

Salary Schedule

Has there been any discussion about the District's proposed salary schedule resulting in some teachers actually making less money this year than last?

- Yes, there's been a number of discussions. The Negotiations Committee needs to look and see who this impacts. There have been conversations about a 1-time payment being considered part of our salary. Without the 1-time payments, some people's pay could go down. We don't want the salaries to go down.
- The \$8000 from 1-time payments in the last round of contract negotiations has not been brought up.

You mentioned SLPTU's counterproposal is a 4% increase for both years. What is the initial district proposal?

- 2.5% and 3% are the overall salary schedule improvements the district proposed. Schedule A is 2.5% largely across the board. The individual cells increase. Schedule B is more scattered with percentages. Some cells receive more and some less.

If someone is looking to retire and raise their high 5, is the bottom right taking a pay cut?

- Because of the 1-time payments, the Committee is very concerned about this as well.

Can you explain the 7.80% that is shown in Year One Step 15 MA+45 and why that doesn't match with the dollar increase shown?

- Step 15 would roll up because of eliminating a year (Step 11) and then all the money from Step 16 goes to 15. There is a chance the math isn't correct.
- It looks deceiving for those at Step 16 or more because the 7.08% is more for those that are moving from Step 14 to Step 15, not those who are already at the bottom right.
- The Committee has expressed a desire to add another cell right there. For these people, the District Year One increase is about 2%.

Insurance and Benefits

Clarification:

- The District will pay for the increases to the high deductible health plan. The co-pay plan stays the same.

For the student loan match toward retirement, would it be possible to give teachers the option to put the matched money from the district toward our student loans rather than retirement?

- That is likely illegal. This is a federal law. Members of the Committee will look this up to verify.

Case Loads and Class Sizes

Clarification:

- Proposal #7 (in SLPTU's counterproposal) was a clerical error. SLPTU's goal is to try to get the District to hire more SpEd teachers. SLPTU and the District are aware it is against the law to exclude a student from open enrolling because of disability.

In the last contract there was an MOU to study case loads and create an understanding [of full case loads]. Where did that land? Are there current numbers of caseloads being considered?

- SLPTU did propose a renewal of the MOU. SLPTU has discussed numbers and utilized those when presenting things to the District. We didn't put those specific numbers in the proposal.
- There are different types of case loads and how they are covered in different buildings. The Negotiations Committee is trying to make the language consistent across buildings.

Negotiations Process, District, and Next Steps

Has the district responded?

- We are going to meet tomorrow afternoon (Tuesday, Sept. 30th) and hear what the District has to say about our counter proposal.

Miscellaneous

How do we balance our need for additional personal days with the challenge of covering classes? *When more staff are out, it becomes increasingly difficult to find substitute coverage, which puts added strain on everyone. Have we considered incentives for not using days or for using personal days earlier in the year? The people the union is proposing to sub (instructional coaches, student services, etc) are also on the teacher's contract.*

- The District is proposing that those people sub, not SLPTU.
- SLPTU proposed more personal days because that came out of the survey we sent out. The sub model does not support additional days.
- We have talked about incentives for not using days, but the District is resistant to anything like selling back days, incentivizing, or anything other that already exists in the contract.

When SPED teachers are supporting without para supports, can they get a stipend for coverage?

- Clarification: Teachers are covering [for other teachers] due to lack of paras. SpEd teachers are covering extra when they do not have a para. Mainstream teachers are having students in their class but do not have the support they should have due to lack of para staffing.
 - This is a concern and a problem across the District. If you are aware that staffing is not filled, and your supervisor is not actively trying to fill that role, you need to contact your building rep and Union President Scott Smith.

Where does the Negotiating Committee see the leverage point with regards to a pre-levy/post-levy settlement? Are we pushing to settle before the vote with concerns of a failed levy vote, or are we thinking that a passed levy could allow the district to "loosen the purse strings" so to speak?

- The Negotiations Committee has discussed this at length and wonder how hard we can push this. The District would love to have our contract ratified by the Board meeting in October.
- Tomorrow at the next meeting, we will likely find out how important it is to them to settle by that meeting.
- We want to feel it out. But the money from the levy wouldn't come for another 2 years or so.
- Our leverage is having members being engaged in the contract and this process.

Any negotiation about a second language stipend for teachers that actively use a second language to teach or communicate with students/teachers/families?

- We have had quite a few talks within the Committee about this. This is something we could potentially bring. This isn't off the table, but SLPTU is dedicated to making sure the most people feel the most money possible.

Was there any indication that portions of your counterproposal gained traction with the district? We appreciate #13 (lane change oversight committee) in your counterproposal and hope that can stick!

- They asked us quite a few questions after the counter proposal. The questions and answers seemed positive. They stated they had a lot to think about. So, it seems some of these ideas gained traction, but we won't know for sure until we meet again.
 - In summary, they didn't take anything we said as a Tentative Agreement.

Substitute Teaching

- SLPTU has proposed some coverage limits to try to help with the substitute teaching model.

In the union proposal about subbing - it talks about deans, coaches, admin subbing. Would the five subbing days apply to staff in those positions but also on the teacher contract? (Would the 5 day limit apply to those who are not classroom teachers but on the teacher contract?)

- Yes.
 - Why?
 - Those on a TOSA would need to abide by their contracts. There is a perception that many of these members have more flexibility than a classroom teacher.
 - This is something we might have to build more specific language around. We are trying to engage the District with the limitations of the sub model. Every building is different and the ways in which members are impacted is different, so it makes it hard to build language district wide.
 - We would like to protect all members from being adversely impacted by any language that we build.

Longevity

Longevity is mentioned in the counterproposal. Does the district's initial proposal include longevity?

- They proposed no change to longevity. SLPTU proposed an additional couple of steps.