

Bargaining
2010-2011

Wednesday, December 8, 2010

The meeting began at 3:25 p.m.

Present were:

Jim Drake-SSC	Kathy Redmond –Palma Sola
Darcy Hopko- SSC	Alan Ramos-SEHS
Willie Clark – PHS	Helen King- Sea Breeze
Pat Barber- MEA	James Horner – Abel
Rachel Bailey – Oneco	Bruce Proud- MEA
Joe Stokes – SSC	Melanie Newhall- Orange Ridge
David Underhill - BHS	Chuck Fradley - Wakeland
Kara Carney - Daughtrey	Dawn Walker - MEA
Alan Ramos – SEHS	Nancy Goux - Blackburn

Also present were Hank Groton, Forrest Branscomb and Nancy Paradise.

The minutes of December 2, 2010 were reviewed. The following changes were made:

Page 1 - Management asked for clarification of meaning of “disruption.” MEA stated that it was MEA’s belief that management’s health insurance proposal would create more disruption in transferring from plan to plan and in premium increase/decrease.

Page 2 – In reference to Lee County’s HIC change “It’s very challenging” to “Doing the work of the committee is very challenging.”

Page 2 – In reference to Lee’s HIC language the last sentence does not reflect the consensus of the group.

Page 3 – Add “It is MEA’s belief that” to the following sentence: “The real issue is heavy-handed pressure from people outside the committee that make it hard to overcome trust issues about collaboration.”

Page 3 – AFR is an acronym for “annual financial report.”

Page 3 – MEA believes that changing modified day and record day language will be perceived as the district taking more time away from teachers.

No other changes were made.

Management discussed a new idea regarding health insurance. This was for discussion as management did not have the authority to make it a proposal. A spreadsheet was projected that included the board’s proposal (based on Mercer’s report), MEA’s proposal and management’s idea. Clarification – management’s characterization of MEA’s proposal is annualized. Reflects April payroll deduction for premiums. Total board same as original proposal. Only tweaking employee & board share in different way to get between MEA’s and management’s proposal - \$1.67 million difference.

MEA Health Insurance Premium Discussion 12/8/10	Management’s Initial Proposal	MEA’s Counter Proposal	Management’s Idea
<i>2010 Blue Choice</i>			
Single	\$100.00		\$100.00
Employee +1	\$300.00		\$300.00
Family	\$500.00		\$500.00

<i>2010 Blue Options</i>			
Single	\$65.07	\$56.24	\$60.00
Employee +1	\$257.25	\$249.90	\$200.00
Family	\$350.00	\$281.15	\$342.57
<i>2010 Blue Care</i>			
Single	\$73.13	\$12.50	\$43.00
Employee +1	\$252.38	\$187.43	\$180.00
Family	\$321.94	\$218.67	\$300.00
Annualized	\$8.861 million employee share		\$8.2 million employee share
	\$27.912 million board share		\$28.5 million board share
			24% increase for employees 18% increase for board Total: 19% increase

Management's idea is to make premium adjustments for this year and then to work through HIC to develop plan design changes. Premium increase discussions would happen in committee in order to have a proposal for '12-'13 that would make plan actuarially sound.

MEA asked for calculation of numbers of MEA's proposal on management's spreadsheet. MEA also asked if there is a way to make it easier to explain that the board's contribution does not go up and then down. The issue is that this creates the perception that board's going to take away and shift money to employee. There has to be a way to figure out what will get the same number in dollars.

Management explained that Mercer's proposal was to have set board contribution. The history is that the board contribution has been different for different plans. The goal is to have a base plan, and employees could buy up from there. HIC could come up with what that would look like. The board wants a 3-year plan to remove deficit. By May 1 management wants HIC to develop a plan for 2012-2013 that would remove deficit and get plan certified actuarially sound by 2014 to present to the board. If that plan doesn't meet the board's criteria management's proposal is to continue on with premiums as proposed by management.

Management asked how management's new idea would affect deficit. More number crunching is needed. Management wants to get feeling from MEA and present to superintendent after number crunching is done. Management believes that this idea would generate an additional \$6 million, and that money could be used to cut deficit if expenses stay flat. Management indicated that BCBS will be bargaining with Manatee Memorial again and maybe Blake, so that may affect things. Management wants to make a big dent in the deficit in the first year. HIC has been looking at ways to lower costs, including looking at clinics. Management believes that the plan could save \$1 to \$2 million.

Management shifted the conversation to the makeup of HIC. Currently HIC has 8 committee members – 2 district, 2 AFSCME, 2 paras and 2 teachers. Management's proposal is to increase that number to 16 people – 8 appointed by the superintendent, 8 by bargaining units. The chair would be from district because that person could run off data. Management asked MEA if both parties could move toward this system.

MEA responded that MEA is prepared to talk about committee makeup and that both parties would need to study premiums. MEA is not opposed to a committee of 16. MEA doesn't see the need to change a lot

of language because current language makes it clear that the plan should be actuarially sound and that the committee will work together. Current contract language and 8 + 8. MEA appreciates that management has shared ideas that get both parties closer but is concerned that management's idea doesn't put both parties in a good position for next year (beginning of January 2012). MEA's desire is to figure out what the money is and equalize it so in future we're in better stance.

In response to management asking if MEA's concern is that the gap will be so large to overcome or if it's going to make things worse MEA responded that it would be too large to overcome in three years.

MEA distributed counter proposal to management's HIC language. Bargaining units would include AFSCME. Management will respond.

MEA stated that management's new proposal is that the board's share decreased at the same rate that the employees' share increased. MEA stated that employees in the HMO assume some risk and some out of pocket expenses. MEA believes that this is not part of Mercer's calculation.

Management stated that this plan was to save money and to give a plan that's affordable to employees.

MEA countered that it is not costing the district more money. That has not been clear.

Management stated that HMOs don't cost as low as \$10.

MEA countered that some districts don't charge employees anything for single employee HMO coverage.

Management stated that both parties need to look at changes coming, especially in 2014.

MEA will evaluate management's proposal to determine if it will be perceived as having value. MEA appreciates that management has addressed the disruption issue.

Break at 4:35 p.m.

Reconvened at 4:47 p.m.

Management asked MEA to present issues before management presented their additional issues.

MEA distributed the following language:

Page 1 – updated page – waivers to contract language

Intent in line 33 to change to 75 % of ballots cast. Those who do not vote do not count one way or another. MEA expressed concern about additional pressure that this places on the school's building representative and the principal on the process. There is the potential for political pressure in explaining the waiver, intense in some cases. Management's proposal adds to that and this has been the concern all along. "Get out the vote" campaigns may exist either pro or con about a particular proposal.

A member of management's team stated this MEA's proposal is perfect and would work fine.

Another management team member stated that it's ok, but it may be a problem. However, if a school can't get 75% the school shouldn't do it anyway because they don't have enough buy-in.

Another management team member stated that 75% is too high.

Page 2 – MEA is looking for confirmation from management that it is OK or not. Management stated that it is in past practice. Management is concerned that if they hire a .5 they don't get health insurance. MEA did not attempt to change the practice, and this is the practice. 18.75 – if split in half no one gets any health insurance. Management will respond.

Management asked if teachers at high school level hired to work 2 days one week and 3 days another week – do they get health benefits? Management questioned if this language has any impact upon that.

Page 3 – MEA stated that the language hasn't changed. Also, advocacy on issues is another issue there that has not changed.

Page 4 – Management's proposal to modify paragraph (b). MEA's proposal is to retain current language. It applies to elementary teachers. MEA believes it would be inappropriate to address all bargaining unit members to language that only applies to elementary teachers in certain circumstances.

Inserted page 5 – MEA's counterproposal moves to June 1 the date for teachers re-nominated. MEA has concerns about timeliness, how this really will work, whether it will change practice, and preparing and getting ready for following year. MEA expects it won't change for many in terms of getting notice of reappointment because there is so much else going on at the end of the year. Management asked if MEA is ready to TA this. MEA responded that MEA is ready to TA this as well as others MEA has proposed.

Page 6 – Management asked if this is current contract language. MEA – clarification of preps.

Page 7 and 8 – MEA's salary proposal has not changed. MEA is not proposing changes to supplementary schedule although willing to discuss supplement relating to data (test coordinator position).

Page 9 – Same language proposed earlier.

Page 10 – Language has not changed. Management asked how often it would occur that negotiations would not happen before July 1. MEA stated that a majority of the time it was not completed by July 1.

Page 14 – Same

Page 15 – Counterproposal. May 15 instead of June 1. MEA expressed concerns about not trying to have para and teacher decisions in the same week. MEA believes it makes sense to stagger deadlines and it's advantageous to have distinct deadlines. MEA believes that extending probation beyond 120 days is necessary nor is changing status. MEA believes that 120 days is long for an hourly worker for a probationary period. MEA is not inclined to change other language at this point.

Page 16 – Grievance issue is "clean up."

Page 17 – Included to make sure both parties capture this.

Page 18 – Language has not changed. MEA believes that there is a need for some checks and balances. MEA's intent is that it would not stop at step 2 but, if necessary, would go to arbitration.

Page 19 – Same as language as in teachers' proposal.

Page 20 – Salary schedules and continue through end of document. Proposal has not changed.

Management's proposal – Revision of terminal pay. Draft form. Concept came out recently. Revised management 3 to address perceived equity issue. Management's proposal places new hires and current employees at same status. Accruing of days would be same but would be paid at the employee's salary when accrued. Management asked MEA to review and respond. Management indicated that there are changes in regular text as well including changes to individuals after July 1, 2011. Mea asked how many additional payroll clerks management was prepared to hire.

MEA asked for clarification for #11. Management responded that only sick days earned during employment with MCSD would be used to calculate terminal pay. Sick days earned first would be used first. (Example – first year of teaching rate of pay was \$25/hour. Now, \$40 hour.) An employee would have to use \$25/hour rate first and hold days earned at current rate of pay (\$40). Management's thought was to change language for all instead of for new hires because of the friction management believes it would cause among existing and new employees.

Management asked MEA when a future bargaining date could be scheduled. MEA asked management when management would have an answer about health insurance. Management indicated that they would be prepared to respond after Tuesday, December 14th.

Future meeting date – MEA will contact management.

Management will make the room arrangements and MEA will make the food arrangements.
Adjourned at 5:32.