

NEGOTIATION MINUTES

June 13, 2017

BOARD/DISTRICT PRESENT: Amy White, Eric Abrego, Ralph Binion, Albert Longhurst, Will Goodman, Cliff Ogborn

MHEA PRESENT: Topher Wallaert, Rosemary Ash, Luke Franklin

OTHERS PRESENT: Rhonda Urquidi, Jennifer Devore, Jan Hughes, Marilyn Kellerman, Jim Main

MINUTES: Sharon Whitman

NEGOTIATIONS STARTED: 3:35 p.m.

These negotiation minutes are a synopsis of the conversations of the negotiation meeting. The negotiation meeting was recorded and a copy can be obtained from the Clerk of School Board of Trustees (Sharon Whitman). A copy of the audio is posted on the school district website under Departments, School Board, Master Agreement & Negotiations, within a reasonable amount of time after the negotiation meeting.

When referencing the Board and/or the District Administration Office, the term “Board” or “District” will be used. When referencing the Mountain Home Education Association, the term “MHEA” or “Association” will be used.

Where the term “master agreement” is used, the true name of the document is Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and may be used in place of it.

For additional information, please contact either the MHEA (Topher Wallaert) or the District Administration Office (Albert Longhurst).

1. Agenda

- No written agenda was presented.

2. Review Negotiation Minutes of May 22, 2017

- Both parties approved the minutes.

3. Discussion

- Amy – we had two issues left from the last meeting, the MHEA Prop 1- New Language – Article 1 – Agreements; Para 1.5.1 – Working Calendar Days Defined (Non-Student Contact Days), and Board Prop 1 – Article 2 – Compensation; Para 2,1,1 Salary Schedule, Exhibit A and Exhibit B, which you wanted to analyze. Which would you like to start?
- Topher – we [MHEA] would like to start with MHEA Prop 1- New Language – Article 1 – Agreements; Para 1.5.1 – Working Calendar Days Defined (Non-Student Contact Days).
 - ~ Amy – we [District] did some homework. We ask around the different schools to ascertain at what level this was a concern or a problem. The feedback was that one school thought it was a concern, but not a complaint.
 - ~ Topher – Whom did you ask?
 - ~ Amy – administration.

- ~ Topher – so you [District] didn't ask the teachers.
- ~ Amy – you [teachers] were already gone [for the school year]. We also discussed the inconsistency regarding turning in [classroom] keys at the end of the year, and yes, there is a difference depending upon the building.
 - * Amy - Three buildings collect the keys, five buildings don't, so there is an inconsistency regarding the collection of keys and I'm sure the administrators will discuss this.
 - * Amy – Albert was tasked with determining exactly what needed to be done in the classrooms at the end of the school year.
 - Custodians need everything picked up off the floors so they clean the floors or carpets, teachers need to cover their computers, they need to clean off the whiteboards, and if teachers want their desks cleaned, they need to remove their items off the desk.
 - * Topher – that's great from a custodial standpoint, but we're [MHEA] talking a professional standpoint, which is completely different.
 - * Amy – what do you [teachers] think needs to be moved [out of the classrooms], especially if the building is locked?
 - * Topher – we [teachers] have materials that need to be put away, we need to put all the textbooks back and in place, we need to make sure all of our data and files are up-to-date, so the teacher workday is us literally working to finish and sign off.
 - * Rosemary – there are also permanent record cards, cumulative files, anything that needs to go with the student to the next grade.
 - * Amy – at this point in time it is the position of the Board to officially and respectfully reject MHEA Prop 1- New Language – Article 1 – Agreements; Para 1.5.1 – Working Calendar Days Defined (Non-Student Contact Days), and we do not have a counter and will not bring a counter.
 - * Amy – the Board and administration will continue to discuss this matter.
 - Amy – Part of the discussion is that teachers requested more Professional Development and the Board/District provided it, but teachers were not attending the Professional Development during the school year; we [Board/District] have to get it in before the school year starts, so we had to address the needs that directly impact the students.
 - Amy – not to mention that we [Negotiations Committee] already agreed and signed off on Article 1 – Agreements.
- Topher – requested a caucus. (3:38 p.m. until 4:14 p.m.)
- Topher – requested to be on record as stating that with you [Board] coming back with the proposal that we [MHEA] gave to you, it's frustrating as an employee, as a teacher, as a certified educator whose administration every year stands up and says we [Board/District] support you, we want to be here for you, we want to take care of you, we want to do stuff for you, and we [MHEA] ask for simple language and it's nothing. They [District] don't ask us [teachers] about anything. They [District] asked administration, they asked the custodians, but they didn't ask us [teachers], and it was a simple request of clarifying workdays as teachers as being workdays. That's frustrating as a certified teacher when administration says one thing and then all of a sudden turns around and does this. I just needed to get that on record.
 - ~ Amy – I understand, but I will point out a few things. The calendar doesn't just say workday, it is designated as both a workday and Professional Development (PD) day.
 - ~ Topher – it says workday.
 - ~ Amy – it's colored coded as both, but I do understand your point. The 2017-18 calendar has already been adopted, and PD has already been set up to finish the math.

- ~ Topher – that is the thing, the calendar that has been adopted doesn't have those days designated as PD, they have them as workdays, but it's not worded for us [teachers] as time in class.
- ~ Amy – and as I said, this is something the Board and Administration will discuss during the year. The Math Curriculum Training must occur.
- ~ Amy – when you [MHEA] brought this up, teachers were already gone, and I wasn't going to send a survey if they were already gone, so you'll have to address it in the 2018-2019 [negotiations] discussion.
- ~ Topher – I was hoping to amend the 2017-2018 language.
- ~ Amy – the calendar has already been adopted and the second part of the Math Curriculum has already been scheduled.
- ~ Luke – I see where it's listed as both [in wording and color coding], so is this more of a philosophy that the administrators have it more at their discretion to use it as a PD day or as workday, you [Board] didn't want to dictate to the principals [how to use the days].
- ~ Albert – explained that PD is going to vary from year to year depending on whether it's elementary or secondary. Right now, there is more elementary PD than secondary and we have to factor what buildings want to focus on, what is pertinent to their building. It's hard to say one size fits all across the district, so we [District] focus on the PD that is more specific to our needs, that's why those days were PD days.
- ~ Luke – is it because you adopted new curriculum at the elementary, so there was a bigger need?
- ~ Albert – yes, and we're working with BSU with the math specifically. There is nothing out there right now that is going to get us Common Core, whereas the Math Module at BSU is much more aligned, so that is the struggle [finding the time for BSU staff to come and train].
- ~ Topher – for future consideration, each school has a collaboration day, is there any way that collaboration be PD during the week, during school. We have 7:30-8:00 every Wednesday, so could we use that time as PD to focus in these areas.
- ~ Albert – it depends on the type of PD you're looking at, so if you have to have someone come in to provide PD, such as BSU or SDE, the differences in the times of collaborations, start of school, etc., we have to work with the PD providers' schedules and the building's schedules, etc.
- ~ Amy – this is something that needs to be discussed before the 2018-2019 calendar is adopted.

4. Proposals

A. MHEA Counter Prop to Board Prop 1 – Article 2 – Compensation; Para 2.1.1 – Salary Schedule

- ~ Topher – stated that the increase that the Board presented was:
 - * Increase the beginning salaries of BA Row 1 and BA Row 2; all other BA rows are identical to the 2016-2017 Salary Schedule.
 - * Increase the beginning salaries of BA+24 Row 1 and BA+24 Row 2, all other BA+24 rows are identical to the 2016-2017 Salary Schedule.
- ~ Topher – the problem is there is absolutely nothing for those at the bottom [cells]. With this proposal, we [MHEA] request a 3.6% increase on the base, which moves through all steps and lanes, and your [Board] differential cost is less than \$1 million from what you originally had. It's a 13% differential, so you're [Board] still getting the money for the General Fund, but also includes money for the teachers, not only making those steps, but at the base.

- ~ Amy – clarified you [MHEA] added 3.6% to all cells, you have placed people off of the scattergram provided to you at last session, and that you have include the cost as being \$10,310,168, with the Differential being 13%.
- ~ Luke – that is the amount that they [state] take out of Entitlement. That’s the percentage.
- ~ Amy – out of discretionary?
- ~ Luke – yes, currently you have 16% out of discretionary and this [prop] would cut it to 13%.
- ~ Topher – it’s the difference in cost between what you [Board] proposed and what we [MHEA] are proposing back.
- ~ Amy – that leaves us [Board] a Fund Balance of \$20,000.
- ~ Eric – We’re budgeted at \$54,200
- ~ Discussion continued regarding the MHEA proposed salary schedule.
- ~ Amy – requested a caucus from 4:26 p.m. until 5:15 p.m.
- ~ Amy – informed everyone that contracts would be issued no matter if negotiations were ratified. [Idaho Code states that contracts need to be issued before 1 July.]
- ~ Amy – had the MHEA salary proposal costed out with benefits.
 - * \$416,892, which leaves about a \$3,000 fund balance without any consideration of compensation changes to classified employees and administrators. As you know, you [MHEA] cannot negotiate for classified or administrators, but from the Board’s perspective when looking at the whole of the budget, that is something that they look at.
 - * If the Board follows the tradition of compensation, we [Board] are back in the red [using MHEA salary proposal], which defeats the purpose of the Board trying to get a Fund Balance.
- ~ Amy – in the 1st session [negotiation], I understand that Topher attended the budget workshop. We discussed the importance of having a Fund Balance for not only the District, but for teachers as well.
- ~ Amy – explained the Board’s perspective of a Fund Balance and their 5-year plan.
 - * To have a \$1.9 million Fund Balance in 5-years.
 - * The \$1.9 million covers 1-months bills, so the District could stop taking out short-term Anticipation Loans, which have fees and interest attached.
- ~ Amy – asked Topher from the Association’s perspective, what do you believe to be an appropriate Fund Balance, given that monthly bills are \$1.9 million, given the proposed raises leaves us [Board] with \$3,000, what is your perspective.
- ~ Topher – We believe that the District and the MHEA need to work together as a team.
- ~ Topher – personally, the Fund Balance is important and is needed, but on the other hand, it’s the employees that create the District, so they aren’t the ones who should take the heat or suffer because the Fund Balance hasn’t been taken care of appropriately. I believe we need to collectively work to gather the Fund Balance without telling teachers that we [Board] aren’t going to show our appreciation for you and we are going to put it [money] in the Fund Balance.
- ~ Topher – You have to look at the teachers and they work their butts off every year, they put up with a lot, they deal with a lot of stress, and they have more mandates and more polices that are put on them every year. To tell teachers that we are going to keep you, but that we aren’t going to give your raises; that Steps is an increase, but not on the base.
- ~ Discussion continued regarding Steps not being a raise, that the majority of the teachers wouldn’t move, veteran teachers being stuck, etc.

- ~ Amy – this leads back to the discussion about the Longevity Stipend. I was expecting that discussion instead of putting us [Board] back in the red.
- ~ Discussion about the reliance on Impact Aid, how the government slashing Impact Aid has caused a zero to a low Fund Balance, how historically salaries were partially paid using Impact Aide, which is not smart, how the government has cut your [MHSD] Impact Aid from \$4.3 million down to \$897,000, etc.
- ~ Amy – given how the salary schedule is built, and given that the Board pays [salaries] so much more over than what the salary apportionment given to the District is, clearly that is what we [District] have been relying on for ongoing salary costs. From your [Topher] personal perspective, where do you think the Fund Balance should be.
- ~ Luke – that is a very hard question to answer and I don't think it's very fair at this point.
- ~ Amy – it's the same question that the Board has to address in ascertaining how much they can afford to spend on salaries. They've had to sit and analyze this question because they are responsible for the wellbeing of the entire school district, not just your [teachers] paychecks, but also in the educational programs of the children.
- ~ Luke – we [MHEA] recognize that, and we are not arguing that point, but to have us [MHEA] come up with a number that the Fund Balance should be isn't fair.
- ~ Amy – Right now, you [MHEA] are saying the Fund Balance should be zero given your [salary] proposal.
- ~ Luke – given your [Board] first proposal versus our counter proposal, I'm wondering how much total that we have in apportionment in discretionary money in Mountain Home. The amount that I have is nowhere near bankrupting or the \$3,000. I'm showing there is \$4 million dollars to play with.
- ~ Amy – \$4 million in where?
- ~ Luke – the total fund between Discretionary and Entitlement Funds and Salary Based Apportionment. That's one of my frustrations is that I'm looking at Entitlement Funds so there is about \$4,992,851.60, based on the Support Units that we have. I've taken that number and then another \$9 million in Salary Based Apportionment, and Pupil Services, Instructional Staff, so added is about \$14 million, we [MHEA] come up with a proposal that is \$10 million, and we are being told that there is about \$3,000 left. That doesn't add up.
- ~ Amy – you [Luke] said the Salary Based Apportionment is \$9 million. The proposal you [MHEA] gave was over \$10 million, so you are already spending \$1 million more of the Discretionary Fund, let alone [having to pay] the transportation bills, the gas bills, all of the bills. When we [Board] crunch the raises from your [MHEA] proposal they range per teacher between 6% and 9 %, and you're saying the District's proposal was effectively meaningless, because we didn't increase the base, when those [Board salary schedule] raises were between 2% to 7%, so it's not like people weren't getting any raises.
- ~ Amy – some of last year's raises for teachers were up to 21% [increase], so the change to the Career Ladder cost every district a heck of lot more money, it threw off everyone's budget.
- ~ Luke – I understand the situation of Mountain Home, but I want you to know that we are going to put that [MHEA salary proposal] and you put yours [Board's salary proposal] out there and maybe we'll land somewhere in between.
- ~ Luke – going back to the Longevity Stipend, [this] might be considered, but I want to see the thought process on the money side of things, because leaving \$3 million for the [paying bills] lights, bills, classified and admin seems to be reasonable.
- ~ Discussion continued regarding each parties proposal, the perceived differences in the costs, the Salary Based Apportionment, etc.

Advance a step with no new hires or retirees plus 3.6%

| | BA | BA +24 | MA | BA | BA +24 | MA | |
|--------|------------|----------|----------|-------------|-------------|--------------|----------------|
| Row 1 | \$34,602 | \$35,224 | \$37,296 | | | | |
| Row 2 | \$35,897 | \$36,778 | \$39,368 | \$466,666 | | \$39,368 | |
| Row 3 | \$37,192 | \$38,332 | \$41,440 | \$1,227,349 | \$38,332 | | |
| Row 4 | \$38,487 | \$39,886 | \$43,512 | \$38,487 | \$79,772 | \$261,072 | |
| Row 5 | \$39,782 | \$41,440 | \$45,584 | \$198,912 | | \$182,336 | |
| Row 6 | \$41,077 | \$42,994 | \$47,656 | | | \$238,280 | |
| Row 7 | \$42,372 | \$44,548 | \$49,728 | | | \$198,912 | |
| Row 8 | \$43,667 | \$46,102 | \$51,075 | | | \$51,075 | |
| | BA + 12 | | | | | | |
| Row 9 | \$44,548 | \$47,604 | \$52,422 | \$178,192 | \$95,208 | \$104,843 | |
| Row 10 | \$45,429 | \$49,106 | \$53,768 | | | \$322,610 | |
| Row 11 | \$46,309 | \$50,609 | \$55,115 | | \$50,609 | \$110,230 | |
| Row 12 | \$47,190 | \$52,111 | \$56,462 | | | | |
| Row 13 | \$48,070 | \$53,302 | \$57,809 | | | | |
| Row 14 | \$48,951 | \$54,494 | \$59,156 | | | \$59,156 | |
| Row 15 | \$49,832 | \$55,685 | \$60,502 | \$49,832 | \$55,685 | \$786,531 | |
| Row 16 | \$50,712 | \$56,876 | \$61,849 | \$101,424 | \$1,478,786 | \$3,896,500 | |
| | Total Cost | | | | | \$10,310,168 | Differential % |
| | | | | | | | 13% |

- ~ Ralph – asked if the MHEA’s 3.6% increase they wanted meant that everyone with a [for example] BA at 3 stays a BA at 3.
- ~ Luke – no.
- ~ Ralph – so the 3.6% in reality is more along the lines \$1,200 plus 3.6%, which becomes not only a 9%, but also potentially a 12% increase when people move [down and over cells].
- ~ Luke – I didn’t work out that percentage.
- ~ Ralph – That’s where the financial problems come in because you [teachers] have the \$1,500 by moving down one lane.
- ~ Ralph – With the 2% to 7% increase, everybody is going to move except the bottom 38 people. Everyone is getting at least between a 2% and up to a 7% raise just by moving one year to the next, but when you add this [MHEA salary proposal] in on top of that, it now becomes from a 3% to potentially a 6% to an 8%; that’s where it eats up our [Boards] Fund Balance.

- ~ Eric – is your [MHEA] bigger concern the bottom three cells, but you [Topher] said it was on a more personal observation.
- ~ Topher – yes, for me. I believe in taking care of teachers. I know that I will see an increase because I'm going to continue to go down [cells].
- ~ Topher – asked to get to \$1.9 million in 5-years, what is it going to take?
- ~ Cliff - \$420,000 per year will give us [Board] near a \$2 million Fund Balance. We are using the FY 2016 expenses to drive the \$1.9 million. As we go down the road [future], our expenses will be higher
- ~ Topher – What other areas have you considered using to add to the Fund Balance besides salary?
- ~ Cliff – we put all the expenses together based upon the salary; we look at contractual expenses, supply [expenses], capital, all of that goes into the whole. We then look at the revenue stream, where the revenue comes from, and how much of the revenue are we [Board] going to anticipate using, to come down to the Fund Balance.
- ~ Amy – some areas [revenues] are mandated for use in and for specific expenses.
- ~ Topher – we agree that negotiations are about us [MHEA] bringing something your [Board] way and you bringing something our way; we negotiate it. What would it look like if instead of putting 3.6% throughout all the cells, how do you [Board] take care of the bottom three cells, knowing that everyone is going to get an increase except for those teachers in the bottom three cells. What would it take to get them some sort of apportionment, some kind of something for them?
- ~ Eric – clarified that the bottom two cells on the left [Board salary proposal] have the option to move if they chose to [receive a BA+24 or Masters]. The teachers guaranteed not to move are the bottom two cells on the Masters.
- ~ Luke – for us, it's not about us caring about one group of teachers over another, it's the balancing act of trying to get something in everyone's pocket, so that's why the fairest way to do that is a percentage for everyone.
- ~ Luke – we haven't discussed freezing cells and then give everyone a 3.6% because that would be the fairest. This is not an offer, but as negotiations go on in the future, we need to discuss options.
- ~ Amy – and next year, when the state starts freezing reimbursements based upon evaluations, it's going to create an accounting mess.
- ~ Topher – how much money from your [Board] proposal goes into the Fund Balance?
- ~ Cliff/Amy - \$420,000.
- ~ Ralph – and that's provided that everything stays where it's at budget wise.
- ~ Amy – yes, because people move with credits and it's hard to know what those numbers might be.
- ~ Luke – the state pays for those moves, BA to Masters.
- ~ Amy – but we [District] already overpay from the state [reimbursement]. We already overpay the salaries [than what the state reimburses the District] and that means the differential will just get larger.
- ~ Luke – yes, just by looking at the \$34,600, to \$37,000, is not what the state is reimbursing the District.
- ~ Amy – think about it; talk about it as you said you were going to. You [Topher] understand the need, but that doesn't mean the entire education association understands. In the long run, have something in place as a safety net.
- ~ Topher – that's what I'm thinking about, something in the long run. In your [Board] proposal, you came out swinging for the fences, \$420,000, my thoughts are, and can you tailor that back this first year and then keep working at it as a team. I understand

the \$420,000, in five years gets you to that \$1.9 million mark, but that's a huge swing the first time.

- ~ Amy – I would agree with you that it's a huge swing if there weren't any increases, but given that there are built-in Steps & Lanes except for the 38 at the end, I don't think it's a huge swing.
- ~ Amy – realistically \$1.9 million is not going to cover the bills [one month's expenses], and the way increases are going, it's going to be more like \$2.3 million to \$2.4 million.
- ~ Ralph – another thing to consider Topher is how long are the city and patrons going to support the \$2.7 million Supplemental Levy. In reality, we need to make that up plus the \$1.9 million, so if the levy fails, that's 13% of our budget in one year.
- ~ Amy – I'm [Board] going to officially reject your proposal.

B. Board Re-proposal of Board Prop 1 – Article 2 – Compensation, including all of the language, the Para 2.1.1 – Salary Schedule, the Para 2.1.2 – Extracurricular Salary Schedule, and the addition of a Longevity Stipend (Para 2.1.b – Longevity Stipend).

- ~ Amy – presented the re-proposal of Board Prop 1 – Article 2 – Compensation including all of the language, the articles, the salary schedule, the extracurricular salary schedule, and the longevity stipend for review.
- ~ Luke – so you're [Board] re-proposing the same [proposal Article 2 – Compensation] with no increases, but with a stipend [longevity].
- ~ Amy – explained that the 23-years was comparable with the 23-years in the non-certificated salary schedule, they get a bump in salary at 23-years, to keep it consistent. They [non-certificated] do not have the 28-year increase.
- ~ Topher – when it states that the stipend would be paid in twelve (12) monthly payments, does that mean \$500 per month.
- ~ Amy – no.
- ~ Rosemary – so this is just a stipend and not to the base, because the base is what is figured into retirement.
- ~ Amy – just a stipend.
- ~ Amy – this gives you [MHEA] something to think about.
- ~ Topher – at the next meeting.

Longevity Stipend:

For the 2017-2018 school year, a Longevity Stipend will be provided to Certificated Professional Teachers according to the following criteria:

1. The Certificated Professional Teacher must have a classroom teaching assignment. Partial assignments shall be addressed in a pro-rata basis.
2. The Certificated Professional Teacher must be frozen at Row 16, Masters Column for at least one year prior to the Longevity Stipend applying. This Longevity Stipend does not apply to any other Certificated Professional Teachers of the Districts.
3. The Certificated Professional Teacher's years of service to the District must be continuous.

| | |
|---|------------|
| CPE with 23 years of service to District. | \$500.00 |
| CPE with 28 years of service to District. | \$1,000.00 |

- This Longevity Stipend is a one-time Stipend and is not intended nor shall such become part of the base salary or base Contract of the Certificated Professional Teacher.
- This stipend shall be paid in twelve (12) monthly payments and will be included in the Certificated Professional Teacher's regular monthly payroll check.
- The stipend amount is not cumulative but is a singular grant based on the above chart (i.e. A CPE with 29 years of experience does not get a total of \$1,500.00 [\$500.00 and \$1,000 for each cell] but gets a singular \$1,000).

5. Set Next Meeting Date, Time, & Agenda

- June 29, 2017, at 3:30 p.m., at MHJH

6. Adjourn: 5:53 p.m.