

MEA Bargaining 2022-2023
Session #2

Wednesday, June 29, 2022

Those present: Pat Barber, Tim Barger, Kara Carney, Dan Evans, Ben Geiger, Helen King, Brian Kirchberg, Rob Lyons, Melanie Newhall, Bruce Proud, Bill Vogel, Doug Wagner and Dawn Walker.

Caucus began at 3:36 p.m. Meeting began at 4:47 p.m.

Agenda

Welcome ▪ Minutes ▪ MEA proposal ▪ Management ▪ Next meeting

BV – congrats are in order. Test scores holding own on ELA. Math impressive. When you think of what's happened with COVID. This side of the table bears the success of that. It's noticed. Thanks for work on that. Partnership with Guy Harvey is amazing. The future is bright in Manatee. Fine with minutes. Today anxious to hear your thoughts on what we talked about last time. Probably no proposals. Did a lot of discussion and homework. Meeting with board on 7/5. Minutes distributed.

BP – had conversations since last session. Met some more to discuss issues. Thought we would begin process by making compensation proposals. MEA proposal distributed. Data that we requested helped us to look at what the information was and how much we're talking about in terms of people and values. April payroll data we received. How many people in different places and what everyone is making. Teacher Salary Improvement Allocation (TSIA) issues. We know the requirement to maintain at \$47,500 so that's where we started. How much it will cost to do that. Calculated what we did in past. Probably overestimated cost. 1st column is maintenance – estimated at \$5.9M.

BV – assumes all entry level steps at \$47,500?

Bp – Yes. 1561. I know we tried to keep on schedule where they are. They are somewhere within schedule at \$47500. Some at level 1, some at 8a or 9b. so what's the actual money? Took a stab using what we used last year of what the dollar value is – take our charters and benefits calculation. If something doesn't jive with your thoughts, I'd be interested to hear.

TB – FRS increase incorporated?

BP – I think 18.16.

TB – I think it's 19.6.

BP – Ok. Used perspective of talking about grandfathered (GF) first to talk about new requirements. This model uses GF schedule at highly effective (HE) and effective (E) at 6 levels. \$312 x 6 @ 2.2M. Column 5. Once you establish GF then HE on performance pay (PP) have to get 25% more than those on GF schedule. 25 more than 6 is 8. Used a division of 1150. Don't have evaluation data yet. From that you can calculate effective. Needs to

be between 50 and 75% of HE. I used 5 levels for E. 3rd column. 500 people. Then requirement to raise base. 75% of GF. That's 4 levels. So the calculations are done. Figure out how to spend TSIA first than spend general fund. TSIA doesn't get to all of what we're requesting.

BV – some people might say that once you reach \$47,500 you can leave base at \$47,500. How do you read the law when it talks about that? Is it clear that the base has to be adjusted?

BP – I think it says that pretty clearly in the law. Definitely know that's pretty specific. Expectation that base be increased.

BV – the 'thereafter' clause. That's this year. So that's where we're getting into having to increase it. Ok. I was waiting to see what you feel. Have not come up with a way out of that yet.

BP – I haven't either. Pretty specific language. Must continue to increase base if you increase the GF schedule.

BV – gone as far as legislate committee. It causes us to have to use this formula.

BP- wouldn't want to go through these hoops. Don't have unlimited options. Would have to change schedule to do certain other things. Going to need to think about how much we want to change the schedule to comply with law.

BV – I think schedule has served us very well. Other districts say we made the right decision. Not a whole lot we can do because law on initial steps we had to continue placement schedule. Think we've done a good job adjusting people close to that mark.

BP – specific number of \$47,500 – some get smaller amount. Don't know it's impeding things. Just know there is a smaller level.

BV – worked that out last year. We're both in agreement on that. Thank you.

BP – next column 6- want to continue to increase masters schedule. Increase 300. 1100. Don't know how long we need to do that for comparability and neighboring counties. Next column is supplemental pay. Looked at data – who paid, how much, saw some issues we need to have conversations about. Saw some positions currently listed that are paid. Saw some listed in the contract that nobody received. Can talk about whether we need those on not. Positions we know people performing duties but not necessarily related to that supplement. Work could be done to sort out. Football supplements not matching. Part of complication is fall and spring sports. Pay out of one supplement is complicated. Some issues around those kinds of supplements. This doesn't address that in any way just looking at across the board increase. Have to spend time now if not soon to approach things that have changed, like lacrosse. Some schools have it. Nothing in there for those positions. Complicated question. At this point in time depending on how we want to approach getting to agreement can give proposals on individual items but now proposing across the board increase. Next is longevity. Hesitated with language because of implementation with budget. Not aware it's in statute. Does not have full weight of legislation at this point. Conflicting language about what longevity means in my view. Don't want to give up on individuals receiving compensation for employees who have done and continue to do a good job over time.

Whether on PP or GF. People on both receiving that and who would be eligible. Know it's an issue already and willing to try to work out. Does our language even apply because it's not on schedule? Not part of base compensation. It's a separate item not part of compensation scheme. To include would put a damper on it. You last said you think you can pay on PP and not GF. Would not be acceptable to us. Would make it hard to ratify. Legislature intended all along to get bargaining unit (BU) members fighting amongst themselves. Not interested in that. Will seek legal advice to try to come up with view point to see if consistent with law and way to make it work. May have to change terminology or look at it in a different way.

BV – awaiting your legal opinion and will take a look, too.

BP – the legislators botched or they intended to really offend half the teachers in the state.

BV – we talk about retention. Not recruitment and retention. When you have a tool that helps you retain teachers why is the legislature taking that away from us. See what we can work through on that one.

BP – we may have to work issue in there such as coverage. Not sure how to put it in a dollar and cents because don't have enough data. It may have a monetary impact.

BV – really want to hear your ideas on this. Want a proposal on what is reasonable. Have had a couple of things and have data from unfilled sub positions. Can look at data. Concern is cost and how we can look at that. Abuses in some cases. Put in safeguards so don't have abuses.

BP - How would you have abuse if you were assigned to do something?

BV - We did find some abuse.

BP – I'm interested in the data. Next is paraprofessionals. Same as last year in trying to achieve \$15/hour threshold. Approach in a way to minimize compression. Worthwhile goal. Recognizing that all of the people in the BU need to be recognized for work and not all money being used to compress at bottom and leave more money along schedule. Proposed 1 step for those eligible and 2% at top. And a \$1 per hour on schedule. Reason for \$1 hour is to minimize compression. At \$13.65 and would only bring us to \$14.65. That's not enough to meet requirements. We believe that in combination with \$1 on schedule minimizes how much it actually costs and minimizes number of people you have to move because of \$1/hour on schedule. Without putting money on schedule you increase money you have to spend. So instead of 2 need 6 steps or more of progression. Need to do something to provide opportunity and living wage and meet requirement for \$15/hour. If you do nothing other than compress it costs \$900,000 to do \$15/hour. Our model broadens amount all get and reduces dollar amount to \$240,000.

TB – made notes, ok if we communicate?

BP – did calculations and can explain more. MEA handout – para schedule. Biggest issue is TA6. Last year increased 50 cents. Added dollar first so that you can see impact of doing that. Brings \$13.45 up to \$14.45. Still need to compress to step 8 to reach \$15/hour. Step 9 would be at \$15.22. Adding nothing would need to compress to step 12. Instead of just impacting TA6 would have to compress PP6 1 level to 6 to reach \$15/hour.

PL1 schedule still has to be compressed to step 2. No real cost because no employee there currently but there would be if we have to compress PP6 as well. 14 people impacted as well. Other issue this addresses is top of the schedule at step 22. Historical top of schedule. Unfortunately, 2% was created as a schedule. So, when we moved 2 steps years ago calculated 4% where there were people and didn't calculate where there were not people, so we had steps that were exactly the same. Steps were not intended to be part of schedule. Were intended to calculate individuals so they would receive some increase. Anxious to clear that up. Not intended to increase top of schedule. That was never our intent. One person at step 33 at PP6. We need to address so individuals are treated equitably. Go back to 22 and fix individuals paid at incorrect calculation. Only got 50 cents and not 2%. Pat has been trying to work thorough issue for a very long time.

DWagner – people off scale are they getting a supplement?

TB – No, ta 6 step 33 is 2% above. 31 is \$1.96 above 30.

BP - 23 and 24 are exactly the same

TB – we're aware of there being a problem.

DWagner – has to work in current system. You're trying to hold at 22?

BP – never our intent to extend schedule. They were supposed to receive 2% not extend schedule because they were already at the top. Last year was the only time hopefully that they did not receive the right pay.

DWagner – we'll chase them if they did not receive right pay

BP – Whatever you do with system is not the problem. We did 2 steps and 4% a few years ago then a step and 2% twice.

BV – in order to accommodate system, they just added the step

BP – longevity in schedule. Top level adjusted differently historically. Haven't changed that in a very long time.

BV – looked at that in a different way.

TB – have a scenario where we have done that

BV – we have a compression scenario, too. We will take a look at that. We have a question on the benefit amount.

TB – we're using I'll email it to you.

BP – that's fine. That impacts what TSIA is overall. It does have an impact so we need to know at some point and impacts overall package.

BV – Doug, do you have data for the association?

Doug – 4 packets of data for subs. If there is other data you need let me know. Management handouts. Ended up with 72% fill rate. Verbiage of what rates are next year. 50% of subs are in that top rate. \$89 rate. By making it \$110 hope to keep from going to Sarasota. Concerned about Title I schools so bumping up to \$120. Don't get many subs for paras. Less than 10% of sub fill. Maybe \$15/hour will help with paras. Obviously concerned with teacher subs. Will see how this impacts it. Think it will help. Before we had ESS had MOU where you were paying teachers to fill in. This year \$50 to go to school and school decides how to do that. Some challenges of paying teachers was keeping data square with payroll. Labor intensive to do that. Timeliness of people calling in for subs. If call in right before school starts it's a challenge to fill in. We are having 7 job fairs in July. Goal is to be fully staffed. Closer to August the fewer you have. Seems like less want to work in profession.

DWagner - So let's say I'm on TA6 step 4 making \$15 hour. Where would I go?

BP – Well, you'd get \$15 hour.

TB – Do the 137 people on step 1 move to step 8?

BP – Haven't moved. That's what we agreed to. Have to know where they would go. What we did last year was to move to \$13.45 if eligible at step 2. If that's not how you want to do it, we can have that conversation. It's a different way to compress.

BV- Why not just say \$15 hour and knock off steps and be done with it?

BP – That's why we had the conversation of how to move this year. It was related to how we moved teachers last year. Have to talk to BU about how it's going to be treated and why and how to approach that.

BV – For teachers we were required to increase the base. With paras we're not required to increase the base?

BP- who knows what we'll be required to do? If we didn't have requirement would be happy. Would like to work it out.

BV – if you have new supplements to add like lacrosse open to a proposal on that. That would be helpful for us. If there is a concept you can come up with to address that issue we're willing to do it. The one year that we did it we used it for the teachers. We'll go back and look at different concepts on paras.

BP – appreciate data on subs. If you know how many unfilled, you know filled ones. Wouldn't be difficult to know who's filling for. Whatever vacancies you have that you don't have a current person in. You could say these are the people who filled that hole.

DWagner– we know teachers not at work. Your ask is who filled in? I've looked at the data but I don't think we're keeping that now.

BP – I would hope the school knows because they're responsible for the students. Don't know that you have the data, but you could create it.

BV - Everyone at \$47,500 would increase 4 levels. $\$312 \times 4 + 47500$. \$48,748.

BP – that would create more compression. Everyone would be at the base.

DWagner – it's hard to explain that when they come from other states.

BP – You can send them to Tallahassee or call their local legislator. I'm sure Jim Boyd would be happy to explain it.

BV – Can we set a date to get back together?

BP – July 25th is a potential date. We will discuss.

Pat – So, you're not coming back?

BV – No, I think we're good. Thank you very much.

Meeting adjourned at 5:53 p.m.

MEA caucus at 5:54 p.m. Caucus adjourned at 6:23 p.m.