



PCSB/PCTA Bargaining Meeting
February 16, 2022
Minutes
PCTA Building



Meeting started at 4:15

Lindsey Blankenbaker presented a written document summarizing the counter proposal to the email that we received last week. Clarification to the comp time section (44F) – changed required to requested as the district can't require teachers to work beyond the contract proposal.

Lindsey stated again that the deletion of Trade Days would be an issue, and comp time was a way to address this. She stated that 3.25% as a whole they have agreed upon and that they are moving past disagreement or discussion on this.

Laurie Dart shared that the district took the issues and concerns that were shared and created the MOU. The extra two days of targeted training would be permanent. The district had proposed that they would be in place for the next two years, but as a compromise the district would add these 2 days permanently, which is an annual cost of \$3 million. And this is a conservative estimate, as salaries go up the cost of this will as well.

The district stated that the parties met informally at the end of January where those articles with financial implications were discussed, and at that time it was shared that PCTA was willing to separate salary and language. The district now knows that PCTA was "considering" bifurcating the salary from contract language but was/is not yet ready to agree to that. The district understands PCTA met as a group to discuss.

The district shared that on Friday afternoon they received an email from PCTA that contained various proposals regarding the articles with a financial impact. If PCTA is not prepared to finalize the entire contract language, then let's get the financial aspects resolved tonight.

The district shared that they have reviewed PCTA's email and prepared an MOU. A draft MOU with financial impacts was presented to the group.

Nancy Velardi shared with us information on the Retention Bonus. She stated that in all honesty it was something she wanted to bring to table before COVID. But they held back on it and she stated that we should consider at some point, as it helps retention. She went on to say that since we have an issue with retention, we need to start working towards this and to start thinking about it for our district. Teachers say that they will stay when they are getting frustrated – it isn't enough – they love teaching and like teaching – another reason for them to not give up is something we need to think about. Something I thought we could discuss this when I first started. Then legislature did what they did.

Nancy questioned again why other counties can do this and we can't even talk about it. Orange settled and they just got it – other counties have been doing this for a while and it's successful. Why we can't consider this. Laurie shared again that it goes against the statute. We understand that this is a

recognition for those of veteran teachers. We offered back in September that if something changes with the statute, we would be more than willing to re-open this topic.

It was stated that with the decision that came out of Orange County, it has set a precedent and it is now allowed for. Laurie corrected that the magistrate gave an opinion and the Board made the decision. Lindsey shared that it is our job to follow the letter of the law, not the intent of the law. She recognized that any discussion about pay is about money. Additional concern from veteran teachers is that the work they do is valued. They are looking for their employer to say that they value the work that is being done.

With that being said Lindsey shared that with the mask mandate, it wasn't a law, it was an executive order. This is a statute that was passed and it has been implemented all across the state and there are no actions being taken to those who are doing this. Here we have an actual statute and other districts have settled – yet here there have been no actions. Enforcement varies based on political reality around this.

Laurie shared that it's more than intent. It states that people on the performance salary schedule should get 25% more than those not on the performance salary schedule. If we add more than we are violating. The intent of the law is not to penalize the veteran teachers, but instead they would tell you that they are recognizing performance. However, debating this is not helpful. We have offered and will continue to offer we will re-open immediately if any clarification on this is made. And it is kind of about money. Look at what we have offered – average 3.25%, healthcare, training, planning, terminal pay increase.

PCTA recognized that the district worked on the hourly rate for training and planning and the work to get it more equitable. Discussion was held regarding recurring and non-recurring.

Nancy shared some words regarding teachers priding themselves about being the best and will continue doing this as this is a source of pride. She went on to say that it is insulting that we aren't paying attention to those rated highly effective on the grandfathered schedule. They need to know that you (their employer) feels that you are sorry for what is being proposed.

Terminal Pay – Article 20 - Kevin shared that we currently have about \$100M in terminal pay – annual basis we pay \$8-\$13M – this proposal will change this. PCTA recognizes and appreciates the district work on this.

Comp Time – PCTA stated that the release of Trade Days will be difficult, and teachers also need pre-school preparation. PCTA's proposal is modeled very closely to those in the support unit, but we know we have to structure it differently. This reflects a practice to value the time our educators. Especially our ESE teachers – there is a great deal of value. Fact is this is already done in Pinellas, but it shouldn't be based on the whim of administration. There is an expectation to use the comp time. Edification of the system, already being done. Further discussion was held regarding this topic and felt a second look was needed on this topic. It could interact with Article 28. It was also stated that release time is more valuable to the employees.

The district stated that they would provide some time to caucus and discuss.

5:10 pm – Both groups caucused to discuss the proposal

5:44 pm – Groups returned, and discussion was held.

Article 28 – Question was asked about how this would work in elementary. It was shared that this has been differentiated and clarification is needed regarding the additional half hour.

Discussion was held regarding not requiring this training off contractual hours and wanted to make sure that this doesn't relieve the opportunity to offer this training during contractual time. The district shared that there will be opportunities to take the training during regular workdays. PCTA said that that has come up before – that a teacher takes training during the summer and then offered again during pre-school, and teachers had to take the training then. PCTA wanted to make sure that if a teacher takes the training during the summer that they wouldn't be required to take during pre-school.

PCTA stated they were looking for a list of possible training (District will speak with Kevin Hendrick regarding this.)

ESE List of Teachers – as roles change, the list could be revisited, ask Lynne Mowatt to review the list – Is the list all inclusive of those in ESE (example used was ET – extended transition) Question was asked regarding adding jobs if a new job code is created or if the state adds the job.

Supplements – Kevin shared that the remaining amount from salaries would go to the supplement committee (\$19,276).

Article 41D – Training and planning time – clarify to read “up to”

Trade Days – PCTA is concerned about getting this ratified, that they are afraid that the Trade Days would be a stumbling block. And stressed that flexibility is a major benefit. Have the opportunity to use the comp time.

Laurie shared that Comp time is already in the contract and ability to use – Article 27 – and the district is ready to get contract language settled.

Question was asked about how the days during Pre-School would be scheduled. Paula shared that those schedules are worked out once everything else is settled, and typically done in a meeting between Paula and the union president.

The district stated that if PCTA was not in agreement with the Trade Days being removed, we have prepared another proposal that leaves in Trade Days in but takes out the additional training day. Everything else is left as is.

Both groups caucused to discuss the proposal. Groups returned, and discussion was held. PCSB recommended the MOU with the additional two days as it would give teachers two days of pay, which would be added to FRS. District also shared that this offer is better than any other district in the state as far as increase in salary percentage, and if we could agree on salary, the teams could then continue to negotiate contract language. PCTA said they would get back with the district. No agreement was reached.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 6:25pm.