

## **2013 – 2014 NTA / NCSB Collective Bargaining**

Minutes Meeting 7

December 9, 2013 Meeting

The seventh meeting between the Nassau Teachers Association and Nassau County School Board bargaining teams was held on December 9, at 5:30 P.M. at the Team Center in Fernandina Beach.

Present were, Mike Dale (FCSU director and chief); Beverly Kurak, Carol Anne Young, Melissa Stokes, Nicole Sipka, and Jim Richards for NTA; and Martin Miller (NCSB chief), Dr. Edward Turvey, and Suzanne Davis for the NCSB.

The minutes for the November 13 meeting were read and one amendment was made. The NTA requested that a discussion at the November 13 meeting on the resolved issue of planning period (Issue 1) regarding the future possibility of a seven period day be reflected in the minutes. The minutes were then approved as amended. One correction was made to the agreed-upon Issue 1 (Planning Period) of the IS document. At the request of the NTA, the discussion regarding the possibility of implementing a seven period day in the future was inserted. The IS document was approved as amended.

The Board chief distributed a language proposal on insurance (Article XVIII, Econ Issue 2) to reflect the same offer as had been previously proposed in a draft MOU that was rejected at the last meeting by the NTA. The proposal would provide a one-time \$450 premium refund similar to the refund provided in 2012 – 2013. The refund would be made available for those employed on January 1, 2014 in Nassau who are enrolled in a Nassau County School Board group health insurance plan other than the Blue Options High Deductible single coverage plan. The Board offer was accepted and Econ Issue 2 was agreed to by the NTA and NCSB teams.

The Board chief next provided a summary of the requirements for the performance pay system that must be in place on July 1, 2014 and a revised Board proposal on salary based on the previous proposal: \$2100 state allocation adjustment to each qualified teacher; transition to a new schedule structure based on incremental multiples of \$300; adjustment value levels of \$300 for 14-15; and new tables for the 2014-15 schedule. The tables would reflect only those \$300 multiples required for the transition and a complete table would be provided to Payroll and Personnel for audit and calculation purposes. The Board offer included the provision of four adjustment levels of \$300 each for all Performance Pay Schedule HE teachers for two consecutive years (14-15 and 15-16), two adjustment levels of \$300 each for all Performance Pay Schedule E teachers for two consecutive years, and two adjustment levels of \$300 each for all Grandfather Schedule HE or E teachers for two consecutive years. This proposal of multiple adjustments would be contingent on the Board not declaring financial emergency in 14-15 or 15-16 and the acceptance by the NTA of the Board schedule plan proposal.

After a caucus, the NTA returned and rejected the proposal of the Board. They stated they were maintaining their previous proposal that included an increment adjustment for this year based on the current schedules, a base salary state allocation adjustment for all qualified teachers of \$2100, and a transition to a new schedule structure based on incremental multiples of \$750. They stated that their concerns regarding the Board's proposal was that they wanted all tables to be included in the contract and they wanted fewer incremental values. The Board chief stated that including the tables was not a problem and that the number of adjustments to get to a particular goal should not be a factor. He stated that in the NTA proposal of utilizing half-steps, the number of adjustments would double since the transparency requested by the NTA would require all adjustment values to be in the contract. He

expressed his disappointment of the rejection of the two year adjustment commitment by the Board. He said the Board proposal offered the best stability to teacher salaries in the future as the \$300 adjustment levels allowed the greatest flexibility for the teachers to receive adjustments in the future while the \$750 adjustment levels proposed by the NTAs provided the most restrictive plan requiring the Board to have a higher fund balance before any adjustments could be made under the NTA plan.

The Board chief stated that he was authorized to provide an alternate proposal that included the state allocation adjustment but \$500 incremental multiples instead of the \$300 multiples but the two year adjustment offer would not be part of this proposal. The two year adjustment guarantee had been intended to be an incentive for the other plan and it incurred certain risks on the part of the Board that it would not be willing to take on with any other proposed plan.

The NTA again caucused and upon return again rejected the Board's offer. They stated that there was plenty of time to design a plan for July 1, 2014 and, if the Board would provide an increase from \$2100 to \$2200 for the across the Board state allocation adjustment to qualified teachers, they would accept the offer. They said the teams could then return after February 1 and try to design a plan for July 1. The Board chief stated he would report the rejection of the Board's proposals to the Board.

The Board team explained the remaining economic issue 3, regarding tech contacts. The team stated that the language in the Differentiated Pay appendix did not correctly reflect how the contacts were assigned.

The teams set the next meeting for Monday, December 16 at 5:30 for the public meeting.

**Next Meeting:**

All future meetings between the NTA and NCSB teams will be held at the Team Center in Fernandina Beach at the District School Board Office. These times and dates are subject to change but will be noticed if there are any changes.

NTA: Monday, December 16 at 5:30 P.M. for the public meeting.