

SRPE Negotiation Minutes
Monday, December 5, 2016

SRCSD Representatives: David Gunter, Darren Brock, Warren Stevens, and Tonya Shepherd

SRPE Representatives: Rhonda Chavers, Marie Bodi, David Godwin,

Meeting was called to order at 4:08pm by Chavers reviewing the proposed language from previous meetings. Discussed the proposed language that is still on the table (see attachment 1).

Chavers said that SRPE was open to a counter on the language.

Godwin wanted to get some clarity from something from the last meeting. He asked Gunter if the proposals that he is making would negatively impact the FCR? Gunter has said no, but Godwin was specifically asking about the 6.95%. For instructional salary cost this year, there is \$92 million that has been budgeted for salaries. Is the money projected for raises in that \$92 million or is it from funds outside of that budget? Gunter stated that whatever schools have been budgeted for staffing comes from the \$92 million amount. Godwin again asked if the money for raises come from the \$92 million? Gunter stated, "No."

Godwin presented a proposal from SRPE. The focus was on projected salary cost and actual salary costs. We are about \$2.4 million under budget for the 09-10 school year; about \$4.8m under projected costs for 10-11; for 11-12, around \$200k under projected budget; 12-13, \$1.4m under budget for projected instructional salaries...so forth so on (see attachment 2).

Per the past 7 year trend, Godwin suggests that the District could be \$2.7 million under projected salary cost (from the District's operating costs) for the 16-17 school year. SRPE has proposed that the District spend \$3,547,763.26 (including benefits) on salary improvements for employees in the SRPE bargaining unit. \$173,130.85 (4.88%) will be paid from Special Revenue and \$3,374,632.41 will be paid from the Operating Budget.

Godwin stated that based upon his suggestions, SRPE is declining to accept the last offer proposed by the District because it will not negatively impact the FCR below the 6.95%.

Gunter sought clarification on budget versus actual expenditure and SRPE is declining to accept the offer presented at the last meeting. Godwin stated, "Yes."

SRCSD requested a caucus.

Meeting resumed at 4:46pm.

Gunter stated that SRCSD is going to continue to decline section G of the proposed contract language because it would violate Senate Bill 736. SRPE stated that this language is not automatic renewal language. Gunter stated it is the stance of the Superintendent and the Board that the requested language would violate the law.

Bodi stated if that is the case then the newly formed Teacher Recruitment and Retention committee is useless; how are they going to retain teachers. Gunter stated that he wasn't on the committee. Gunter then asked if SRPE believes the only way to retain a teacher is to provide automatic contract renewal language.

SRPE stated that they didn't understand how this language could be considered automatic renewal language. Bodi read a quote from Scott Peden, School Board member. Godwin stated that he had a problem with the School Board calling it something it's not just because they don't want to do it. Gunter stated that he has not polled each individual board member, but was informed as part of special session not to accept the language. The consensus was that everyone agreed.

Bodi stated that the School Board members will basically say what they need to in order to get PACT endorsements, then do something different. Bodi stated 3 of 5 School Board members were all in agreement with SRPE at that time. Gunter stated that he is unsure that the Board members or anyone at the time could be fully aware of the impact SB736 would have when they were asked during the endorsement process. Bodi stated she believed that the Board members questioned were very aware of SB736.

Chavers stated that she just wants to make sure that the Board is made aware of SRPE's side. Gunter stated that he cannot speak to what has happened in the past, but any information that passes across this table is communicated to the Superintendent and the Board.

Bodi questioned if it suggested that other Districts are being unlawful. Gunter said yes he believes other districts may have negotiated around the intent of the law. Godwin asked if SRCSD is following SB736 to the letter. Gunter stated that all attempts are made to do so. Gunter stated that he will check to find out what specifically from SB736 does not align to SRPE's proposed language.

Gunter stated that he will counter at 65% free and reduced lunch rate and increase the amounts as SRPE proposed for the low SES school incentive. Gunter stated he has language that speaks to the Military experience to present similar to what SRPE has asked for. SRPE stated that they have not moved on the offer made on 10-3-16. Gunter stated that Godwin has asked several times what is the district's best offer that could be made and not negatively impact the FCR. Gunter stated that SRPE is wanting to label proposals as good faith, but they (SRPE) have not moved on their offer since 10-3-16. Godwin stated that good faith offers have been made. Gunter questioned the willingness of SRPE to settle since the district has continued to move forward and SRPE has not moved since 10/3. Godwin says that SRPE should have started negotiations at an offer that would put FCR at 7%, SRCSD could have started at an offer that puts FCR at 5%, then the 2 parties meet somewhere in the middle...in that range.

Gunter clarified that SRPE stated they would like to see the salary improvements that occurred during the 11-12 school year. Gunter questioned whether SRPE is wanting budget and expenditure to be that close to one another. Gunter asked SRPE what would happen is an unexpected event occurred in a year that is that tight. Godwin states that if \$3 million is put

toward salary improvements, that would still leave the District's FCR near the top of the 7% range.

Godwin stated that the District has never spent what has been budgeted. Gunter questioned whether SRPE would prefer the District under budget and go in the hole each year? Godwin stated that he is working off of the numbers that School Board gave to the public. Chavers stated that School Board (Susan McCole) in July (video recorded meeting) is telling the public one thing, but then something differently here.

Gunter ask that attachment 3 be taken into consideration as we continue to move forward. The verbiage to the middle of the page:

“Clearly the district must be prepared to self-fund from spending cuts any increases in operating costs and any initiatives to meet the goals of the Board and Superintendent. The district should also be preparing to address a potential cut in per student funding through spending reductions.”

Bodi stated that the State is seeking an increase in funding. Chavers asked who the HBEC Group was. Gunter stated that group is associated with Jim Hamilton who provides financial forecasting information to school districts. Gunter stated that we can chase semantics all around the bush, but if you take money out of your checking account, does it not reduce the overall amount of your savings? Gunter pointed out that FCR is not the static number that Godwin wants to continue to refer to in the budgeting report. Gunter says that it is the Board's goal to not negatively impact the FCR so it will have flexibility moving forward to address district issues moving forward and have the ability to address something unexpected. Godwin says that the Board has proposed writing a \$92 million check for instructional salaries.

SRCSO requested a caucus.

Gunter presented the *Incorporation of Signed MOUs, Proposed New Language and Modified Language Proposals for 2016-17* (Attachment 4 and Attachments A-G). Item C, if included would be sun setting soon. Godwin stated that he had a question on letter D. He stated that he received information (a letter) previously from Gunter that employees of Community School are not School District employees and wanted to know why the MOU was needed. Gunter told Godwin to ask your President, she signed it. Chavers says that Ratliff dropped the ball on a bunch of stuff and the items were not ratified with the contract. Godwin again sought clarification as to whether individuals that perform services for Community Schools are School District employees. Gunter asked if Godwin wanted to know if the Community School employees were “employees” or if they were members of the “bargaining unit”. Godwin asked again were they employees and Gunter said he believes they would be.

Gunter says that Item E is most likely sun setted language but need to be memorialized. Item F may be captured in Item E (similar language). District wanted to make sure that this was memorialized. Item G is memorialized in the Instructional Personnel manual. Chavers questioned what are the articles of the 2 non-mandatory items on page 2 of Attachment 4? Chavers stated that they (SRPE) would have to vet this but to go ahead and finish the presentation.

Bodi stated that #2 on page 2 of attachment was law. Gunter says that yes, it is law, but teachers are asking to get out of parent-teacher conferences claiming they fear discipline will occur during the meeting. Chavers said let's move on because y'all don't want to settle the contract. Gunter continued to review the items from Attachment 4. Chavers stated that SRCSD only gets to open 2 specific articles and she will get them tomorrow because it was presented at the last minute. She questioned whether or not there was an offer because we are almost at our 2 hour limit.

Gunter presented a 2% for highly effective and 1.5% for effective (see attachment 5). Godwin asked about ed-support having highly effective pay as questioned by Landra McCrary at the last meeting. Gunter says that both sides have acknowledged they do not agree with performance pay and SRCSD does not seek to have use it. Godwin questioned as to why district-level admin gets it? Godwin further quoted (attachment 6) that "school administrator" is Principals and Assistant Principals. Godwin stated that he is taking issue that one group of individuals falling under SB736 and another group of individuals not. SRPE went on to state that it appears to be a pick and choose-type of thing. Gunter stated he would verify the definition and see how that would apply to Ed Support.

Chavers stated that SRPE will not reject the offer today, but will consider it and discuss at the next meeting.

Gunter asked Chavers, what if I (the Board) pulls all the language, would you (SRPE) accept the offer? Chavers asked for a caucus.

Chavers stated she feels that the Board made a really good faith offer and SRPE would like to consider it. Chavers asked if they (SRPE and SRCSD) could meet next week, December 12th? Gunter asked again if there is a number that would settle the contract tonight? Comments were made that no, not at the eleventh hour. Godwin says that he would like to look at some numbers. Chavers stated that they (SRPE) are moved by the good faith effort. Gunter questioned if there was a number tonight that he could put on the table tonight that he'll take....SRPE reps said, yes...theirs.

Chavers said they will look at has been presented and the committee will meet again on Tuesday, December 13th.