

NEGOTIATION MINUTES
May 19, 2014

DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION PRESENT: James Gilbert, Cliff Ogborn, Rick Checketts

MHEA PRESENT: Robynn Schipani, Rosemary Ash, Karen Kohring, Terri Sanders, Rita Olson, Rhonda Urquidi, Rich Urquidi

MINUTES: Sharon Whitman

OTHERS PRESENT: Harry McCarty (IEA Representative), Jim Main, Marilyn Kellerman, Brandie Garlitz, Stephanie Hiler, Jan Hughes, Lynn Knudson, Judith Case, Victoria Armstrong, Mollie Marsh, Denise Weis, Rebecca Lyons, Connie Day, Albert Longhurst

NEGOTIATIONS STARTED: 4:30 p.m.

These negotiation minutes are a transcript of the conversations of the negotiation meeting. The intent, meaning, and direction of the conversations are transcribed below; not every word spoken has been transcribed. The negotiation meeting was recorded by both the District Administration Office (Administration) and the Mountain Home Education Association (MHEA). For a copy of the audio, please contact either the MHEA (Rosemary Ash) or the District Office (Sharon Whitman).

Where the term “master contract” and “Master Agreement” are used, the true name of the document is Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).

1. James thanked everyone for taking a Monday and attending negotiations.
2. Rosemary – I would like to start by saying that we’re [MHEA] hoping to move forward with respect to all of our members, and keeping questions and thoughts relevant and pertinent to building positive relationships and healthy working environment.
3. Rosemary – we [MHEA] would like to have an open dialog about committees, not necessarily a proposal, but a presentation of committees, a list of committees, and the names of the people on them, and is there more we [MHEA] can do to help the district?
 - James – okay, so what committees...
 - ~ Rich – ...we’re thinking ...like insurance, policy, leadership money...I think that went to the building...PLC, professional development planning, those are just some ideas that we had. If you have any other ideas or committees that we can look at...
 - ~ Rhonda – ...we want to help and we want to be involved.
 - ~ James – the insurance committee is almost all Association members, there’s Cliff and I...and a few other folks...that’s a big one [committee].
 - James – I think it’s important that any of those [committees], whether on a committee or not, you still have the ability to contribute, because if a committee is going to present something to the Board, [if] they’re going to help guide a policy, the Board wants the input from the people involved, which is no different than what we think.
 - James – Rosemary, are you asking for a listing of all the committees?
 - ~ Rosemary – yes, if we could have a list of all of the committees, [some] clarity on what those committees are [about], and the representation on the committee.
 - ~ James – okay.

- ~ Rosemary – you already talked about the insurance [committee].
- ~ James – yes, and I'm going to say that this is a discussion to have with...outside of the scope of negotiations...with Denise and members from the MHEA. She [Denise] comes in monthly and meets with Tim and me...we can go through all of that.

- *Silence*
- Rosemary – does anyone else have questions on committees?
- Rhonda – that sounds like a good idea...especially groups working together...it has representation in those places...that's important.
- Rosemary: sharing the load.

4. Minutes of May 13, 2014

- Rosemary – does anyone have corrections to the minutes?
 - ~ Terri – yes, there was one correction...I think I saw...if I can find it...
 - ~ Rita – Courtney's last name is Lewis.
- Rhonda – would you like a signup list?
 - ~ Sharon – it would help since I don't know all the names...whatever you decide on how to get it [get names of attendees] is fine by me.
- Terri – Sharon, the correction I wanted to make was regarding the survey...something like 63% of membership was recorded, but it should say 63% of membership surveyed.
 - ~ Sharon - ...61.5% of the membership surveyed.
 - ~ Terri – thank you.
 - ~ Rita – ... [you can find the statement] on page 7, halfway down.
 - ~ Rosemary – would you state the correction again?
 - ~ Rich – of membership surveyed.
- Rosemary – any other corrections?
- Rosemary – I guess the minutes are approved with corrections.

5. Rosemary – we have another proposal for you tonight.

- Rosemary – it's on the salary schedule. We [MHEA] propose the last column in the Mountain Home Pay Schedule be amended to reflect, "...PhD or MA+36 credits." It would be the addition of MA+36 credits.
- *Silence*
- Rosemary – ... we feel this proposal would better reflect the state's pay scale for reimbursements.
- James – Rosemary, do you know if that has any implication as far as funding...additional or changing the funding from the state?
 - ~ Rosemary – the changing of the funding from the state to the district?
 - ~ James – so if a person from the state has the...understand the reimbursement from the state, or what you here [MHEA] refer to as the "state salary schedule," is not an actual salary schedule, but the reimbursement mechanism; do you know if by changing that [lanes] on there [salary schedule] has any negative impact to the District financially?
 - ~ Rosemary – I'm sure it would move some people over [lanes] that would not otherwise move. Cliff, do you have a number of the amount of people it would affect?
 - ~ Cliff – I wouldn't even venture to guess, but ...
 - ~ Rhonda – ...I don't think it would affect the reimbursement from the state.
 - ~ Rosemary –no, it wouldn't affect the reimbursement from the state. I would think the District is reimbursed on the...
 - ~ Rich – ...the one person we would have right now would sit...they would still be...I don't think it would change that persons...
 - ~ Rhonda – ...it would be more in line with the schedule.
 - ~ Rich – at least that last line would be in line [salary schedule].

- James – okay, this is the philosophical debate; do you [MHEA] consider a MA+36 similar in education to that of a PhD?
 - ~ Rich – the state must.
 - ~ James – that’s just a reimbursement number...
 - ~ Rich – ...so why would the state do that then, if they didn’t feel that it was something...
- James – I think the thing I’m getting [from the MHEA] is that if you look at...if an employee comes in and they’re looking at the salary schedule, the PhD level is an incentive to someone to get...if that’s what they want to do then they can work towards that, obviously every salary scheduled is going to bottom-out at some point with that.
 - ~ James – what the implication is that I would look at is, is it equitable to someone...and granted we don’t have many people in that column, but to change that to a MA+36...
 - ~ Rich – I would think it would give some incentives for teachers to look at getting some more administrative type classes, and now you [District] have a bigger pool to be able to move over into administrative things, which is positive for you...if someone is gung-ho early in their career...wants to get...that they are going to be there, but I think if someone has put in...they already hit their Masters...what’s our...10, I think...if they hit that pretty early, this would give them incentive to be able to further their education and still be able to be compensated.
 - ~ Rhonda – think in 18...20 years, when you’re recertifying, if you’re just going on the recertification schedule, you’d end up with 18 more credits, so 36 [credits] is really an effort above and beyond what a regular recertification is.
- James – my concern with that is ...with this tiered licensure that’s coming from the state too, you start changing the salary schedule now, and I have a feeling we are all going to be changing salary schedules pretty drastically in the future with what’s coming in. We already reimburse more cells than what the state reimburses us for, we reimburse sooner within each of those steps, so there is an increased cost for the District to do this. You’re talking about a substantial number of people that move now from the one corner to an additional step in the corner...that’s my number one concern with this, is the additional cost.
 - ~ Rich – that’s our concern also, but I think you’re getting those people that are moving there...they’re getting that education, that experience to be able to do that...I mean it’s just making your employees that much...
 - ~ James – ...at no additional reimbursement from the state is what the issue is going to be with it...
 - ~ Rich – ...even if they move over your still going to...
 - ~ James – ...it depends. I don’t have a copy of the salary reimbursement, but ours [District’s]...again we’re trying to compare apples and oranges with the salary schedule and the reimbursement schedule. Our [MHSD] cells move quicker in steps than what state reimburses, and they move at a higher percentage than what the state reimburses...you know we have a 4.1% movement from cell to cell whereas the state has a 2.2%...
 - ~ Cliff – ...3.75%.
 - ~ James – 3.75% is ours...
 - ~ Cliff – no, ours is 4.3% and 4.25%.
- James – as we move... as our employees move, again, that is an additional cost that the state doesn’t reimburse us for...again it is apples and oranges with those schedules.
 - ~ Rhonda – yeah, and we’re really looking at those people who are furthering their education and the value in that...the value in the people working here...and a reminder to that the tiered work that the state is looking at, if we’re planning into the future, if that is the reimbursement schedule, it’s not one we have to adopt...we can keep our schedule and the reimbursement will fit into that.
 - ~ James – that’s assuming they keep the same reimbursement, instead...
 - ~ Rhonda – ...it’s all we can do.
- James – so with the additional cost, do you [MHEA] have a dollar amount that’s tied to your proposal?

- ~ Rich – we’re [MHEA] not sure how many that would be...I mean just...the only thing I have are the contracts and I’d have to dig through all of those because I don’t have a scattergram...where everyone is placed on the different salary schedule and our schedule...so I’d have to get that.
 - ~ Rhonda – Cliff you don’t have...kind of know where everyone is in the building...or district level [lanes]?
 - ~ Cliff – no, not for this kind of proposal. I don’t know how many people are at Masters, or 48, or 52 [credits].
 - ~ Rich – ...but it says on their contract though... right?
 - ~ Cliff – it has these segments on there...the steps...which lane you [teachers] fall in, but there may be more credits beyond that.
 - ~ Rich – so you [Cliff] just have to ask...it would be a question that we [certified] are asked every year...are you [teacher] planning on moving on the educational scale...we would just need to see where we would be...correct?
 - ~ Cliff – yes.
 - Rich – but now when you [Cliff] turn in something to the state...so you [Cliff] have something where everyone sits [Steps & Lanes]...you turn something into the state...where everyone sits...so you [Cliff] know what you’re [District] going to get reimbursed...correct?
 - ~ Cliff – we turn in what their [certified] Maximum Allowable Certification is and how many credits they [certified] have.
 - ~ Rich – so you [Cliff] have that in a document?
 - ~ Cliff – we [District] have it in the ISEE program, but sometimes it’s more financially beneficial for us to report a BA with 67 credits than a Masters with no credits...so there’s going to be a lot more analysis to see where these people [certified] would fall because there may be quite a few people that stand in that Lane 6 (frozen corner) that could move over into Lane 7.
 - ~ Rich – my calculations is there are about 25 people that sit in there [Lane 6 and Lane 7] with all the data that I could find and I’m sure not all of them would move either...so, okay.
 - *Silence*
 - James – I’m **not** going to respond to this proposal at this time. We [District] will look to see what the financial implication with it [MHEA proposal] is. If there’s a significant...any financial implication to the District, or this isn’t covered simply by movement, then it’s going to be an issue to implement.
 - *Silence*
6. Rosemary – we [MHEA] just have a clarification on the two days that you gave us in proposal, are those in addition to the revised April 15 calendar?
- James – That I can’t speak to...I don’t think so. I don’t think those days are in that **revised** calendar at this point...I think it’s a 185-day calendar.
 - Rhonda – do we have a calendar so that we can double check that?
 - ~ *Rich had a copy of the calendar (Revised: April 15, 2014)*
 - ~ Rich – which of the two days that the Board put on to this then...
 - ~ James – ...they haven’t added them in yet for the 187 days, correct Sharon?
 - ~ Sharon – correct. That revision was to switch spring break.
 - ~ Rich – was to switch spring break?
 - ~ Sharon – right, moved spring break a week earlier than what was originally scheduled, but no, the two days that he [James] was proposing are not in that [calendar].
 - *Silence*
 - Karen – if I bring this calendar over, can we count up the days?
 - ~ *Karen and Sharon reviewed the calendar and counted days...it was suggested that it would be easier for Karen go by the District Office to look at Sharon’s worksheet that she uses to calculate the calendar. All agreed.*

~ *NOTE: PLC days count as student contact days, but only if they occur after the first day of school and before the last day of school.*

* *There are 180 student contact days (89 days the first semester; 91 the second semester) including four (4) PLC days that occur after the start of school; in addition to the 180 student contact days, there are three (3) paid holidays for staff (Thanksgiving, Christmas Day, and New Year's Day), one (1) PLC day before school starts (August 12), and one (1) teacher workday (August 11), equaling a total of 185 contract days.*

7. Rhonda – a concern from our [MHEA] colleagues is that the schedule has changed in a couple of places, and I understand the background of that and it's wise because we have days a lot of kids gone at certain times such as ski days at the base. I noticed that the October workshop days are now student contact days, which we've had in the past, and there's a large concern from our group [MHEA] that it's really hard to attend state conferences, which is sometimes the only time where they [teachers] can get together with colleagues that are teaching the same things that they are teaching and have those meaningful discussions. Is there a plan to have compensation, so that they can apply building money or a way for people to attend those [state workshops] ...and not everyone in the district attends those...but there were people who presented [at workshop] or developed professionally as part of the state workshops, so is there an avenue that might be approached?

- James – this goes back to the approach of how are you [MHEA] going to pay for that...I know I've been harping on that for three sessions, but you know these are things like I've said ...if you want to give up some things financially, those are some things you can get back.

- ~ Rich – but wasn't there state professional development money this year that went to everyone, but not everyone used it?

- ~ James – and that state professional development money that is coming back this year is what is used to fund a portion of the two days that we [District] are proposing to put back into the contracts.

- ~ Rich – so it's not going to take care of all of those days?

- ~ James – it covers...I think \$87,000 of it for two days.

- Rhonda – so how much is it per day for us to have it?

- ~ Cliff – about \$57,000.

- ~ Rich – so doesn't some of that get made up with just not having all of our FTEs covered from the state that were getting...isn't that correct...that we're getting paid more than we have?

- ~ Cliff – no, we...

- ~ Rich – ...doesn't that mean we have...

- ~ James – as far as the professional development money specifically...

- Rich – ...obviously you've [directed towards Cliff] taken some money from some other places to finish paying off some of those, so my question is on some of that professional type of days...to set up a fund for that...[hypothetically] if we only have 185 teachers, but we get funded 195 [teachers]...I don't know what it is...I know you [Cliff] told the Board something like that, so is some of that money possible to use...it is for teachers.

- ~ James – no, that dollar amount is what they [state] are reimbursing us, and you were at that meeting Rich, when they said it's the number of FTEs out of all accounts whether it's special education or whatever, that dollar amount that they're [state] giving us is that [specified] amount, so that is why we [District] proposed using it to give all full time certificated teacher back the two days so that money...

- ~ Rich – ...so does the District feel it's important to...does the Board feel it's important for our teachers to be able to go to some of their professional development...that's that the only time that they [teachers] get...do you [directed towards Rick] feel that that's important?

- ~ Rick – I feel that it is...

- ~ Rich – ...is it important enough to be able to find somewhere in the budget...to be able to cover \$57,000 somewhere?
- ~ Rick – that's up to the financial...
- ~ Rich – ...so if they [Cliff and James] can find that [money] somewhere, would that be something the Board would look at?
- James – I think Rich, this goes back to what I've said from the get go...the budget next year is built with a \$5,000 fund balance built into it, so the decisions as far as how we got to that budget was based on adding those two days back knowing that we had this additional professional development money...so the question goes back to if you guys [MHEA] want that money back in some other form then let's get rid of that [adding] two days additional [days] back and we can divide that money up some other way...that's what I've said from the get go. There is a pot of money, that pot of money is divided, so if you guys [MHEA] want to use that money in a different way, you feel that you don't want those two days back in your contract, and you prefer to put it in some other form of professional development, then we can do that, but to say that the Board has to try to find this additional \$57,000...look at where they're anticipating ending the financial year next year with a \$5,000 budget, so I throw that back out. If you guys [MHEA] aren't acceptable to adding the two days back for teachers in that form, then let's talk about what to do with the additional \$87,000 of professional development money, and [if] you feel that your membership [Association] doesn't want the two additional days added back into the contracts, and would prefer to spend it in a different form of professional development, then that is certainly something that can be done.
 - ~ Rhonda – would it be okay to have those two days back and have them on the October days?
 - ~ James – I think what you're [MHEA] going to have to look at with that is again, where do you get the most bang for the buck ...so whether that's those two days...I don't know maybe it is...I think the issue is number one, do you [MHEA] want those days back in your contract? If it's a yes, then let's look at what is the best for that...you said yourself that not everyone is going to attend those days [October workshops], so if not everyone is going to attend those days, and you try to do a District professional development, now you have a division of staff, so is that the best use for it...
 - ~ Rich – ...as a PLC, it would be great to have some time to work with people in other buildings that do good things.
 - ~ Rhonda – additionally, when I worked at the junior high, several of us would attend an English conference and then we would come back and have meetings with our planning teams so that we would all be on the same page again, so it's that time in PLC to actually talk to each other and develop professionally...but you're right, the discussion needs to ...
- James – ...like I said, that's why we've proposed this; the Boards priority has always been...was to get back to the 190 days [contract]...that's been priority number one, that's why that [District's] proposal was made...was to add those two days back with that money [professional development].
- Rhonda – when we're looking at the funding from the legislature, and it is public information that they have shared, there's a 1% increase in the base, there's professional development increase as well, so there's quite a few pots that they're [state] adding back in and prioritizing that together. Budgets are tough that way...that's hard but it's doable if we agree on the expected outcomes.
 - ~ Rick – keep in mind that this is an election year and things are always given during an election year and then they [legislators] turn around and change their minds afterwards.
- James – I think the big thing with it is that when you get these funding streams coming in from the legislature, all of those streams are used to build the budget and that's what Cliff based that budget on...it's not that these are direct-pass through to the district...like the 1% in salary reimbursement from the state [1% increase on the base], It's not a pass through, it is simply a mechanism to fund schools...just like this professional development money is...and sometimes they[legislators] put strings on it [funds], and sometimes they don't. You know with the professional development money it was stated that it is to be used for professional development, so we look at it and ask how we best use that

money and still try to be fair with the staff with it. Like I said, the budget that Cliff has proposed for this year is based on all of those funds coming in, and in building around that, he proposed in his budget that there is an additional two days, and there is an additional \$219,000 in healthcare cost, and he presents that budget in that form, and anticipating the \$5,000 fund balance for the year.

- Rich – so what are some of the things in maintenance that’s going on with the budget?
 - ~ James – as far as maintenance, we [District] don’t have a Plant Facility Levy anymore since the voters turned that down.
 - ~ Rich – is the Board planning on asking for another Plant Facility Levy?
 - ~ Rick – I can’t answer that right now...I’d love to.
 - ~ James – I can tell you that there’s been discussion about that Rich. I mean part of the thing is when this building [junior high] is paid for...at the same time you don’t want to over burden tax payers, so that is a discussion that we have is once that bond [junior high] comes off of the books, do we go back and say we need a Plant Facility and list specifically the projects...and I can tell you the project that is the most dire is a new roof on HMS, and depending on how you build that...an overbuild is about and \$7 to \$8 million project.
 - ~ Rich – so is there a budget built for that? Did you [District] put some money in for a build for that?
 - ~ James – there is no Plant Facility money and so these things [maintenance repairs] that occur are Band-Aid type fixes right now.
- Rhonda – one of things that was really frustrating and you [James] expressed too, was when that levy didn’t pass, and who voted, and who helped, and when the teachers feel like they’re on board and part of the group, they definitely make sure that things happen, because they feel like they’re part of something moving forward. So me...the association want to help with that. We want to make sure people feel that way...[teachers] have that feeling, and the importance [of it]...and part of the working environment.
- Rhonda – the workshop money, the professional development money...I just attended the workshops at the State House and I got to hear it first hand, and we got to see a presentation that was on secondary, but helpful as well with the IEA...and one thing that when we were talking about how the money could be used was that the professional development could be used to encouraged people to attend workshops and we thought that was important and definitely our membership is concerned about that...having the freedom to develop professionally with colleagues that are in their content areas.
- *Silence*

8. Karen – where in this revised schedule are we looking at for those professional days?

- James – from the first time I presented it, there’s nothing definite. Again, you go back to where do you get the best participation, placement wise?
- Rhonda – so if we’re limited with those student participation days that we get credit for it, have we used all those up?
 - ~ James – yes.
 - ~ Rhonda – so is it possible that one of the two days could be at the beginning of the year and protected from [building] meetings so that teachers can get in...
 - ~ James – ...not if it’s not going to be a professional development day.
 - ~ Rich – can you shift one of those [days at the beginning]?
 - ~ James – I would say no to that placement, Rhonda. I think we’ve all seen...and take this for what you want...but we’ve all seen people who have abused those October days, so the issue is if you put them there [PD days on the calendar], is there going to be participation or does it become an encouragement for a four-day weekend. I hate to say that, but it really is one of the things that happens...if you go back to the days of Jerrie LeFevre...is why he moved the early release days off of Fridays because they turned into three day weekends for a lot of people. Whatever we decide, it has to be...again...where we get the most staff participation...and I’m not saying it is right or wrong. If people choose to take personal days on those days, so be it, but I think if you look at how

we're trying to progress within the District, we got to have staff involved in trainings at a high level of participation to be successful with it...I might have been guilty of using one of those days as a personal leave day as well.

- ~ Rhonda – but it is important...like you said...that personal days are used and if somebody does that then it is on them...and there's a fear that it will reflect on evaluations.
- ~ James – but I would contend though that this is all part of it...one day here or there isn't an issue, but when you have individuals take every single professional development days off...and we do have individuals who do that...and I can see how it would affect performance.
- ~ Rhonda – and that defiantly warrants an administrative one-on-one conversation. Is there a change to the policy?
- ~ James – as far as what policy?
- ~ Rhonda – like personal days or attendance?
- ~ James – Personal Leave Policy hasn't changed.
- ~ Rhonda – yah...not that I've seen directly...in the Board policies.
- Rhonda – if we're looking at those two days, then is possible...a committee with MHEA [members] would be involved?
 - ~ James – yes, I think that would be valuable to decide where they [two professional development days] are placed...whether in [placing them] both in the first semester, or one in each semester.
- Rhonda asked to caucus.

9. Caucus 5:09 p.m. to 5:25 p.m. (*Harry McCarty, IEA Representative, caucused alongside of the MHEA*)

10. Rich – we have a couple of questions; so how much did the District get for Leadership premiums?

- James – \$850 per FTE, so 202 x 850.
 - ~ Rich – \$85,000 in professional development or did you get more than that?
 - ~ Cliff – yes, about \$85,000.
 - ~ Rich – so the 1% apportionment, what's the value of the 1% apportionment?
 - ~ James – do you mean the additional reimbursement?
 - ~ Rich – the additional, yes.
 - ~ Cliff – about \$87,000, I think.
 - ~ Rich – discretionary money? How much did you get...I know they gave us a bit more discretionary money also, so what is that amount?
 - ~ Cliff – \$2,400 x 184 support units
 - ~ Rich – Forrest Funds?
 - ~ James – as far as dollar amount with it?
 - ~ Cliff – for next year?
 - ~ Rich – yes, for next year?
 - ~ Cliff – I have no idea.
 - ~ Rhonda – the one we just got.
 - ~ Rich – how about the one we just got?
 - ~ Cliff – I think about \$180,000.
 - ~ Rich – how about any carryover from this year to next year?
 - ~ Cliff – we have a negative -\$235,000 fund balance.
 - ~ Rich – the next thing, Cliff can I get the complete proposed budget for 14-15?
 - ~ Cliff – what are you looking for?
 - ~ Rich – I just want a complete copy of it?
 - ~ Cliff – do you want what was published?
 - ~ Rich – no, not what was published...I would like the complete proposed budget...line item if I could.

~ Cliff – okay.

11. Rich – so here’s our counter proposal: 1) We accept the return of the two employee contract days to be designated as professional development days; 2) No change in the 2013-14 employment premium contribution for health insurance; 3) We propose a increase to the calculating base to 2.7%, beyond the addition of the two days.
- Rich – I would like to put this into record: this is an email from Mr. Gilbert on May 26, 2010: Good Afternoon, the MHEA and the Board of Trustees have reached a tentative agreement regarding the 2010-2011 contract. The willingness to reach an agreement shows a strong commitment by the association, district administration, and the Board to address the financial crisis faced by the MHSD and its employees. The Association, District Administration, and the Board remain united and committed in their effort to ensure that our state legislature adequately fund public education as required by the Idaho constitution. The following Memorandum of Understanding will be attached to the 2010-2011 Master Agreement: It is the priority of the Board of Trustees to restore employee salary and benefits to the 2009-2010 level. As predictable and reliable funding increases return, the Board and the MHEA will cooperate in restoring these benefits. This conditional Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) will be reviewed annually during contract negotiations. Respectfully yours, James Gilbert, Mike Curtis, Tim McMurtrey, Brian English, Jim Alexander, and Tom Rodney.
 - James – I’m going on record and say we are rejecting the additional proposal of 2.7%. There will not be an additional proposal from the Board regarding any increase in financial commitment at this point. With a proposed budget with a \$5,000 fund balance, the Board does not feel that it is responsible to further commit beyond the increase of 1.0108% and the additional \$219,000 that the Board is allocating to cover the healthcare increase...
 - Rich – ...so James have you caucused with them to get their approval with that...are you speaking for them?
 - James – I’m speaking with the board member that is here, so that is the directive that I have...
 - Rich – ...that’s the directive from the school board to you?
 - Rick – we don’t have the money. If we have an emergency in one of our schools...we don’t have any building funds left.
 - Rhonda – Rick, have you seen a line-item budget? Have you seen a budget that breaks things out...line items that’s more...what’s the total cost of the budget...is it in the \$20 million...have you seen more than a six page summary of that?
 - Rick – yes...I think.
12. Rich – we propose our next meeting on Thursday, May 22; if 1:00 p.m. works well, then we can do that.
- James – I can tell you at this time we are going to have to wait on scheduling a meeting; that week...
 - Rich – ... [you mean] the rest of this week.
 - James – yes ...this week is not going to work and with that I’m going to let you know that with the current issues that we [negotiations] have we [District] are going to request that Amy White and Scott Marotz enter the negotiations process on behalf of the Board, so I need to contact them to see what available times are and then I will contact Rosemary.
 - Rich – can we have a quick caucus?
13. Caucus 5:33 p.m. to 5:39 p.m. (*Harry McCarty, IEA Representative, and Denise Weis, MHEA President, caucused alongside of the MHEA*)
14. Rosemary – at this time we would like to request mediation and we would like to request mediation through FMCS (Federal Mediation Conciliation Services), because it is free. I would suggest that because it is free.
- James – with that request, can I email you with the confirmation after tomorrow?

- ~ Rosemary – yes.
- ~ Rich – you can't call them right now?
- ~ James – no, we have a board meeting tonight.
- ~ Rick – and you are all invited.
- ~ Rich – thank you.
- James – I'll email you [Rosemary] on Wednesday morning.

15. Negotiations ended at 5:41 p.m.

UNOFFICIAL