

BPS/1010 Bargaining

MINUTES

JANUARY 28, 2019

1:00 PM

ESF TRAINING RMS 5 & 6

BPS ATTENDEES	Jennifer Brockwell Mark Langdorf Rick Morton – Lead Negotiator Jim Powers Rochelle Schwindt Dr. Beth Thedy Kevin Thornton Pennie Zuercher
1010 ATTENDEES	Patrick Darville Annita Dunn Lydia Felton Debra Greco – Chief Negotiator Judy Griffin Leslie Lawter Patricia Orlando Delores Varney – Admin Assistant
NOTE TAKER	Angela Kersten

ITEMS DISCUSSED

ITEM	BPS Offer to 1010 - Compensation
	<p>P Zuercher opened the session with the presentation of the Funding Outlook for Fiscal Year 2018-2019 and indicated she will give copies of presentation to D Greco. P Zuercher closed the presentation with the BPS Offer to 1010-Compensation which stated as follows:</p> <p>Recurring Pay Increase</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1.6%, no steps <p>Bonus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - \$600 for benefits eligible positions - \$300 for non-benefited eligible positions (below 25 hours/week) <p>D Greco asked if an employee can have two positions working 4 hours in one and 2 hours in the other, would they qualify? R Schwindt confirmed the employee must be benefit eligible. D Greco has concerns regarding the non-benefited employee's compensation and asked P Zuercher for a total of compensation. P Zuercher stated she did not have the total at the table but could provide it.</p> <p>Both BPS and 1010 Bargaining Teams broke for discussions at 1:25pm returning at 1:43pm. During the break-out session, P Zuercher provided D Greco with the total compensation as requested earlier.</p> <p>D Greco stated she was not surprised by the BPS Offer, but extremely disappointed. She stated Food Service employees are again mistreated due to non-benefited status. She is also concerned their benefited co-workers will make it worse with unnecessary talk. She stated she wasn't sure how much Food Service employees could take. P Zuercher added this was also the group with the most turnover. D Greco asked if there was any thinking "outside the box?" She mentioned 6 days off. P Zuercher commented she was not sure if it is an option but can see if it is a possibility. D Greco questioned ACA compliance and that she thought BPS had to supply benefits to those who work over a certain number of hours. M Langdorf answered stating ACA compliance is to offer benefits to 90% of employees who work 30 hours/week. Present time, BPS is well in compliance offering benefits to 98.6% of employees who work 30 hours/week. P Zuercher added split/dual positions are as stated per contract and she does not have an answer on handling those positions for bonuses at this time. D Greco asked if the reason was due to contract language. R Morton answered the employee must be in an eligible position as stated in contract language. D Greco wished she had historical knowledge of why or how language was determined. L Lawter commented language was effective June 30, 2003. K Thornton interjected he believes it was before that time, possibly the 90's. D Greco stated she will not be able to get the BPS Offer to 1010 passed. P Zuercher asked if 1010 had a counter.</p> <p>D Varney confirmed and passed across the table Article 32.01 (a) which stated as follows:</p> <p>All support staff to receive a 6.95% raise for 2 years, 6.95% 2018-2019 and 6.95% 2019-2020. After these 2 years have ended, raises will be negotiated once again between Brevard Public Schools and the Union Local 1010.</p> <p>D Greco suggested moving on with other items to allow BPS Team time to digest counter. She ended with her frustration with the incompleteness of the Comp Study.</p>
OUTCOME	On-Going, TA not signed by either bargaining team.

ITEM	Article 32.05 Wage & Salary Schedule – 1010
<p>Article 32.05 Proposed Language: Effective the <u>2018-2019</u> school year, all current food service workers shall be paid on the existing <u>Core 1010</u> salary schedule.</p> <p>D Greco began discussion stating the salary schedules have been a problem since she started. Although it is better than it was, in 20 years, we are still at the same rate. She added there was some movement made the year prior to the wage freeze but stopped like everything else. She stated this would give employees more money and a chance for increases. If this is not a possibility, she asked for an explanation as to why. P Zuercher asked if D Greco had completed a calculation, D Greco answered ~ no.</p>	
OUTCOME	On-Going, TA not signed by either bargaining team. P Zuercher commented BPS would have to analyze the cost involved.

ITEM	Article 32 Page 47 and Article 32 Page 50 - 1010
<p>Article 32.011, 32.012, 32.013, 32.014, 32.015 Page 47 New Language and Article 32.010, 32.10 Page 50 New Language was presented by 1010.</p> <p>D Greco began discussion stating discrepancy of core schedule and professional technical hourly. In her opinion, everyone should be treated the same. P Zuercher asked for clarification. D Greco clarified the movement from one salary schedule to another. R Schwindt commented, although she was not here at the time, historically, each group was held on its own. D Greco again commented that each employee should be treated equally and is looking for consistency. R Schwindt agreed by stating no one disagrees. D Greco out of frustration added that's the way it has always been. R Morton stated changes have been made and BPS can come up with options. R Schwindt added making a major sweeping change is much more involved and said as soon as we change the rules, more calls will result in those changes as well. D Greco is concerned about the employees who have been here (BPS) for a long time and should be treated better. D Greco expressed again her frustration with the incompletion of the Comp Study by BPS.</p>	
OUTCOME	On-Going, TA's not signed by either bargaining team.

ITEM	Article 33.05 Professional/Technical Wage and Salary Schedule - 1010
<p>Article 33.05 contains language pertaining to the 2001-2002 year only. 1010 has proposed deleting this article as it is outdated.</p> <p>D Greco asked if this was necessary to remain in contract. P Zuercher agreed it should not.</p>	
OUTCOME	TA signed by both bargaining teams.

ITEM	Article 27.011 Overtime – 1010
<p>Article 27.011 Overtime was presented for discussion. R Morton asked to set this TA to the side as BPS had a counter regarding 1010's previous article presented at the September 18, 2018 session which was Article 27.013.</p>	
OUTCOME	After a brief discussion by D Greco and D Varney in the hallway and both bargaining teams agreeing, 1010 WITHDREW Article 27.011 Overtime as it was submitted in error.

ITEM	Article 27.013 Overtime – BPS Counter
<p>Article 27.013 Overtime was presented as a counter to 1010's Article presented at the September 18, 2018 session.</p> <p>BPS Response Language: Board paid holidays and/or annual leave days as defined in Article 16 shall count as time worked for the purpose of computing overtime pay for a given work week.</p> <p>R Morton explained this is the same language with different wording.</p>	
OUTCOME	TA signed by both bargaining teams.

ITEM	Article 1.02 Classification Title - BPS
<p>Article 1.02 Classification Title was presented. R Morton explained BPS edited this article to make it more user-friendly by referencing the days of service calendar as opposed to adding actual dates.</p>	
OUTCOME	On-Going. TA not signed by either bargaining team.

ITEM	Article 16.02 Holidays - BPS
<p>Article 16.02 Holidays was presented.</p> <p>New Language: All employees shall receive their normal scheduled pay rate for annual leave days as prescribed on the assigned 'days of service' calendar referenced in Article 1.02.</p>	
OUTCOME	TA signed by both bargaining teams.

ITEM	Article 5.06 Communications, Courier Service – BPS Counter
Article 5.06 Communications, Courier Service was presented in memo form as a counter to 1010's Article presented at the September 18, 2018 session.	
Memo form as to not add language to contract stated: Our proposed fee is \$60 per event. This fee would include delivery from your location located at 1613 N Cocoa Blvd, Cocoa, FL, 32926 to all District school locations.	
OUTCOME	TA signed by both bargaining teams.

ITEM	Evaluations/Training
D Greco suggested additional training for supervisors on how to give proper evaluations to employees. She has had several employees mention that during their evaluations, no job description is present or referenced. R Morton commented the supervisors are constantly evaluating employees. D Greco added directors are giving evaluations instead of supervisors. How can a director conduct an evaluation if they are not 'hands-on' each day with the employee? They are removed from the day-to-day. D Greco gave an example of a custodian at the ESF was evaluated by Dane Theodore, Asst Sup, and not by the direct supervisor. R Morton stated he was sure that he was not acting alone and sought input from others. L Lawter added she has had conversations with employees who do not receive a 'face-to-face' evaluation. They are simply told to go online through ProGOE, read the evaluation and sign-off. R Morton commented BPS would make sure communication is given to administrators and to give him names/departments.	
OUTCOME	On-Going.

ITEM	Orientation
D Greco inquired about the progress of Orientation. R Morton commented it is not on the radar.	
OUTCOME	On-Going.

ITEM	Board Members Forming Committees
D Greco explained Board Member, Matt Susin, had visited one of the bus depots and informed the employees he would be forming committees to discuss issues and concerns. D Greco has concerns and asked BPS if this is allowed. P Zuercher answered she has not heard of this and will discuss with Amy Envall, School Board General Counsel, for legal clarification.	
OUTCOME	On-Going.