

## **SRCSD and SRPE Negotiations Meeting**

**September 27, 2018**

### **SRCSD Minutes**

Present: SRCSD-David Gunter (Chief Negotiator), Dan Balsalvich, Cheree Davis, Emily Donalson, Larry Heringer, Missy Floyd, Alexandra Timmons, Jon Watts

SRPE-Rhonda Chavers, President SRPE (Chief Negotiator), David Godwin, Marie Bodi, Tamela Strickland, Landra McCrary

Other-Linda Sanborn

Attendees offer introductions.

Ms. Chavers notes that she is recording the meeting and offers Mr. Gunter the opportunity to open the meeting.

Mr. Gunter welcomes everyone and stresses that he looks forward to a productive negotiating season. He offers that the mutual benefit of all stakeholders is the goal, keeping students first. He states that the focus should be focused on bigger issues. Mr. Gunter adds that the members of the negotiating teams are the representatives of our groups, and the ultimate course and direction is determined outside of this room. Mr. Gunter recommends that both groups avoid personalizing and assigning blame but productively focus on the greater body and mutual benefit of stakeholders. He states that all need to keep in mind that we are vested in the school system and doing what is best for the body as a whole. He underscores that we should work towards a mutually-identified goal. As a committee we can influence to build morale locally or create issues locally. Mr. Gunter states the groups need to determine what the root causes of the issues are and recognize many of the issues are at the state level.

Mr. Gunter outlines legislative policy and budgeting issues in the last couple of years that impact local decisions:

- Florida General Revenue has grown by 4% over the last 3 years yet Pre-K-12 education funding has only increased by 1.0%-1.39%.
- Underfunded and unfunded mandates like Marjory Stoneman Douglas Bill have shifted budgetary burdens to local districts.
- Best and Brightest: Instead of a one-time bonus that doesn't count towards retirement, would it be better to spread out among more teachers and use it to increase base salaries which would then count towards retirement? The current practice is exclusionary and creates divisiveness.

Mr. Gunter noted that state level budget allocations have not been keeping up with inflation.

- Unweighted FTE 2007-08 \$7306
- Unweighted FTE 2017-18 \$7307

- Simply adjusted for inflation, the UWFTE in 2017-18 should have been approximately \$8,500 just remain at the same level.

Mr. Gunter observes that we are seeing the dismantling of public education from the state level, and we need to stop letting state level policy designed to limit local control create divisiveness among ourselves in Santa Rosa; our focus needs to be on working together locally to the best we can for our stakeholders and to mutually address issues in Tallahassee.

Mr. Gunter asks, “Where do we want to be in 3, 5 or 10 years? Do we want to continue to let policy and practice from Tallahassee divide and distract us locally, or do we want to look at real issues of public education funding and work together to do what is best for our stakeholders?”

Marie Bodi, Political Action Committee Chair for SRPE, stated that she agreed with Mr. Gunter’s opening statements. Mrs. Chavers interjected and stated that SRPE would not comment or have a reply to Mr. Gunter’s question.

Mr. Godwin questions the figures presented, and states that there was a 5.43% increase in the 2<sup>nd</sup> calculation in 15-16 in FTE funding.

Ms. Chavers asks if the SRCSD wants to go over any ground rules. Mr. Gunter presents a copy of previously agreed-upon ground rules. Ms. Chavers agrees that the ground rules look good to her but wants to limit meeting duration to two hours. Ms. Chavers asks that the economic issues at the outset be discussed and the time be divided as half and half between non-economic and economic items. Mr. Gunter stated he did not believe that would be an issue in this session because the District would be reserving the right to open language but at this time is forgoing any language items in hopes of a settling quickly by only addressing economic issues and getting money to employees as quickly as possible. Mrs. Chavers responded that SRPE would reserve the right to open on language as well and was agreeable to focus on the economic items.

Mrs. Chavers stated that with no language issues to lengthen the process SRPE would like to get the process completed before the end of the year and hopefully before Christmas. Mr. Gunter stated he has items ready for this session and that the Superintendent and Board are committed to getting money to employees as quickly as possible and would like to see it done before Halloween.

Mr. Gunter presents Santa Rosa County School Board Proposal 1. Mr. Gunter passes out *Appendix H—SRPE Miscellaneous Salary Schedule*. Mr. Gunter states that the changes would allow for accommodation of compression at the beginning of the salary schedule for the awarding of military credit. Mr. Gunter reviews proposed change in language and calculation of military service credit.

Chavers asks, “It’s almost supplement language then?” Mr. Gunter explains that this new calculation provides almost the same value as the previous but puts the payment at the beginning of the career service or the entry point for the employee. Mr. Gunter notes by putting the service credit at the beginning or entry point for the employee the value actually increases over the employees’ career by giving them a larger base to build on.

Mr. Godwin states that the credit for the military teachers would be greater than non-military teachers. Mr. Godwin says that the language is not recognizing teaching service. Mr. Gunter noted that the District wants to recognize military credit as has been done in the past and this language allows a limited amount of military credit to be used as credit for teaching experience.

Ms. Chavers adds that you are valuing military credit more than teaching experience. Mr. Godwin provides figures that states a new teacher would be making \$36,076.00 whereas a teacher with military credit would begin at \$39,600. Ms. Chavers says they may have a counter offer. Mr. Gunter replied that it's a salary schedule issue not a military credit issue.

Mr. Gunter pointed out that any level an applicant or employee can qualify for military service credit will create the same scenario. Mr. Gunter points out this proposal uses the same principle historically recognized in past practice when awarding military credit as a year of teaching experience. Mr. Gunter also pointed out that the monetary value is equitable. Prior versions of the contract awarded the military credit after 22 years of teaching service with the District with the award worth approximately \$3700 at the end of a career. Under the proposed language, an existing employee or new hire with 5 years of military service could get approximately \$3600 at their current years of service or entry.

Mr. Godwin and SRPE objects to the language recognizing military credit. Mr. Godwin again compares the salary schedule and suggests there is an unfair salary benefit. Ms. Chavers stated that the military service is not as valuable as the teaching service. Mr. Godwin says it is not fair for those with military service to make more than someone teaching. Mr. Gunter again states that the District would like to continue to recognize military service as has been done in the past and for SRPE to look at it and propose something else since they are objecting to the District's proposal attempting to equitably recognize military service for both existing employees and new hires.

Mr. Gunter then provides Santa Rosa County School Board Proposal 2 *Appendix E Differentiated Salary Schedule*. The addition of item 4. should be viewed as retention/recruitment issue in critical shortage areas.

The SRPE wants to caucus.

Upon resumption of meeting, Ms. Chavers asks if there is still recruitment and retention money from the state. She states that this is a good effort to retain and recruit, but language needs tweaking and assurances. Ms. Chavers states that the concern is if a critical area exists that the district honor transfers. She asks for clarification of critical areas.

Mr. Gunter explains, for example, ESE is a perpetual critical shortage area and another could be a specialty area for a one time need such as a technology area for cybersecurity in vocational. Mr. Gunter clarifies that critical shortage areas would be designated by course code by the District.

Ms. Chavers states she has looked at the job line and noticed many ESE positions unfilled. She questions when this addition would begin. She asks who determines a critical storage issue? Ms.

Chavers gives an example of a previously-offered state bonus that she received years ago. Ms. Chavers states that this is “very good” and that SRPE will counter with the clarification needed.

Ms. Chavers states that she is concerned with placement on the 17-18 salary schedule advertised on the district website. She says that once again newly hired teachers are potentially making more than current teachers—same issue as last year.

Mr. Godwin distributes *SRPE Employee Salary Comparison* and *SRPE Proposal Salary Improvement Formulas*.

Mr. Godwin explains the *SRPE Employee Salary Comparison* chart is a comparison of 14-15 salaries to 17-18. This shows district level positions at an 11.13% increase versus teachers with an 8.27% increase. Mr. Godwin states that district-level administrators aren’t required to be on performance pay, and they have the highest percentage increase over any teacher groups. He says, “It looks like we are awarding those with no student contact more than those with student contact.” He says that those percentage increases should be equal.

Mr. Godwin then references the *SRPE Proposal Salary Improvement Formulas document*. He states, “Every proposal we make will be based on this formula.”

Performance Pay  $HE=X$

Performance Pay  $E=.75X$

Grandfathered  $HE=.99x$

Grandfathered  $E=.75X$

Ms. Chavers says there is something inherently wrong with the system that you make more money the further you are away from student contact.

SRCS D team wanted clarification on Mr. Godwin’s claim that district-level administrators had the highest percentage increase over any teacher groups. The question was asked, “What was the percentage experienced by a highly effective performance pay teacher over the same time period?” Mr. Godwin conceded that if highly effective performance pay had been awarded to employees and he had included it on the *SRPE Employee Salary Comparison* chart then that group of teachers would have made 11.13%, the same as the district-level administrators.

Ms. Chavers says that it will be a high priority to use the formula on the *SRPE Proposal Salary Improvement Formulas*. Ms. Chavers explains for those attendees new to the process that SRPE gets its reports from the salary reports published by the district.

There were no other items to discuss, and a future meeting was set for October 4, 2018 at 4:30 p.m. in the Board Room.

Minutes prepared by Alexandra Timmons.