

SRCSD and SRPE Negotiations Meeting

October 4, 2018

4:30 p.m., Canal Street Board Room

SRCSD Minutes

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

SRPE-Rhonda Chavers, President SRPE (Chief Negotiator), David Godwin, and Tam Strickland.

Guests present: Elizabeth Hewey and Wei Ueberschaer

Ms. Rhonda Chavers, SRPE President and Chief Negotiator opens the meeting at 4:40 as agreed to in the ground rules where parties agreed to rotate the opening of each session.

David Godwin begins with an opening statement that for the two groups to have a productive negotiating session district leadership will need to resolve issues locally. Godwin suggests that to increase the positive environment for students, the conditions for teachers should be improved.

Mr. Godwin presents *SRPE Funding and Salary Facts* and presents figures for funding comparisons of Florida/Santa Rosa Funding Comparison and Instructional Salary Comparisons for 2007-08 and 2017-18. Based on Mr. Godwin's comparison's, Santa Rosa received 91.2% of the state UWFTE in 07-08 and 98.3% of the state UWFTE in 17-18. Godwin then moved to comparison of salaries and presented a chart created to show SRPE's claims for corresponding teacher pay over the same time.

Mr. Godwin submits amended *SRPE Employee Salary Comparison* and details those changes. Mr. Godwin offers that district administrators received performance pay despite no law requiring that district administrators be on performance pay.

Mr. Godwin then presents *SRPE Analysis of District's Military Service Proposal*. Godwin takes exception to the Sept. 27, 2018 minutes regarding his objection to military credit. Godwin clarified that he has no objection to that military credit but with the rates of teaching experience vs. military credit. Godwin provides examples of new hires vs military hires and stated the belief that providing military credit creates divisiveness in how it is currently calculated. Godwin discusses the compression at the beginning of the salary schedule. Mr. Godwin says that Mr. Gunter identified last session the issue is in the salary schedule issue. Mr. Godwin explains the salary schedule issue is what SRPE objected to in the September 27 session. He offers that SRPE has something else to address the issue.

Mr. Godwin then presents SRPE's *2018-19 Instructional Base Salary Placement Schedule* (SRPE 1 in artifacts). Godwin suggests a new salary schedule is the solution to the military credit issues and other issues that exist with the current schedule. Godwin outlines the presented schedule established that each year of experience increases by a value of 2%. Mr. Godwin offers that the proposed placement would create a fair format to those with five years worth of experience as compared to those with five years military credit. He adds that SRPE is open to

looking at this document as a basis for future improvements. Godwin addresses the previous year and the district's cost of \$1 million just to correct the ed-support salary discrepancies from last year.

Ms. Chavers says, "It's got to be fixed."

Mr. Gunter stated he has questions about the new salary schedule. Gunter clarified that employees would be moved or placed on the schedule using years of qualifying service. Gunter asked if SRPE knew how many of the current employees would be effected. Mr. Gunter asks if SRPE has calculated a cost for the moving employees to a new schedule.

Mr. Godwin says it would be very difficult for SRPE to do that. Ms. Chavers says that SRPE estimates the cost of the presented schedule at about \$3.5 million. Mr. Godwin says that with the reports they have now, it would be difficult to figure. Godwin states that there were employees no longer with the SRCSD that are in the reports.

Mr. Gunter says explains why those employees could still appear in the report. This could be due to retirements and that those numbers are used for estimation going forward.

Ms. Chavers concedes the report is a "snapshot." She states the calculation is more difficult due to numbers being all over the place with performance pay, etc.

Mr. Gunter spot checks Mr. Godwin's figures on *Oct. 4 SRPE Proposal: 2018-19 Instructional Base Salary Placement Schedule* and asks, "What would be a total cost of this proposal?"

Ms. Chavers says that we estimate \$3.5 million and SRCSD should take it out of committed fund balance and the negotiations can be wrapped up by Halloween.

Mr. Godwin states that he doesn't know exactly how much SRCSD is spending on teacher salaries. Ms. Chavers states the expenditure is \$92.502 million in salaries based upon the report she has.

Mr. Gunter asks to clarify if the increase the employees would receive would be the salary placement increase only.

Mr. Godwin states that new salary placement schedule would be part of it. He suggests they would then negotiate additionally for a raise. SRPE would leave the door open for continued negotiations even if the proposed salary placement schedule were implemented.

Mr. Gunter noted that just quickly looking at figures estimated by SRPE, the move to the salary schedule could potentially cost more than the amount of money potentially available for salary improvements.

Then the negotiators discussed past schedules regarding longevity supplements and how those teachers with over 30 years' experience were paid and how they could potentially be handled going forward.

Mr. Godwin states that the proposed salary schedule takes care of salary inequities in new hires.

Ms. Chavers says, if you think Best and Brightest is divisive, the salary schedule is very divisive.

Mr. Godwin adds that employees have a hard time determining and understanding how salaries are set. Godwin states that it gets complicated and trying to communicate that through emails is not easy.

After reviewing the numbers further, Mr. Gunter asks, “if we place all instructional in your bargaining unit on this salary schedule, what would be the cost?”

Ms. Chavers states that SRPE estimates \$3.5-\$4 million.

Mr. Gunter asks how many employees SRPE is using for the calculation.

Ms. Chavers says 2,050. She adds that in 17-18 SRCSD budgeted for 1,994 teachers, in 16-17 1,938 teachers, and currently 2,043.

Mr. Watts refers to last session’s proposal the *SRPE Proposal Salary Improvement Formulas from Sept. 27, 2018* asks for clarification as to how this formula would be used with the placement schedule offered in the present session.

Ms. Chavers says that we would use this after the placement.

Mr. Godwin adds that the proposed salary schedule doesn’t have to be a step scale; the formula would be used to calculate raises.

Mr. Gunter asks SRPE what would be the potential cost increase for benefits associated with the new salary.

Ms. Chavers states an estimate of about 15% of \$3.5 million, which she says has been the figure [15%] used in the past.

Mr. Godwin says that would put the total cost at \$4 million, adding that amount is an estimate.

Mr. Gunter asks, “So the SRPE proposal is about \$4 million for placement on the new schedule and then with the performance multiplier on top of that?”

Mr. Godwin and Ms. Chavers both agree.

Mr. Gunter asks if they have a cost estimate for the remainder of what this potential proposal would be?

Mr. Godwin answers, “We thought we would take care of all the inequities first.”

Mr. Gunter asks, “What other issue besides compression at the beginning are getting solved with implementing the new placement schedule?”

Mr. Godwin says that [compression] is the main issue that this proposal addresses. Godwin concedes that he is aware of the pretty tight budget issues. He added that there has been no other tougher year than 2011 and the district still had the block schedule and managed to improve salaries.

When Mr. Gunter noted that the salary corrections agreed to last year did not permanently fix the issues SRPE is trying to address currently, Ms. Chavers and Mr. Godwin concur that the last placement schedule did not fix the issues.

Mr. Gunter then offers questions regarding the *SRPE Proposal Salary Improvement Formulas (9-27-18)*. Gunter states the district's concern is that the proposed formulas from SRPE would not comply with the law on performance pay. Mr. Gunter reminded the team of SRPE proposed language asking for the annual renewal contracts (auto renew after set numbers of effective/highly effective evaluations). Mr. Gunter pointed out that legislation was passed at the state level clarifying that new contracts could not be awarded and existing contracts awarded after the deadline could not be renewed in the future. Mr. Gunter added that the district is trying to follow the law and does not want to get in a position of having to correct something possible not in compliance. If legislation changes or is further clarified through future legislation, the items not in compliance would have to be changed.

Ms. Chavers says, "Coulda, shoulda, woulda."

Mr. Godwin counters that then we would have to follow the state law and the teachers would understand.

Ms. Chavers suggests Gunter knows what other districts are doing regarding interpreting legislation.

Mr. Gunter acknowledges his awareness of what other districts are doing and what other districts had to undo when the contract clarification came through. Gunter says SRCSD doesn't want to be in that position in the future.

Ms. Chavers again says, "Coulda, shoulda, woulda."

Mr. Godwin says he knows the SRPE proposal follows the law and that other districts may not.

Mr. Gunter noted that the intent of the state legislator's law for performance pay was to attempt to entice employees away from professional services contracts and move to annual contracts in order to have access to a higher potential salary increase.

Mr. Gunter asks, "Do you have anything else on the monetary proposal?"

Ms. Strickland states that this discussion is nothing new and has been a long-standing process that has been covered in many conversations both at the table and in committees addressing performance pay.

Mr. Gunter moves for a caucus. The SRSCD moves to another room to caucus.

Upon the end of the caucus, Mr. Gunter states that last session Mr. Godwin has said the UWFTE increase was something over 5% in 15-16 calculations. Gunter researched various prior FTE calculations (SRCSD 1-3 in artifacts) in the FEFP reports to validate this claim. Mr. Gunter details that the FEFP numbers reported did not align to the numbers Mr. Godwin presented in the Sept. 27, 2018, session.

Mr. Godwin clarifies that he was comparing different years.

Mr. Gunter distributes *Response to SRPE Salary Comparison from 9/27/18*. Gunter notes that he added some employee classifications and indicates that the percentages reflect the statutory requirement for performance pay.

Mr. Godwin questions if SB 736 says that district administrators are on performance pay.

Mr. Gunter says it does not.

Mr. Godwin asks if the district puts its educational support employees on performance pay.

Mr. Gunter says, "No, we do not."

Mr. Godwin suggests that district administrators are on performance pay but ed support is not.

Mr. Gunter asks Mr. Godwin if administrators have a choice about whether or not to be on annual contract.

Mr. Godwin replies, "No, they do not."

Mr. Gunter noted that the performance pay law from the state established that employees on annual contract were eligible for performance pay. The discussion continued regarding the intent of the state law. Mr. Gunter recalled that in the past SRPE did not support educational support being on performance pay due to the fact that educational support employees are not on annual contracts.

Mr. Gunter refers to the *SRPE Proposal Salary Improvement Formulas September 27, 2018* (prior session artifacts). He notes that on the proposal the multiplier is at .99x for highly effective grandfathered employees. Mr. Gunter asks if SRPE is willing to consider a different percentage since the current multiplier is .75, noting any cost increase in that one area influences the total cost of any proposed salary placement schedule.

Mr. Godwin states that the SRCSD allocate a certain cost, then look at the total cost.

Mr. Gunter asks, "Are you stuck on .99? That number impacts the total cost."

Ms. Chavers moves to caucus.

Upon the return from caucus, Mr. Godwin asks if Mr. Gunter is offering a counter.

Mr. Gunter says it is hard to counter when SRPE has not provided concrete calculations for their proposal. If the proposed increase is from .75x to .99x, then SRPE has to calculate the total proposal cost for SRCSD to have something to reference.

Ms. Chavers suggests that the reports SRPE has been provided are not accurate.

Mr. Gunter asks, "What do you need that you do not have?"

Mr. Godwin states SRPE is requesting salary reports with years of qualifying service.

Ms. Chavers asks for Mr. Gunter to give SRPE a proposal.

Mr. Gunter asks, “Would SRPE be willing to take a .80x multiplier?”

Ms. Chavers declines, stating that SRPE is firm.

Mr. Gunter states that a salary proposal without numbers to establish a cost and a multiplier with no cost numbers is not a proposal.

Mr. Godwin says he does not know the numbers or people involved.

Ms. Chavers says that a teacher experience grid can be run. She states that in the past she has been given such reports.

Mr. Gunter offers that if SRPE thinks it is missing some information, Ms. Chavers can provide him the Z number at the top of previous reports she has, and the District can work from there to get SRPE additional information. Mr. Gunter adds that SRCSD can get numbers of highly effective/effective teachers if that’s what is requested by SRPE.

Mr. Godwin restates SRPE would not take .80x as the multiplier for grandfathered highly effective.

Ms. Chavers adds they are not changing their proposal.

Mr. Gunter introduced the last item regarding an email to him that he wants introduced into the minutes. He summarizes an email from Ms. Marie Bodi that suggests she was misrepresented in the September 27, 2018 minutes which suggested that her statement, “I agree” meant that she agreed with Mr. Gunter’s opening statements from the first session. She states that the district presumed she agreed. Mr. Gunter reminded SRPE that the ground rules clearly state that both sides will keep their own minutes.

Ms. Chavers agrees that the SRCSD should not amend minutes in that section.

Mr. Gunter then shows a copy of the SRPE Facebook page that has what appears to be inflammatory language regarding the Canal Street office doors being locked at the start of the last meeting. Mr. Gunter outlines that two district employees working in the Canal Street location had received direct threats and procedures were put in place to address safety and access issues. The doors were secured at the end of the regular day as part of those ongoing safety measures. The threats were serious enough to warrant the Sheriff’s Department assigning the deputies for the time the issue was being investigated. An unexpected personnel change at the front desk on September 27 created a situation in which the door was inadvertently secured prior to the beginning of the session.

Mr. Godwin says he wants to go on record to state he does not think there was any effort to keep any person out of the meeting. Ms. Chavers concurs.

Ms. Chavers states that she feels that the specificity in referencing Ms. Bodi as Political Action Committee Chair for SRPE in the last session was problematic, since she was not introduced by that title. She adds that Ms. Bodi’s title is SRPE Vice-President. Ms. Timmons states she did not realize that was a negative denotation and asks if Ms. Chavers would like the current minutes to reflect Ms. Bodi’s other title. Ms. Chavers confirms that she does, and Ms. Timmons notes that

future minutes should state that Ms. Bodi is SRPE Vice-President, not Political Action Committee Chair for SRPE.

The next meeting is set for Oct. 11, 2018, at 4:30 p.m.

Meeting closes at 6:40 p.m.