

MEA Bargaining 2017-2018
Session #6

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Those present: Carl Auckerman, Pat Barber, Sarah Brown, Kara Carney, 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 a.m. Meeting began at 9:21 a.m.

Each team's minutes of the 10/6/17 meeting were distributed.

Ron distributed teacher payday language for teachers and paraprofessionals. Clarification language regarding section 2 for paras, section 2 for teachers regarding when the end of the school year is.

Bruce asked, is there a reason in C for what is in B, about December 25?

Sarah replied, no. We didn't mean to be that way.

Ron asked in #6 did you mean 2017 or 2018?

Bruce replied, I think 2018 is too late.

Ron said 2017 is fine. Just wanted to make sure.

Bruce continued, 2018 is too late because it would already be implemented 5 months. Not wedded to November.

Ron said he would ask Ciber.

Sarah said the district is going to start doing some testing and will check on a date that might be more relevant.

Ron asked, so ok?

Bruce said that we need a conversation. This is a significant change involving payout for summer.

Sarah explained that the difference has to do with when the last work day is. With calendar changes end is in May, actual pay for someone who is not taking lump sum, the last day will be June 10th pay. If calendar change happens to fall on 6/3 last pay will be on 6/25. This is how contract pay is set up in the new system. That's why clarification is there.

Ron said he will get clarification on what month for testing works best for Ciber.

Ron asked if MEA has a counterproposal for salaries? What do you wanna do next?

Sarah commented, whatever you all want to do.

Ron asked, did you have one you were going to give back to us?

Bruce distributed salary proposal and Article XII, Section 5.

Bruce said that based on previous conversation about bottom of schedule we are recommending \$100 on each step of schedule of both schedules. That would have an impact on their immediate pay even for those recently hired. Will impact them over time. Within a short period of time would redeem \$600 bonus. 4 level 5 level model based on the numbers provided on effective (E) and highly effective (HE) in performance pay (PP) schedule. Grandfathered (GF) – 5 levels. Longevity – \$2100 and \$3600. Paras: 4 steps with 4% at top of schedule. On the second page took a stab at how to address health insurance holiday in health insurance (HI) language for that particular year. Just this year. Weren't sure it was better though MOU or this method but

seemed to fit there.

Rebecca replied, we should probably caucus to talk about it.

Bruce said that we do have language about highly qualified (HQ), primarily looks like language provided previously about certification. Certification process and those who may be assigned out of field. HQ still part of DOE's vernacular . . .

Sarah commented, we are all trying to figure it out.

Bruce continued, the first change involves removing denial of PSC because it is not part of the law. Now it is more actionable as non-reappointment or termination. Others about not certified in field or certification related.

In B it appears it was voluntary but language said involuntary; don't know if language was intended or not.

Language appears it was voluntary for which you're not certified. Involuntary is in C or other way around.

Sarah said that in B1 at the 10 day count there are times when voluntary and involuntary may be pertinent.

Bruce replied A is voluntary. B is involuntary.

Sarah replied, ok just want to make sure understood that it wasn't something different.

Sarah asked Bruce, you mentioned Appendix A?

Bruce said that is more related to how we implement salary proposal.

Sarah said, ok we'll wait. Just double checking.

Ron said, ok caucus.

Bruce said, wait we have more. Payroll error language. Attempt to recognize we don't want this to go on forever. There is a need for a cutoff point. No longer than 1 calendar year. You may have some that decide to quit. May be minimized. If they resign it's part of final check payout. Has potential of not being sufficient. Small window to address issue of errors.

Bruce continued with terminal pay language that was modified a few years ago. It is very complicated for teachers to understand what's going to happen once there are several different models and calculations at the time language that was in the current language. We propose to revert to previous model basically deleting alternatives of after 7/1/11 for both normal and early retirement. Otherwise there is a need to develop some way to notify employees how many days they have. More complicated because of no retroactive pay last year; there were 2 pays in different parts of year. That's all we have.

Caucus at 9:44 a.m. Reconvened at 11:31 a.m.

Sarah said that we are fine with working condition piece. Put in format so we can sign off. We've worked through review.

Ron said it's OK.

Rebecca said that district is ok with salary and health insurance plan design (holiday). OK with payroll errors. Really confident that system will have fewer errors.

Sarah said regarding terminal pay that we are happy to take into consideration. Looking into language. Will have counter this afternoon.

Rebecca gave salary counter proposal. Regarding teacher salary, one message we received from the superintendent and the Board was their concern over brand new teachers and the new teacher incentive. We can't budge off of that. They feel passionately about that. It needs to be within the package. Proposal is a stretch for us but we recognize what you're asking for. Trying to compromise. 4/5 split for E regardless of schedule. 5 for HE for anyone regardless of schedule. Did not change longevity. \$900 and \$2400. It's a bit of

a stretch but we know we are trying to do the best within the budget.

Rebecca continued with paraprofessionals – we are not in a position to offer, to meet proposal you made to us. One thing our board and superintendent expressed is concern for lowest paid individuals across all employee groups. Propose moving step 00 to 1. This would eliminate 0 and increase starting salary for paras coming in. Offer of 2 levels for all those eligible employees and 4% for everyone at top. \$100 one-time bonus for all eligible employees (not new employees) according to 99 day thing. Anyone over that would be eligible. This is a bit more rich than our original proposal.

Bruce asked for the rationale for maintaining evaluation split for both schedules.

Rebecca said that this is something the district feels strongly about. The Board feels strongly.

Bruce asked why? Based on what?

Rebecca turned to Ron and asked, would you like to help?

Ron said the Board wants to see differentiating between two levels.

Bruce asked, they believe the evaluation system differentiates?

Ron said, yep. They believe it does.

Bruce asked, even with flaws that exist within the system?

Bruce said it's not relevant, not real without having turmoil. The district will then expect challenges from anyone that is effective. They will challenge because it is attached to money. The only reason those on PP will not challenge is because it's the law. If this language is imposed we will encourage those on GF to challenge their evaluation because administration is refusing to explain evaluation information to people, is not providing sufficient information so people can see actual results and is not giving teachers the ability to see which students count for their student growth score. There will be an impetus on administration to do it right. You can see we're opposed. We won't counter propose with that in it.

Ron reiterated, that is the district's proposal.

Bruce asked, new teacher bonus proposal rationale?

Ron said that it is to be as competitive as we can; to be competitive with those around us.

Rebecca interjected that it was only for those currently on board since January.

Bruce asked, were they told they would be getting an incentive when hired?

Sarah replied, no.

Rebecca stated that it is a one-time for this year only. It does not carry over; does not continue.

Bruce said, I heard – it was a bonus.

Bruce asked, what about people on GF who are rated less than E but not U?

Sarah replied, I don't think (Florida Statute) 1012 allows us to provide dollars.

Bruce said it only talks about those on PP. Now, you are adding to those individuals rated as needs improvement (NI). You're giving a bonus of \$600 to those who have not worked at all yet giving nothing to those who worked here because of a NI evaluation.

Bruce said, moving to longevity –was it intent to exclude any monetary amounts?

Rebecca said that she believes longevity is negotiable every year. Believe putting in contract language is inappropriate.

Bruce asked if there was anything else.

Ron replied, no, that's it. I gave cleaner language.

Bruce said, that's alright and provided a counter on payroll language.

Ron asked, what did you change?

Bruce said that he added an option of 20 equal pays over a 10 month period for people to receive their money in time that they worked. Proposal includes November date. No objection to February date.

Ron asked on both the teacher and paraprofessional contracts?

Bruce replied, yes.

Ron said that he will have Ciber Bob review. Anything else? Assuming you want to have lunch, too? Return at 2:00 p.m.? Is that reasonable?

Bruce replied, ok.

Ron said, ok. See you at 2.

Caucus at 11:48 a.m. Caucus at 2:00 p.m. Reconvened at 2:32 p.m.

Ron distributed counter to counter on pay. We can do 20 but we can't do the lump sum payment. Either 24 equal pays or 20 equal pays. But if we do that we can't do lump. Pretty much the same language just took out the lump option. Take your time. Discuss. Everything else stayed in there. I kind of prefer the 20 equal pays. It's pretty clean for payroll purposes; less chances of errors.

Bruce said, I understand your proposal.

Ron asked, did you have counter to salary?

Bruce said, still working on that.

Ron asked, want to go with retirement?

Sarah distributed terminal pay language. Our language doesn't fit with FRS, particularly those new retirees. Pension – 8 years creditable. 33 years vs. 30 years. Age 62 vs. age 65. Different changes that is a little more complex. More complexity with early retirement with how FRS looks at that. From teacher and from business standpoint having so much complexity as to how numbers are configured. Those are hard numbers to decipher. Section 1 – added language to #1 added language specific to FRS. 1 – added that it would be defined by FRS at time of teachers retirement. Strike 2,3 and 4. New #3 if they were an employee of the MCSB only those sick days earned while here. Doesn't change. Hope to change how you get your money. What rate you're going to be using. Go back to beginning years at a certain time frame. Teachers average salary rate in 5 years of employment. Average of last 5 years instead of going back and looking at that hourly rate as to how it has been in the past. We indicated in #2 it would be normal and early retirement. Process would be same for either group. Shortened language to make it more defined. Combining some and allowing more percentage as to less. Formula for early retirees or not. This gives benefits to those who would early retire. Early retiree with 16 years or more.

Bruce said, I think I understand your proposal. Average base salary rate – have same questions about what the base salary rate and what that means.

Sarah replied, right. Ok.

Bruce said that he had no other questions. Regarding use of the last 5 years. Rationale of using that over something else?

Sarah said that FRS uses top 5. That would be a difficult process other than looking at last 5. Typically can see last 5 and typically are highest earnings. Looking at category of teacher and para – it's consistent and easy to determine and see what they have made the last 5 years. We know FRS has capability we don't have and

employees can see that.

Rebecca said that the first 4 or 5 years we won't have that information. Right now we can't provide that data. As we build history in the ERP enough data will be available in ERP system and people can calculate for themselves.

Bruce said that he had no further questions.

Ron stated that Rebecca has an appointment between 3 and 3:30. She can come back but if you have anything you want to talk with her we can do that briefly.

Sarah asked Pat, did you send things to me?

Pat replied, no. I wasn't sure what you needed.

Sarah said, the ones we had agreement on. Payday language. Was hoping to see if you signed off.

Bruce replied, we can sign off on those.

Bruce asked, in your salary proposal on PP level \$1220 for 4 levels and \$1525 for 5 levels and I'm trying to figure out how you got to those numbers.

Jacob replied, it's just \$305 per level.

Bruce said the \$2 was added just once. Was there intent to do any more changes to the PP schedule?

Rebecca replied, no; it was not our intent.

Bruce asked about the para schedule – you move all from 0 to 1. Is that calculation for all currently at step 1 or only for those individuals who wouldn't move?

Rebecca replied, for all at step 0. No one at 1 unless eligible.

Bruce asked for those at 0 now the 2 steps would be moving 2 steps more?

Rebecca replied that only those not eligible for 2 step movement.

Jacob said 0 to 1. Everyone else 2 step movement.

Bruce said, that's what I thought but not sure while we were talking. And the \$100 one time for anyone who is eligible, not those who are moving?

Rebecca and Sarah both replied, correct.

Bruce said that he is not a big proponent of a bonus. Not sure what it does. Struggling with conversation. Not going to recruit or retain anybody. What does it mean in terms of recruitment and retention?

Rebecca said, I will be honest because you know I try to do that. Looking at your proposal and our proposal – 4% for everyone is more valuable than moving 2 steps. At the end of the day not fair or reasonable for me to come back with counter that is less valuable. \$60,000 does not permit us to do more level movement. That was more costly; couldn't do more level movement. \$100 for everyone was my attempt to have a proposal as valuable and shared equally among those and make it valuable. Looking for some counsel on how to best use dollars and not come out less valuable to our people.

Bruce replied, thank you. Don't think I have any more questions. That will help in us finalizing the next proposal. We'll take a caucus.

Caucus at 2:57 p.m. Reconvened at 3:58 p.m.

Bruce distributed MEA para salary proposal. This is our counter for paras. We have agreed to move 00 to 01 but proposed 3 step movement for paras. They are being frozen for so long. In the past it has created an issue

for paras, so we are proposing movement. 4% at top. Did not include bonuses. It's a money issue. No need to address bonuses.

Bruce distributed MEA proposal to district on teacher salary. Shows bonus of \$600 for those ineligible to move levels, including those less than E on PP. 4 for E, 5 for HE, 5 levels for GF for all eligible for movement regardless of performance unless they are unsatisfactory. The longevity is same as our previous proposal. Gone back to 12-13 compared to what individuals are making now with or without longevity and still behind where they would have been by more than a \$1000, even more if you are on the masters schedule. Way behind what it would have been had we not converted to the new salary schedule. In every example many are people who are on the bargaining team or people they know, there is a gap even using the \$2100 and \$3600. Top of schedule was more than \$5000 for step 26. And there were several other places – steps 16, 19, 21 that were \$2100 or more.

Ron said, we will get some more then we will caucus.

Bruce stated that we have not written counter proposals to payday. That's why we asked for data. Need to think about eliminating lump sum and get some rationale for that change and get some ideas for individuals that had lump sum if they are interested in going to 20 or 21 model. In the terminal pay language the issue is related to the average of 5 years of knowing that there is a number who are close to retirement now. Certainly would be interested in shortening to 3 year average. The other has to do with what IS the average salary. Now that we have started longevity supplement, if removing base from salary. Need to have a conversation about what base salary means.

Ron said, I agree. We have to standardize what it means.

Sarah stated that we have had several HIC meetings, and we have put together a proposal to talk about wellness program. Sarah distributed language. Postpone tier 1 and 2 as we move into 2018 to use that as a developing year. Participation was less than 2% that were working on it; it did not appear to be as successful as hoped. Maybe better ideas with some initiatives. Hold off on continuing with program until we can come up with something more meaningful in 2019.

Bruce asked, what does 'all stakeholders' mean?

Sarah replied, HIC, typically is in the MEA contract, involves AFSCME and district representation. It is a collaborative effort through HIC. That is where the 'all stakeholder' idea comes from. We could do focus groups and work toward putting something meaningful together for MEA members as well as district as a whole.

Bruce said this implies it will be implemented in the 2019 calendar year. Who decides that?

Sarah said that she is hopeful to have something to put together. There were some programs that went away and then came back.

Ron said that 2019 would be the goal.

Sarah said that 2019 is not iron clad. The hope is to implement then. That is what we would do.

Ron said, let's go back and get our calculators out.

Sarah asked, any other questions, Bruce?

Bruce replied, no.

Caucus at 4:13 p.m. Reconvened at 4:47 p.m.

Ron passed out a district proposal.

Rebecca stated, we hear and appreciate what you're saying. We are trying to accommodate within limitations.

Jacob discovered that 4 level 5 level for performance is no longer compliant because the ratio is too high.

When we moved E to 3 level it is to make that compliant. All individuals on GF 4 levels. Adjusted longevity from what we had proposed. Keep new teacher incentive. Those starting 1/10/17 and after. This is it.

Rebecca stated that the para proposal has not changed. We are too far apart. Cannot accommodate MEA's proposal. This is the best that we have.

Bruce asked, are you prepared to declare impasse if we don't move?

Ron stated that MEA's proposal exceeds his authority. This is the best offer. Yes.

Bruce stated, I don't believe your proposal for teachers will get ratified. You have given a good reason for people to vote no. This is a bulk of the people. No reason to take to ratification.

Ron stated, if you can reconfigure this . . .

Bruce said, I looked at the money you have. You have money in the budget to reach MEA's proposal. On health insurance we have no objection to removing Tier 1 and 2. HIC has authority without any additional language. So where do we go from here?

Ron replied, I would hope you would give this serious consideration. If there is something we missed on levels and how we ought to reconfigure. That is the pot of money we have to work with. I said from the beginning the big chunk of money is going to come with the referendum.

Bruce replied, it's not a big chunk of money. It's going to programs and more work. It's not a salary increase.

Ron said, it's going to be a salary increase.

Bruce stated, it's not enough money to do much in terms of salary. Superintendent had it earmarked for other programs.

Ron stated that the superintendent's proposal has been revised. Can share later. Don't want to lose sight of that.

Rebecca asked, are there any others so we know we're clear?

Ron asked, do you want some time to caucus?

Bruce replied, 5 minutes. We've already discussed this but we will discuss again.

Caucus at 4:56 p.m. Reconvened at 5:11 p.m.

Bruce stated that we discussed your proposals. Have had a number of conversations in caucuses, looked at different proposals. Salaries that you are provided to us. Not able to accept that.

Ron stated, you said you did not want anyone on pay for performance on GF. Would that help?

Bruce replied, no.

Ron said, where do you want to go? We worked numbers. Willing to listen.

Bruce said we are willing to listen, too. It's still about priorities. We are not that far apart. Wouldn't think district would be that burdened with reaching our last proposal.

Ron said that there are bigger ramifications than just that.

Ron stated, we have to sustain what you put in and what you're bargaining for. We will share with Pat about the referendum and how that will work. What we do here impacts that as well. I think we are \$1.5M off on salary alone. It is a lot in the total budget even if it's not a lot to you. Will go back and look at budget. Will update board on progress. Bringing referendum to 10/24 board meeting. Want to stay on positive track. Would hate to lose referendum because a few dollars off.

Bruce stated, any claim that we are not looking at the budget is false. I look at the budget more than you do. I've been looking at budgets and the district's ability to pay. In the past you gave more money to other bargaining units than paras.

Ron replied, I think it was the paras turn the time before.

Bruce said, no; it wasn't.

Ron asked, do you want to come up with another date? Or send invitation?

Bruce said he's not sure it's worth it. Want to send another date? Any other ones to sign off on. Not ready to do payday one yet.

Ron stated, that does have an impact on being implemented. We will have to move forward.

Bruce said, if you move forward without bargaining that has impacts, too.

Ron stated, I hope wouldn't hold up \$19 million project that you have had over a year to look at.

Bruce stated, your proposal is something different than what we had earlier today. We need to know how it will impact employees.

Ron said that came because you gave us your 20 pay proposal. We will come back for that one. Will send you some dates.

Meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.