

MEA Bargaining 2022-2023
Session #3

Monday, July 25, 2022

Those present: Pat Barber, Tim Barger, Cory Bernaert, Kara Carney, Helen King, Brian Kirchberg, Rob Lyons, Bruce Proud, Jon Syre, Bill Vogel, Doug Wagner and Dawn Walker.

Caucus began at 1:07 p.m. Meeting began at 2:05 p.m.

Agenda

Welcome ▪ Minutes ▪ Management proposal ▪ MEA proposal? ▪ Voluntary Transfers ▪ Payment for No Subs ▪ Deductions ▪ Next meeting

BV – Manatee moved up to 25th ranking in the state. Credit to teachers. Hard to move up in ranking. Everyone working hard to accomplish more than anyone else. Pulled together agenda. All in agreement with the minutes. Considered your proposals. Would like to give you our proposal. In terms of overall would be nice if we could agree today. Awaiting items from you, you're waiting for proposals from us. Management proposals. We have spent a lot of time on the phone. Everyone struggling with formula everyone having to comply with. Everyday getting new requirements, having to do new calculations. It's absurd. Hopefully we have some people advocating to set some stuff aside. I'm sure you have people in Tallahassee doing the same. What we're proposing is 3-4-5 model. Base is Highly Effective (HE) – 4 pay levels on that. HE on Performance Pay (PP) to have 5. Proposal has Grandfathered (GF) and PP Effective (E) at 3 levels. That's our counter. Still out for audit. We got flagged again by that from auditor. A number of years ago we got flagged. No one under effective gets increase. Put that out to satisfy potential issues.

TB – Pay for performance calculator. If GF is HE is 4 steps then the HE PP has to be 25% more. That's where we got 4 steps and 5 steps. GF is \$1248. 5 steps is \$1560. For effective have to be between 50 and 75%. \$936 falls within that range.

BV – Association used calculator on that also. Dollars coming from Tallahassee are becoming tighter and more restrictive every single day. Fortunately, based on work of MEA, the community and the board we have the referendum. Without that we would be in real trouble. Helps to fill in gaps. Tremendous effort on board and MEA. Amount was increased. We gave information to the association.

BP – Nothing about the base?

BV – Base would increase 3 levels. \$48,436. Plus referendum.

BP – No corresponding dollar value for that?

BV – Did not separate value out for that.

TB – Included in 3, 4 or 5 steps

BP – What about 1c – 9a?

TB – Would get steps based on performance.

BV – If they were HE they would have to get 2 more for a total of 5 steps.

TB – Movement on existing would have to be based on performance.

BV – You can't increase GF without increasing base. No choice.

BP- PP people are at base. So, some of them moving 5 levels would that get them out of the base?

TB – Oh yeah, wasn't thinking about that. Move from \$47500 up 3 steps.

BV – It could get more out of the base. Everyone would still be moving up base ladder.

TB – Need to talk to HR about implementation. Add on supplement getting them up to \$47500

BV – \$48436. Work with admin to make sure getting minimum increase. Not an issue

TB – Maybe we should be considering getting rid of all of those 1a, 1b, 1c and shift everyone to first step?
Dollar value could be 8a, 8b, 8c, I don't have it committed to memory.

BP – Currently it's 10a. I'm assuming that's what you meant. That's more. 9a to 9b is \$188.

BV – The people sending guidelines don't have any experience working through this formulized process. It would be nice if FEA nd DOE could talk about it and explain that it's a big challenge. The more we're learning from other districts - it's causing a major issue.

BP – As I would expect it would. Hard to deal with and doesn't make much sense. Doesn't fit into structures. Not sure it's not their design.

BV - In agreement to continue increasing master's degree \$300.

Supplements – We are awaiting supplement recommendations. Welcome to look at those. Know some that are needed that are not being supplemented now.

Longevity – All of us respect very much Ron Meyer and his opinion. Spent time talking with attorneys and others about that. Very concerned. Decided against getting legal opinion. Thought it might be counterproductive. Some people in the state have even more opinions on what that meant than what our thoughts were. Didn't want to insert another legal opinion into the mix that might make resolving the issue more difficult. Still maintain that those still receiving it should continue to receive it. GF or PP. Still of the feeling that we're reluctant to move forward, that those on GF approaching longevity, about moving those into that because of information we've received. That's the best place for us to be right now in terms to resolve it. If we get another opinion mixed it could have more ramifications. Sill can give longevity but would have to give 150% which is unaffordable at \$4600. Would be something we

could not afford. Want to leave longevity proposal where it is. Open to discuss with you. Not that board or superintendent want to do it. Feels restricted by statute. Certainly, Ron is well respected. Maybe his opinion would be honored at some point. Position is same as it was last time. Getting numbers and names of people who might be impacted by this. Should we be able to reach agreement we could set this aside and determine best way to resolve. Hopefully come up with positive resolution. Friendly disagreement which we can't resolve which we can set aside

DWagner – 257 teachers currently receiving longevity supplement for 16 years. 125 teachers currently receiving longevity supplement for 25 years. 382 teachers total. There are 49 teachers expected to qualify for the 16 year longevity supplement this year and 31 teachers who will qualify for the 25 year longevity supplement. That's 80 teachers total. That would be a grand total of 306 teachers for the 16 year supplement and 156 teachers for the 25 year supplement.

BP – No one receives salary as supplement.

BV – As far as next 3 columns – paras – in agreement with your proposal. 2% at top. \$1 hour on schedule. Reach \$15/hour base.

TB – Question on top step – applied \$1 across the schedule first then add 2% to maintain 2% between steps?

BP – Yeah.

BV – Sylvanna identified all individuals above schedule. Willing to work with the association to reconcile those. Not sure of concept but could be done outside of table.

DWagner – 23 individuals.

BV – Every time resolve salary always want to give something at the top. Sometimes it's 2%. Sometimes it was something at the top. Depending on the payroll system in place.

TB – Kept adding people above 22. How do we now go back in time and put at 22 but add pay? The system prefers to have 23, 24, 25, 26. We could have 22b, 22c, 22d, 22e . . .

BV – Also have dilemma with schedules because some steps were the same.

BP – They were the same and should not have been the same. There were some of them that were the same depending on what schedule you were on.

BV – Open to working with you on that.

BP – That includes more people than this because individuals at those steps did not receive a step last year.

TB – Is the problem that they didn't get a raise for one year?

BP – Yes.

TB – That should be easy to resolve. I could go to my office and figure it out when in caucus.

BV – Next under transfer. We've had an issue where schools have been fully staffed, principals have schedules made, parents know who new teacher is, and teachers know who teams are and teachers transfer. Proposing expanding teacher language. Requesting move to 4 weeks prior to start of school. Not for this year but for next year. This doesn't restrict the ability to transfer. I think it's a benefit not only to schools but for teachers, students and parents. It will slow down some people moving right before school starts. Asking to consider a 4 week window to benefit everybody.

BP – Can you tell me again how it benefits teachers?

BV – Teachers work in teams or departments. They have schedules. At elementary teachers work all summer with teammates. All of a sudden a teacher leaves. That throws everything off. People call HR to figure out what to do, change room, change assignments. This would benefit not only schools but teachers. Probably not going to have that big of an impact. Principals probably going to approve anyway. Assures a smooth start.

BP - We understand your proposal.

BV – We also have heard association concerns about subs. Board has raised rate to \$110 and \$120 for Title 1 schools. Had MOU a couple of years ago. Thought it was hard to deal with. But instead of talking about pros and cons resurrected MOU. Currently in place \$50/day to schools to pay teachers a pro rata share for filling in for subs where you couldn't get a sub. Proposing as MOU to get started this year. Also, very willing \$356,000 from last year under \$50 – willing to go ahead if association would like would pay that out to teachers in form of a bonus or a supplement. If it's a supplement then it would be less money because deductions would be taken out. Money has not been distributed to schools yet.

TB – It has been distributed.

BV – It has not been spent yet. Could provide to teachers where they filled in. Trying to alleviate problem. Realize that is an issue. I know the association gets a lot of concerns. Reinstated sub pay. Also been taking last year's money to redistribute to those who filled in. This is probably going to be a big budget impact for us. Could end up being double. Could be a million dollars.

TB – Hopefully we get more subs with the higher rates.

BV – Here are the rates.

BP – I think you gave us the rates last time.

BV – Final item for consideration. This has to do with deductions. Sore subject for association and for us. A number of us lost sleep last year. We verified today. No deduction on skinny check this year.

DWagner – Right, that's what Mark said.

BV – But there are advantages.

DWagner – It's important for AFSCME to not have deductions on skinny checks; they do not have smooth pay. Open enrollment is coming up in October. Thought it would be confusing to have different costs for plans. Would be great to have everybody on 20 deductions. Same deductions that referendum pay is on. That's the thinking to try to standardize it for the entire school system. Look at rates on Tim's email. It would be more for some on family. But for most it's pretty close.

BV – Doug assured me that the deductions are aligned with the referendum. That would be more dollars coming in. So we'd like the association to consider that. Know it's been a challenge working through the payroll system. So, as you can see we tried to do a lot of work. Tried to answer questions. And looking for more questions and/or response.

BP – Tell me again what you're proposing?

DWagner – 20 versus 22 deductions to align with all other groups in district. I'll pass this around. A 'what if.' An example of how payroll is set up every other Friday. Don't want to have change, change, change. Want to have - this is it! We had to change for AFSCME. I feel for them it was the best thing. Just trying to standardize so we have one common language. We have a lot of new people coming in. In this group you say this, in this group you say that. With millage get more money.

BP – We'll take a caucus and review your proposals.

BV – Thank you very much.

Caucus at 2:52 p.m. Reconvened at 4:44 p.m.

BP – Ready to give proposals and counterproposals and have conversations and hopefully make some progress. First, compensation proposal. There may be some calculations that could differ from this and reality. Frankly, still confused about data and who is HE and E because so different than what we had before.

TB – I got it form HR.

BP – I'd like to see those numbers so if there is anyone who is NI/D or U.

DWagner – We'll get names.

BP – So different model than what we've talked about before. 3/4/5 model. Different than yours. Includes a cost of living adjustment (COLA). 3 levels at base or \$936. Have to adjust base to make formula work. Not necessarily a straight level. HE and E at 4 levels. PP E at 4 levels. HE at 5. Believe that still meets requirements. COLA at \$600 which has to be no more than 50% of an E individual. Doesn't say GF or PP. 4 levels is \$1200. Fits that criteria for everyone in the bargaining unit (BU) including the base. Base would then become \$49036. Does not discriminate against anybody. Calculations done recognizing how many individuals were done at base. Calculate at additional level. 150 people above the base on PP. GF is calculated at all individuals in GF schedule receiving 4 levels. Those numbers based on data received earlier from April. Split in dollars looks at Teacher Salary Increase Allocation (TSIA) compared to GF money to make sure spend all of TSIA. Appreciate

the increase in the masters supplement. Notice tentative agreement (TA) in that column as well as para columns show TA. We're in agreement with those places. Have a proposal on differential pay. May be additional costs because made modifications to schedule and need to have conversations on how to address some issues to make sure we know how people are being paid on differentiated pay salary schedule. Last year increased by 10% and additional 10% of what supplement would be for that particular supplement. Highlighted areas in football. Want to figure out how they're being paid so there's no confusion. Some paid for spring, some paid for summer and none equals amount in contract. Prefer to separate into spring and fall payment. That may or may not be paid to same individual. Easier to track if we separate into spring and fall. Any suggestions you have would be helpful to know. Not sure anything other than football that does that. May be cheerleading but didn't seem to be as prevalent.

BV – What has been done? What do coaches say? Who knows? It has to be one of those things.

BP – Coaches will tell you they deserve a lot more and would prefer to be paid Texas rules. But this isn't Texas. Some of them make more than the superintendent. There are people that are full time and some that are not full-time employees other than coaching. A little more complicated. Issues around continuation of coaches, it's a spring-fall kind of sport for their season. Complicated. Some schools paid more than others and I don't know why.

BV – I agree with what you're saying. This one is probably going to be one that will take more time to figure out. I understand the issue.

BP – Added lacrosse. Currently 2 schools that have lacrosse but haven't seen anyone paid for that. Next one is middle school (MS) intramurals based on conversation with MS folks. MS are competing with other MS. Don't know there are programs within the school. This \$3531 is being split by those assisting with coaches coaching MS sports (Basketball, etc.) Are we talking about assistants? Clearly not doing intramurals anymore. We do know that 38 people were paid for intramurals. Most of them paid \$401.13. Not sure how they came up with that number or why. Wasn't discussed when they changed it. Very confusing to look at MS supplements paid at different times but not at amount of \$3531. They were at \$401.

BV – I don't see that # anywhere else on here.

BP – Want to clear that up. Gather they are assisting coaches because it makes sense to have them assist. Doing boys and girls in some sports. Still need to work through that. Then, some paid to individuals but not in contract – flag football, sand volleyball – paid to individuals but not sure how they came up with amounts. Middle school one looks comparable to other sports. Not sure that's really the way it works. HS flag football paid similar to freshman basketball coach. Hard to tell if that's appropriate amount at all. Same with sand volleyball. Paid the same as volleyball at varsity and assistant level. Don't know what comparability was done. Know it's very competitive to have female flag football games. Had 5 people paid at HS level female flag football. Sand volleyball is HS.

BV – Not sure what difference it makes, not sure why volleyball isn't the same. Are those the supplements you're recommending?

BP – Not sure the season and how they determined what to pay them since it wasn't in the contract. Next modification, really is just a highlight – team leader elementary supplements – 153 people paid a reduced rate through waiver in contract. 80 paid at contracted rate. Too many waivers. People reducing amount from contracted amount so more individuals get paid. Variety of reasons. 1 – size of schools are not the same. Want coverage for team leaders to meet to represent departments. District says this is how many you get and apparently it's not enough to cover specials, and PreK may not be part of calculation, ESE in addition to regular grade levels of grades 1 through 5. Elementary doing waivers. Not an issue at secondary. HS big enough. some elementaries have 6 at each grade level, and some may have 2. So concerned that there's a better way of distributing something to schools that makes it less likely that they will do waiver and reduce rate. Some reduced by half. Have not added language but makes sense that there should be a chair if there are 3 or more instructors. If you have 4 specials, ESE may not have a voice at all if put in with another team.

H – peer/mentor – there were laws and rules dealing with peers. No longer law but now they're mentors as prescribed by rules and laws. Have seen duties and responsibilities – suggesting they be paid \$1200 out of ESSR. Find that objectionable that would not negotiate. Have similar supplement and should get amount listed here. Unfortunately, districts eliminated peer assist when no longer required. That was probably a mistake. Don't know any researcher that says new teachers don't need assistance.

AMIGO center – delete. It was a center for non-english speakers to go.

Supervisor activities – heard from survey and from speaking with teachers about things that are occurring without compensation attached. (listed them) looked for a term instead of listing them all separately. Have to coordinate and work with parents to have programs. No scientific method of determining \$2042. Looked at academic competition sponsor. Similar to tech ed. May or may not be connected or appropriate. Open to conversation. Change in language in O.

DWagner – Tech recommended CTSO. Elementary TSA. Career technical student organization. Have them for each content area for career and tech.

BP – Next revision Q. Supervisor of Duette. Duette no longer exists.

BV – So much growth out there may need that one again! So, you're maintaining 10% plus additional supplements?

BP – Yes. Next, I'm sure you're not surprised that I would agree with Ron Meyer. In my 40 years I have taken his advice and used term retention instead of longevity. Clarified longevity payments but make it retention payments.

To the issue of sub pay - wanted to emphasize how important this issue is to teachers. Not sure how that would work in terms of current year payout in distribution to teachers as some payment. Not going to address that at this point. We think this addresses the issue for teachers in terms of coverages. Oftentimes the sub system isn't called. Some instances avoidance to calling even when a sub is most appropriate to get. This proposal asks that "Any classroom teacher or a member of the bargaining unit that covers the class or classes of an absent teacher or vacant position shall be eligible to receive one-seventh (1/7) of the teacher's regular rate of pay for each class period or hour provided in coverage. If the coverage extends beyond one period or hour, additional time shall be compensated for each additional half-hour or half-period increment. Under no circumstances shall a teacher

receive more than two times the teacher's daily rate per day." Understand it's a significant dollar value. Want to be sure that if we're talking about as many opportunities teachers are given to cover that it is recognized. Wanted to make sure it's recognized how it is done per level. Sometimes it's missed in computation and reporting process. May not be keeping track of how often covering. Applies oftentimes to special area teachers who take on larger load somewhere whether a specials or regular teachers. Causes them to make adjustments. Last is when it's paid. Haven't heard when were going to pay teachers. This proposes within 2 payroll periods. Open to conversation. Want to have a conversation when payment will be made. Appreciate your proposal and believe there is a way to get to agreement on this issue.

BV – That looks like what our concept was.

BP – That talks about school district budget as well. Would require you to spend more than just sub coverage.

BV – Even on first one spending more.

TB – The word 'may' instead of 'shall.' Thought that was interesting.

BP – Where you get the money from is not my concern. It was my intent that they will be paid. Should probably say 'shall.'

DWagner – 20 kids to disperse. Really taking 5 and putting them in 4 other 4th grade teachers' classes. How would I be compensated?

BP – Each teacher would be compensated at their regular rate of pay. This is signifying how important this issue is to teachers. Minimize how much extra I'm doing because the district can't or won't find subs.

BV – Certainly if money was not an option that would be one thing. I understand the concern of teachers. Thank you.

BP – Transfers. 4 weeks is not appropriate. Current Contract Language (CCL) is most appropriate. Gives teachers time they need to prepare. Teachers return next week. Haven't heard a thing about schedule. I don't know how prepared they are. When do they need 4 weeks to prepare if they're not prepared for me as a parent?

BV – That may be a unique.

BP – Teachers know there are principals who withhold positions until they can do it without getting transfers from somewhere else. Not so easy to get a transfer as you described.

BV – This would provide stability we need for our schools.

BP – We will continue to discuss. Last is payroll deductions which almost makes me laugh. Have been negotiating this for 5 years. Still hasn't been done correctly in 5 years. Don't know how to respond. Several sections in contract. What's the district's stance on making it work? Why haven't we gotten smooth payroll for employees? Salaried employees? Part of argument was that it will make deductions easier. Now we're back to we want 20 deductions. Why did we change at all? We keep going around in circles and it doesn't work and we

agree to the next thing and it doesn't work and we agree to a MOU that they don't follow. Only talking about deductions not payroll distributions. And referendum? Distributed in 20 or 21 or 22 and why? Still not sure. Struggling with issue. Part of the issue is covered in benefits, part of the language is in payroll distribution. Want it aligned and want it to work?

DWagner – Trying to make uniform with AFSCME.

BP – It's not going to be uniform with AFSCME and never will be the same in how they want to be paid because they have a different mindset and legal stance on how they should be paid. They want payment in timely way of overtime. Want paid as it is. I understand their issue. I have negotiated their contracts; they're not the same as teachers. That's how Ron Ciranna started this conversation. That's how he sold 26. Because it works better for AFSCME who are hourly employees.

DWagner – I can't speak to what was said prior. Seemed to be confusing to have different rates last year. Have them come out of same paycheck as referendum and all other supplements people get. I hear frustrations. I can only say what I know. Payroll working better than last year. Used to meet people in parking lot and pay people off cycle checks.

BV – What do we have right now? Deductions on calendar year that start in January. Have payroll schedule set now through January.

DWagner – Have set for next 3 years.

BV – Only 21 deductions when MEA looked at it.

DWagner – Had to split it up in 4 or 5 deductions

BV – Not going to have that again. OK, do you have anything else for us?

BP – Encourage you to look at compensation article II, section 5 #7 – teacher payday and MOU. It's more than one provision that talks about this issue.

DWagner – This idea is for January. To correspond with the new insurance rates, not now. Still believe August will have no deductions for first pay. Preparing for work that has not been done is an issue – that's why we can't smooth.

TB – It's a software issue.

BP – You mentioned new insurance rates?

DWagner – When you advertise 20 vs. 22 they will be different amounts?

BP – They always have been. What are you proposing?

DWagner – If you have fewer deductions you have to have 2 sections in the booklet to look at their insurance. It generates lots of conversations of why is there more or less? It's the same bronze plan

BV – Something you always have to deal with. Do you have any other proposals for us?

BP – Not today.

BV – I have a couple of things to talk about para schedule. First – schedule in contract has many more steps than 22. Have a list of everyone with more than 22 but not sure because everybody has to have their own place so we can pay them. Not certain how we can go ahead and make schedule in contract easily change into a lower number. Not sure how we can do that because of wide range of salaries above that number. If intent was to stop at 22 because of the changes of payroll system, some years it was 2%, some years it was step but need a place to put them to pay them. Willing to fix things but not something able to be done in short order.

BP – Why? This was changed in short order. This changes every year. Wasn't intentional on our part to do it that way. You saw what my proposal was. It's likely not to change until we see something different because never going to agree to something in this district that shows up like this, by human error and not reflecting what we talked about in bargaining. Have in minutes that say it's not appropriate but you paid them anyway. If we have to file a grievance we'll do it right now.

BV - Wiling to work with you

BP - Then not in agreement until we see what resolution is. You're reflecting that people were paid in previous years. You just said you want this schedule to be the schedule. Until you show me the schedule, we're not agreeing to it. Until we see that people are paid appropriately. People are still being paid wrong! Fix it, bring me a schedule and we will talk about it.

BV – Agree on concept but need schedules before we move forward.

BP – We didn't agree to annual, we agreed to hourly. It's not what we agreed to and it's not in the contract this way.

BV – Look in contract

BP – It's an hourly rate. Then we apparently made a mistake and will NOT make that mistake again. The hourly rates are in the contract. We agree to the hourly rate.

BP – we have the list of employees you sent us. We have the data.

TB – clarifying question – on TA6 . . . people on step 23 did not receive 2% last year, just 50 cents.

BP – If you're going to extend the schedule we need to agree on every single cell.

BV – I'm concerned about cost out. That's going to change the cost of this thing.

BP – No, it's not. I've costed them out individually.

BV – We will go ahead and take a look and get back with you.

Caucus at 5:53 p.m. Reconvened at 6:58 p.m.

BV – Took some time to review counter proposals. Have some items we can respond to tonight. First on COLA proposal unable to afford that. Would be an additional \$1.757 million. Not able to agree. Will go ahead and even up the GF schedule effective with HE as you recommended. That would bring our cost up on that, too. Also, we all worked hard for but one thing the board is very concerned about is the millage. Cannot discount millage amount. Increase in millage alone for teachers is almost 4 pay levels if you make that equivalent. That's something I'm very concerned about. The board is very concerned about that.

BP – So what's the point? To acknowledge it exists and the board wants credit?

BV – No, the board and MEA and the community worked hard. That money is not going into salary schedule. A substantial part is going into salary. That's the reason that has to be recognized. Want to make that known. Additional dollars are available; that's an important source.

BP – It comes from a different source of money. It's not bargained, so how is it put in bargaining?

BV - It is bargained in MOU. Want to acknowledge when you look at total compensation that needs to be acknowledged.

BP - And when it goes down next year, what are they going to do then? Put more money into the general fund?

BV – I hope the legislature will put more money into the general fund.

BP - It would be terrible if we didn't have it. But the comparables have it. Have to keep pace. That's what this does. We're also going to have similar amount of increase. It fluctuates. It doesn't always go up. Other places have experienced when it goes in the opposite direction. We don't have a problem recognizing it exists but it doesn't really go far. Still have questions about this – have you checked E and HE? Still need numbers to know if numbers are accurate. We asked for the numbers and haven't received the numbers.

TB- The numbers I got were from a couple of years ago.

BP – We get numbers every year. I guess we would have to reconcile dollar values. Our proposal is less with COLA in terms of you haven't really said where money is coming from – what's part is from TSIA? What part is from the general fund? Does that not matter?

TB - Growth for 22-23 is cut in half. Getting 4 million. Remaining bucket cut in 2. Remaining has to be spent on classroom teachers. Clear as mud. Classroom teachers and other instructional staff – roughly how much do classroom teachers consume, if less than that bucket. Remaining funds can be spent on 2nd bucket for non-classroom teachers or anyone who got less than 2% you spent that money on those people and then if you still have money left over it goes back to the state. Can't comingle buckets. Trying to get some more clarity on where we're going to be for headcount. FAQs I'm referring to came out this morning or Friday. Right now at 50,000 foot level. This is how overall budget works their way through the budget. Have to get into the weeds of what is TSIA and what is GF. Will send you FAQs.

BV – Doug to get HE and E from GF and PP. Next item – concern about salary schedule for paras – all in agreement – Tim has come up with method for dealing with that one step that was the same.

TB - TA 6 – problem is 23 and 24. Tim’s assumption is that somewhere in the history they lost a step. This is from the data mine out of HR. Took 2% above step 29. Was envisioning shift everybody down so step 24 instead of being \$20.18 shift down so step 25 at \$20.57. then we could create a new step at 31 at \$23.37. Person that is on step 25 would catch up a step and get the step they’re due this year. Hopefully that makes sense.

BP – That would make sense except for how it applies to whatever changes are agreed to. Is this current?

TB – We could fix this tomorrow before anything goes into effect.

BP – There are other individuals at PP6. There are 8 people. There was one on PL2 impacted as well. This would be before we do anything.

TB – If we do it now, if I’m on step 24 – go from \$20.18 to \$20.57. The \$1 agreed to would then be adjusted.

BP – Pat has had conversation every year with HR to make adjustments.

TB – My solution is making it a bigger problem than it really is.

BV – Pat may have fixed most of the problems. May not cost that much.

TB – If fewer individuals, advance them another step and then figure out a way . . . what do we do for people on step 23? Are we moving them a step and then getting a \$1?

BP – Yes.

TB – Step 24 becomes \$20.57. We continue to move down until it fades away.

BV – Going to make a note. Give us a call and let us know. That seems like a better plan.

BP – Doing a quick calculation, I’m not sure that equals 2%.

TB – The only one I recalculated was \$23.37.

BP – We will discuss it.

BV – Transfers. Disappointed that you are not able to work with us on that one.

BP - I didn’t say we weren’t able to work with you. We haven’t come to any agreement at this point.

BV – Pay for no subs. Understand your concern. Unable to change our position on that one also. Think by reinstating MOU with increased rates think that’s going to make a difference and offering \$356,000 from last year getting that back to teachers is same position we had.

BP – Ok, we’ll have that conversation.

BV – On supplements, it’s going to take us a little time to review. Could you tell us – these numbers are numbers you received from us?

BP – Those are from district data with the exception of data from survey and conversations.

BV – Will take a look at that and football. 3 flag football. 2 sand volleyball. Not on schedule but people are getting paid.

BP – Correct. were on data and were listed as titles.

BV – Will work on that one. As far as longevity language – our position remains the same. Specific conversation we did have about that. Originally was retention incentive. Appreciate wording change. That was a specific discussion we had when meeting and talking with others.

BP - Who else statewide has a similar provision?

BV - That’s why we’re careful how we want to get others involved in this situation. Not ready to change our position on that point.

BP - If you find out information that would tell me that it’s somehow different than a classification of what a COLA would be since it’s separate and distinct but doesn’t have to be calculated because provided in an equitable way to all schedules.

BV - I like that. I like what you said. I think that’s something that’s a good observation. I think that was the extent of our responses.

BP – I forgot some more issues. (MEA handout). Provisions – changing hiring threshold from 10 to 12 years. Coupled with conversation about moving everyone to the base or not. Have had a lot of conversation about how we deal with hiring. Curriculum and development special projects rate prosing to raise from \$15 to \$25.

BV – Did you do a cost on the 12?

BP – Cost out the last and it wasn’t very many because they’re still in the base. Find it hard to believe that it would cost much. I would think this would be less or the same at best. Don’t know that there would be a cost. It would be small.

BV – Curriculum move to \$25/hour?

BP – right. On the back, getting the contract up to date. Last paragraph has to do with premiums. Used the term ‘for less than 7 days’ pay’ – there would be no premiums deducted if you have a skinny paycheck there would be no premium deduction. More generalized language than previous MOUs.

I did look back at 2017-2018 contracts where there were 23 levels. No one in contract beyond 23. Not sure how or why an urgency to put in annual salaries and up to 33 steps. Seems to make it more complicated. Get that this is part of the system that was supposed to solve things but seems to be causing more mistakes. Will we always have people who will top out? Will we have 50 if someone decides to stay? Where is the end point? The end

point to me is making sure everyone gets paid and gets paid correctly. Never intended to pay anyone the same amount. Thanks for providing the correction.

BV - We share your concern. Want to get things straightened out. Positive end to tonight's session. So, look over it and let us know if you want us to make changes. We're going to go ahead and follow up. Will get information on E and HE on GF. Want to make sure we have numbers we can agree.

BP – Dates?

BV – Available next week some time. Anxious to come to some resolution.

BP – We'll get together to send available dates.

BV – Our team was thinking 8/3 and 8/4.

Pat – We're good for 4:45 p.m. on 8/4/22. SSC 203.

Meeting adjourned at 7:39 p.m.

MEA caucus at 7:41 p.m. Caucus adjourned at 8:19 p.m.