

SRCS D Representatives: David Gunter, Warren Stevens, and Tonya Shepherd

SRPE Representatives: Rhonda Chavers, David Godwin, Marie Bodi, Tamela Strickland, Landra McCrary, and Ruth Blackman

David Gunter called the meeting to order at 4:08pm. Chavers referenced *Attachment 1* and stated SRPE's position on past language items presented. Chavers believes the district needs to readily approve substitutes for the PMP language. Chavers reiterated the language that the teacher has the sole right and responsibility for grading students.

Since the last negotiation meeting, SRPE sought further clarification to the information provided by David Gunter in reference to the legal position of the Board opposing the annual contract renewal language proposed by SRPE. SRPE reviewed page 6, article 9 of an 8-page document handed out by Chavers. Chavers read the final recommendation by the magistrate per this document and asked does this language have merit? This document was the opinion and recommendations of Special Magistrate in reference to annual renewal language being disputed in St. Johns County. After reading the document, Chavers stated that SRPE would be more than willing to accept St. John's language for renewal of annual contracts. Chavers stated that according to this document, it is not illegal.

Gunter stated that the document presented by Chavers was only in the opinion of the magistrate, and is in no way recognized as a legal decision or binding in any manner nor is it considered a final judgement and ruling. He noted the final judgement of the Board is what is legally recognized by law. Gunter referenced the previous session and prior comments in that session where SRPE wanted to dismiss the legal position of the Board and its attorney and asked to see the final judgment. Gunter noted that SRPE was also quick to dismiss the Board's view as legal opinion despite the fact it was actually referenced in case law but now wants to misleadingly present a special magistrate's opinion as fact and finding. Gunter asked if SRPE had the final ruling of the renewal language from the St. John's case. SRPE responded that they did not. Gunter questioned what was the final ruling and judgement of the Board? Chavers stated that it would be up to the District to determine what is lawful and unlawful. Chavers questioned why all other districts weren't being challenged on this? Bodi questioned what will Santa Rosa County do? Gunter stated that he cannot determine that at this time.

SRPE requested a caucus.

Meeting resumed at 4:32pm.

Chavers referenced *Attachment 2* and stated that in December, SRPE asked Gunter what was the rationale for not moving on the retention and recruitment language. Chavers presented the SRPE rationale based on the special magistrate's opinion and

there are still concerns why the Board will not consider the renewal language. Chavers stated that Gunter claims that John Dickinson's opinion is highly regarded, but now it's not holding water in light of the special magistrate's opinion. Gunter stated that the final ruling of Board is the legal settlement and he would get that information to share with the negotiating committee. Gunter stated that he would take St. John's renewal language back to the Board but would anticipate a rejection and their legal position and advice from John Dickinson has not changed. Chavers stated that by using this language, you have all parts covered and getting quality teachers to be hired and stay. Chavers stated that we (SRCSD) has never had this many positions open during the school year. Godwin stated again that Pace High had advertised a math position all summer. Students went without consistent instruction for 9 weeks. Milton High went through something similar. Chavers stated that the magistrate's language would be more attractive to new hires.

Godwin handed out *Attachment 3* and referenced the email Superintendent Wyrosdick sent out on January 17, 2017. Godwin stated that he is seeing a \$5.57 million dollar increase and not a \$3.5 million increase. Why the difference? Gunter stated that there is approximately \$2 million of the \$5.57 million that are categorical funds which were not included in the amount referenced in the email. Some may be issues related to ESE funding, funding for class size, etc. Godwin stated he understands categoricals, but feels that class size funding could be used for an increase in salaries. Godwin asked, how much of the \$5.57 million could be spent on salaries. What would the state allow to be used for salaries? Gunter stated that that would be a question for Susan McCole. Godwin stated that he has studied the categoricals and wants to know how much the state will allow the Board to use for salaries of this \$5.57 million.

Godwin questioned did we get \$3.5 million or \$5.57 million. Gunter stated that we got \$5.57 million as the report shows. Godwin stated that Wyrosdick misrepresented this in the email he sent. Gunter again stated that there is approximately \$2 million in categorical funds which are restricted in their use so that is why they were not included in the email. Gunter noted that Mr. Wyrosdick referenced only funds that were not restricted at the time which was the \$3.5 million. Gunter further stated that some of the categorical funds are special project monies and asked Godwin is he wanted Mr. Wyrosdick to represent funds that were not available? Gunter stated he does not know what exact percent of each categorical could be used toward salaries.

Bodi questioned if we are negotiating salaries, then why this information is not available? Gunter stated that he is just now hearing the question so how can he have the answer? Bodi asked Gunter why he doesn't have answers to the questions they have not asked yet. Gunter stated that Susan McCole is aware of what categorical funds can be used towards salaries and that information was used in advising the Board when it set the overall amount of money that could be used for salary increases. Bodi stated that on December 5<sup>th</sup>, SRPE asked how much money would be committed to salaries. Gunter noted that he has presented everything the Board has made available for raises.

Godwin stated that he's not saying that the \$3.5 million is wrong, it just doesn't match what's in the budget. Chavers stated that the district has more money this year to spend on salaries than they have had in a while. Gunter clarified the question: SRPE wants to know if the District had more money and the only expense was salaries, how much money could the District spend on salaries? Chavers stated that this is not the District's money, it is the tax payers' money and the tax payers' want to see teachers get a raise. Godwin stated that the percentages just do not match up. How much money of the \$5.57 million can be used toward salaries? Gunter asked if it is SRPE's belief over 75% of the funding be spent on salaries and benefits. Godwin stated that maybe not 75% but if the district received \$5.57 million, then a portion can be spent on salaries. Chavers stated that if you look at the presentations from the Chief Financial Officer, the District spends about 75%-80% of its funds on salaries.

Godwin presented some information pulled from DOE's website to show a comparison of the average instructional salaries (*Attachment 4*). Per this information, Santa Rosa County is behind Escambia and Okaloosa. In *Attachment 5*, Godwin referenced the 2009-2010 school years. He stated that he assumes the District went to a 6-period day to save money. If we are saving so much each year based upon what Escambia gets, how can we not keep up with the salaries of the neighboring districts (Escambia and Okaloosa). Gunter stated that going to a 6-period day was to save money. Godwin questioned, then why have we been unable to fund salaries?

Godwin stated that he does not see how the money is being saved. He keeps hearing that the FCR is low and we may be taken over by the state? Where is the savings? How can we compete with Okaloosa? Chavers stated that both Escambia and Okaloosa has annual contract job security language that this district seems to think is illegal. So, Godwin questioned again, where are the savings of going to a 6-period day? Chavers stated that it is probably going to a special interest in this district. Godwin stated that when the district went to a 6-period day, it put the burden on the teachers. Chavers asked if the District considered how many additional teachers it would take to meet a 7-period day. Gunter stated that based on the amount of money set aside it would be approximately 60 teachers.

Chavers found that per Susan McCole's budget presentation, the District spends 76% on salaries.

Gunter asked for clarification on Godwin's comparison for instructional salaries between Santa Rosa, Escambia, and Okaloosa. Gunter clarified the reason's Godwin had identified the 09-10 and 15-16 school years, then took the difference of the two? Gunter noted that Godwin apparently did not take into consideration that Escambia and Okaloosa could be retaining teachers at the higher end of the salary scale or average experience rates of teachers in each district. Gunter also noted that there appeared to be no consideration in Godwin's calculation for settlement amounts in each given year

in the range of years identified which would give a more accurate comparison of increases over time.

Chavers stated to Gunter that you can take any data you want and twist it...Gunter stated "that's exactly my point." Godwin says he could pick any one of those years to show the Santa Rosa's has been stagnant and Escambia and Okaloosa has gone up. Godwin says that he would not be making this argument if we did not have a less expensive schedule than the other districts.

Chavers stated that she has been doing this 9 or 10 years and SRC has always been ahead of Escambia, so she attributes SRC being behind Escambia to the leadership. Per Godwin's math, Okaloosa teachers make \$11,000 per class and Santa Rosa teachers make \$7,500 per class. Godwin asked why would you choose to teach in this county and make less money? He feels that a significant portion of the \$5.57 million could be used to add to what the District has already proposed. Godwin stated that SRPE is still going to stay with the last offer they presented and not make a counter offer (*Attachment 6*).

Godwin stated that per this proposal, SRPE and the Board are about \$1.2 million apart. Godwin questions why the District won't use some of the \$5.57 million to meet that request and per Chavers, it would still meet the goal of returning to a 7-period day and stay above the desired FCR.

Per Chavers, the Director of Pre-K presented a grant proposal and the Pre-K program received a \$40,000 COLA (*Attachment 7*). Who determines that? Gunter asked Shepherd to clarify how this has been done with the Pre-K program in the past. Shepherd stated that it has been some years that she has dealt with that, but the District's Pre-K program cannot offer their employees a COLA if the District's employees have not received one. The question was raised how those funds are repurposed? Shepherd stated that the Pre-K program has to get approval from the Regional Office to utilize that funding for something other than COLA because of the District's bargaining contract that must be followed. The question was raised about other ways in which those funds could be repurposed? Shepherd stated that again, permission has to be granted to utilize those funds for things such as supplies or T/TA (training and technical assistance); however, all of that has to be approved. The question was raised again on how those COLA funds are used if the program cannot use the COLA? Shepherd stated again that using the funds for something other than COLA has to be approved by the assigned financial officer for the program at the Regional Office.

Gunter requested a caucus.

The meeting resumed at 5:31pm.

During the caucus, Gunter was able to locate the final ruling of the St. John's Board with regards to the contract renewal language. Gunter shared the St. John's Board rejected all the opinions and recommendations of the special magistrate in reference to contract renewal language. Gunter noted that he would forward a copy of that information with the minutes. (see highlighted Attachment 10)

Gunter handed out *Attachments 8 and 9*. Gunter responded on the annual contract renewal language. The Board is still going to remain with the same position and reject that language. However, Gunter will take the St. John's language back to the Superintendent and Board but anticipate the same rejection as stated earlier. The PMP language will also be rejected. He spoke with Mrs. Patrick and feels that this can be addressed through a site-based management practices. At this time, the Board does not want to address this as an additional pay/supplement/stipend issue. Wages language (see attachment 8). Chavers questioned why would someone on the grandfathered schedule have a step back? Whatever a person is making during the day, they should make at night. Clarification was given. Chavers stated that part-time hourly that are grandfathered should still get their previous wage. Only new people coming in would be placed on the placement salary schedule. Chavers stated that what is being described to her is not what is happening. Gunter stated that part-time hourly people do not get an evaluation. Gunter provided further clarification. However, these folks will start getting an evaluation. Gunter stated that he would get with Chavers and Godwin. Both side agreed the part time hourly could be handled and resolved through MOU if needed. Other wage language included that for Military, Board certified Behavior Analyst, and Speech and Language Pathologist. For the latter 2 positions, the Board is having to contract these positions out. They work for us to get the experience, go get another job at a higher wage, and we end up having to hire them back at a higher wage because of their experience.

Chavers stated that SRPE would need to revisit this language because it differed from the existing School Psychologists.

Gunter stated that due to developments since the December 13 negotiations session, in order to be fiscally responsible, the SRCBS reauthorizes its last offer of 2.2% for Performance Pay Highly Effective and 1.65% for Grandfathered Salary and Performance Pay Effective employees. This constitutes a summary offer of 1.8% for the bargaining unit. Despite receiving \$5.5 million from student growth, the Board has to plan for known costs and be in a position to address unknown costs that may arise.

Chavers questioned the \$1 million self-funding. Gunter stated that he was going off the numbers he was provided. Chavers said to just move on.

Gunter went on to state that if a settlement is not reached prior to March 15, 2017, the Board will not be able to award retroactive pay for the 2016-2017 contract year and any settlement at that point forward would apply only for the remainder of the fiscal year.

Gunter noted that the late settlement required more resources than what finance has available to complete without lapsing over another fiscal year which also causes potential audit issues and the state and federal levels.

Per *Attachment 9*, the Board is offering 2.2% salary increase for highly effective and 1.65% for effective.

Godwin questioned verbiage from Superintendent Wyrosdick's email on January 17<sup>th</sup> and wanted to address a discrepancy in his verbiage and what was being presented. Gunter offered clarification.

Godwin stated that this offer was not accepted last time and being the Board has an additional \$5 million, it is not going to be accepted now.

Gunter stated that he is topped out on what he is able to offer and this is everything the Board will authorize for salary improvements.

Gunter questioned SRPEs quick rejection at the table stating that when he goes out to schools, he gets asked by numerous teachers why an offer hasn't been reached and they were willing to settle before the break. Bodi stated that she is asked why the District isn't giving more money.

Gunter asked if SRPE is willing to send the offer out to the members for a poll or vote? Chavers said SRPE doesn't poll and vote and the Board doesn't either. Gunter asked why not? Chavers stated that she wasn't playing the poll game and our representation is present. Chavers stated we have strong enough support to reject the offer. Chavers stated that SRPE has enough representation present to make that decision. Godwin questioned whether a poll can be put out by the Board about using the \$3 million? Gunter answered, "No, it could not." Gunter stated that if the District could poll we would have done so a long time ago.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:58pm.

No future session was scheduled at this time.