

## 2014 – 2015 NTA / NCSB Collective Bargaining

Minutes Meeting 6

November 5, 2014 Meeting

The sixth meeting between the Nassau Teachers Association and Nassau County School Board bargaining teams was held on November 5 at 6:00 P.M. at the Yulee Middle School Library in Yulee.

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

The minutes and the IS documents for the October 8 meeting were read and approved as read.

The NTA chief announced that the NTA was rejecting the Board's proposal for settlement for the 2014 – 15 contract year. He presented a new NTA proposal on performance pay that reflected a different concept, design, and structure than discussed in the past.

The NTA chief stated that the structure was the same as a regular salary schedule with varying incremental values between steps but broken up to allow for 6 different placements depending on the individual's current step placement. Even though the incremental values used in making step adjustments range from \$200 to \$1200, the performance increases for HE and E range from \$2.00 to \$1.00. So, an individual in Placement I (steps 0 through 4) would receive \$202 if rated as HE or \$201 if rated as E. In Placement II (Steps 5 – 8), an HE-rated teacher would receive \$402 or \$401 if rated as E. In Placement III, a teacher rated as HE would receive \$902 or \$901 if rated E. The remaining three Placement groups, or columns, are similarly calculated depending on the step values for each group.

The Board chief reminded the teams that the total adjustment for E teachers must fall between 50% and 75% of HE rated teachers. He stated that, in the proposal made by the NTA chief, the 50% to 75% requirement is not met. For example, the Board chief stated that within Placement I, the range of adjustments for HE and E teachers are \$202 and \$201. The '\$201' adjustment is not between 50% and 75% of \$202. He pointed out that the adjustment problem is even greater when one compares each of the six Placement groups or columns to each other. For example, in Placement IV, the adjustments are \$1202 for HE and \$1201 for E teachers. If comparing the adjustments for Placement VI to Placement I teachers, the differences are nearly 6 times as great.

The NTA chief responded that the step movement is not considered an adjustment under his proposal. Therefore the 50% to 75% ratios are met by the \$2 and \$1 amounts. He reminded the teams that it also was \$150,000 less costly than the last NTA proposal.

The Board chief stated that he was pleased they were looking at a less costly proposal than their last one but that it had to meet the requirements of the law. The Board chief said the law in section 1012.22(1)(c) 1. a., FS, states that an "adjustment means an addition to the base salary schedule that is not a bonus and becomes a part of the employees permanent base salary..." In other words, he continued, the difference from the last salary paid and the new salary is the adjustment. Therefore, he said, the adjustments by law are \$202 for HE or \$201 for E in Placement I, \$402 for HE or \$401 for E in Placement II, etc. and these adjustments must be compared to each other and not just the \$2 and \$1.

The Board chief also shared his concern about the varying HE adjustments among all Placement columns or groups. The HE adjustments range from \$202 in Placement I to \$1202 in Placement IV. He said it would be impossible to know to which HE adjustment any of the E adjustments were to be compared since there was such a large difference between the HE adjustment values.

The NTA chief stated that was not a problem since each “placement” group is considered a different classification and each group would stand on its own for the purpose of the 50% - 75% comparison.

The Board chief stated that when the law (s. 1012.22(1)(c) 5. b. I., FS) speaks of “salary adjustment available to an employee of the same classification” it is referring to employee classification such as school psychologist, teacher, etc., and is meant to differentiate between salary schedules for school psychologists, classroom teachers, speech therapists or other classifications for which a district may have adopted a schedule. It is not referring to creating different schedules for the same job.

The Board chief stated he did not understand how this proposal could have been made after 3 years of reviewing the law at the table.

The meeting was adjourned until further notice.

**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: TBA