James said that since FOCUS records are able to be done much quicker that is leaving time that's left over that could be using for teacher planning, collaborative planning that we never seem to have enough time for.

Carl said that there are so many programs that would benefit from having additional time for such as AICE and AVID. That would be helpful.

James said that especially ESE has a lot of work to do on those days. I used to be the one who walked out and said where did everybody go?

Bruce said that this proposal says PD. Doesn't say anything about collaborative planning. How would it fit into this?

James said it would have to be written differently. PD could be very different than collaborative planning.

Bruce said that it says PD. That's a different mindset than collaborative planning. And who is generating topics for that has a different connotation for what happens in that time. Just saying PD leaves it open for district doing district-wide PD.

Sarah said that the district is open to how it might be used.

Bruce said that teachers tell me and the bargaining team that they have more paperwork that they need to do during record days than even before the electronic grading system was implemented. There are requirements that they have to complete. We will discuss in caucus. We did not really discuss this specifically. Do you want us to caucus now or wait?

Ron said sure.

Caucus at 2:33 p.m. Reconvened at 3:34.

Bruce said that we are good on insurance coverage language and health insurance committee.

We had a long conversation about record days. There is an awful big misperception about what teachers do. It isn't just grades. This affects not just ELL and ESE teachers; it applies to everybody. There has to be planning around that. There is a long list of the kind of work teachers have to do to prepare for next quarter. Some take time to collaboratively plan with teams. No objection to that. Maybe object to name of the day but not the function. It is a day for teacher work. Some give tests or other written requirements that need to be corrected during that time before issuing grades. Not in favor of changing record day to ½ PD day. No one here has said they don't have anything to do during those days. If you need a longer list of things we can provide a list of things that they do that I did not list. No objection to striking "2005-2006" however.

We spent a lot of time talking about your salary proposal and need some further clarification. Thank you for the correction of the longevity amount; however, it's still not the right amount for longevity in looking back at the historical salary schedule. Still a considerable gap between where we are in the schedule compared to where they might have been in the old schedule. There was as much as \$10,000 in bumps in the schedule that occurred in 4 or 5 places. None of that exists now. There is not a 1-1 correspondence in the schedule now. I get that there were agreements made. Would like to separate that now. Now what's the differential? What's the dollar value for longevity? Where is that right spot that recognizes things that happened in the shift of schedule for those who have been here 16 and 25+ years?

Regarding the new teacher incentive – are you talking about a bonus?

Sarah replied, yes.

Bruce said that is not all that appealing to those already hired. It's great to have extra cash, but a bonus is not a good way to go. There are certainly ways to do that that would impact folks throughout the schedule. There is a way to do that in combination with level movement or some other issues.

Regarding the benefit holiday issue – we are trying to figure out how you have 24 pay periods of which

premiums need to be paid in 24 separate amounts. How is it the system can't do that since it's a regular payroll cycle, regular amount, doesn't change? It's the same amount. Why is this an issue? Particularly for those who serve on the HIC removing employee premiums, and only employee premiums, out is concerning. Don't get how it's a system problem. How is it not going to be a problem every year? Are you talking about doing a benefit savings this December?

Rebecca replied, yes.

Bruce asked, how is it a problem in this December?

Rebecca said that the district is trying to align processes with where we need to be July 1 of the new year as we are building the system because it has to be built and tested before going live. System can only collect 1 premium ahead. You pair the suggestion with the aligning of premium with month with other language we're asking for helps us manage through the process. These are only employee premiums. No other employee who is not on the district's health insurance would benefit from them. Money would remain in the pocket of those who would otherwise pay. The only savings would be to the people who are already paying into the health insurance fund.

Lesli said that in the current system we are able to make health insurance effective 10/1. In payroll we put them in the system and that premium is going to pull from the 9/10 check. In the new system we don't have the capability of going back more than 1 pay period. 10/1 is for 9/16 – 9/30. Can't go back and pull a full month of premium in new system.

Bruce asked, so when does the holiday occur in the system?

Rebecca said that it would be the 2 paydays in December 2017.

Lesli said we would not collect new deductions until January 10<sup>th</sup>. The holiday would be both December deductions. 2 pay periods.

Bruce asked, premiums from January forward would be paid in current month?

Lesli said that it would only deduct premiums in current month. When person hired in August deductions would come out in September to be covered in October. We would no longer collect a month in advance. All deductions will begin in month coverage is effective.

Bruce said, so the total amount that will not be in the plan is \$900,000 for all employees?

Lesli said yes, just shy of \$1M. Not that it's coming out we're just not adding to the plan for that particular month. And only the employee piece would . . .

Rebecca stated that the district's share would continue to be made.

Bruce said that we asked for evaluation data so we would know what we were talking about instead of guessing. Performance vs. grandfathered. How many of HE, E, NI/D, U? We need to know the real value. Do we have the numbers yet?

Rebecca replied that evaluation information was not available at Monday's cabinet meeting.

Bruce said that there is concern about the student data portions of the evaluation regardless of where you are. Objection in terms of grandfathered (GF) schedule. Very little belief that this schedule differentiates. MEA only wants to comply with the law. We don't want to expand the issue to GF in this way because we don't believe evaluation is valid to apply. Not sure it works for the performance schedule either. We may need to campaign together to get rid of it altogether. We would rather hold in abeyance and work together until we have a schedule. With the State's approach to Best & Brightest we may get away with it for a year. We believe we're differentiating enough and are complying with state law as it applies to the GF schedule. Don't know where we are as far as a counter proposal other than those concepts we talked about.

I really don't want to have a benefit holiday attached to a real salary increase. The district will say it is giving a different percentage including that number.

Rebecca said she can pull that line into a different section which can memorialize it. Doesn't have to be on same schedule as whatever agreement on salaries.

Ron asked if MEA understands we have to do this (benefit holiday) because of PeopleSoft.

Bruce replied, I didn't before but now I do.

Regarding paraprofessional salaries, Bruce said that paras have a history of being concerned about step movement. They want to catch up with times when they did not move. They want to be recognized. Moving from one step to the next has a dollar value and they are moving ahead of individuals just being hired. We thought it was important to move last year. The real impact of 4% is that they would remain on current level. Your proposal is to increase salaries across the board impacting new and current employees, correct?

Sarah and Rebecca both replied, yes.

Bruce said that in Pinellas they have moved from 0 to 1 by eliminating the bottom step. This minimally changes the starting salary compared to what 4% would be. The pressure of those individuals who want to move steps is significant. What are you really wed to here? Can we negotiate and find a way to distribute money that is acceptable to everybody?

Rebecca said that it is our preference to do % increase because it benefits the general populace of paras greater than step. In keeping with the objective to get payroll issued correctly when we do step movement in current system it requires a lot of manual issues. It is easier to administer a percentage. It is the best way to ensure people are paid properly. We have done creative things in the past. We're not adverse; I have come to the table with ideas myself not realizing how challenging it is in the current system to make those things happen.

Bruce said that having steps was a way of saving money. If you want to increase across the board people aren't going to complain. It does not help people at the bottom of the schedule; it doesn't get them closer to a higher wage.

Rebecca said that she understands Bruce's concern. We have a concern; the lowest paid are hard to attract and retain. It does help to attract to those positions.

Bruce said that it actually doesn't help because 3 level movement is more in every step than the first. Even if you do it's more for the majority of people than . . .

Rebecca said that if you have a counter proposal we will entertain.

Bruce replied ok, will counter another time. Do you want to schedule another time?

Ron asked, could you send counter proposals next week or at least by the 16<sup>th</sup> so we can review and do research? Counters on paras and teacher salary. Ok with payday but want to add section on discrepancy in pay. If you want to put language together and give 3 days in advance that way we can have it on Monday, the 16<sup>th</sup> to do research we need to do on that.

Bruce said, on what day?

Pat said the 19<sup>th</sup> is what we talked about.

Ron said promise payroll and we can do it today.

Bruce said we would be happy to get it all finished.

Ron said that at the next board meeting we'll be all finished.

Pat said yes file leave forms for a full day of bargaining.

Sarah agreed, yes.

Bruce said ok.

Ron said we're all set. Sign off on TAs?

Bruce said yep.

Meeting adjourned at 4:07 p.m.