

MEA Bargaining 2018-2019
Session #3

Monday, October 1, 2018

Those present: Pat Barber, Cory Bernaert, Scott Boice, Sarah Brown, Linda Bryan-Beachler, Willie Clark, Melissa Cohen, Jacob Davis, Heather Jenkins, Helen King, Brian Kirchberg, Melanie Newhall, Bruce Proud, Sharon Scarbrough, Lesli Strickland, Marlyce Stringer, Bill Vogel, Doug Wagner and Dawn Walker.

Caucus began at 4:55 p.m. Meeting began at 5:10 p.m.

Agenda

Approval of minutes ▪ Final teacher and paraprofessional bargaining unit numbers ▪ Cost of 1% increase ▪ Salary options ▪ Next meeting - October 16th or 17th???

Approval of minutes

Management is good with minutes of 9/18/18. Minutes of 9/19/18 were distributed to both teams.

Final teacher and paraprofessional bargaining unit numbers / Cost of 1% increase

Bill said that management has reconciled teacher and paraprofessional numbers and did a 1% calculation. Handout distributed.

Jacob said that the total payroll for paraprofessionals is \$14.15M. This is based on 740 paraprofessionals. Let me give you precise number. Paraprofessionals - 725.01 FTE. That is the sum of FTE for all paras.

Bill stated that may be partial positions that add up to total number.

Jacob said that for teachers there are 1539.81 FTE on the grandfathered (GF) schedule, 1222.09 on the performance pay (PP) schedule total 2761.90. Performance numbers based on last year's numbers. Used same percentages and multiplied by this year's FTE to project how many would be projected to be highly effective (HE), effective (E).

Bill stated that he understood that teachers received their ratings today; however, the district didn't have current numbers overall. Jacob has tracked the numbers, and they have been consistent.

Jacob stated that the split between HE and E has been about 50/50.

Bruce said before you go on, last year we used 63% E and 38% HE. So it's a 9% difference.

Heather asked, was that an estimate?

Bruce said it was an estimate as well. It would be easier to use real numbers.

Jacob said that the cost breakdown is \$141M for the teacher payroll. HE on the PP schedule and those on the GF would get the same movement with E coming in lower. 1 level for E. 2 levels for HE on GF. 2 levels +\$2 for HE on PP.

Bruce asked, that includes referendum?

Jacob replied, no, none of this uses referendum. I'm happy to take a look at it. \$312 on GF. Referendum would be a wash.

Bruce said, not talking about referendum.

Jacob stated that management's proposal includes the .333%.

Bill asked, PP schedule moved \$13?

Jacob said he was using the '18-'19 PP schedule adjusted. \$312 or \$313 per level.

Bruce said that is with the referendum time.

Jacob said it's the only schedule we have.

Bruce disagreed. We have a ratified schedule. Have to have a base to go on. The referendum could be temporary. Does this include the time or not?

Jacob replied, it includes the time.

Bill said I see what Bruce is saying. 15 minutes includes cost for teachers and paraprofessionals. That's what makes it \$13 difference.

Heather said it's because time's increased.

Bruce said we haven't determined if it's coming out of cost of referendum. That's negotiable.

Heather said the 15 minutes comes from the referendum.

Bruce said correct.

Bill asked can we agree on our numbers 2761.90 and the 725.01. If we agree we can recalculate. Correct?

Bruce said I don't mind having the calculation both ways so we know. Contracted rate and referendum costs.

Bill said that was a good catch. Bill continued by stating so what we have below is a scenario.

Jacob said it is in line with what was done in the past. Movement for rating for E and HE as well as those on GF. Differentiation of GF and PP by \$2. Cost is just above 1% at \$1.499M.

Bill stated that this proposal will be marked that it includes 15 minutes and will do another calculation.

Jacob said he will take non-adjusted PP \$302. Will do additional calculation so makes a difference of \$11 per person.

Bruce replied, OK. I understand your document.

Salary options

Bill said this is consistent with what we've done in past.

Bruce asked, your proposal is 1% across the board?

Bill replied yes, 1% at this time.

Bruce said the reason why the numbers are so small is that it did not include anyone not eligible for level movement because did not include anyone hired after February. So I'm guess there is maybe a couple hundred people who are not eligible who would not move so you would have to take them out. Do we know how many that is that would not move?

Jacob replied, approximately 10%.

Bruce asked, 10% of what?

Jacob said that is somewhere in the vicinity of 276. 10% of people on both schedules.

Bruce said we need to know where they are to calculate.

Bill said we're still having data issues.

Heather agreed. That's correct. Since teachers just received ratings today should be able to get data.

Bill said it's going to take time to pull data together to make sure we're accurate.

Bruce asked if management has an estimate of what 1% is of the teacher bargaining unit is.

Jacob said \$141M. \$1.41M is 1% of \$141M, the total teacher payroll exclusive of fringe.

Bruce said that's what I wanted to know. Thank you. Appropriate to take caucus and have a conversation about this page.

Jacob said Bruce, that's \$1,451,282.12 without the time adjustment. \$305 for 1 level. \$606 for 2 levels.

Caucus at 5:37 p.m. Reconvened at 6:22 p.m.

Bruce said we reviewed your documents and rationale. No further questions. Extremely concerned about paras catching up. Believe it will take 3 steps to do that.

Bill said he would like to find out MEA's expectations. Where do you want to head knowing where we are right now? Would like to talk about that on the 17th.

Bruce said that step movement does not occur for everyone in the bargaining unit. Know the numbers are different. Using 621 which is similar to the number used last year in calculation knowing new hires on 1st step of salary schedule. 192 is data given on step 1. Know some were moved from 0 to 1. Some may be eligible for step movement, some won't. There is no magic in 721. Trying to figure out exact cost. Estimate for 3 step is \$725,000 without benefits. 5.6% increase without benefits. Have been making headway. Appreciate that but it is still general discussion of getting back to where they were and make progress where it was lost previously. Some mobility last year, but that's what we see and hear on a regular basis. Last year 2 steps plus \$0.15/hour, not quite equivalent of 2 and ½ steps. 4% at top last year. We would expect 5% at top of schedule this year. Not sure if there are 16 or 18 steps, where is top of schedule?

Bill asked, you're saying 725 people. Did you use a different number?

Bruce replied, yes, subtracted from number I had.

Bill asked, you're projecting 100 would not be eligible?

Bruce stated, right. Can use 621. Not wedded to that number. Did not see 725 previously. Whatever we can figure out right numbers I'm good with that. At this point, we know how struggled to get things ratified in recent years except last year it was a 4/3 model when ratified. Calculated using 4/3 with numbers that Jacob gave today. Just under \$3.1M to do that for teachers. \$3.64M + something with benefits. \$3.1M is without benefits. \$227,700 for longevity without benefits. At 16 years there are 57 that would get \$2100, 31 at 25 \$3600.

Bill said he appreciates that. Numbers will be a challenge for us.

Bruce said I hear what you're saying based on state's contribution of \$0.47 but struggling with having over 5% fund balance doesn't say you didn't have some to spend. Employees starting to think that the district is making out looking good by not giving them everything they're due.

Bill said I get that. I would like Heather to talk about quality control features in place and why this is not going to happen again. Trying to monitor payroll. Monthly payroll tracking so not headed in same direction. Confidence issues.

Bruce said he is still concerned when we can't get to numbers. Have asked each session. Seems to be difficult. Hard for us to have conversation when don't have numbers on level movement.

Bill said it's a concern of ours, too. Totally understand. Challenge for both.

Heather said that is her job to let the superintendent know what the fund balance will be. Large portion is salary. Just as frustrating to have exorbitant amount left over so couldn't pin point. There was turnover in the allocations department. Pulled apart staffing plan. Found \$8.5M over budget, some lines things were counted twice, some lines there were incorrect formulas. Cleaned up. Now a sound document. Budget per allocation is 100% correct. We now have a new system. Requested lots of different reports. How do vacancies affect fund

balance? Increased credit rating. Can borrow at low interest rate. Want to give back to employees. Fortunately we are where we are to do the things we need.

Bill said we will take into consideration what you've given us. How we are verifying payroll vs. what is going to come out at the end. Have been here having tough discussions based on what we've had at end of year.

Bruce said what we have reviewed is much more about priorities rather than payroll. I get that priorities change with superintendents. Bigger than just payroll in terms of priorities. You made it a priority to change SAMP's day by one half hour and take that from the general fund. That's clearly a priority. Not saying right or wrong. Just says where money is going. Can't stand to hear about ERP. Money funneled into that is not available for employees. How do you start to talk about employees as a priority? I get you didn't get a lot from state. You moved around money and that may be educationally sound. Many people talking about budgets. Heather is dealing with other people's priorities. I know already in your mind you're already being generous based on what the state has done. Know referendum is important, but it's temporary. Going to have to work hard to get it next time. Intended to add, not supplant. Not suggesting you're supplanting at this time. I don't want to talk about that with every teacher and paraprofessional.

Bill said we are all concerned about ERP. Saunders is doing everything she can to fix it. Funding comes out of capital budget.

Bruce said, but personnel keeps getting added to the budget. Shows as personnel in general fund. Not showing up as transfer anywhere else. Not just ERP, some general fund paid. Some may be capital if you can make it work. Other things going in that are coming from general fund. Moved something that used to be textbook categorical in to general fund. Shifting money around that wasn't in the general fund that is now in general fund. Still haven't heard about personnel. Growing by leaps and bounds. No explanation in budget documents. It just is one example of many that we talked about previously. \$14M. Talked about over last 2 meetings. Increases of \$14M in business end in some categories.

Bill said that this board and community including teachers made commitment to improve teacher salaries. Not every board has addressed this as a priority. It's very impressive what board and community want to invest in. Want to keep that out there.

Bruce said that we appreciate that. Still Sarasota and Pinellas have not resolved their bargaining this year. If they move ahead then all referendum conversation will be lost if they negotiate better salary increases.

Bill said we will consider. We will talk more on 10/17. Thank you.

Meeting adjourned at 6:42 p.m. Next meeting October 17, 2018 at 5 p.m. in the SSC.