

MEA Bargaining 2024-2025
Session #3

Monday, July 29, 2024

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

Meeting began at 6:15 p.m.

BV – Congratulations to teachers and everyone who made grades come out so well. Probably best performance in years. 24 A schools. 54% is a strong showing in 3rd grade reading. Building (remediation at SSC due to the flood) is coming along. All cleaned up.

Joe – ServPro is out. Hope to have pricing shortly. At least we're not paying; insurance company is.

Minutes

BV – The minutes look good.

Follow-up Items

BV – The exact number of ESE and paras that if we go ahead and propose supplements we hope to have by next session on Wednesday night. Also working on 10-year retention. Have some issues we will discuss. Proposal for you on health insurance. Items related to compensation also. Starting with health insurance. (Handout)

Board Proposal

BV - Listened to your concerns. If we made benefit changes individuals could take a hit. Best option is to increase 10.9% with no plan design changes. District contributes \$5M to offset 21% premium change. Impact to MEA of \$2.8M.

RS – Contribution by district is not something that is budgeted for 24-25 calendar year. Decided to already do it. To be actuarially sound would require 21% increase. Health insurance costs are increasing. Fund balance of 2 months' worth of premium claims. \$5M contribution takes increase down to 10.9%. 2nd page shows what impact would be on individuals. Most expensive is family gold. \$1345 increase. Step and COLA beat what maximum cost would be. Increase to salary is making sure an employee is more than compensated. For those on bronze only \$52 increase. We are pointing out the premium splits. Showing what employee and what board is doing. Employee only bronze, employee only puts in 6% for themselves. District picks up 94%. We are really close to Sarasota. Sarasota has a very expensive plan for those on family. Board picks up 54%. Hopefully this percentage will help explain to some people. Want to make sure proposed increases are covered.

BV – District has made commitment to support spouses and children, too, as opposed to other districts. Any questions?

BP – Nope.

BV – (Handout) Feel like we've brought the best option at this point. Moving toward your model on the spreadsheet. Maintain 3 levels for effective (E) on the performance pay schedule (PP) and for grandfathered (GF) and 4 for highly effective (HE). Left PP not evaluated off. Still trying to define that area. Next proposal will see some numbers on that. You talked about presenting new concept. Interested but very concerned moving in that direction for this year. Willing to study. Hoping that we will continue with our concurrent model this year. Will make sense for employees. Proposal you had still didn't deal with compression. Another factor, logistics of gearing up at this late date. Brings COLA to \$468. Maintaining 10 and 11-month hourly the same. 2% supplement increase. 16 and 25 remains the same. Agree. Concern about whether they receive both. Still studying. Degree supplement. Masters – 11 month was \$2204 and so recommending bringing masters for 10 month to \$2204.

BP – Do you know why? Because it was calculated on 11-month contract as opposed to 10 month.

BV – Proposal is to have them both the same.

BP – Even though they (11-month employees) work more days in a year?

BV – It's a degree supplement.

BP – Then why not the other 2 degree supplements?

RS – a PhD who is 10 versus 11 is earning the same degree supplement.

BP – No, they're not.

BV – We will take a look at that. 2% for paras which is 1 step. Adding a 15 cent per step increase per hour. Another area – retention supplement for 10 year which you proposed. Our concern is that we would rather separate that from 16 and 25. Supplement amount that teachers if they have between 10 and 15 years and have continuous service in Manatee County, they would receive the supplement. Then, it would sunset. Then would receive supplement already in the contract. Concerned with that supplement continuing through the entire salary schedule for everybody who has 10 or more years because of cost. Your proposal said \$1.5M. We can propose some language. Finally, (handout) language on collaborative planning. We talked about this earlier – this is one of the best practices that has proved successful. Provision for collaborative planning outside the student day. Proposing changing outside student day when principal or designee meets during student day. Often not convenient for teachers in time after or before school to meet. They have other responsibilities. Propose to change that to two times a month. Also, would be willing to use early release days for release time. Also open to work with MEA on MOU on collaborative planning. Use MOU to see how those work to also to make a change such as that. Open to discussion of how to work with collaborative planning which is really important to help the district move forward.

BP – I understand your proposal. Will be happy to discuss.

BV – Thoughts on discussion on 10 years? Concerned about high cost? Any way of looking at that that you would consider?

BP – We'll talk about it. Doesn't seem to follow the pattern we're looking for. You've raised enough concerns about other retention.

BV – We will look at that, too.

BP – We will take a caucus and discuss.

Caucus at 6:39 p.m.

Reconvened at 7:50 p.m.

BV – You're correct on the supplements. We withdraw that proposal.

BP – Which proposal?

BV – The masters supplement.

RS – We thought we were correcting an error.

BP – Good. Reviewed proposals. Health insurance – understand your proposal. Have had good conversation about that option. Not ready to agree. Need further conversation to understanding the ramification on individuals and cost impact on them. Particularly on paras and being able to afford where they are and looking at where they are in the plans. How many impacted and to what extent.

RS – Would it help if we get background for paras vs. teachers?

BP – Think we have it. Overall proposal – MEA teacher totals. Cost with benefits line and line with teacher salary maintenance cost - To what extent are funds being used from the general fund out of this proposal as opposed to teacher salary dollars?

BV – Have to come back with follow up.

BP – Paras – You said 1 step is 2% average. That is not close to being reality. Very few exceed 2% as a step. Aggregate is less than a 1%. Not even close to being 2%. It's less than a percent. Prefer not to use 2%. It's not real.

BV – Will take a look at that.

BP – Only used 2% at top because those steps were generated at 2%. Several steps near top were calculated at 2% but are really 1.9%. I assume it's a rounding issue.

BV – Have been talking about that in our caucus.

BP – Supplemental pay – 564 FTEs. What does that mean? The list I see is over 1200 who receive supplements. Trying to figure out what 564 is.

BV – Those are appendices in contract.

BP – Yes, all differentials. How do you get to 564? And, teacher retention at 16 and 25 I'm still confused how you're calculating or interpreting it. It's always been discussed in bargaining on every sheet at 21 and 36. It's calculated out. The number you are using is close enough to my number. Positions times 36 and positions times 21. That says it should have been paid an additional 3600 since we have been negotiating it that way and calculating on the sheets that way. 215,400 is same number I have in calculating 33 people x 3600 and 46 people x 2100. So, when we do that every year it makes sense to be paid that way every year as an additional payment. Concerned we need to file legal action to resolve if we can't get it resolved quickly. It is not being paid as we have agreed to in bargaining. Definitely needs to be resolved before we can agree to issue.

MEA proposal (handout) – current position on compensation. Switched from percentage model which we still believe is important to move in that direction because of difficulty with the number of individuals on PP schedule that have been at the same salary at the beginning salary rate. Used 7/5/5 model with COLA of \$780. We believe it complies with law. The reason for the high levels is because of issue as it related to beginning of schedule and compression. We have to address those individuals in compression and move them out. Not sure compression complies with the law anymore. 1400 people are in the compression zone. This will move them out quicker. Will move into other salary to get fewer people that stay at same rate of pay. Proposed COLA. Those not evaluated probably include both GF and PP. Some on GF don't receive an evaluation because of position or someone missed opportunity to evaluate them; it's not just new people. These people should have been evaluated but didn't receive one. Don't know if Evan has that data. There are over 400 people. They are a combination of new people and those who slip through cracks every year. It's not a new issue. Assumption of effective level for those individuals.

BV – Agree on assumption. Trying to get more info. Agree it happens every year.

BP – You're using a larger number on the GF schedule. Data I have is 877. Can't imagine there being more than 877 + 90 on GF. No one should be on GF as a new employee. It would be reducing not gaining every time. The number you used is higher than last year. And pretty sure that can't happen. 11-month hourly equivalency I come up with \$103,973. If you have better data to tell me how many people we're talking about.

RS – Did you have the data by employee?

BP – The data we received has individual employees. It shows their correct salary level on schedule.

RS – Do you know the number of employees?

BP – I have it somewhere. Surprised I didn't put it in there. Around 100 eleven-month employees in both PP and GF schedules. Maintained 5% on supplemental differential pay. Calculation done from figures used in the past assuming not significant difference between new and old data. You listed individuals in a lot of different ways and a lot of different data points. Teacher retention – 10 + still there. Not real fond of the sunset approach.

It diminishes other supplements. Same concern. If you are going to recognize because of length of time in district going to diminish value of other supplements. Don't want to devalue original intention when they have served the length of years of service. For paras maintained 4%. Actual number is less than \$750,000. \$738,379 + step advancement. Believe we are close to the same number. Total costs for that without and with benefits. This proposal and health insurance proposal are still ongoing. We believe that's a fair position to be in in negotiations at this point. Last is collaborative planning issue. We have a lot of questions about what collaborative planning includes, how it's defined, how principals define it. Different definition of what teachers are required to do. Teachers plan more than anyone realizes informally and formally in schools. Not sure there's enough consistency at secondary schools. There is more consistency in elementary in how they schedule planning. There has been a recent change in how principals schedule planning time. Not as consistent in elementary as we would have hoped. Need to have a lot more conversation about collaborative planning. Almost as complicated as changing the salary schedule when talking about teacher time both in and outside of the student day. People are concerned enough to consider how we use record day. Principals using record days not for what the purpose is. Concerned about getting quickly to agreement on this issue. This is a perfect issue for collaborative bargaining.

BV – Thank you very much for work and proposal. Will take a look. Next sessions. Wednesday set for 5:30. Want to consider other days. Thursday August 1st at 4:30. August 6th at 4:00 if those dates work for you. Hopefully won't need 8/1 or 8/6 date but want to put on calendar now.

BP – We will talk about moving schedule up or later if your schedule allows. So, we're done for today?

BV – Yes, done for today.

Meeting adjourned at 8:17 p.m.