

## SRPE and SRCSD Negotiations

October 22, 2014

SRPE Representatives: Rhonda Chavers, President (RC), Jeanette Miller, Venetta Schang, Ruth Blackman, Marie Bodi, Landra McCrary, David Godwin

SRCSD Representatives: Steve Ratliff, Chief Negotiator (SR), David Gunter, Floyd Smith, Nancy Haupt, Chad Rowell

Ms. Chavers and SRPE expressed the desire to open the session with David Godwin reviewing their previously proposed Pay for Performance Salary Schedule (see attached SRPE Item #1).

Mr. Ratliff presented a resolution that will go before the board on 10/23 to be considered for approval (see attached SRCSD Item #1). S.R. stated that the beliefs and philosophy of the District is in line with the desires of SRPE. The District goal is to provide its employees with the best working environment possible and recognizes their loyalty and contributions. The District desire is to give the employees an increase on the salary schedules while at the same time maintaining a secure financial condition ratio.

As was the case during the previous sessions, Mr. Ratliff responded that the district is still holding on presenting a salary proposal at this time. S.R. stated that the district is continuing the process described in the previous negotiating sessions and is in the process of finalizing employee evaluation scores for the 13-14 school year. S.R. stated that once this process is finalized the district would be able to offer a proposal for salary.

Mrs. Chavers asked if the District had information about the settlement from Navarre Beach property taxes and money that was supposed to be escrowed and then distributed from the settlement to the district. S.R. stated that he would research that issue.

Mrs. Chavers and SRPE responded to the Article I: Recognition language changes proposed by the District and submitted documentation supporting SRPE's objection to the language change (see SRPE Item #2). R.C. stated her belief is that the proposed language change would have to be certified by P.E.R.C.

Mrs. Chavers and S.R.P.E. responded to and continues to object to the District's proposed language change in Article II paragraphs M and Q. R.C. stated that Weingarten Rights assured through the NLRB requires that a member has access to a representative of their choice.

Mr. Ratliff continued reviewing the proposed language changes that were passed across the table by the district in prior negotiating sessions. Through this process, the District and SRPE made good progress towards resolving several key language items which were verified and tentatively approved by both sides. S.R. also pulled several other items the District had previously requested from consideration.

Mr. Ratliff responded to a previous request from SRPE referring to language in Article X regarding ESOL stipends and the cost incurred by the District in paying those stipends to employees (see attached

SRCS D Item # 2). S.R. also presented revised language for Article XIV: Employee Evaluation (see attached SRCS D Item # 3). This language was refined at the table and tentatively approved by both sides.

Mr. Ratliff reviewed new language proposed by the District which would be in Article XVI and would establish the option of using furlough days in the event of a budget crisis. R.C. responded that she had inquired about this issue with FEA and that her belief is that the consideration for possible furlough days is a permissive item for bargaining but not a mandatory item. Based on her belief SRPE does not have counter language and it not willing to open this item at this time. R.C. did present what she stated was related counter language (see attached SRPE Item # 3) which would tie possible future salary increases to increase in the BSA at the state level. S.R. stated that he would present the language for consideration.

Mr. Ratliff wrapped up the language review and moved to presenting a Pay for Performance (PFP) Salary Schedule Model (see attached SRCS D Item # 4). This PFP schedule represents a model and not an offer for a salary increase at this time. The model presented establishes the tie between an effective evaluation rating on PFP and the Grandfathered Salary Schedule. It also needs to be noted this model would represent a placement schedule good only for one year. Each year it will be negotiated and would represent a percentage improvement over the previous year. This would avoid any negative impact on the schedule long term and would retain the current earnings potential of the proposed Grandfathered Schedule thereby protecting employees. Mr. Ratliff stated that he would be in a position to discuss a salary proposal following the School Board meeting on 10/23/14. Based on this information, S.R. requested that the nest session be set for 10/23/14 at 4 PM. There still remains a few language items needing further research or not being settled at this time.

The next negotiations session was set for October 23, 2014 at 4PM in the board room at Canal Street.