CBLT Bargaining Minutes
9/26/19

CTA Office

1. Introductions
2. Message from the President of CTA – See Document
3. Message from Chief Negotiator
   a. The District stated that they are coming to the table to present an amended package and counter proposals
   b. The District distributed all of their documents at once and stated that they would walk the CBLT through each one
      • Upon seeing title on the District’s documents “Last, Best and Final Offer Amended Comprehensive Package Proposal,” CTA immediately voiced disappointment that the District persisted in using the same language in the title. CTA clearly communicated that the wording was offensive at the last meeting and reiterated that it feels like bullying and does not lend itself to collaboration.
      • District stated that they have the right to put whatever they want at the top of their documents and it is okay if CTA does not agree with it. They stated that they want to use this title so that CTA knows where the District stands.
4. District Responses to CTA Proposals from 9/19/19:
   a. Truth in Budgeting: No Interest in this Proposal
      • District believes that there is already a mechanism in place, similar to the committee that CTA is proposing, called the Budgeting Committee and CTA participates in this committee
      • CTA stated that the Budgeting Committee is a waste of their time as it includes too many people and CTA’s priorities are rarely addressed. The proposed Truth in Budgeting committee would be entirely different, with priorities centered around student learning and employee working conditions
      • The District added that the School Board is also creating a new “Budget Review Project” and distributed a schedule with tentative topics and dates. They stated that these meetings would explore opportunities to adjust the budget to address student learning and employee compensation efficiently. Anyone can attend these sessions.
      • CTA stated that these meetings sound similar to Budget Workshops and that this is not adequate in terms of a mechanism to improve transparency.
   b. Association Rights
      • District provided counter-language to Article IV related to new employee orientations, as well as bulletin boards, striking all of the language proposed by CTA
      • CTA will take this under advisement
   c. Working Conditions
      • District provided counter-language to Article VI regarding replacement ID badges, striking all of the language proposed by CTA and adding the need to provide a police report for stolen badges
      • CTA asked if students are required to pay for replacement badges. They also asked about which police entity the District is suggesting, District police? CTA pointed out that there are frequently fees attached to obtaining a police report
      • District stated that they will get back to CTA
   d. Teacher Rights & Responsibilities: No Interest in this Proposal
      • District stated that the proposal related to investigation of teacher complaints of misconduct by administrators was “administratively burdensome”
e. Evaluation
   • District struck through all of the contract language proposed by CTA, officered counter-language for ratings lower than “applying” and presented “Letters of Understanding (LOU)” related to:
     o Appeals Committee Decision Tiebreaker Process
     o Observer Training for Evaluation Committee Members
   • CTA asked what was the District’s reservation to putting language in the contract as opposed to offering an LOU?
   • District stated that LOU’s with a “sunset date” allow the language to expire if it is no longer applicable. Contract language has to be re-negotiated
   • CTA contends that everything in the contract is always open to re-negotiation
f. Duty Day: **No Response to this Proposal**
   • District needs more information about the process of how this proposal would work in terms of teacher coverage during breaks

g. Work Year: **No Interest in this Proposal**
   • District stated that they could not commit to the first day of pre-planning being on a Monday due to statute requiring a certain number of instructional days/hours in a semester and the district’s desire to complete the first semester before winter break.
   • District added that it is a management right for principals to offer summer school instructional positions to the candidate they believe is best suited for the job
   • CTA asked why that would not be the person who taught the course all year.
   • District stated that in every situation, this might not be the case.

h. Salary: **No Interest in this Proposal**
   • District stated that they cannot commit to the recurring cost
   • District’s financial package offer remains the same
   • CTA restated that teachers do not want bonuses and the District’s offer sends the message that “we do not hear you.”

i. Appendix B
   • District referred the committee to their original District Proposal #4

j. Supplement: Mock Trial: **No Interest in this Proposal**
   • However, District is open to further discussion about this proposal in the future as it seems to apply to less than ten people

k. Visual and/or Performing Arts
   • District provided counter-language, offering specific details about requirements for the Visual/Performing Arts Sponsor

l. District Proposal #9: Contract Compliance Revisions
   • District presented new “clean-up” language that they purport include no substantive changes, but simply verbiage that the committee talked about all year.
   • CTA will review and take this under advisement

m. District: **Frequently Asked Questions: Budget, Compensation and Benefits**
   • District presented their document that is online, adding that they want it to be part of the bargaining record

n. District Proposal #10: Bargaining Team Members
   • CTA requested that “Nick Anderson” be revised to reflect “Nicholas Anderson”

5. CTA Responses to District’s: Last, Best and Final Offer Amended Comprehensive Package Proposal
   a. Truth in Budgeting
      • The Budgeting Committee does not include community members and there is a need to get more stakeholders involved
b. Association Rights
   • CTA rejects the term “controversial” related to the district language about the CTA bulletin boards. This term is subjective and CTA gave examples of items that a principal have deemed controversial, while teachers may not agree
   • District stated that it was not their intention for contract language to be controversial

c. Working Conditions
   • CTA asked about how much money is being generated by charging employees for replacement badges and questioned why employees are being used as a revenue source when they need a new badge.
   • District replied that there are not a high number of employees that must pay for a replacement badge; most are already replaced at no cost. District was simply trying to codify the language.
   • CTA inquired about who would pay the fees associated with the police report for stolen badges.
   • CTA contended that the District should treat lost badges as a potential safety issue.

d. Teacher Rights & Responsibilities:
   • CTA questioned what is meant by “administratively burdensome”
   • District stated that their response was related to the turnaround time in the proposed language and that they are open to creating an LOU
   • District added that there is a statute that gives them sixty days to investigate and that teachers can get a copy 10 days after it is closed, as the report then becomes public record.
   • CTA replied that they want contract language to address this, adding that LOUs should only be used for issues that come and go and may not be applicable in the future
   • CTA and District disagreed on the purpose of LOU’s
   • CTA asked about their proposed language related to peers directing peers.
   • District responded that they have no interest in this proposal and have said this three times.

e. Evaluation
   • CTA wants language in the contract, not in the form of an LOU

f. Duty Day:
   • CTA stated that language already exists about teachers’ right to a break after three hours of student contact time and gave several examples when teachers had no mechanism to use the restroom. CTA contended that a plan must be devised for this basic human need
   • District stated that they need more process information and they will also investigate

 g. Work Year:
   • CTA asked what statute the District is referencing related to school start days
   • District responded that it has to do with school not being permitted to begin before August 10th and they want to start instruction as soon as possible to finish the semester before winter break.
   • CTA stated that members to not want to start pre-planning on a Friday because they lose their last weekend of summer.
   • Related to summer school instructional positions, CTA asked why a teacher hired for a position during the school year would not be best suited for the summer job, particularly if they received at least an effective rating
   • District suggested that CTA provide a proposal if they want to revise their proposal to include “effective/highly effective” language.

h. District asked about their proposed “clean-up” language and CTA stated that they will get back to them later
6. CTA Additional Proposals
   a. Supporting Student Success
      • CTA explained that this proposed task force is for the purpose of analyzing decisions/procedures that are in place for student educational planning to confirm that processes are student-centered. Several examples of students being scheduled for classes that might not be in their best interest were shared
      • District will that this under advisement
   b. Duty Day
      • See proposed additions to Article XIV regarding common planning time.
      • District stated that there is already an arbitration award addressing this, but they will take it under advisement
      • CTA stated that teachers need time to address the needs of their classroom, not reviewing CRMs and templates that they are not even required to use
   c. Work Year
      • See proposed additions to Article XV regarding Early Release Days
      • CTA stated that this proposal provides no cost extra planning time. Many years ago, the early release days were for teacher planning and now all but the 5th Wednesday are consumed by meetings
      • District will take this under advisement

7. Hurricane Days
   a. CTA questions why only one hurricane day can be waived, as the calculations seem to be based upon the requirement of 8100 instructional minutes and CTA cannot find this figure in statute. Middle school appears to be the only level that is short 31 minutes (if 8100 is an accurate requirement)
   b. District stated that they would research this information and get back to CTA.
   c. District added that is the discretion of the superintendent to waive days.
   d. CTA reviewed the timeline related to their request from the district for information related to instructional minutes
   e. District stated that they released the information to us as soon as they were authorized to release it.

8. Request to Impact Bargain
   a. CTA stated that they are still awaiting a response on their request to impact bargain several issues
   b. District responded with a list of dates throughout June and July 2019 when CTA had many opportunities to ask about this and neglected to do so.
   c. CTA reviewed their timeline and multiple requests to impact bargain specific issues explaining that the District is referencing “general” bargaining which is different and separate from “impact” bargaining
   d. CTA added that the District’s chief negotiator is misrepresenting verbal conversations and had promised to give responses in writing
   e. CTA and the District disagree about bifurcating bargaining to separate entities: general bargaining and impact bargaining

9. CTA asked their forensic audit consultant, Jewell Gould, to present his budgeting analysis. See attached
   a. District requested a copy and will review and reply.

10. Next Meetings:
    a. October 3
    b. October 23rd