

Thursday, October 24, 2019

Attendance:

- **SRCS**D: David Gunter, Victor Lowrimore, Patrick Keene, Tonya Shepherd, Joe Trujillo, & Tiphany Sapp
- **SRPE**: Rhonda Chavers, Tamela Strickland, David Godwin, Landra McCrary and Marie Bodi

Meeting called to order at 4:32 p.m. The district agreed to let SRPE open the session. Rhonda Chavers began the meeting explaining that due to some other scheduling items, she and Mr. Godwin will need to leave by 5:20 p.m. Chavers recommended that the team open with introductions on both sides.

The bargaining unit opened with passing of a summary of their proposals (see SRPE items). SRPE wants to change language regarding advanced degree pay in appendix D. By changing this language, it eliminates anyone being hindered from getting the advanced degree pay because the degree is not in the education field.

The district provided information about this issue being created because once DOE has certified an undergraduate degree, they don't go back and look at the advanced degrees. The district wants to SRPE to consider additional clarifying language (for example: if there was a prerequisite undergrad degree that led to the advanced degree path, that's what will be considered for the advanced pay). This will be another option qualifier. Chavers stated that the "education" language should just be removed.

Chavers mentioned the critical teacher shortage areas (math and ESE). In prior discussion of this issue, the district didn't include SRPE in the process of identifying the critical shortage areas. SRPE wants language changed to "list determined yearly by SRPE and district". Gunter stated that this is also one of the potential proposals he was bringing to the table as it was presented last year.

Chavers went on to propose that Guidance Counselors need a 10% supplement. She stated that guidance counselors have contacted her, and they are now being required to do 504 plans...they are being called 504 facilitators. Chavers stated that ACCELIFY has been a nightmare and this has been a huge task placed on guidance counselors. She and Mr. Godwin stated that 504s are not in the counselor's job description, so SRPE believes this is a change in their working conditions.

Godwin stated that we still have the issue where new teachers are being placed over returning/veteran teachers (see SRPE items). Godwin believes this is because the district is using an 18-19 salary placement schedule for the 19-20 school year. Basically, the new hires have already been awarded the past year of credit when placed on the scale and the returning teachers have not moved forward yet. SRPE said it was their understanding that no one would be rolled forward until after the contract was settled. Gunter said he would verify to see if this how this was processed when entering new employees into the system. Gunter noted that new hires were placed on the salary schedule that was settled and approved by SRPE and there was no other schedule agreed to for HR to use. Gunter also stated he was under the impression it was corrected when the salary schedule corrections were settled last year but agreed he would look into it further. Godwin states that to keep this from happening, you have to have a new schedule. Chavers stated that when the district doesn't roll forward July 1 every year, people apply to the district, see the pay, want to apply and when they get here, this is not exactly what they are making.

On the next SRPE proposal (see SRPE items), Godwin presented a revenue comparison from 18-19 and 19-20. Based on calculations provided by Godwin, SRPE claims the district has been given a 5.58% increase in revenue from last year to this year. This 5.58% of the \$96 million would equal \$5,408,420.59 on instructional salary improvements for FY 2019-20. SRPE proposed an overall salary schedule increase of 3.42% with forward movement of one level for employees. Godwin furthered that there is still over \$11 million in new revenue. Godwin stated that the budget is

built based on the fact that 80% of the operating budget is for salaries. Godwin noted SRPE is not asking for the 80% of the new revenue. Chavers reiterated the point is there is almost \$12 million in new revenue and SRPE is only asking for a small percentage of it. Godwin and Chavers explained that this information was developed based on district employee/HR data. Chavers stated this information is everything SRPE had to present at the time and reminded the committee that she had to leave early and only had about 12 minutes left.

The district listened to all proposals and information provided by SRPE. Gunter stated that he had some clarifying questions to ask and inquired about employees sitting at the 30-year level and how they would be handled in SRPE's proposal. Gunter noted that SRPE did not include how performance pay would be addressed in their proposal and asked SRPE if they intended go with the language proposed last year with the \$1.00 for HE and \$.75 for E. SRPE stated they would if the district agrees to their proposed salary improvements.

With SRPE concluding their presentation for the session, Gunter passed out the "SRCSD and SRPE Negotiations Sessions Ground Rules for 19-20" which was a revised version of the prior document that had been approved by both sides in the 18-19 negotiations. Gunter stated that nothing had changed except for the year reference and clarifying that no meetings go over 2 hours in length. Chavers acknowledged the ground rules and agreed to carry them over from the 18-19 negotiations.

The district's first proposal item was passed by Gunter and addressed the addition of a 12% supplement on the differentiated pay schedule (see SRCSB Proposal 1). SRPE tentatively agreed to this with Chavers signing off on this item.

The next proposal from the district presented language related to part-time and awarding of benefits (see SRCSB Proposal 2). Chavers stated that she was fine with this, but countered for the language to say "one half or more." Gunter stated he believes this is related to FRS eligibility issues and requires that the language needs to require "more than half". Chavers mentioned a previous situation where this was an issue for an employee. SRPE will take this proposal under consideration.

The third proposal from the district was related to the critical teacher shortage areas (see SRCSB Proposal 3). Gunter mentioned there is not that much difference from what the district and SRPE is proposing. Chavers stated that in the interest of time with her needing to leave, SRPE will take this proposal under consideration and bring it back.

The fourth proposal from the district was (counter offer) for salary increase for FY 20 (see SRCSB Proposal 4). Gunter acknowledge the work accomplished by both sides last year in negotiations when the compression issue on the salary schedule was addressed resulting in a good settlement for SRPE and allowing for the possible restoration of forward movement as part of the process to increase salaries. The initial offer from the district would move employees forward one level on the salary schedule. Godwin asked and Gunter clarified that the teachers who are off the salary schedule would get nothing. Gunter confirmed the current district offer would not improve salaries for those individuals that are above level 30, but he noted that could be addressed in counters offers to come based on negotiations. The district offer would represent an average increase of approximately 1.85%.

On behalf of SRPE, Godwin said he appreciated the forward movement, but SRPE would not accept this offer. Godwin noted that he doesn't want the veteran teachers forgotten. Chavers stated that SRPE wants their portion of the \$12 million in new revenue as she departed the meeting. Chavers stated she was leaving the process in good hands with Godwin and the SRPE team. Godwin said that he is in agreement to restore and preserve the forward movement on the salary schedule, but he would develop a counter offer and present at the next negotiation session.

Godwin proposed how the district could increase the FCR immediately stating the district could move committed funds to uncommitted funds and the FCR goes up 2 points immediately.

Gunter stated that he had one other question to clarify SRPE's salary proposal before concluding the meeting. Gunter noted that SRPE's initial offer also did not ask for the proposed increases to be retroactive to July 1, 2019. Gunter asked if SRPE's intent was for the increases to be retroactive. Godwin replied that SRPE did want the increase to be retroactive to July 1.

Bodi inquired about access issues so the public can gain entry in the building for meetings.

Gunter inquired about SRPE's availability to meet again stating the district would like to move forward and offered to set a date for the following week. Godwin stated SRPE wants to get it settled as well. In her absence, Godwin asked that Chavers be contacted about scheduling the next session.

Gunter thanked everyone for their participation in the session and reiterated that it appears both sides are approaching this with the same general idea of restoring forward movement plus a possible overall improvement.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:38pm.