

SRPE Negotiation Minutes
Thursday, November 7, 2019
4:30pm

ATTENDANCE

- SRCSD: David Gunter, Victor Lowrimore, Joe Trujillo, Melissa Baxley, Patrick Keene, Tonya Shepherd
- SRPE: Rhonda Chavers, Mari Bodi, David Godwin, Ruth Blackman, Tamala Strickland, Landra McCrary

MINUTES

Meeting was called to order at 4:37pm.

Mr. Gunter opened with proposal #5 (handout SRCSD 1 -Differentiated Pay Scale). There are employees that have teaching positions plus a 10% supplement for curriculum coordinator duties. At some point in the past, there were similar positions that were removed from the contracts, and the old language remains; however, the positions remaining after the language change did not get listed in the supplements section for differentiated pay. Auditors may ask about this, so this language needs to be cleaned up to reflect what we are doing as a district. SRPE agreed to the language clean up on the added underlined language (Supplemented Curriculum Coordinator .10).

Mr. Gunter presented information for clarification purposes; looking at part of the verbiage related to critical shortage areas. There was some previous discussion on the dates (June 1 or closer to time when staffing plans are provided). Mr. Gunter read the proposed language and Mrs. Chavers stated that what was read sounded about right...”in conjunction with SRPE.” Mr. Gunter stated that he would get that language cleaned up and present again.

Additionally, Mr. Gunter mentioned that SRPE was proposing specific positions to be supplemented at 10% and the district was proposing the critical shortage and retention at 5%. Gunter recommended that all these potential positions be handled through the critical shortage language. Mrs. Chavers stated that SRPE is in favor of rolling guidance counselors and adaptive PE teachers in the critical shortage area. Mrs. Chavers inquired about whether the list was being made now. Mr. Gunter stated that the District’s intent was to create the initial list in the spring for the upcoming year. Chavers stated that SRPE is talking about this calendar year, 2019-20, and is looking at getting the critical shortage list paid this year. Chavers stated the shortage is this year and SRPE would caucus on this. Chavers stated that the district is saving quite a bit of money on that this year. Gunter stated that he would get the language cleaned up and present again.

Gunter presented an updated Analysis of Funding/Usage for 19/20 (handout SRCSD 2). He explained the increase in costs/revenue reductions. Gunter also clarified which items were costs that would be incurred, and which were estimates. Gunter did note that the costs were rounded since some are pending and yet to be paid. Chavers stated that she knows the district is ahead because she gets a copy of all the FTE information and knows the district is over 100 students. Gunter stated that enrollment is up from the prior year; however, based on projection, the district is currently under projection in the current year by 100 students. Gunter mentioned the costs of safety requirements related to the new mandates from the Marjorie Stoneman Douglas Commission. The \$2.7 million balance is what the District would have available for all salary

increases without reducing the FCR. The current FCR is down to 5.23%. From the SB2500 (appropriations) the FEFP per student increase is about \$224.03; so, the district is looking at about a 3.06% overall increase in new revenue.

David Godwin reviewed a couple of items from the list on analysis of funding/usage 19/20 and mentioned several items on the list that are normally paid out of capital outlay funds and he was also not confident in the estimates provided. Gunter stated that the estimates provided came from finance and pointed out that the number SRPE was trying to present as money available is also an estimate since the District has yet to receive all the funding from the state for 19-20 fiscal year.

Chavers stated that it's the district's option to not fully pay software out of capital outlay. Godwin states that the current budget shows about \$1.1 million being paid for software and feels that quite a few of the items on the list are being paid from capital outlay. Gunter explained that part of the funding from the items questioned by Godwin are being paid out of capital outlay but stated finance is having to pay the part listed out of operating dollars. Chavers stated to let's call a spade a spade because a few years ago, the public was told that certain things were being paid from capital outlay, but that is not reflected on this list. Godwin says SRPE used projected numbers on their proposal because he was told that's what the district based their proposals. Godwin was adamant that if our district did what other districts do, our FCR would be around 11%.

SRPE took a caucus at 5:01pm.

The meeting reconvened at 5:16pm.

SRPE will agree to put their recommended .10 supplement positions in the critical shortage language if the 5% in the language starts this year (19-20) for guidance counselors, adaptive PE, ESE and math...make this part of the retention component. Gunter stated that he would work on this and bring a counter proposal back.

SRPE presented a proposal (handout SRPE 1). Language in appendix E added "music directors." Chavers wanted to further clean the language up by saying "choral/music" director. Gunter questioned whether the language should just list as "music". SRPE wanted to keep things clear for everybody and felt their language did that.

Chavers read information related to SB7026 and the additional responsibilities this bill has placed on guidance counselors.

Chavers wanted the following language added to article V(K): *"a discipline referral shall not be changed to a teacher note unless the principal first gives written notice to the teacher(s) making the referral. A referral change form needs to be completed by the principal making the change."* There was a lot of discussion on both sides about when a referral is an office discipline referral, or a teacher note and that a referral is not coded until processed so it does not "change" as part of the processing. SRPE feels that authority should not be given to a Dean (a teacher) changing another teacher's referral to a teacher note that has been submitted without notification to the teacher who wrote the referral. Mr. Gunter stated that he would get with Mr. Emerson on this since it would reside with student discipline and curriculum. Chavers said ok, but there needs to be a district policy where teachers aren't changing record-keeping "willy-nilly."

Godwin reviewed an article from former Governor Rick Scott in 2017 (handout SRPE 2). Godwin presented the *District Cost Differential* again. Godwin claims FLDOE expects a district's salary/benefit costs to be approximately 80% of its operating costs. Godwin reported FLDOE allocated \$189.9 million toward operational costs. SRCSD (19-20) budgeted salary/benefit costs are \$178 million. That is a difference of about \$11.9 million. Godwin says SRPE's last proposal was \$6 million to go towards salary improvements and doesn't understand why this is a problem when the legislature and the public expects districts to do and the money is there based on these calculations.

Gunter pointed out that at the article Godwin referenced also states in its opening that at time the article was written, Governor Scott was dealing with low poll ratings while contended that low teacher salaries were largely out of his control and instead could only be remedied by county school boards. Gunter noted that Scott and the legislature at the time failed to adequately fund public education and this was their attempt to pass the blame to the local level. Godwin stated that the last offer SRPE put on the table was \$2 million less than what his current calculations show.

Godwin stated that in the spirit of wanting to get everyone a fair offer and get things negotiated as quickly as possible, SRPE presented another offer (handout SRPE 3). SRPE is proposing a level increase, a forward movement, plus a 3% increase in the salary schedule. The total cost of this would be \$91,779,653. Employees over 30 years would equate to \$8,541,492 and advanced degrees would equate to \$2,269,152. This would need to be retroactive to July 1.

Gunter went back to the choral/music issue and asked how many school sites this issue was impacting. Chavers stated not many, but SRPE was looking to the future and wanting to fix this now.

SRCSD caucused at 5:53pm.

The meeting reconvened at 6:22pm.

Gunter asked SRPE for a clean copy of the choral/music language. The district is going to "TA" this item.

Gunter stated that he cannot accept the offer that SRPE has proposed; he doesn't have the authority from the Board and Superintendent to do that. However, he presented a counter offer (handout SRCSD 3). Level increase as proposed before, increase the percentage to a .35% improvement to the overall salary schedule. Gunter stated that he is looking to address the 30+ year people with language to put an increase equitable to an average level move in place in the form of a longevity supplement that would be FRS eligible. Gunter noted that the District appreciates the service of these employees and is not leaving the people at the top out of a proposed settlement. Chavers stated that SRPE would take this proposal under consideration. Godwin noted that the district has come up 1% above where we're currently at. Gunter stated that finance is telling him he has \$2.7 million to work with and right now, he has \$2.5 million of it sitting on the table. Godwin stated that SRPE would reject this offer because of the state calculation he presented earlier.

Next meeting has been tentatively scheduled for Monday, November 18, 2019 at 4:30pm.

Meeting was adjourned at 6:34pm.