

**MEA Bargaining 2022-2023**  
**Session #1**

Wednesday, June 1, 2022

Those present: Pat Barber, Tim Barger, Cory Bernaert, Dan Evans, Ben Geiger, Helen King, Brian Kirchberg, Rob Lyons, Melanie Newhall, Bruce Proud, Marlyce Stringer, Jon Syre, Bill Vogel, and Dawn Walker.

Caucus began at 9:30 a.m. Meeting began at 10:20 a.m.

Agenda

Welcome ▪ Team Introductions ▪ Minutes ▪ Budget update ▪ New legislation discussion and impact ▪  
Bargaining issues ▪ Supplements ▪ Next meeting

Bill – Congratulations on a safe and successful year. Each year has its challenges. Finished on strong note. More stress on teachers than ever before. Superintendent and board recognize that. Hope to come up with mutually beneficial salaries and benefits for teachers and paras.

Pat, do you want to introduce your team?

Members of the MEA bargaining team introduced themselves.

District bargaining team were introduced. In addition, Bill added that Wendy and Doug will be joining. Conflict came up and unable to meet today.

Dawn Walker will take notes. Notes will be shared and approved at the following meeting.

Budget update from Tim. Overview of what legislature has done.

Tim – Two board workshops on budget so far. Legislative session ended in March. Shared revenue picture with board. Shared staffing plan. Next workshop is June 16<sup>th</sup> to fill in other parts of operating budget. Tim handed out “2022-2023 FEFP Conference Calculation Change in FTE and Funds Compared to the 2021-22 Third Calculation.” Legislature prepares document. Politicians are going to say we gave Manatee a 7.56% increase. Tim distributed a second handout “2022-23 FEFP Conference Calculation Change in Funds and Funds per Student Compared to the 2021-22 Third Calculation.” This is what puts us at odds with legislature every year. When you dig in to the numbers there is a different story. We take the spin out of the story. We’re projected to grow by 1100 students. When calculated per student it drops to 5.29%. Third handout distributed “School District of Manatee County 2022-23 FEFP Analysis.” Another piece of the story – year to year comparison. Manatee County run for each year. Row 8 begins categoricals. Have to use funds for those specific purposes. Those dollars are not discretionary. Line 47 remove categoricals. Went from 7.25% to 4.08% after taking out categoricals. There is a need to take out of 4.08% the mandatory FRS contribution increase. This is what we’re using. FRS is a \$2.5M impact. Raising wages to the minimum \$15/hour costs \$2.2M. Scholarship changes – getting hurt with family empowerment. Last year had a ton of students go into that.

Don't know what it's going to be. New charter – \$4.7M. Staffing allocation workshop – 1,100 new students. Need teachers and other support staff. \$4.2M for that. Discussion at board at taking referendum expenses and moving into general fund. If we do that it would be \$2M. 2% budgeted for raises. Just a placeholder. Everything is negotiable.

Any follow up questions feel free to email me. [Bargeront@manateeschools.net](mailto:Bargeront@manateeschools.net)

Bill – Bruce is probably the expert in the state as far as knowledge of budget on the union side. Pleasure working with this organization to figure out what dollars are available or not available.

Bruce – thanks, Bill. I think that's because I'm old.

Bill – (handout distributed) legislation issues. We've already had some conversations with MEA leadership on these. May or may not agree. One thing we have tried to do is when legislature passes new laws we try to figure out ways to implement with most flexibility as we can to negotiate what we think is best for teachers. Start off with something positive. For those teachers in the investment plan they actually raised contribution 3%. So, all of those in FRS contributing 3%. State was matching at 3.3%. State raised it another 3%. Going to give more money for teachers in investment plan. Many are still on the defined benefit plan. Surprised they did this. District is having to pay for increase. But this is a help for teachers on the investment plan. Will be 9.3%.

There is not one place you can go to find new legislation. Have to dig it out. Bruce has done a good job summarizing information. In the statute it says on the 2<sup>nd</sup> page, 'grandfathered must be based on performance.' 4. Grandfathered salary schedule under b "In determining the grandfathered salary schedule for instructional personnel, a district school board must base a portion of each employee's compensation upon performance pay for both instructional personnel and school administrators based upon district-determined factors, including, but not limited to additional responsibilities, school demographics, critical shortage areas, and level of job performance difficulties." We put in contract language about unsatisfactory performance. Auditors flagged us again this year. Hopefully we won't have to discuss. Wanted you to be aware.

Also, shall provide differentiated pay. Our supplement pay is called differentiated pay schedule. This is how we worked together but the auditors called us on this again. Had Title I teachers get differentiated pay. Haven't paid. Need to get back to that. Probably will base upon reading. Not going to have scores until end of July. Will have to do something to meet auditors on that one.

Next thing is base salary – last year ended up reaching \$47,500 for this year. Then didn't have to apply second part because said 'thereafter.' Now, that is this year. Going to be hard to get away from. Top of page 3.

"Beginning July 1, 2021 and until such time as the minimum base salary as defined in s. 1011.62(14) s. 1011.62(16) equals or exceeds \$47,500, the annual increase to the minimum base salary shall not be less than 150 percent of the largest adjustment made to the salary of an employee on the grandfathered salary schedule. Thereafter, the annual increase to the minimum base salary shall not be less than 75 percent of the largest adjustment for an employee on the grandfathered salary schedule." Legislature is not happy with the way we have been addressing our salary schedules. Now, performance is supposed to be higher than grandfathered (GF). Highly Effective (HE) must be 25% greater than employee on any other salary schedule. If teacher on performance pay (PP) is HE the teacher has to get at least 25% more than HE teacher on the GF schedule. We don't like it. Haven't figured out a workaround yet. Legislature is trying to get more people to switch to

performance schedule. We have to increase the minimum salary of \$47,500, too, if you're going to give an increase to anyone else. If there were 3 steps for those at the start we would probably have to go to 5 steps for PP and 4 steps for everyone else. Going to be tough. It's a challenge we're going to have to figure out. Also says we can't give an increase for anything other than HE or E. so then the next big issue that we had was one that is very troubling to us. – longevity.

Our board and superintendent have valued continuity of service. Right from beginning committed to longevity. “Any compensation for longevity of service awarded to instructional personnel who are on any other salary schedule must be included in calculating the salary adjustments required by sub-subparagraph b.” We have longevity listed as a supplement. Saying you would have to add those amounts in to be able to continue longevity. Two issues – what about those continuing to receive longevity? Our position is that we're not going to fight that one. If you receive longevity that's going to continue. May get an audit criticism. If on PP can get longevity but if on GF can't get longevity. To me, putting that in is punitive. We do have some on PP getting longevity. These are the two issues where we feel legislature is pushing people to PP schedule – 25% more and getting longevity. Can't move into longevity unless on PP schedule. Know it's a tough one. Willing to take a chance on people already receiving it. Finally, \$15/hour for paras. This presents a challenge for us.

Superintendent has to file by October 1<sup>st</sup>. People can sue by January 1<sup>st</sup>. There are a lot more new paras that we hired. This is not inexpensive. Last year we had to do compression. Don't like doing compression. If you look at millage money and you add that into \$13.45/hour for starting salary, if you add that up and divide by hourly rate we are close to \$15. Hope we can work together to not have to do more compression. Looks like tax collections might be up. AFSCME settled their contract. They got to \$15 hour. Have \$1 baked into salary schedule. For paras, it's a supplement. Looks like it would take a lot of compression to get to \$15/hour. That's a summary of where we think we are, of what areas are going to be a challenge.

Bruce – You're right, we probably won't agree on everything. There is a lot to be interpreted. Chances are legislation will change again. Backing up to Tim's presentation. What is the total FRS rate for regular class?

Tim - going from 10.82% to 11.91%. 10.07% increase in total contribution rate.

Bruce - We've had conversations in caucus as to what's clear and not clear. No more questions.

Bill – Ok, thank you. Supplements – happy last year when we boosted supplements last year. Dan, please give us update.

Dan – Good news – after many years of supplements not seeing increase, last year got 10% increase. Should celebrate that progress. Subsequently, realized we couldn't make year to year decisions without good data. Did comparison of comparable sized and contiguous counties' supplements. Everything from football to band. Completed mid-year this year. Also want to be sensitive to MEA's survey a couple of years back. What is causing extra duty that could be supplemented? We have what surrounding districts are paying and MEA data that could be updated. Used 2 data points to arrive at one conclusion. Are there areas that we do supplement that we probably should take a look at and what should be supplemented that we are not currently supplementing? 9 or 10 supplemented areas that need more analysis by this team. Probably 4 or 5 that come up in survey that are supplements that we don't offer that we should consider. Team considering this includes head of HR and head

of athletics noted those for our consideration. Those would be lacrosse, MS athletics, fine and performing arts supplements, team leaders. Even after 10% increase probably still need to consider for compensation. Looked at every supplement we could locate that we just don't offer. The ones specific to us are TSA, FBLA. Those come up in your survey. May want to look at and adjust. Don't have anything to offer as far as a suggestion. Need to have dialogue with MEA. Last year we were successful with 10% across the board. Didn't say it would increase. There was conversation about money set aside for committee to work but did not agree to set money aside for that purpose but would reengage in this work. Have systematic process to consider supplements moving forward. Also, and this is not really a bargaining issue – we continue to discuss the process of giving out supplements, working with payroll, budgeting and the processes around those.

Bill – we're open with input from MEA based on data on looking at new supplements. Numbers are a district decision.

Bruce- We took a look at the data. Is there a reason for including Lee County? It's not the same size and not contiguous. Rationale?

Dan – It was nearby. No other reason than to say it was a nearby district. This is a moving target. As soon as we collected data they negotiated changes to their supplement salary schedule.

Bill – It would be nice to set up a group to look at supplements on a continual basis. Any other issues need to bring up? Anything we need to do homework on our end?

Bruce – The issue of coverage has not gone away and has only gotten worse. Need to discuss in great detail.

Bill – We understand that. Just looked at fill rate. It was probably pretty good compared to other districts but probably wasn't one of the best. Looking at increases in sub rates. Sometimes on the fill rate we found that people had not called in until late. That was biggest issue last year. Several hundred called in late. Know there are emergencies. Willing to talk about that. It's an issue all over.

Bruce – I consider it to be a false issue. People call when they can call. Don't know you're ill until you're up and moving. Sounds to me like the district wants to put pressure on people to call in the middle of the night. There are a number of issues in the system and the problems. There are lots of systems issues. So many issues at end of the year. Like taking subs off of the list because they didn't work enough. Changing sub assignments once they get to a school. There are system issues. One small issue of calling in late, let's talk about all issues in system. This is a volatile issue. End of year was disgusting.

Bill – One school reports were very concerning. Not sure of status of system for next year. Maybe at next meeting we can talk more about that. Would like to do that. I was not aware of taking people out of the system.

Bruce – teachers called subs they typically used only to find they were taken out of the system because they haven't worked enough.

Bill – Health insurance is always an issue. It seems like so far we're keeping our head above water. Have a lot of new cost saving methods in place.

Tim – Have seen reduction in prescription costs since implementing Ventegra. I think I missed a call. Haven't seen a lot of savings with MCR and specialty drugs. Don't have claims info on Meritain and Quantum navigation.

Bill – that's just something on the radar. Unfortunately, Aon always recommends increase. Not sure about that. Right now we're alright, Tim?

Tim – For the filing we're alright. State requires we have a certain set aside.

Pat – in '23.

Bill – any other issues we can think of? Have full book if we need it. We need to address things we talked about. What about pay dates?

Bruce – There is always an issue with pay dates.

Pat – No we're not going to have deductions on the first check. Let's get on that so we can have smooth pay.

Tim – it's the software!

Pat – current agreement is that there are no deductions if we have skinny check

Tim – language says no skinny check will have less than 4 days. I think in June 2023 there is a check with 3 days' pay.

Pat – guess you better solve that problem.

Tim – I'm on it.

Bill – last year took a lot of effort. Solved problem last year by working together

Tim – The software just doesn't understand we have a fiscal year ending and beginning.

Bill – As far as the next meeting dates. June 15<sup>th</sup> in afternoon and June 29<sup>th</sup> all day. Pat, if you want to get back to me.

Pat – we will.

Bill – look forward to working with you and your team to figure this stuff out. May not agree on everything but we will do the best we can to come to some agreement.

Bruce – ok. Thank you.

Meeting adjourned at 11:18 a.m.

MEA caucus at 11:25 a.m. Caucus adjourned at 11:50 a.m.