

CBLT Bargaining Minutes

10/8/20

Virtual: ZOOM

1. Mental Health Proposal

- a. District presented a revised proposal (see document) that crossed out the “whereas” language while adding a provision in #5 which they explained covered the same point from the 2/27/20 MOU but they were simply presenting it in a different way.
- b. CTA shared their counter-proposal which stressed the need to provide teachers some form of compensation as staff were at the breaking point with increased teacher demands. Many districts offered comp time and this CTA request was not unreasonable.
- c. District stated that they would review the proposal and consider a counter today.

2. Instructional Evaluations

- a. CTA presented a revised proposal (see document) that crossed out the District’s proposed timelines as these offered no benefit to teachers.
- b. CTA pointed out that the Impasse Hearing was addressing the issue of teachers being required to instruct students under both modalities but this proposal outlined that no matter what happened with that, teacher observations and evaluations should only be based upon one of their instructional delivery platforms.
- c. Additional recommendations were made by CTA for more liberal scoring this year including the suggestion that teachers be provided support before receiving a rating under “Applying.” Final Summative rating ranges were also proposed.
- d. District asked if CTA was withdrawing their prior evaluation proposal.
- e. CTA affirmed that they were.
- f. District asked for CTA’s response to their evaluation questions that they had submitted.
- g. CTA responded that they will discuss this at Caucus and get back to the District as they may withdraw the language that the questions referenced.

3. Main Table Bargaining: Salary

- a. CTA stated that it was important that offers in the proposal would reflect the minimum percent increase that any bargaining unit member would receive.
- b. District provided a summary of their amended salary proposal.
 - Classroom teachers below \$47,500 would be brought up to \$47,500.
 - \$8.2 million would go to those teachers who earned less than 2% (from above) as well as those who received nothing.
 - If non-classroom teachers were brought up to \$47,500, this would cost \$2.3 million, leaving \$5.9 million left over.
 - The remaining teachers would receive a salary increase of 1.27% on average.
 - CTA asked why the percentage was not a flat rate for everyone.
 - District explained that the 1.27% was an average minimum, as some would get a little more after being brought up to \$47,500.
 - District added that to be in compliance with the state mandate, they must first get teachers up to \$47,500 from the “80% bucket” and from there, use the “20% bucket” for those who earned less than 2% or for other instructors.
 - CTA stated that they were proposing that if a teacher received \$25, for example to reach \$47,500, then that \$25 would be calculated as part of their 1.27%.
 - District asked for examples so they could understand.
- c. CTA asked about teachers with advanced degree supplements.

- District responded that they would be addressing this with examples.
- d. District voiced that there were 3 major salary scenarios (see document):
 - Teachers currently earning \$40,900 who would be moved to \$47,500 representing a 16.14% raise.
 - Teachers already above \$47,500 who would receive an increase of 1.27%, rounding up.
 - Teachers who were earning not quite \$47,500, such as the CTA example of \$25 less, and then that amount would be included in their 1.27% raise.
- e. District stated that based on contractual language for advanced degree supplements, there would be increases that they would cover with their own separate funds (see document).
- f. District shared that VPK teachers were not among instructional staff that could receive raises from any of these state salary funds based upon statute.
 - CTA responded that they would never leave these 109 members of their bargaining unit behind and asked how much it would cost the district to include them in the proposal.
 - District calculated that with benefits it would cost them approximately \$211K
- g. CTA pointed out that there were also 3 Adjunct teachers who were not included in the District's salary proposal as their salary never changed and was based upon beginning teacher salary.
- h. District's Response to CTA's "Me Too" salary proposal clause:
 - District explained that it was unnecessary to include this provision as no one else besides teachers were getting raises this year.
 - District countered with language that the parties would only renegotiate additional salary increases if the state provided an increase to OCPS funding.
- i. District shared Salary Structures for Instructional Personnel ranges (see document)
 - A separate range for prekindergarten VPK teachers, with range still beginning at \$40,900.
 - A range for school psychologists would not reflect a change to the minimum as the 1.27% increase would not apply to new staff with no experience.

4. Impact Bargaining: District Mental Health Counter Proposal

- a. District offered that teachers could leave with students on the day of the mental health lessons to compensate for their time, which fell on Tuesdays or Thursdays.
 - CTA pointed out that this would only reflect approximately 20 minutes for high school teachers and 5 minutes for middle school teachers.
 - District retorted that they could not offer Wednesdays because there were few Wednesdays left for trainings at the high school level.

5. Impact Bargaining: District Questions to CTA Evaluation Proposal

- a. In reference to CTA's suggested language "For those teachers utilizing both LaunchEd and Face to Face simultaneously, the teacher will have the discretion to only be observed and evaluated on one of those instructional deliveries.," District asked if CTA would consider allowing teachers who preferred a blended observation to choose that option.
 - CTA stated that no "look fors" existed for teachers instructing in the blended model.
 - District replied that there was no difference in the "desired effects" of instruction and its impact on student, no matter which model teachers were using. The only changes would be teacher actions and the way students respond which was outlined on their CANVAS documents.
 - CTA stated that some students were F2F but provided virtual instruction exactly the same as the students who were at home and should not be penalized on their evaluation for this. Many high school teachers were not doing two separate preps.
 - District perceived that CTA was speaking in hypothetical scenarios while the scales were concrete. They were considering creating some video examples.
- b. District asked CTA to explain their objection to reducing the number of evaluations for teachers.

- CTA replied that if there were not ample observations, teachers earning lower scores would not have an opportunity to increase their scores.
 - District thought that teachers would like more time between observations but understood CTA's position.
- c. District asked CTA to explain their rationale for their proposed language "Before a teacher may be given a score of "Not Using," "Beginning" or "Developing," the assessing administrator shall meet with the teacher to provide instructional support and the teacher must've had an opportunity to increase the rating with a subsequent observation."
- CTA explained that there were too many unknowns. Teachers have never taught before like they were teaching now. They need the opportunity to receive coaching and support, as well as a new observation, before lower ratings became final.
- d. District asked how CTA created their adjustments to Deliberate Practice and Instructional Practice/ Final Summative Rating scores.
- CTA stated that they came up with the suggested language as an idea to help teachers during these unprecedented times.
- e. District thanked CTA and stated that they would hold on a response to the CTA proposal at this time.

6. CTA Additional Issues

- a. Arts Supplement
- CTA was being told that principals were denying some teachers this supplement because art shows and concerts were no longer being done in person and that this directive was coming from the District. Now that these shows and concerts were online, they required even more after hour work. There was no contractual requirement to submit logs as several principals were requiring.
 - District would speak to Finance to gain additional incite to any directives that might have been given but understood the need to document extra work.
 - CTA stated that band and chorus instructors were not required to "prove" extra work through logs and Art teachers should be treated no differently. By virtue of teaching the arts courses teachers spent additional time outside of the duty day, for example, choreography for their classes would also be choreography for an after-hours recital.
 - District stated that this was work required for teachers' classes and part of their regular grading but would be open to holding a meeting outside of bargaining to discuss this.
- b. CTE Schedules
- CTE teachers were reporting that contract language related to early release days and meetings was not being applied to their working conditions. Their administration reached out to Labor Relations and had been waiting for a response since October 1st.
 - District stated that they were in conversation with the new Associate Superintendent to get clarification about how CTE schedules worked as this district administrator was new to the job and wanted to look at historical data.
 - District would be open to holding a meeting outside of bargaining to discuss this issue, as well.

7. Next CBLT meeting:

- 10/14/20 10:00am
 - Continue Impact Bargaining for Evaluation and Mental Health, as well as Main Table Bargaining for Salary