

**SRPE Negotiation Minutes  
Tuesday, December 3, 2019**

**ATTENDANCE****SRCSD**

- David Gunter, Joe Trujillo, Tonya Shepherd, Victor Lowrimore, Tiphonie Sapp,

**SRPE**

- Rhonda Chavers, David Godwin, Ruth Blackmon, Marie Locklin, Tamala Strickland, Landra McCrary

**MINUTES**

- Meeting was called to order at 4:39pm. Gunter opened with details from the previous meeting regarding language on recruitment and retention and the SRPE proposal that the supplements be implemented for the current year. Gunter reminded everyone about prior discussions on the SRPE proposal to implement all the supplements in the current year could be too costly. Gunter says that based on SRPE's request and trying to work with monies available, the first proposal that he is presenting will have the low socioeconomic supplement at 5% that will be retroactive to July 1 built into the offer. The critical shortage list would be identified in May as the new hiring season opens and the remainder of the critical shortage supplements would be implemented in the new year 20-21 after the critical shortage list is identified and approved.
- See handout (*SRCSD Total Monetary Proposal 19-20*). This puts the overall money required to address salary increases at a 3.14% improvement to the prior. Bagdad, East Milton, SAIL, Santa Rosa Adult, King, T.R. Jackson and Rhodes are the low-socioeconomic schools. Gunter says this is a way to get more money on the table and try to get at least part of what SRPE requested implemented. Godwin questioned whether the low SES money was restricted money and Gunter responded it was not. Gunter noted the \$3 million on the table in the District offer does not include FICA and FRS cost which would be additional dollars to cover that expense. Page 2 shows what the proposed salary schedule would look like with the proposed improvement. Godwin clarified that the low SES funds are a supplement. Gunter stated that it is a supplement, but it is FRS eligible and counts towards the employees' salary the way it is paid.
- SRPE took a caucus at 4:50pm.
- The meeting reconvened at 5:05pm.
- Godwin opened saying that SRPE has been looking and studying the expense report sheet that was passed around at the last meeting and he (Godwin) has been contemplating on whether SRPE's proposals have been reasonable. Godwin presented an *SRPE Salary Analysis*. Godwin states that total instructional salary was \$97.6 million and on the same salary report, ed-support was \$21.5 million, and the cost of ratified ed-support contract was \$1.1 million. Godwin asserts that

if you take the \$97.6 million and divide by \$21.5 million and multiply by \$1.1 million, you get an average \$5.1 million difference (what the district must spend to get teachers about as equal as what ed-support received). Godwin continued that the cost of what SRPE proposed on 11/18/19 was \$5.2 million and feels that this is very reasonable considering what the ed-support contract was ratified for. Godwin states that with these current proposals, the district is wanting instructional staff to take about half of what ed-support received.

Gunter stated that is not true. Gunter noted that anyone can go reference the settlements with the other unions in both Board minutes and posted online. Gunter also explained the offer for Educational Support that Godwin is referencing settled for forward level movement for current employees and one percent (1%) improvement to the salary schedule. Gunter also noted the recently settled Blue Collar contract was structured the same way with forward movement and an improvement to the salary schedule. Gunter pointed out that the offers to SRPE had been in the same structure as the offers have continued to be increased by the District through the negotiations process.

Godwin stated that he is going by the numbers presented by the district in a previous meeting. Gunter stated that the way Godwin is trying to represent those numbers is not accurate. Godwin reviewed the math again and stood by his calculations.

- Chavers inquired about how the district thinks school recognition money would go over if instructors knew that ed-support received more than double what teachers were getting in salary improvements? Gunter stated again that this is not the case and the numbers represented by SRPE cannot be applied the way they are claiming. Godwin claims that based on the numbers, it still shows that ed-support is getting more than what is being proposed to instructional staff.
- Gunter brought up the proposals that Chavers presented in previous sessions asking for the supplements to be implemented in the current year and again noted that is why the current District offer is attempting to incorporate part of what SRPE requested and at the same time increase salaries across the board. Godwin stated that to get it equal, it would be \$5.1 million. Gunter stated that this was again incorrect and SRPE could not apply the numbers in the manner being represented. Chavers stated that the \$97 million (in October) was paid out to teachers and \$21 million was paid out to ed-support. Chavers stated that this is the tax payers pot of money and the tax payers think teachers ought to be paid more. Gunter asked that if the District is continuing to put more money on the table, then how is SRPE being asked to take less. Chavers said proportionately speaking that is what is happening. Godwin went back to the numbers and said that the numbers are the numbers. Godwin went on to state that he is baffled that SRPE's offer of \$5.2 million is so far out of the ball park.
- Godwin also questioned if the Board was aware of how much less they are asking instructional staff to accept than what was given to ed-support? Gunter stated that

the Board gave the approval of what could be put on the table and the structure is in line with what has been offered and agreed to by the other two unions. Gunter stated that the District started out with forward level movement on the table and came into the negotiation sessions trying to get something done. This District noted this when the first offer was made stating a desire to get a settlement reached and money to employees. Gunter pointed out that two other unions have looked at the same numbers SRPE is looking at and both of those unions agreed with the numbers represented by the District and have settled their contracts. Gunter asked if SRPE was prepared to make a counter offer?

- Godwin presented a counter offer to get SRPE to what they feel is fair (see handout SRPE 2). Proposing a level increase of 2.65% plus a 3.65% for instructional staff over 30 years and 2.65% advanced degrees. This is an additional salary increase cost of \$4.45 million (\$5.178 million with benefits) and claims that is what gets SRPE at a proportionate level with what ed-support settled for. Gunter wanted clarification because the District offer put money on the table regarding the low SES because SRPE wanted to get the critical shortage proposal implemented this year. Godwin stated that the district is way off than what was settled with another bargaining unit and that maybe Gunter could explain to 2,100 teachers why they are getting a significantly smaller salary increase than what was given to another group of employees.
- Gunter stated that the educational support contract referenced by SRPE settled for approximately 3.5% improvement represented by forward level movement and an improvement to the salary schedule which is the same offer structure the district is offering SRPE. Chavers questioned the low SES implementation. Gunter stated that ed-support didn't address that in their contract. Chavers stated that the district proposed that increase. Chavers stated to be clear that her main concern was getting those critical shortage areas in the contract this year. Gunter provided clarification. Godwin stated that every time he quotes the DOE he's told he's wrong or misleading people, but now that he has taken the district's numbers, he's still wrong. Gunter stated that the numbers he has to work with are provided by finance and represents total costs that the District has or will have to pay. Godwin stated that to keep things proportionate, this is where he got the \$5.2 million and it's hard for him to accept considerably less than what was given to another group. Chavers stated that she equates this to the contention surrounding school recognition money this year. Godwin stated that he is staying on this sheet and is not coming off the \$1.145 million. Gunter again stated that the two other unions have looked at and considered the same information presented by the District to SRPE regarding money available and those group agreed with the District and have settled their contracts.
- Gunter reviewed the offer from SRPE and clarified that SRPE is asking for \$4,455,833 in salary increases. Godwin said yes and dispersed as proposed on handout 2. Gunter stated that he wants to make sure he is not skewing numbers and stated that what SRPE was asking for is for 4.6% in new money and that is more than what was received by the District from the state which was 3.06%. Godwin stated that he is asking for an amount proportionate to what ed-support

received. Godwin stated he is going off the \$1.145 million. Godwin reiterated that the numbers are not his, they are the district's, but the calculations are his. Gunter clarified that SRPE is asking for 4.6% in new money. Godwin stated that what SRPE has calculated is what's needed to get SRPE proportionate to what ed-support received. Chavers stated that the district has not even offered 3.5% to SRPE. Godwin stated that based on the numbers the district provided to him, he presented an offer that he felt was reasonable and the proposal that was last put on the table is as close to be where it needs to be. Shepherd stated that school recognition money has not been contentious at her school because ed-support and the instructional staff came together to work through the process. Chavers stated that this school has been fortunate, but she could assure it would be contentious if ed-support staff received more in salary improvements than what instructional is receiving and that is what the district is asking SRPE to do. Gunter pointed out that the offers to SRPE had been in the same structure as the offers to the other unions and those offers have continued to be increased by the District through the negotiations process. Gunter also stated again that the two other unions have looked at and considered the same information presented by the District to SRPE regarding money available and those groups agreed with the District and have settled their contracts.

- Chavers stated that SRPE has DECLINED this offer.
  
- Gunter asked for clarification from SRPE about trying to implement the low SES money as part of the critical shortage proposal and if SRPE wanted that off the table so that possible offers from the District would only dedicate money to overall salary improvements?
  
- SRPE went to a caucus at 5:47pm.
  
- The meeting reconvened at 5:57pm.
  
- SRPE DECLINED the offer.
  
- Gunter informed SRPE his authority from the School Board was not enough to cover the amount currently being proposed and the District could not accept SRPE's current offer.
  
- Chavers stated that on the record, SRPE never asked for the low SES to be implemented this year and wanted the critical areas for ESE, guidance counselors on the table this year. SRPE states that this can be placed on the table for next year.
  
- Gunter asked if SRPE wanted to meet again before the School Board meeting on December 12<sup>th</sup> in order to try to get something settled. Chavers stated that SRPE

would not be available to meet again until after the return from Christmas break and proposed setting a time to meet on January 9, 2020. Both sides agreed the meeting would be January 9, 2020 at 4:30pm on SRPE's recommendation.

- The meeting adjourned at 6:01pm.