

**MEA Bargaining 2024-2025**  
**Session #6**

Wednesday, August 14, 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 5:58 p.m.

BV – welcomed guests for attending. Congratulations on successful start to school year. Happy parents and kids. Monumental effort. Got through storm well. Hope all teachers and staff got through that. Minor changes to minutes. Dawn made changes to 7/31 minutes. 8/6 minutes look good.

Proposal for you where we left off. (Management handout.) Many items in agreement. Health Insurance (HI) explanation – board transferred \$5 to HI. \$2,803,642 was for MEA represented individuals. Board premium increase of 10.9% equals \$2,884,396. We talked through the 10.9% increase; it was better than plan changes because plan changes could hurt those who work with us. Performance – Effective (E) would get a 4 level increase, Highly Effective (HE) would get a 5 level increase. Those who are not rated (NR) would get 4 levels. Those on the grandfathered (GF) schedule would get 4 levels. Increased COLA to \$624. In agreement on 11-month hourly equivalency adjustment. Came down to 4% on supplement increase. We had a higher number of individuals receiving supplements than you had. Have backup to send you.

BP – Yes, I would like to see backup.

BV – Retention – 16 and 25 stacked. Agreed. ESE supplements. Varying number of these. Self-contained ESE would get \$500 each and paras and aides - \$250. After talking with you all we have a salary schedule for paras. (Management handout.) Increased to 20 cents an hour increase on that schedule. 1 step increase for paras. You were at 60 cents. We met at 50 cents/hour. Paras – ESE paras would receive 70 cents. (50 + 20 = 70). Substantial progress. Looking forward to going ahead and coming to agreement tonight. Collaborative planning on table. Hoping for a counter. We finalized the referendum dollars. All set for next paycheck – 8/23. Heard we did well on the skinny check. A lot of work that went into that.

DJ – Collaborative planning. Discussed language was to not modify unstructured teachers' time. Some concerns about what that would look like in HS. Surveyed principals. Have planning within the school day at 6 out of 7 high schools. Have shared planning periods already.

BV – Questions? Would like to hear from you.

BP – What do high stakes areas mean?

DJ – State assessed areas.

BP – The schedule would apply to high stakes and what about everybody else?

DJ – Schedule crafted for flexibility. Going forward could design around language like this to collaborate within the school day. Happy to work on what that looks like if you have concerns about singleton teachers. How that time could be used effectively.

BP – It makes sense to plan for it. Doesn't sound like you're ready. There is 1 school without common planning. Would they have to comply?

BV – Appreciate your willingness to look at that.

BP – The intent of bargaining is to do that upfront. Not wait until bargaining for complex issues. We try to do that. It doesn't always work out.

BV – It looks like we're close. Anxious to see what we can do to wrap up those issues where we are not in agreement.

BP – It seems like we are not in agreement on larger ones so we have to continue to work. Regarding the proposed ESE salary schedule. There are 308 basic and 237 ESE. Where are the other 100 people?

SI – We have behavior techs.

BP – Behavior techs are not on the TA6 schedule.

SI – They were on the active roster as of last week.

BP – Vacancies?

SI – 50 some vacancies. ESE 101 aides are on TA6. Have to add 86 one-on-one ESE aides. This was designed to match proposal for \$250 that we had.

BP – This time you have 237, last time you said 229. One-on-one is excluded. Are those part of the 308?

SI – Don't know. Have to check.

BP – The number of TA6 in the past was greater than the number that was listed on this sheet. That's the issue – 652 is the number of TA6. That's what I've been using to calculate the cost for TA6. Been using 788 for the overall unit. 758 is the data I got. Trying to figure out where the extra people are. If you have updated numbers that would be great. I have 2 on PL1, 11 on PL2, 93 on PP6 and 652 on TA6.

BV – Will work on that during caucus. Anything else? Will email you clarification on regular supplements.

BP – No other questions.

Caucus at 6:17 p.m.

Reconvened at 7:02 p.m.

MEA handout.

BP – You asked us to consider addressing compression. We addressed the issue. Looking at graduated percentages at beginning from 1 – 4. There are 2 schedules: one for HE and E that differ from the current structure. Handout to address that so you can see how that impacts compression in a graduated way. Doesn't resolve it, but it is a step in the right direction and an opportunity to continue working in multiple ways to get to resolution in the future. 3-4 percentage model for E, HE And GF. You will see that in the handout. (MEA handout.) Current schedule for performance pay (PP) 10 month teacher schedule. Levels start at 1c. There is a 3 because data sheets always has a numerical value for 1,2,3 rather than a,b,c. Then you see the number of employees on PP schedule. Compression of \$49,210 occurs to 10a which we have been talking about and large number of people there. Middle columns address E schedule with increases of 1 – 3 % for first 4 levels = 1%. Then 1.5%, 2%, 2.5%, 3% for remainder of the schedule. Graduated increase in terms of values. No one at the end at this point. Teachers would stay on their current level. Not an increase in levels of pay. Level 33 is the highest level anyone is on PP schedule at this point. Changes compression significantly. \$49,700 to \$50,686. 4-6 levels still stay the same so there would be 5 groupings of compression. HE – increases start at 1.25 and go to 4%. Increasing in the HE range to get to 4% at 9a and continues that way for the remainder of the schedule. People without an evaluation would move to E schedule. Calculated cost based on math of 21% of people being E and 79% being HE at each level. MEA handout (GF schedule) – no one is in compression. No one can be hired on the GF schedule. No one can move from PP to GF. No graduation, just a simple 3%. Keeping levels only to be consistent and not complicate what we've done in the past. 3% at every level on GF schedule. Calculated using all individuals at schedules both 10- and 11-month numbers. This is first blush to see. If you want to see it I can print out 11-month schedules. Calculations include 11-month individuals.

BV – GF schedule – pay levels would not have any impact?

BP – No, would stay at level and receive 3% increase because the salary schedule would change to 3%. 10 month bachelors, masters, specialist, doctorate were calculated. \$2000 becomes \$2060, showing that's part of their schedule. In PP schedule 11-month degree supplements were included in calculations – degree supplements.

BV – Help me with numbers. First 4 columns – you don't have COLA. What is the difference between your cost and our cost minus COLA?

BP – Compression folks get an increase other than COLA. In some cases, in some cases less than COLA, sometimes more. Yours is calculated in COLA, ours is calculated on the schedule.

BV – Have to subtract COLA cost?

BP – We are providing an increase for everyone in compression.

BV – I want you to tell me what the difference is between your cost and ours. I'm sure you've estimated that.

BP – I can calculate what yours is. Mine comes out higher than what yours is. Guess I didn't do it right.

BV – May take some time to figure out.

BP – It comes out higher. Maybe we should accept yours since it's more money. It's more than what you said it is. \$361,584. The difference is \$369,584. \$4,200,787. \$300,000 dollars apart.

BV – Continue with the rest of your proposal.

BP – Added in 11-month hourly equivalency; we have the same number for that. Supplements at 4%. We have higher calculation in there than your calculation for supplements. Can't really tell you why. Have a total value that I had from the list of supplements. Calculated that at 4% additional. Still at 4% on supplements. Schedule is the schedule. May be difference in the number of people who receive or something else. Retention – numbers are different. You included additional money to pay people who were not paid correctly last year?

BV – Correct.

BP – I don't see that as a bargainable issue. It's the correction of an error. Should have done it already. Those were people who were due last year or the year before that. ESE teacher supplements – we had a conversation about making it comparable to supplements last year. Lowest was \$525, should start there since that is what we used last year for new supplements. Using 229. Not sure who the people are. Not sure we agree on who is eligible. Strong disagreement of who is eligible for the supplements. Case managers. We believe there are people who work full time addressing ESE students like SLPs and others who should be included in that. Not sure it's what's listed and not sure it's more. Who is eligible for supplement?

BV – We provided you the list of positions.

BP – I don't think you did. You listed schools and how many people were in self-contained classrooms. We're not sure those are the right people. We believe it ought to include other people.

BV – Thought we were in agreement with that one. Thought you knew where we stood.

BP – We believe that needs further discussion. May be more than just self-contained. May be case managers, SLPs, may be other people. Never had an agreement. We talked about agreement around concept but never agreed on who is eligible

BV – That's why we gave you the sheet. Who do you think is eligible?

BP – People who work in ESE classrooms and work with students all day long. Case managers in some cases have students. We believe that needs further conversation. Said that in every bargaining session and in every proposal we've made. That is a change from \$500 to \$525 because we went back to what we agreed to previously and don't want to go back and be inconsistent. Look at CTSO that was added last year which was probably not enough for what they were doing and won't be enough for these people either.

BV – We think the place to start is \$500.

BP – Ok, we disagree. You can certainly give a counterproposal. Would hope you would be flexible to be consistent over time. ESE paras – appreciate the schedule. We believe 25 cents is an appropriate gap. Didn't hear explanation of why 20 cents.

BV – For the same reason you gave 25 cents.

BV – Our original proposal was a \$250 supplement. You asked us to come up with a schedule. 20 cents exceeded that amount.

BP – 282. So, you're at 20 cents.

BV – That's the starting point for us this year.

BP – Trying not to make changes to schedules year after year. We will be talking about modifying the schedule next year. If you place value on a position talk to me about it. We believe it needed to be different for a while. We've seen a migration away from using people on the higher salary schedule and putting them on a lower.

BV – Disappointing that you came back with this. Heading in wrong direction instead of getting closer.

BP – We stayed at 60 cents and step.

BV – We came to 50.

BP – There have been a number of times where you haven't moved at all.

BV – ESE would get 70 cents.

BP – That's true, and we believe they would get differentiation and its still at a very low level.

BV – All you're asking for with other increases is heading in wrong direction.

BP – We made a lot of movement in addressing compression. That's what we've done. In some cases, to the detriment of COLA. Significant movement in the way you have asked to address compression.

BV – It's an increase in cost.

BP – It's a significant decrease in cost compared to the last proposal. Believe it's important to do to comply with the law. To move to a place to function. Unless you're not concerned with compliance anymore. If that is the case we can do away with schedules and create something new. Never said that when you put more money into paras and then took it back because you don't calculate correctly. That's regressive. You proposed more money in paras then than you are proposing now.

RS – That was a typo. It was not in the budget.

BP – Are we to assume you don't have money in the budget when you gave us that proposal?

RS – It was an error. Calculated benefits twice. Was not meant to be there.

BP – We believe you put the money on the table for paras.

BV – We have always worked together without chastising the other party.

BP – You chastised last year and are now. You just chastised me just now.

BV – I'm sorry you feel that way.

BP – You said you're disappointed in me.

BV – Right. Because we were talking about lower amounts.

Caucus at 7:42 p.m.

Reconvened at 9:07 p.m.

BV – Very disappointed in interactions that took place last time. We put our best effort forward. Thought were making progress. Way you responded does not go forward to bring resolution. Very disappointed especially with relationship over the years. Some questions. 2817 and ours comes up at 2923. Discrepancy – your proposal would be less money. Can you explain?

BP – From the list of individuals that were on the schedule. You have brand new individuals who are not going to move. How many people are hired brand new who you have no intention of giving a raise? It's the number you gave us in April. April's data.

BV – Don't have that number right now.

RS – You asked for what? We gave 2923 and 788.

BP – Used the number of people who would be eligible for a raise. You excluded them in your proposal. I included them in mine. I know there are individuals who won't return at the beginning rate who aren't eligible for any salary increase.

BV – Will look at proposal. Would like to get 11-month schedules. Please forward.

BP – ok.

BV – Also we don't agree on degree supplements. Feel they should be the same regardless on PP or GF.

BP – I did include them as the same. Increased by 3%. And it's included in calculations. On GF they are in the schedules themselves. Included as part of PP schedule.

BV – How much did that come out to?

BP – Different in each classification. If you want me to break everything down I'm happy to do that, but so far you have not said that you are interested. Not interested in doing extra work for nothing.

BV – You're telling me you want us to change the entire salary schedule concept without planning. You're talking out of both sides of your mouth.

BP – You asked for a way to address compression. And I did.

BV – If you're asking us to look at a different salary schedule concept we're asking you to take a look at collaborative planning.

BP – We have done work on collaborative planning. You're asking people to give up hours of 10 days x 2 of at least 50 minutes for a few hours which is not specified on one record day. It comes out to be worth more than 2 days of time for what? Why would we give up over 2 days of planning time for a couple hours that we still have time to do as teachers?

BV – We're willing to take a look at this. It's going to take this time. We may be in touch for more information.

BP – Ok, are you really going to look at is what I ask. You want teachers to give up time for a small amount of time on record day.

BV – Want to hear what you think is fair.

BP – Give us a proposal. Your proposal doesn't specify how much.

BV – We're going to do some studying of this.

BP – Do you want me to ask teachers if this is a good idea?

BV – They already have that; it is outside the student day.

BP – Not even most of bargaining team feels that way. Have you studied what principals want to do during this time?

BV – There are logistics that go beyond this.

BP - Like what?

BV - Like payroll, programming.

BP - Don't they do that every year?

BV - This is very late in the game to be doing this. It's going to take us some time to review. Next time to meet would be on 8/21 at 5:30. Need a cost of increase for supplements, masters and other and 11 month schedules.

BP - You want the cost that is already done. The cost is already there but I would be happy to provide that if that is what you're asking for.

BV – Your master, specialist and doctorate. We would like those detached.

BP – I will show how it works on GF and I will include where people are at every place so you know what data I have that I think is already on the spreadsheet I gave you. It's just not on the first page because there is no one there. I put everyone on page 2, 3 and 4 where they exist currently. Only 877 people.

BV – 5:30 here on 8/21.

BP – You want data between now and then? How much time do you need? Are we going to schedule a meeting to have something to negotiate with?

BV – That’s our intent. If we’re not ready, we will cancel. Hope to hear from you on collaboration.

BP – We are allowed to propose a structure just like you are. That is a viable stance to take in bargaining whether it comes from you or me.

BV – You have priorities, and we have priorities. That’s negotiations. We have had a lot of conversations, too, and are willing to take a look at it.

BP – Current contract language (CCL) may be the proposal from us. It’s already there and available for us. So, we’re not saying it is something we disagree with. It’s about when it occurs. You already have the flexibility to do it. We ‘re not opposing it and when and how it’s done and what collaborative planning really means. We haven’t seen clear definition. We heard that principals squeeze in something else and call it something else.

BV – That’s when you bring the issue to the district.

BP – Believe me, Pat Barber talks to the district about these issues. All 11 month people didn’t get paid for 5 days on the skinny check. Somebody determined something different than what was agreed upon.

Meeting adjourned at 9:28 p.m.

Next session, August 21, 2024, at 5:30 p.m. SSC.