

CBLT Bargaining Minutes

9/30/20

Virtual: ZOOM

1. CTA Opening

- a. The president delivered an opening statement (see document) related to the dangerous impacts of the governor's move to Phase 3 and the District's constant, unilateral changes to policies and procedures that impact teachers' working conditions. It was reiterated that teachers have been asked to make the impossible possible in order to ensure student success. Negotiation decisions should reflect the challenges, extra work and commitment that has been demonstrated by teachers throughout this crisis. Evaluations must be fair, as every single educator must be innovative to perform under these unstable and challenging conditions. No evaluating administrator has ever taught virtually or taught the so-called "blended model." The union called for an end to the disparities between how administrators and teachers were treated in terms of the elitist system that rewarded administrators and regarded educators as replaceable, disposable labor units.
- b. District requested a copy of this statement.

2. Salary: District Responses

- a. Exhibit H: (See document) The District updated their "FY21 Teacher Salary Allocation," changing their charter allocation from a budgeted figure to a forecasted figure.
 - CTA asked questions related to the percentage difference.
 - District stated that they did not calculate the percentage but that their document reflected the new figures.
- b. Instructional Proposed 2020-21 Summary: (See Document) The District described the allocation of state funds and shared that Orange County was one of only a handful of Florida districts who were able to achieve the \$47,500 beginning teacher salary with the funds they received.
 - District reached out to the state for clarification about questions raised at the last bargaining session and learned that they were permitted to combine the funds left over from the 80% "bucket" and add it to the 20% "bucket. This added \$2.5 million to the funds available for bargaining.
 - They added that it would be a violation for teachers getting more than a 2% raise, to bring them up to \$47,500, to obtain any additional monies from the 20% bucket.
 - District asked CTA how they wanted to distribute the \$8.2 million.
 - CTA stated that they would review this information at caucus.

3. Salary: CTA Responses Following Caucus

- a. CTA needed to spend more time analyzing the figures before they could respond to the District and posed questions about the non-classroom teachers making less than \$47,500 who were not included in the 80% "bucket."
 - District stated that there were 612 instructors who fell in that category.
 - CTA replied that the lists they received from the District on 8/14/20 reflected under 500 instructors in this category.
 - District responded that they were using the same list and if all 612 teachers were brought up to \$47,500, it would cost \$1,920,350 out of the 20% "bucket" of \$8.2 million.
 - CTA requested a breakdown of how the District designated the 612 teachers as their calculations were different.
 - District agreed, but pointed out that it was necessary to exclude pk teachers who not funded through FEFP. While ESE pk teachers were, there were 109 pk teachers who were not.

- CTA needed this breakdown along with a list of teachers whose salaries were paid for with grants. District only supplied numbers on a prior request.
- District agreed, but cautioned that even grant-funded teachers would have their raises be paid for by the new monies as the statute did not differentiate between full-time teachers who were grant vs. non-grant funded.
- CTA understood, but also requested the amount of money that the District saved on teacher positions that were funded by grants.
- CTA asked for another bargaining date to continue this conversation.
- A date of October 8th was agreed to and the District reminded CTA that they were still waiting for a response to their questions from Sept. 28th about CTA's proposed MOU related to teacher evaluations.

4. CTA Presented a Revised Mental Health Proposal

- a. CTA reviewed their proposal (see document) and explained that they wanted to include a reference to the LOU that no teacher evaluation observations would occur during the Mental Health instruction.
- b. CTA also provided more specificity to their request for teacher comp time.
- c. District stated that they would review the proposal during caucus.

5. District Response to CTA's Request for Information (see document)

- a. (1) Materials from Great Beginnings: CTA stated that there was no need for the District to review this.
- b. (2) District reviewed specific statutory violations referenced in CTA's evaluation MOU proposal, specifically not complying with student performance requirements, as well as the District's need to differentiate four levels of teacher performance.
 - CTA stated that they did include four levels but that the District created rules about how it was implemented. Perhaps all categories did not need to be used this year.
 - CTA added that a major problem was that they understood state requirements but did not know the District's positions on many issues, such as how the District intend to evaluate teachers during a pandemic. For example:
 - Many students are taking assessments at home that are proposed to count toward a teacher's evaluation, however no one knows the assessment conditions of the home and validity / reliability could not be guaranteed.
 - Contact Article X. C. 3. E was read by CTA, which outlined that electronic evaluations were not permitted for teacher formals.
 - District responded that they were simply responding to the request about which statute violations existed in CTA's proposed MOU. The suggestion that no one received less than "Effective" violated the statute.
 - CTA replied that this team needed to have a conversation pertaining to the way the evaluation tool would be applied during a pandemic.
 - CTA needed more time to review other Districts, as well as implications.
- c. (3) The District reached out to three districts when consulting about this year's evaluation process; however none of these had signed language but rather sent a report to the state that reflected "in negotiations."
 - District discovered that other counties were looking to extend timelines and reduce observations while some were not changing anything.
- d. (4) – (6) were related to Mental Health and no explanations were needed. District planned to respond to CTA's latest proposal as soon as possible.
- e. (7) CTA would need time to review District's response to CTA's over-spending analysis and CTA would inform them if they had additional questions.

6. Final Discussions

- a. CTA questioned the CBLT minutes that the District was posting on their Labor Relations website and suggested that it include a disclaimer since this team no longer approved the minutes, but took them separately.
 - District responded that their site did include a disclaimer and read it to the team.
- b. CTA voiced concerns for the District's COVID Dashboard as it was not being updated daily, as promised, and much data was missing. CTA had documentation that confirmed missing cases from the OCPS dashboard, as well as data that was missing from the Dept. of Health website.
 - District explained that there was a technology glitch on Monday and that now all data was up to date.
 - CTA believed that there were still mistakes.
 - District asked that those errors be sent to them and CTA agreed.
- c. CTA questioned the comprehensiveness of the COVID data sent to them in their request for information.
 - District voiced that they sent exactly what CTA asked for.
 - CTA sensed that there was a column missing and would resubmit their request with clarifying wording.

7. Next CBLT meeting:

- 10/8/20 10:00am
 - Continue Impact Bargaining for Evaluation and Mental Health, as well as Main Table Bargaining for Salary