

SRPE Negotiations
Wednesday, October 30, 2019

SRCSD Attendance: David Gunter, Tonya Shepherd, Melissa Baxley and Patrick Keene

SRPE Attendance: Rhonda Chavers, David Godwin, Marie Locklin, Tamela Strickland, Landra McCrary, Ruth Blackman

MINUTES:

Meeting was called to order at 4:35pm. David Gunter deferred for SRPE to go first and have the opportunity to respond to the District's offers and counter-offer from the prior session.

SRPE opened discussing an issue under the teacher salary schedule for 2018-19 with a teacher that came in with a Doctorate and it was not analyzed at DOE for certification. Her Doctorate was not readily recognized because it was not from a college of education and in a different but related field of study from the undergraduate degree. See the new language in SRPE handout 1. This is a proposal of the bargaining unit to have the language changed in order to address the issue and have advanced degrees related to a teacher's certification areas recognized.

Chavers revisited the SRPE proposal for guidance counselors to receive a 10% supplement for what SRPE considers a change in working conditions. Mrs. Chavers reported speaking with Mr. Bill Emerson to understand the history of how the district got to the point where Guidance Counselors are writing so many 504 plans. Chavers stated counselors are worried about their accountability with this new responsibility.

Chavers presented a new issue regarding choral teachers/directors. This is mostly an elementary issue. Chavers said when this language was written (about 20 years ago), it was intended for this to be the chorus teachers related to 2 performances (winter and spring). Some music teachers are covering both chorus and band. In some of these cases, chorus may not be getting the 50 hours of after school, but the band component is getting an abundance of hours. Marie Locklin questioned whether director should remain in or out of the language. David Godwin questioned the supplement being received at the end of the school year and what happens if the person only receives 49 hours and not the 50. Chavers said this language needs to be cleaned up and remain in the contract to address "directors and/or instructors." Gunter stated he knew this language had existed in the contract for a long time and was not aware of any prior issues brought to the attention of the District regarding the language. Gunter said he would follow back up with Mrs. Chavers on this.

SRPE had another language proposal regarding their critical teacher shortage proposal of a 10% supplement. There were some questions from SRPE about whether or not elementary schedules reflect 6 class period for a total of 300 instructional minutes. Gunter stated he had looked at the elementary schedules and found there were 6 documented periods for the purpose of FTE. Gunter said he would verify this is still in place. Chavers went on to review the new language proposals/changes that states "*If ESE is identified as a critical shortage area, then all adaptive PE teachers shall receive the supplement.*"

Chavers wanted to go on record because she has had numerous calls about the process for approving A+ recognition money at the school sites. She stated that we need to be reminded that school-based administrators should remain neutral and unbiased in the establishment of a plan

since they potentially benefit from the division of the bonus money. Chavers and Locklin reported site-based examples they felt were not appropriately handled by school administrators. Gunter stated that he would bring this to Mr. Bill Emerson's attention so that he is aware of this. Chavers said SRPE normally doesn't get involved in this process, but when members are concerned evaluations could be impacted then SRPE would get involved. Gunter stated that he would bring this to Mr. Emerson's attention.

Chavers also reported it was brought to her attention an MTSS plan should be opened for students with D/F course grades in core classes. Chavers reported speaking with Jason Weeks and is proposing a potential language change in the process. Chavers said she also spoke with Ms. Sharon Patrick this morning and she stated that state statute says that PMPs only have to be opened for students who scored a Level 1 or 2 on FSA math, reading and science. Gunter questioned whether he needed to do anything on this since Chavers was already working with Weeks and Patrick. Chavers stated that changing the language potentially addresses the issue and needs to be considered.

David Godwin brought up a concern he has about accurate information getting out to the Board and to the public. He stated that he has listened to the District Cost Differential for years and it's been wrong. Godwin read a previous statement made district staff related to the District Cost Differential and how it is used in the FEFP calculations. Godwin referenced the 2018 Florida Price Level Index (SRPE handout 2). Godwin read the highlighted information on the page and clarified what DCD is and what it is not. Godwin pointed out that the market-basket methodology has not been used since 2003, but this is what we are sharing with stakeholders and the public and we should be getting accurate information out.

Godwin also referenced SRPE Handout 3, District Cost Differential related to the district being funded based on 80% of costs being operational costs.

Godwin reviewed how this 80% looks based on the union's proposal from last meeting (see SRPE Handout 4 -FEFP calculation). Godwin states that 80% is not just instructional personnel. Current instructional salaries is \$97.6 million (73% of salaries on instructional employees). Godwin states that with the FEFP formula, there should be about \$9.4 million in available monies for instructional salary increases.

Gunter asked if SRPE had a counter proposal for salary increases in response to the offer put on the offer put on the table last week by the District. Mr. Godwin stated that the proposal SRPE gave last week was well below the \$9.6 million mark that should be available for salary increases. Gunter again asked if SRPE had a counter offer and questioned if SRPE was staying with the proposal put on the table last week or if there was anything new. SRPE requested and went into caucus at 5:17pm.

The meeting reconvened at 5:25pm with a counter offer (SRPE Handout 5) from SRP. Godwin asked for a level increase plus a 3.25% improvement in the salary schedule. Godwin has gone through and moved everybody forward. Starting at the bottom of the salary schedule (2019-20), the total cost of this would be about \$92 million...not including advanced degrees. People over 30 years would get a 4.25% improvement and advanced degrees would get a 3.25% improvement. So, the new total salary, including advanced degrees would be about \$102.8 million. Godwin furthered that if the district accepts this proposal, SRPE would like to have performance pay at X=\$1.00 as it was handled last year.

Gunter clarified what was being proposed in the new offer and verified the structure of the SRPE counter was the same as the prior offer with the change being a .17% decrease in the overall improvement to the schedule and a .25% decrease in the percentage awarded for longevity bonus. Godwin confirmed Gunter's analysis of the counter offer.

Gunter stated that he could not accept this offer because it is above the authority that has been granted by the Superintendent and the Board. Godwin noted the conversation at the state level about increasing teacher pay and stated that a lot of people talk about raising teacher pay, but when it comes to presenting the money, no one wants to do it. Chavers says she thinks this is very reasonable offer from SRPE. Gunter stated he understood what SRPE is saying, but it is currently above what he has permission to accept from board members and the superintendent. Gunter asked if SRPE had any other items to propose or review which SRPE stated they did not.

Gunter presented proposed language (SRCSD Handout 1-Article XX: Insurance). He stated that researching back into older language, the 17.5 hour reference appears to come from when lunch time was not included in the work day and a full week would have been 35 hours. The proposed language would eliminate the exact time amount and reference half of the contract hours of a full-time position. SRPE agreed to this and a tentative agreement was signed by both sides.

Gunter presented language on critical teacher shortage (SRCSD handout 2: Differentiated Pay Scale). Attention was brought to paragraph 4, line 5 "*The District with input from SRPE, will identify and publish the list of critical shortage areas no later than May 1st of each year. This list will be specific to the needs of Santa Rosa County School District and eligibility will not be considered based on critical shortage areas identified from the state or federal sources.*" Gunter brought attention to the Low SES schools and the current supplement paid to that group. The district is proposing to include the Low SES schools in the recruitment and retention language (i.e. *high economically disadvantaged schools will be defined as those schools with a free and reduced lunch rate of 65% or greater as of October 1st of each year. The maximum value of the supplement will not exceed five percent (0.5) of the IBAOO slot on the current salary schedule.* Chavers said the reference needs to be to the prior year salary schedule. Gunter reminded the committee about the prior conversations to get this supplement in place and to work to get it increased as opportunities presented themselves. The district believes the critical shortage proposal could provide that opportunity. Gunter and Chavers both agreed that we need to pay this on halves like SES is done now. Chavers stated that SRPE would take this under consideration. Gunter addressed SRPE's proposal about guidance supplements and stated this process could easily identify Guidance Counselors under this area (critical shortage) and both sides could address their issues with one process. Chavers said that is an idea to put Guidance Counselors in the critical shortage area. Chavers stated again that SRPE would take this under consideration, but "current" needs to be changed to "prior." Chavers questioned about putting adaptive PE teachers in this category. Gunter stated that he would need to seek additional clarification but that any of the areas needing attention could potentially be identified through the critical shortage process.

Gunter presented the district's version of language to address the issue SRPE brought to the table related to advanced degrees (SRCSD 3 -Teacher Salary Schedule). Gunter stated that DOE is not going to acknowledge the advanced degree if they already reviewed an undergraduate degree and have awarded a certification area based on the undergraduate degree. SRPE agreed to this language proposal. Gunter noted that this option addresses the SRPE concern brought to the table

without eliminating an option to get recognition for an advanced degree currently available in the contract.

Gunter presented analysis of funding/usage for 19/20 (SRCSD Handout 4). Gunter stated he asked finance to provide this based on the new revenue model and monies available for salaries in 19/20. Gunter was provided this list of “big ticket” items by district staff which shows funds required to cover other district expenses making those funds not available for potential salary increases. SRPE questioned the \$800K spent on the OT/PT contract. Chavers stated that IDEA should pay some of that. Gunter stated he would seek clarification on whether IDEA offsets any of the costs on this. Gunter stated his understanding was this list reflects cost incurred or to be incurred by the district above and beyond what any other source of funding would cover. Chavers asked about the *increase due to years of service salary adjustments*. Gunter explained this was related to the HRP language change and experience verification process that was recently completed. SRPE questioned the increase in health tech contracts and LPN contracts. Gunter stated that the Best and Brightest funds are the biggest item on the list at \$2.78 million. Gunter noted those funds are included in the current FEFP amount, however, in previous years, Best and Brightest was not a part of the FEFP. Gunter clarified that since this year Best and brightest was rolled into FEFP it takes away from what is available for overall salary increases. Godwin questioned this total as an estimate. .Gunter clarified that while some amounts were an estimate and yet to be paid, the Best and Brightest is an exact number. Chavers questioned what the “increase in system supports, Microsoft fees and reduction in funding due to FTE penalty.” Gunter stated that the FTE penalty is still pending and this an estimation; however, funds have not been withheld or returned to the state as of yet. Chavers questioned what the increase in district testing was all about. Gunter said that he will gain clarification on this. Gunter stated that right now, we are about 100 students short on FTE projections. Chavers says the student count on basics have gone up. Chavers says the shortage is probably because of weighted FTE due to ACCELIFY issues. There was some discussion on the new FOCUS system. Godwin stated that it’s hard for him to have a lot of trust in these numbers when some district staff are saying that District Cost Differential is based on market-basket methodology which was not been the case since 2003. Chavers said she believes the FTE is down because it hasn’t been able to be reported correctly due to ACCELIFY. Godwin stated that he understands that these are estimates, but some things can’t be disputed and that he believes 80% of operating costs should be used for salaries. Gunter stated these are all payouts that reduce the possible funds available for salary increases on this year’s budget. Chavers furthered that a large part of this list could come out of Capital Outlay funds. Godwin stated that he would like to see last year’s estimated costs on these things and what the actual costs is so he could see the difference. Gunter stated that this list was for informational purposes and to show where dollars were being spent and to identify the amount of money considered as available for salary increases when board members and the superintendent evaluate what can be offered to employees.

Gunter presented a counter-proposal (SRCSD handout 5) which would increase the District’s offer from and overall of 1.85% to and overall of approximately 2.1%. This offer includes employees moving forward one level on the current salary schedule and an additional 0.25% improvement to the salary schedule. Godwin questioned what would happen with teachers who are not on the salary schedule (beyond 30). Gunter stated that at this time the district’s offer does not address that group specifically, but the district is not opposed to having a longevity supplement at the top as has been done with past settlements. Gunter noted the districts desire is negotiate a settlement that is equitable for all employees.

Locklin asked what Gunter's authority is because he knows SRPE is not going to accept this offer and the District should put the best offer on the table. Gunter reminded Locklin that the District did exactly that in past negotiations and when they did SRPE did not accept the offer and wanted to continue negotiations.

SRPE asked for and went to caucus at 6:23pm.

Meeting reconvened at 6:29pm.

Godwin stated that as far as the estimated costs presented by the District are concerned, he doesn't know what to make out of those. Godwin stated that SRPE believes the state funding model delineates that 80% of operating costs go towards salaries. SRPE is not impressed and will reject this offer.

Gunter asked SRPE if they had a counter-offer for the District to consider. Godwin stated that SRPE has no counter-offer to present at this point.

Both sides identified November 7th, 2019 as the next potential meeting date and the meeting adjourned.