

MEA Bargaining 2016-2017
Session #7

Thursday, October 3, 2016

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

Meeting began at 4:10 p.m.

Minutes – The minutes of September 22, 2016 were distributed. Side by side created by management was distributed. It is unchanged from the last version distributed.

Insurance discussion

Neither side has accepted the HIC recommendation at this point.

Board response to association salary proposal

In normal times it would be a reasonable proposal. Besides we could not afford it was the difference of opinion on grandfathered and pp schedule. Everything to be discussed is in terms of overall agreement. Willing to even up GF schedule as MEA proposed with HE and E. Follow statute on PP schedule. We're not able to afford MEA proposal.

GF

PP

HE – 3 steps

3 steps + \$2

E – 3 steps

2 steps + \$2

Accepting concepts. Costs us considerably more than last time. Close to \$700,000 increase over last time.

Board had an exec. session at 9 a.m.

Bill distributed summary of proposal.

Paras – evened up paras. Taken average of each steps. In agreement to put that at the top. Paras at the top would receive the same amount based on their particular schedule.

Instructional - # of folks ineligible for increase has grown. Total eligible 2522 (decline from before). GF schedule modest decline (5). PP more substantial.

Jacob explained the charts.

Only difference is that district has embedded 16.9%. Able to come up in offer. 2 levels for E. 3 for HE.

Everybody on GF gets 3 levels.

Bill stated that the district is trying to make it a real-time situation. That's why these numbers have changed.

The board is very committed to teachers and all staff. It just has been disastrous in terms of money. Will have to be budget reduction to make this happen. Potential of mid-year cuts. Had very lengthy discussion with people he works for about that. Would like to do more but this is the most the district feels it can do. Have made major movement. Listened to MEA's rationale. District has shown that we have listened by this proposal.

Longevity – we are OK with MEA’s package on longevity.

District OK on MOUs.

2014 MOU that started PP process. Auditors were upset because we did not sign it for 15-16 and 16-17. That MOU formed the foundation for work that has been done. Bill read MOU.

Changed Modified Instructional Week (MIW) MOU because of hurricane make up days.

VAM MOU – still under discussion.

Talked about urgency of moving forward to get open enrollment done. Interested in getting process going.

Should we be able to reach agreement we can create salary schedules in the morning.

Bruce asked what happens to paras at the top of the schedules?

Jacob said every schedule differs. Top is average for all groups. Whatever percentage was % applied to the top of the schedule varies vastly.

Bill stated that the person at the top would get the average of a step.

Bruce asked about the GF receiving 3 levels. Does that include everyone on GF schedule?

Jacob stated that it does.

Bruce asked that those who are not included are those ineligible because they have not served enough time to be eligible?

Jacob stated that only see drop off on PP because everyone hired is carved out of that group.

Bill stated that this is consistent with what we have done in the past.

Bruce asked if there are less than effective included

Jacob stated that 2% was carved out for less than E.

Bill stated that those numbers are still under discussion based on VAM scores. Hard to figure out what that is.

Bruce said excluding those less than E are not

Bill said yes, less than E are not included.

Bruce asked for the rationale.

Bill stated that the intent on PP excluded teachers if less than E. It would be same for teachers on GF schedule.

Original position. Moved considerably on position. That is the position we still maintain. Estimate right now.

District has no idea of numbers.

Bruce asked if that includes developing and if they don’t get anything.

Bill answered, correct.

Bruce stated that PP is based on statute. GF based on position and feeling of the superintendent and board.

Bill stated that is our position. Correct.

Bruce stated that we understand your proposal.

Bill stated that everything on that MOU we’ve followed. 3 year transition to PP. It was a very productive time when we worked on that.

Bruce stated that the memo on modified school year reflects change in early release days based on calendar decision. 12/7 and 10/5 have been removed from modified Wednesdays. This was agreed upon by whom? It was not agreed upon by anyone in the Association. We don’t have anything else.

Bill asked if the association wants to discuss.

Bruce answered yes, we will caucus.

Caucus at 4:36 p.m.

Reconvened at 7:09 p.m. (Don Sauer and Lesli Strickland not present.)

Bill asked Bruce if we had time to go over proposal and if we were ready to sign off.

Bruce stated that there were 111 fewer people eligible than last time. Hard to give calculations where we're talking about money.

Bill stated that the district is under tight budgetary constraints. District wants to maximize money based on current situation.

Bruce stated that in the interest of getting this resolved. GF – no differentiating occurring for individuals for less than E. Other people proposed not being able to move a step. For those NI on GF need to be included at 3 levels. There shouldn't be anyone on GF that is developing. That's long been past for them.

Bill stated that teachers that are U do not move on GF. Talk about rationale that if someone is NI they should receive . . .

Bruce stated that nothing in law that requires that. When developing PP schedule we said we wanted to hold harmless from PP scheme. System is not prepared to do that. We're struggling to get numbers, data collection plan is not refined yet. System has not been tested and refined to make sure all administrators are using it in a consistent way. There are too many variables. Unfortunately, that law is written in such a strict manner before the district is ready for the system. It's hard for individuals to track where they are. Payroll needs to know that people will want to know where they are in the system. There is no way they are going to be able to tell. Don't want to go down that road for GF and making it more of a burden.

Bill stated that we will think about that. Where are you on rest of proposal? If able to agree except that some are marked U, follow law on PP schedule (3/2/0 for those less than E).

Bruce stated that he thinks it's one of the worst laws.

Bill agreed that it is. In terms of overall agreement, I didn't hear other areas of concern.

Bruce stated that we are in agreement with longevity as proposed. Paras – 1 step, some confusion as to language at top of schedule to calculate. If you do average you're doing something different at every level. We're talking about 29 people.

Bill stated that we can work with you on that. It's not an issue. Regarding the latest MOU – Bill was not sure who agreed upon it (calendar make up days). Hopefully that will take care of that issue. Longevity – set those out for TA. Have everything we agreed upon. Issues disagree – Health Insurance didn't disagree but have not accepted it. Contract – agreed to roll. Cost of salary – walking through that. Essentially in agreement on all items open for bargaining this year.

Bruce asked to put in writing issues around implementation of longevity.

Bill stated that in the future he could not agree to new people meeting those marks.

Bruce stated that it's part of compensation so subject to negotiations every year. Longevity supplement. It's going to be a challenge given structure of schedule. Recognize longevity because you're not recognizing it in other ways.

Bill stated that it is negotiable. Because of uncertainty of budgeting in the future the district is willing to negotiate longevity but it may not be at same level as this year. Appreciates MEA working closely with board team and payroll to make sure people who reach that don't receive that again.

Bruce stated that they are not eligible if they reached the threshold previously. Hope you would let board know

that you bring up issues and then remove it makes it harder to ratify contract. There are a big chunk of individuals who will vote no because of health insurance or those on PP who are less than E. They are not going to be really happy about sticking around.

Bill stated that we have to deal with statute put before us. He wanted to make sure people are aware of that.

Bruce asked about longevity for those years, 16 and 25 – will we have to renegotiate for them next year?

Bill stated that no, the district understands that that is a recurring cost.

Bruce asked about those not rated.

Bill stated that if they are not rated they would get 3 steps. Only ones who don't get raise are U.

Bruce stated that technically those NR are supposed to be on GF schedule, even if brand new.

Bill stated that teachers receiving longevity would be considered recurring expense. The amount is negotiable depending on budget circumstances. We could generate schedules in the morning.

Bruce stated that it's probably important how we implement. Have to add steps at top.

Bill stated that's one thing about our system - it's self-explanatory.

Bruce said there is plenty of language around longevity. How to become eligible, what does that mean?

Bill asked if the association has language we would agree on.

Bruce presented Bill with longevity language. (handout)

Bill said that he needed to clarification: this applies to 16-17 school year. This suggests this is ongoing for future years. Would be more comfortable with something that says 'for the 16-17 school year on July 1 each employee would be placed into longevity grouping as follows.' We know amount has to be negotiated every year. Ok with amount. Hopefully that satisfies your and our concern.

Bruce said OK. (Copies were distributed to all members of both teams present.)

Bill stated that on our proposal we will make a change – only teachers to not receive adjustment are those marked "U."

Bruce said OK.

Bill asked what language you would prefer for U on GF?

Bruce answered simple is better. Not eligible for level movement.

Bill stated NR or NI on GF receive 3 steps. Teachers receiving longevity this year would be considered recurring expense.

Bruce asked when do you think we will have docs to TA on?

Bill stated that we have them now for most part. Our preference is to wrap up tonight. Can have salary schedules in the a.m.

Bruce said OK.

Bill –

1. HIC recommendation.
2. Contract language – took term of agreement, Article 17 – changed to June 30, 2017.
3. Performance Pay – Bill asked Jacob to update to say NR or NI and then U would be . . .

What we try to do is leave items in even if they were in the past, so we can track them.

Bruce – underlined language looks new.

Bill – we can clean it up.

4. Longevity – 'for the 16-17 school year on July 1 each employee would be placed into longevity grouping as

follows.'

5. MOU on vacancies, transfers and promotions (5 day postings).

Bruce stated that we have never had any conversations about this. Have never seen it.

Bill stated that this has worked out well for teachers. District is getting them placed quicker. Bill apologized because he thought we discussed it.

6. Perfect attendance – going to have to make a change on the perfect attendance dates.

Bruce - I think these might be better worked through with Pat when they are cleaned up.

Bill – do you have any problem with them?

Bruce – No

Bill – assessment being discussed through parties.

7. Early release days -

8. PP salary schedule

Follow up items on MOU. Bill to get with Marilyn. Any documents we might have missed? Jacob revising now. He will produce salary schedules tomorrow for the association. Everyone on the GF schedule will move 3 levels. Levels will be added to each of the schedules to make sure that those at the top will move 3 levels.

Bill - As far as notifications, we have traditionally sent out a joint release to avoid confusion.

Pat – it's important to send out internally first. We can agree to send out at certain time tomorrow.

Joint internal release to be sent at 2 p.m. on Tuesday, October 4, 2016

Meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.