



SPALC Negotiations Minutes May 26, 2009

District Team: Dr. Greg Adkins, Pete Bohatch, Dr. Ami Desamours, Robert Dodig, Ron Frazer, Dr. Charles Luckey, Georgianna McDaniel, Victoria Ramina, Jack Shelton, Sonny Stelmacki, Susan Strong

SPALC Team: Suzan Rudd, Bob Rushlow, Patty Allen, Arto Brown, Fred Bucher, Betty Chang, Mike Hukowski, Robert Lane, Jamie Michael, Lori Overhoff

Facilitators: Patti Elkin, Shellie Hallstead, Donna Mutzenard, Janet Borchers, Marsha Bur, Neketa Carthan, Sara Kohlhauff

Recording Secretary: Linda Jo Sanders

Agenda

Check In
Minutes 5-19-09 approved with edit
Budget Update
FRS Alignment
Temporary Reassignment
Non-reappointment/Poor Performance
Job Classification
Calendar

Check In

Time Constraints: 11:30, 3:30, 4:30, 5:00
Missing: ~~Suzan~~, ~~Arto~~, ~~Charles~~, Sonny
Elephants

Expectations:

Get er done //
Make progress ### ### ### /
Move forward //

Budget Update

Aligning With FRS

From 5-19-09 session

Interests

- Clarity
- Affordability
- Fairness
- Manageability

Options

1. Status quo
2. Rewrite the language for clarity
3. Employees be able to collect their terminal pay if they leave after 6 years and are vested in FRS

SPALC asked for an estimated cost for Option 3 – issue tables until 5-29-09 session

Non-reappointment – Poor Performance

Story

- Concerns with evaluations forms – for example, an employee was concerned that he or she was being marked “I” in multiple categories for same problem indication of redundancy
- SPALC would like to have input into form development
- Sometimes employees are not getting copies at time of signing concern form may be changed
- Employees have seen where employee evaluation has been whited out after initial signing
- Evaluation is a different article but is lined to non-reappointment for poor performance
- Management has access to evaluations, but SPALC does not have access until 1 year later
- Rebuttal should be attached to original – what happens now that it is electronic
- Employee should be getting a copy of the evaluation – if not then management would like to know location
- Rebuttal is placed in file with evaluation

Non-reappointment – Poor Performance

Story cont'd

- Security documents is tightly controlled – only certain people have access
- “clean-up” of evaluations is expected to take time
- FS 1012.31 – Superintendent, School Board, principal or designee & personnel have access to evaluations – public needs to wait 1 year
- SPALC needs copies of evaluations people other than the person who has a grievance i.e. for comparisons – bit management always has access
- Article 7.084 why do we have to wait 10 days now that the process is electronic
- 10 days helpful for managers who may have 100 or more people to evaluate
- Possible that a system called e-performance will be implemented which could decrease turn around time
- Perception that evaluations should be for 12-month period but sometimes a recent action is weighted heavily
- Under FS 1012.31 the union isn't given any special treatment over public
- Management brought up topic originally looking to clean up language to make process efficient
- Existing concerns over evaluations may make it difficult to come to consensus regarding efficiency
- Article 7.11 employee with good evaluations who have clarity less than 2 years can be non-reappointed
- Concerns about who does the evaluation, i.e. paraprofessional form should not be signed by teacher
- 10 days: the problem is that employee should get a copy right when they are signing
- Article does not say “evaluation” anywhere despite that being the common language used in discussion
- Assessment does not provide enough opportunities to provide positive comments
- Some people are under the perception that the union does not grieve performance assessments, they do
- Professional opinion regarding performance is not subject to grievance, but documentation of that performance is
- Some supervisors will not let a refusal to sign go

Interests

- Respect
- Fairness
- Clarity
- Accountability
- Morale
- Retentions

Non-reappointment – Poor Performance

Options

1. 7.11 clarify that the district uses this language to make budgetary cuts - line 12, page 20 - addat the end of the employee’s contractual year “regardless of performance”.
2. 7.08 add language that the union would have input into assessment forms
3. In Article 7.09 - Employee would receive copies of any document, referred to in Article 7.08 and 7.10, within one (1) business day from when he or she signs it
4. In 7.08 language add the word “evaluation” (in brackets is okay)
5. Add language that supervisor must provide a rating in addition to an asterisk if an asterisk is given
6. Remove last sentence in 7.01
7. 7.094 employees will not sign document that are not completed

Straw Design A

1. 7.11 clarify that the district uses this language to make budgetary cuts - line 12, page 20 - addat the end of the employee’s contractual year “regardless of performance”.
2. 7.08 add language that the union would have input into assessment forms
3. In Article 7.09 - Employee would receive copies of any document, referred to in Article 7.08 and 7.10, within one (1) business day from when he or she signs i
4. In 7.08 language add the word “evaluation” (in brackets is okay)
6. Remove last sentence in 7.01

Temporary Reassignment

Story cont’d

- Data compensate at higher rate of pay 5 days....how much - \$57,000 – 32 custodians, 25 others – 2 non-SPALC

Temporary Reassignment

Options

1. Pay compensation for the higher position from day 1
2. Status quo
3. compensate after 5 or more days at the higher rate of pay
4. Line 43 – in such cases the (add administrators) designee shall be paid.....
5. Page 22 - Have language (re: head custodian, building supervisor,) when assumes (line 45-48)..... more than 10 days to align with the other positions (5 days)

6. 8.04 strike first and second sentence, strike in 3rd sentence “other than those specified in the preceding paragraph”, line 47 change “ten (10)” to “five (5)” and change “more than 10” to “5 or more”

Job Classification

Story

- No job classifications that were brought out except minor revisions to custodial
- Conversation with Superintendent re: Schedule “N” jobs not being put into SPALC bargaining unit – discussion and positions not taking place
- Discussion of unit placement of Schedule “N” positions to take place in Labor Management
- Process of determination for Schedule “N” positions is a practice that takes place

Options

1. Move issue to Labor Management for discussion

Work Year/Work Day moved to “Work Schedule Task Force”

Accrual Sick & Annual Leave while on Workers Compensation

Story cont'd from 4/23/09

- Documentation of communication about Workers Comp law previously – discontinued in mid 90's due to change in Law – accrual of sick leave while worker's comp
- EMI – workers comp-Third Party Administrator at the time

Interests

- Fairness
- Moral
- Affordability
- Manageability
- Clarity
- Honor Service

Options

1. Effective January 1, 2010 - Employees who have been absent from work due to “injury or illness in-the-line- of-duty” (ILD) (Workers Compensation)– upon their return, (for no less than 30 days), to full service, will be credited with sick ~~and vacation~~ leave accrual for the period they were absent exclusively for the Workers Compensation
2. Status quo

District Caucus Report – discussed options – came to agreement to support option

Sick Leave – Article 9.021

Story cont'd from 4/23/09

- LARS = employee absentee report
- Some administrators use this report for evaluations
- In PeopleSoft its called Absence Management Module
- Some principals use LARS when hiring for summer school

District Caucus Report – Tried to take a look at story and recall how this unfolded – looking back line 37 option offered – when items table – provide more detail – change in language has significant impact

Sick Leave

Story cont'd

- Practice not in compliance with law
- District not interested in being out of compliance

Legal interpretation of the law will be brought back at 5-29-09 session

Article 9.0108 Leave Applications

- Conflicting language exist in articles 9 & 10 – 5 days vs. 24 hours
- 24 hour notice for vacation leave seems difficult
- Except “emergency, vacation, sick, personal” language exist

Compensation

Story

- Last year employees received pay increase across the board but no step increase
- Money is tight this year
- Budget report received from district
- There is no formal recommendation from Board
- Budget based on no salary increase
- A lot of people outside district with no jobs salary provide feedback to Board/Superintendent
- Need to be cognizant of reoccurring costs
- Savings built on one time reductions
- What if we gain students instead of losing them
- Equates to revenue we can keep rather than send back
- Does not mean salary increases are available
- Any additional \$ set aside balances against jobs that need to be cut
- The unemployment in our area is higher than national average
- Districts struggling with having to impose salary reductions
- SPALC has taken its share of hits over the years
- Work still needs to be done – falls to those left with jobs
- If there is extra \$ will additional support staff be hired like teachers will be
- End of last year or beginning of this year – employees not spending
- If we go without raises this practice is not spending will continue and affect our economy
- If additional \$ allocated to schools then support staff may be hired as well

Compensation

Story cont'd

- Class Size amendment will bankrupt state – hard to get this message out – business community was lobbying employees of school district
- Schools are bare bones when it come to support staff
- Because of transportation & other factors out of control will have to provide additional support to maintain planning time for teachers
- Reference made to support staff in 16.3 million figure in budget
- FEA supports Class Size Amendment for smaller class size better for students
- Paraprofessionals will be moved to fee-based programs not kept in classroom during early dismissal
- Less people in Maintenance Dept. with 106 facilities then when there were 70+
- Class Size – the law is unreasonable and unmanageable
- Class load for middle school at 22-23 manageable-district has a good history of maintaining manageable class sizes without mandates – there is too much state control
- Budget \$ will allow flexibility which equals more support staff even though not delineated as line item in budget
- Class Size under attack for years not just in hard budget time – Class Size need to be reasonable - mandates not reasonable or affordable
- Above formula allocations often used for support staff
- Supply dollars needed for conversions to personnel dollars – cuts have affected school's abilities to do these conversions
- Student populations would not support budget – Principal maintained classified positions used fee-based program

Interests

- Morale
- Equity
- Affordability
- Manageability
- Fairness
- Safety
- Value Employees
- Compliance

Compensation

Options

1. Use a portion of unspent funds toward additional compensation at the end of the year –one time, non-reoccurring
2. No step increase or adjustment to salary schedule for FY10 (school year 2009-10)
3. If funds are \$27 million and above – additional compensation adjustment of 2% of base salary after 4th calculation prior to the end of school year 2009
 - \$10 - \$26.9 million will be 1% of base salary
 - Below \$10 million – no salary adjustment
4. If funds are beyond (\$35 million) expectations – parties would discuss forms of compensation adjustment at Labor Management
5. If teachers come in at a higher percentage SPALC wants ~~language added~~ assurance that employees will get matching percentages
6. Stipends, awards and supplements would stay the same or continue unless negotiated otherwise
7. Status of funds, if available, will be reported periodically through Labor Management

SPALC Caucus Report – wanted to discuss compensation – options & to poll team – we have a few more options

District – No official caucus – implementation issues regarding options

District Caucus Report – District looking at additional options-concerned with option #4

Straw Design A

1. Use a portion of unspent funds toward additional compensation at the end of the year –one time, non-reoccurring
2. No step increase or adjustment to salary schedule for FY10 (school year 2009-10)
3. If funds are \$27 million and above – additional compensation adjustment of 2% of base salary after 4th calculation prior to the end of school year 2009
 - \$10 - \$26.9 million will be 1% of base salary
 - Below \$10 million – no salary adjustment
5. If teachers come in at a higher percentage SPALC wants ~~language added~~ assurance that employees will get matching percentages
6. Stipends, awards and supplements would stay the same or continue unless negotiated otherwise
7. Status of funds, if available, will be reported periodically through Labor Management – Reference Article 18

Check Out