

**MEA Bargaining 2016-2017**  
**Session #5**

Wednesday, September 7, 2016

Those present: Pat Barber, Sara Brown, Melissa Cohen, Scott Cooper, Jacob Davis, Michele Hulbert, Helen King, Melanie Newhall, Bruce Proud, Rebecca Roberts, Don Sauer, Lesli Strickland, Bill Vogel and Dawn Walker.

Also present was Heather Jenkins.

Meeting began at 4:24 p.m.

Minutes – The minutes of the August 24, 2016 session were distributed.

Discussion of items in agreement

Bill distributed “Board and MEA Association Position – September 7, 2016” and stated that these are not TAs, just a summary.

**Performance Pay**

Bruce stated that the Association agrees that the law for PP states that less than E do not get an increase. He is not suggesting that the district does not follow the law. To better restate the union’s position it should read: “Teachers on the PP schedule receiving an evaluation less than E would not receive an increase unless there is a COLA.”

**Longevity**

Bill commended the association for working with Michele. District is open to discussing amount.

**Salary cost of proposal**

Bill stated that the benefits cost outweigh amount available for salary. District and association far apart here.

Rebecca stated that \$5.1M is available for salary and benefits for MEA. \$4.5 million over what we have remaining. After we allocate teachers \$4.6 M going into health insurance premiums.

Bill stated that the district only received .98% from state, and the district is concerned about the fund balance.

Rebecca stated that the district is eroding part of fund balance this year. District is budgeting for \$12 million unassigned. She is worried because the district got more students than projected. 300 additional students at 10 day count. The district is going to have to dip into fund balance to fill additional slots. The Board is not happy with \$12 million fund balance. They want more like 5%. The district’s priority is teaching and learning and is trying to put more money in classroom.

Bruce stated that the district moved money from community services out to other areas including instruction. School admin received an additional \$1M over last year. If the district is closing a school why is an additional \$1M needed? Central services budget doubled over last 2 years. It was \$6.4M; AFR says \$12.2M for this year. How does this relate to putting more money in instruction?

Rebecca stated that she will have to look at central services budget. You need administration to run a school. She stated she is not familiar with line item details. She stated that overall instructional services went down. This district suffered from lack of personnel in certain places and is trying to put those people back.

Bill stated that it is a challenge. There will be a ballot initiative to renew sales tax. Districts without additional millage are struggling to meet 3% fund balance. Board is doing what they can. It's not a pretty picture with what state does not fund. At caucus district can get budget book to answer association questions.

Regarding salaries, Bill stated the difference in the amount available and our proposal. Management has a proposal that would provide for HE teachers on GF and PP schedule 3 level increases. E teachers on GF and PP would receive 2 level increases. The caveat is that the PP schedule is \$2 higher than GF to meet state requirement. Teachers below E on both schedules (2% of unit) would not receive anything. That would take all the money that the district has available for salaries and we would talk through longevity. \$158,000 for longevity. We're prepared to give it to you.

Bruce stated that he is still confused on how the district is valuing health insurance. The district is spending less than last year. The district is not increasing the budget in any way. It is a reduction in what you are going to spend for HI plus what you're going to get from state. It's less than what the board paid last year.

Rebecca stated that it is not true that we are spending less from budget to budget. Board's contribution as of 6/30/16 was \$36,996,000. That's \$488,918 more than what was budgeted last year. With plan presented to HIC the spend is \$36,796,000. More than what we budgeted. \$200,000 more than budgeted last year.

Bruce stated that instructional media is significantly less than what was budgeted.

Rebecca stated that it's a categorical.

Bruce stated that it's part of the bargaining unit, not just a categorical and that you have to look at what was actually expended. That's more accurate. He stated that he looked at the district's budget. It was corrected from tentative to final budget. There are a lot of line items that you change from month to month. The district is not expending more but spending less. Health insurance is part of overall FEFP money.

Rebecca asked how the district is spending less.

Bruce stated that the budget increased by 1%. When not applying money to categories it is available. MEA would expect it to be made available for salaries.

Rebecca stated that there is no more money to be found. Since 2013, we had to recover. We have been cautious and budget conscientious. Any other district would not have been giving pay enhancements as we have done.

Bruce stated that employees lost money if you go back past 3 years. Employees have not caught up what they lost. Employees are well aware of pain the district has had in the budget.

Rebecca stated that we're being generous with reducing fund balance to continue to invest in teaching staff and classrooms.

Bill stated that if receiving 1% in money and have 3% on table it has to come from somewhere. The district is taking money from fund balance to do it.

Rebecca stated that she uses the high mark of employees which is from March and calculates what 3% of total teacher salaries would be. She is giving MEA the benefit. If she ran the numbers as of 9/1 it would be lower. We have \$5.1M on the table. \$127,000,000 total spending on teacher salaries.

Bruce stated that the district is not spending \$3M over. Not even counting \$4.9. It's not an increase. It's an exchange. Employees are picking up more of the cost. That's the reality. It's coming out of their pocket. Not giving an additional \$5M. Teachers won't agree with that and hopefully tax payers won't believe it either.

Bill stated that that is a point of disagreement. He understands the union's position. We can caucus and get the information requested.

Bill distributed a proposal “District proposal to the MEA September 7, 2016” and a 3 page stapled handout that costed out 20%, 25%, 30% and 35% being rated as HE. Bill asked Jacob to explain. Jacob stated that the district’s proposal did not include health insurance in benefits cost.

Caucus at 5:00 p.m.

Reconvened at 5:55 p.m.

A handout was distributed: Year-End Dates Memo

Bill began by stating that the only way the district could prepare the budget this year was by reducing the fund balance. Budgeted fund balance is \$12M (just about 3%).

Rebeca stated that school administration went down by \$372,000 from spend to budget. \$10 million over spend. One change to note is that payment to charter schools have gone up by \$400,000.

line includes 8.5 for salary enhancement benefit package. Includes holdback or AP, IB, AICE, CAPE, SAI and reading categoricals. School recognition is also in there. Budgeted 700,000 higher than last year. If revenue doesn’t come in we reduce revenue and expenditure.

Bruce asked if it is additional.

Rebecca replied that we budgeted at 2.6. Central services is up by \$248,000 due to software rentals. Software service has become more prominent, and this can’t come from capital. It has a negative effect on budget. Also, subscription services can’t come from capital and has to be absorbed in operating budget.

Other large increases in admin technology: \$623,000 due to software subscriptions. Some vacancies were held back that were filled this year for ERP implementation.

\$1M increase in instructional technology or digital classrooms.

Bruce said there are increases for more than software. For example, there is an increase from ‘14-‘15 to ‘15-’16 for research and assessment.

Bill said that we would be happy to go through the budget line by line and that we may want to set up a separate meeting for that purpose.

Rebecca said they could email the budget presentation. There are slides for each line.

Bruce asked about increases in school administration in April, May and June.

Rebecca stated that we could look at detail but it could take time to look up. She stated that part of instructional services is terminal pay as employees terminate we move to school administration to pay out of there. That’s why you see the adjustments.

Bruce said he would send additional questions.

Bruce stated that 164 people are not listed anywhere and asked for an explanation.

Jacob stated that is because it is based on start date. If an employee had not worked 99 days within a school year they are not eligible for an increase. That is why those individuals are carved out at the time of the data pull which was on August 19. Those people would be ineligible for increase by virtue of contract.

Bruce stated that he doesn’t see a proposal for paras.

Bill stated that we can talk about concept and address next time.

Rebecca stated that the superintendent would like to do something specifically for classroom aides, those at the lowest salary level. They are the most impoverished. The superintendent would like to propose an additional

½ percent over other paras. Any aide in the classroom would get 2%. The rest would get 1.5%. More people get 2% than 1%. This is different than what we normally do. All paras deserve more but we are able to do something more for that group of aides. Rebecca has a list of aides which she will bring next time.

Bruce asked what pay group? Or something separate?

Rebecca – titles that would benefit would be IDEA aides, ESOL aides at all levels, teacher aides, teacher aides for ESOL, ESE teacher aide, Title 1 elementary aides, VPK aide full time. ESE one on one, health, child development aides, administrative liaison, home school liaison, general aide high, middle, other basic, phys. ed. would receive 1.5%. There are more in the first group than in the second. 475 in first group; 116 in second group. Para share of HI is 5% of payroll. \$205,000 is just for salary enhancements. Benefits is another \$258,000. We've struggled in the last 2 years trying to figure out what we can do.

Bill stated that before we give you a proposal we like to talk about concepts.

Bruce stated that it would be difficult to communicate with individuals in same group that they would get a different amount. Negative implications on those not receiving it having less value. This is similar to teachers.

Bill stated that teachers are looking at evaluation system and differentiating. It's not the same.

Bruce stated that he thinks it is. The requirements are different for what you have to do with schedules.

Bill stated that that's why we like to talk in concepts to bring forward or discussion.

Bruce said that if there was any other information we needed from the district he would request it before the next meeting.

Bruce included 164 people based on data provided to MEA. He will amend MEA's proposal and bring it to next meeting. The reality is that it will be less and less. It won't be more. There will be more people that won't qualify. The number will go down, not up.

Rebecca stated that in prior years it was calculated that people hired in the last 99 days of school year were ineligible. Anyone hired from July 1 is not eligible.

Bill will email Dawn updated side-by-side.

Meeting adjourned at 6:24 p.m. Next meeting Thursday, September 22, 2016 beginning at 4 p.m.

School District of Manatee County  
Board and MEA Position – September 7, 2016 (Revised)

Topic	Board Position	Association Position
Health Insurance		Received Insurance Committee Recommendation – not accepted
Contract Language	Agreement to roll contract to July 1, 2017	Agreement to roll contract to July 1, 2017
Performance Pay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highly Effective teachers on the Performance and Grandfathered schedules received the same</li> <li>• Effective teachers on both schedules would receive the same</li> <li>• Less than Effective would NOT receive an increase</li> <li>• Agreement that Highly Effective on the Performance Schedule would be \$2 higher than Grandfathered</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highly Effective on the Performance Schedule and Grandfathered and Effective teachers on the Grandfathered Schedule receive the same</li> <li>• Effective teachers on Performance Schedule receive less than highly effective teacher on Performance Schedule</li> <li>• Teachers on the Performance Schedule receiving an evaluation less than effective will not receive an increase unless there is a COLA</li> <li>• Agreement that Highly Effective on the Performance Schedule would be \$2 higher than Grandfathered</li> </ul>
Longevity	Agreement the amount to be negotiated as a supplement.	Agreement the amount to be negotiated as a supplement.
Salary Cost of Proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$1.91 Teachers</li> <li>• \$205,000 Paraprofessionals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$4,590,248 over available amount</li> <li>• \$834,793 over available amount</li> </ul>
Benefits Cost of Proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3,034,637 Teachers</li> <li>• 258,057 Paraprofessionals</li> </ul>	
MOUs	Agreement Board team noted that the Assessment Test and EOC MOU is under review because of a change in State Board of Education rules and may not be able to remain in effect.	Agreement Board team noted that the Assessment Test and EOC MOU is under review because of a change in State Board of Education rules and may not be able to remain in effect.
	District and Association leaders are meeting to address this.	