

MEA Bargaining 2024-2025
Session #2

Monday, July 15, 2024

Those present: Rick Bailey, Pat Barber, Cory Bernaert, Silvana Ianinska, Derek Jensen, Helen King, Brian Kirchberg, Rob Lyons, Gina Malinak, Kevin Pendley, Donna Peregoff, Bruce Proud, Joe Ranaldi, Sharon Scarbrough, Rachel Sellers, Jon Syre, Evelyn Townsley, Bill Vogel and Dawn Walker.

Meeting began at 5:55 p.m.

BV – introduced Kevin Pendley, staff general counsel, as a new bargaining team members. Newly hired from Volusia County. Bill also asked Derek and Joe to update what happened at the SSC. Kevin’s office flooded.

DJ – appreciate flexibility in moving location and enduring traffic. Substantial burst pipe at SSC flooded superintendent’s wing and cascaded down the west side of the building. Took down info services, finance, HR. People displaced and working out of PSC while building remediated.

JR – hoping might get back in by end of month but doesn’t look likely.

BV distributed the agenda.

August 9th payroll

BV – 8/9 payroll. At the end of the last session we got together to make sure everyone knew what the 8/9 payroll ramifications were. 8/9 wasn’t the problem but the end date was.

Supplement Cost

Supplement cost was sent over.

DJ – Irina sent it to you, Bruce.

BP – I received data with people’s names with payout and partial amounts without summary data without saying what the supplement was. Going to take a lot of time to figure out the data.

New Salary Options

BV – last meeting talked about restructuring the salary schedule. Discussed with superintendent and team. Not opposed to looking at it. Concerned with time before school starts. Possibility of confusion. Current version is confusing. Look at forming a committee and study basis. Concerned about timeline. Like to continue discussions for a future time when we bargain. Suggest staying with traditional schedule we’ve used in the past. Find out what other districts doing. It’s not a great money year. Get referendum behind us. Good to start study and come up with something for future bargaining.

Next, HI proposal not presented was a \$1.6M estimated savings that was discussed at HIC. See if there is interest in that. Open to those plan changes. Management handout

BP – so how is this one different than last one? Higher or lower?

BV – had a \$1.1 and a \$1.8.

Bp – So this one is in between?

BV – Yes.

BP – significant difference appears to be no changes to deductible or annual out of pocket (OOP) but changes to prescription (Rx) copays. Something else different? We will look at it.

MEA Proposal

BP – Exchanged MEA proposal. Not sure it's complicated to address salary and schedules in way we're proposing it for teachers. Wouldn't require a lot other than what's on the schedule in a different way and multiply by percent. And no one moves by level just change in salary. Not any more complicated. People would be changed based on their evaluation (HE & E) on the PP level meeting requirement of law for 25% more for HE than anyone else on any other schedule. Numbers are based on history and data provided to us. Until we have actual data on evaluations it's my best guess where we are in terms of what it would mean. 5/4/4 model including those who are not evaluated for one reason or another. Open to discussing for future years because we're going to need to. This would be a good start in the right direction. Less complicated than what we have done with levels and COLAs and multiple calculations not to mention the over 1400 of those who are at the base. Not proposing to change base. Base would remain the same.

BV – compression – the only difference would be HE and E?

BP – correct.

BV – really can't do much . . .

BP – open to suggestions.

BV – that's a tough one.

BP – It's a good start and goes in the direction of individualized pay, but I don't know that's all that different than what we're doing now.

BV – say more about what you've done with referendum.

BP – Just for informational purposes. Based on tentative idea of what's there. Just there for reference. Doesn't have an impact on the total dollar value of cost of anything. Same for any category of employee.

BV – 4.23% increase?

BP – Yes, on average.

BV – Could you walkthrough line by line?

BP – Sure. At the top of the proposal - year, schedule, how many employees, data we received provided employee numbers. Data was from last spring. Total salary based on spreadsheet received from the district. Some positional supplements media, guidance, ROTC and degrees included so that might be a little high. In 24-25 used numbers you provided – 2923 - knowing things change a little bit. More people on PP and less people on GF as people retire. Those who have no evaluation is a ball park number. Used past data to project. Calculating a 5% increase from the average. Just using average. Categories may be different as we look at individuals. Simple calculation. Likely to be close at end and different at middle. Some growth based on average and included in there. Also used data provided on spreadsheet that said how many people were on PP and were HE to get to projections.

BV – You’re using same percentage of HE & E as we had last year.

BP – I had that.

GM – We don’t have more HE than E.

BP – It was hard to tell because data excluded everyone who was at the base. They didn’t move. Hard to figure out. If you have better numbers I’m happy to use better numbers.

BV - Still have a number that didn’t have an evaluation. That’s interesting.

BP – And have to be separated by PP & GF.

BV – What percentage would you apply throughout the employees?

BP – None, it would be based on individuals.

BV – If at base pay?

BP – It depends on evaluation – 5% or 4%

BV – 5/4 model instead of 5% or 4%

GM – Those who didn’t get an evaluation would still get a 4% increase?

BP – If they had no evaluation, yes. We have done that in the past

GM – Just wanted to make sure.

BV – What about new? Need placement schedule

BP – Still need a placement schedule.

BV – Have got to work half a year to receive credit.

BP – Yes, some would not be eligible. But I don't have that number. That would be less money.

BV – Does not include benefits?

BP – No, it does on another spreadsheet that I have. It's more complicated than that because of TSIA, as you will see in next spreadsheet. BP exchanged proposal. Similar proposal format used in the past. Numbers carried over from previous document for teachers. 1st column – maintenance. # taken from spreadsheet received with individuals and their pay rate and pay rate with \$41,135 but received \$49,210. Those numbers were on spreadsheet that I used for supplement and what was used in spreadsheet. Some higher because of added supplements. Did not include all who got supplements when obvious and people who were not at base. Better number than what . . .

GM – Used prior year COLA because that was reported to state.

BP – Yeah, reported but may have been in district budget.

BV – We may not be in agreement on maintenance.

BP – I anticipated that because you didn't agree last year. COLA wasn't paid out of TSIA money. What state provided was small. Can't contribute money that came from GF as TSIA maintenance. That concludes salary. Includes getting 11-month rate to be equivalent. Should be calculated from 10-month salary and then figure out what the rate would be. Don't think it is contrary to anything in the law. Projected that as \$104,000 based on the number of people on 11 month contract.

RS – Paras?

BP – Step + 5%. Step is somewhere around 2% or less.

BV – We came up with a lot bigger number on 11-month conversion. 51 people. Ninety (90) 11-month.

RS – We have benefits and he doesn't.

BP – Sliding scale for a \$1 to larger amount for those further up schedule.

BV – Willing to work with you on that.

BP – Happy to bring backup material next time. Will dig into data to find out what it says. Teacher retention is 16 and 25. There is an issue in looking at retention spreadsheets and pay for individuals receiving retention that when they move from 16 to 25. It was our intention and has been all along that they continue and receive both payments which was a proposal from previous schedule amounts based on bumps in previous schedule that we were no longer allowed to occur. These individuals not getting equitable transition as 16 is maintained and 25 is added.

BV – Past practice. . .

BP – Mix up in past practice. Just discovered this past year. Some people eligible for both. May have been past 2 years. Not intention in the way language was developed. Patterned after the previous schedule.

BV – Cost included way it was administered right now.

BP – No, individuals would receive 16+ rate and when eligible for 25 get 25+ rate. Otherwise would be deducting money. I wouldn't calculate it that way. It would be a different calculation. We are proposing to add a 10+ at \$1500. People that would be newly eligible – have to pay those at 16 and 25 \$1500.

BV – That's still a big amount.

BP – If using your philosophy those individuals would be reduced at 16 and at 25 they would be reduced again.

BV – They would be going from 1500 to 2100.

BP – When they're eligible. But should be receiving 1500 + 2100 + 3600. That was the intention. Haven't been subtracting cost for new people.

BV – Those who were administering it were following process as stated in contract. May not be in agreement.

BP – It was clear in proposals that those who meet that threshold receive that amount. Never been costed out as subtracting. Believe it has been administered wrong for 2 years because people haven't been eligible prior. It takes a while for people to get from 16 to 25.

BV – Looking for step + 5% for paras?

BP – Correct. Calculated from spreadsheets provided from where individuals were on salary schedule and what schedule they are on. Even though the bulk are on TA6 was calculated on each individual schedule.

BV – Appreciate your work. Challenge is there is a substantial difference in 4/5 model or 3/4 model than 4% and 5%. The question is our preference is to work through previous model rather than . . . budget cannot afford 5/4 model. That is going to be our problem right now. Counter on the current model or try to counter on new model? Comfort level is to work through old model and study. Open minded to it but this proposal is way over our budget.

BP – We disagree that you don't have budgetary funds. Believe funds are available. Although you say you don't have the reserves you do, and they are considerable. And you have budgetary priorities that could be used for this purpose.

BV – Recurring funds? Long term commitment but reserves are not recurring long term.

BP – Not all. Sooner or later the district is going to have to recognize they're going to have to make changes and compete with other counties. Don't want to undermine value of the referendum. See that and the importance of continuing. But issues with schedule at the base and frustration with people above base when

base gets more. Been using level model at their detriment to benefit to people at bottom of the schedule. That was the intent of the legislature. It's not good business.

BV – Good point. Saying the same thing. Follow same requirements.

BP – It's questionable if you're following the requirement.

BV – This model doesn't take care of compression.

BP – Not entirely. Can be handled through hiring schedule.

BV – That's why we're open minded to some increase at step 10. On board with that retention point. That might help. We will go back and look. Do we counter with current or new model? I just don't see how we will have the dollars to do a model like this right now.

BP – Plenty of room for conversation as new model or any new model you wish to propose.

BV – Another area – Teachers and paras working with ESE in self-contained settings. Like to hear your thoughts on supplements for those individuals.

BP – No problem with looking at those individuals for both teachers and paras. Have to identify who we are talking about. Lots of elementary who work with ESE students every day. That is the challenge. Work with multiple students every day. As well as middle and high school teachers. They take on a higher load. Have to be very specific about what you're talking about.

BV – Do you have ideas for differentiation?

BP – Ideas for differentiation for ESE teachers? Look at duties and functions. We get calls from ESE teachers and regular teachers about ESE work they're doing. Not opposed to digging into that issue. Will be a few other supplements that come to mind when you talk about supplements and look at what we did last year.

BV – That brings up an issue for us, too. Elementary team leaders – what are expectations of meeting with teachers on teams and collaborating with them on that work. Are they – best practices changed over the years. New model from state on assessment – different intervals of testing – important that those teachers meet with team leaders and at times administrators. Open to input on how to accomplish that.

BP – Have to look at what requirements are and state vs. district requirements. And how it interferes with ability of teachers to plan.

BV – There is new legislation for more flexibility for district. Preference to have some way to have something we can agree on. The matter at hand . . .

BP – Specific law or rule?

BV – 7002 provides district flexibility to best practices to work with schools and students who have academic issues. Low performing. What are things we can do or agree on because I see SDMC soaring to be an A district.

Anything we can put into practice that may help achieve that on a consistent basis is good. Preference is to have working relations with MEA. Record days that were – is there flexibility? Record days have been in the contract for years. Now able to use that time for teacher. What can we do to address needs. Especially with team leaders at elementary.

BP – We've heard some pushing it at different schools. Some do more electronic work than non-electronic work that needs to be evaluated. Different in different areas. If you want more projects and hands on work you can't take away the ability to use that tool that they need time to do.

BV – Have good discussion on that.

BP – I'm sure we can have more conversation at more depth.

BV – Back to counter – take dollars that we could spend on 3/4 model and convert to a percentage which would be less percentage.

BP – That's up to you. At some point need to move in the right direction so moving in a way that's needed.

BV – Don't disagree. Concerned about time and budget impact.

BP – I've never been in negotiations where budget was not the point.

BV – I know. We're always able to figure it out.

RS – Referring to 2nd MEA handout – TSIA bill adjustments – is that an increase?

BP – You have flexibility to do. You have flexibility to use for salary.

RS – Was only \$4.1M.

BP – It's less than the total value that you gave last meeting. I would disagree that you need that for maintenance based on data you gave me. If you have more data, provide it.

RS – Thanks for the clarification.

GM – For maintenance. Based on allocation or people on board?

BP – People on board. You have never over filled positions except for paras 5 years ago.

BV – Thank you. We will talk about it and decide what we're going to do.

Caucus at 6:55 p.m.

Reconvened at 8:18 p.m.

BV – Thank you for presenting concept. Feeling now that we need to study and willing to work with MEA to put together a team to study new salary schedule format for future years. Proposal to move things along.

Handout from management. 3/4 model. Increase COLA at \$468. Used a different number than you did to equalize daily rate of pay for 10 vs. 11 months. \$207,000. Agree to retention supplements for 16 and 25. Offering 1 step for paras (2% average). Numbers are different on PP HE and E and GF numbers. Finally proposing school and athletic supplements at 2%.

BP – Rationale for COLA for \$468?

BV – Statutory amount for effective teachers of \$946. Didn't see any change in statute for COLA provision.

BP – More data on equalization. Don't see how it's that different from data I have.

BV – Happy to take as follow up and send over.

BP – retention – 16 and 25?

BV – open to further discussion.

BP – New people? How many at 16 and 25? Still in disagreement as to how that's going to be distributed?

BV – Yes, we are. That has a lot to do with 10-year but certainly that has a big impact on that based on your interpretation.

BP – What about 16 and 25?

BV – That's the way it has been administered over several years.

BP – It hasn't been for several years. It's been 2 over the past 5 years unless you have actual data. So, I'm requesting that data.

BV – Will write that down for follow up.

BP – Disagree it is a practice. No one told us that. Proposals clearly established you get both. Costed them out. Same as here. So if you costed it out then how do you say that's a practice. Need to see how you calculated.

BV – Fine.

BP – For paras you have a step and no other increases?

BV – That's all we have at this time.

BV – Projecting 26 teachers would reach 16 year mark and 33 teachers would reach 25 mark.

BP – My calc is \$215,400. Have you added benefits?

BV – That's how we got \$225,424 – benefits included. You added benefits at end.

BP – Rationale is that you are only receiving 16 + 25+ and calc at \$3600 doesn't that mean you get both. As long as you're employed . . . then either you're not following your practice or you're calculating it differently.

Or you don't have a practice which is what I've believed the whole time. And you need to pay those people correctly. Where do numbers come from HE, E and GF?

BV – Debate on that. Finally arrived at numbers –

RS – Checked with Evan. Some results related to the grandfathered schedule. Those were numbers he had. When it came to HE & E – looking at who got to number at that point to send up seeing a payout and using those numbers instead. Until we actually get numbers at the end of September, until then they're still estimated.

BV – Lowered numbers to how it impacts the budget.

RS – That's the total number of teachers.

BP – You have to since most are not receiving anything on the PP schedule. Not even sure there are enough to get to 511 or who will move 4 – 5 levels. You used steps? Are we using steps instead of levels?

BV – No, we will get that corrected. Like some of your members it's been a long day. Snacks got us fired up to produce a proposal.

BP – Your proposal doesn't appear to show you're interested in recruiting paras much. You have 200 people on schedule brand new. Half won't be eligible for step increase. How many people did you use to calculate?

BV – You did work on the schedule last year.

BP – Added a nickel to help with compression. You're not proposing to do anything at this point?

BV – Just wanted to think and see what you came up with.

BP – I thought you were in a hurry to finish. It's hard to respond. We will do our best.

BV – It's one of our first best proposals we had across the table!

BP – You don't remember a better one?

BV – It's strong.

BP - We had better agreements.

RS - Last year 60 cents added per step.

BP – I understand. That was last year. Are you still having trouble hiring people?

BV – We are.

BP – Paras are 23rd in the state. In the district they're lower than any other position as it relates to the state.

BV – Average or starting?

BP – Average. This proposal won't help that in any way. I'm gathering that folks are tired. May not want to caucus. It may take us time to develop something.

BV – We can wait for you to propose something.

BP - How much time do you have?

BV – We can do it tonight or wait until the 29th.

BP – We'll take a caucus and let you know.

Caucus at 8:42.

Reconvened at 10:23 p.m.

BV – Thank you very much for working on the proposal this late. Appreciate it very much. Otherwise, we would have to wait until the 29th.

BP – Here you go, Bill. MEA handouts. The proposal we have has changed the teacher increases to a 4/3/3 percent model. Mostly because our team really believes it's important to address the compression issue and the people at the other end that feel they are being shortchanged over a period of years by getting small amounts in terms of percent for anyone above the average of what we've done over the past 4 years. Seen relatively small increase in levels. The issue at the beginning of schedule. Even with COLA, in a limited sense, your proposal is not going to satisfy and it's half of the bargaining unit (BU) at that base. Really concerned about ratification if we don't do something to address the issue. Half of BU is at 49, 210 and a COLA isn't going to satisfy them at this point. Didn't change 11-month amount. Went back to figures. Fairly confident that figures are accurate. Supplemental issue – we can have more conversation when we have data. Used your 46 and 33 numbers on 16 and 25+. And we just ran out of time having conversation about other retention at this point. Paras' proposal is step + 4%. Whether convert to cents per hour. Dealing with percent is more advantageous for those at the higher levels. People who have spent a lot of time in district feel they are not being recognized. Step alone is not going to work for employees to ratify. They do ask what teachers are getting when we are working on ratification.

BV – They benefit from the (referendum) increase.

BP – They do, and they appreciate it. And they appreciate the local taxpayers.

BV – Thank you. Preliminary cost out of yours. We came up with a higher percentage than you did. As far as an increase in dollars.

BP – I don't know what you're using, but I can give you the backup data.

GM – The biggest difference is we're assuming that based on prior data that there are more higher performing teachers.

BP – Give me some data and I'll be happy to modify. Same as I did on retention. I work on data not on mysteries.

GM – We have data from 22-23.

BP – What about 23-24?

GM – Haven't been paid on 23-24.

BP – I understand.

BV – We will go back and look and have more discussion and meet on the 29th.

BP – Thank you.

Meeting adjourned at 10:32 p.m.