

LINCOLN COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT BARGAINING COMMUNICATION

The Association and District exchanged proposals on May 5, 2015: LCEA proposed Articles 6, 18, 20, and 21 and the District proposed Articles 4, 6, 9, 10, and 15. There was a good discussion around academic freedom, and it seems that teacher concerns are more around systems rather than contract language. See the most recent proposals and updated bargaining log on the website at the following link: http://www.lincoln.k12.or.us/our_district/bargaining_information.php).

Later in the day, the Association posed questions around the District State School Fund reports for 2014-15 and 2015-16, which indicate that the District is receiving \$3 million more in the general fund in 2015-16. The District communicated that these extra funds will go toward the added costs of the following:

- \$1.8 million in roll-up costs
- \$400,000 in General Fund expenditures paid with non-general funds – reserves exhausted
- \$200,000 in additional transportation expenses
- \$1 million in additional operating expenses of a new building and the costs of full-day Kindergarten across the district

There were also questions around the \$2.285 million State School Funds anticipated to be received in May. It was explained that these funds will be used to increase the ending fund balance, and a portion held in reserves for the 2016-17 school year due to the State School Fund 50/50 split, in which funds will be needed to sustain status quo.

Salary Schedule Adjustments

There was discussion around the withholding of COLA increases for the licensed group, and LCEA stated the licensed group has taken the largest financial hit over the past five years. Following is a history of salary-increase information for all employee groups for the past seven years.

YEAR	LICENSED	CLASSIFIED	CONFIDENTIAL	***ADMIN
2008-09	3.90% + step	1.00% + step	2.90% + step	2.50%
2009-10	2.70% + step	1.00% + step	No step	0.00%
*2010-11	2.00% + step	1.00% + step	5.88%	3.50%
*2011-12	Step only	1.00% + step	No step	0.00%
*2012-13	Step only	Step only	Step only	0.00%
2013-14	Step only	Step only	Step only	0.00%
2014-15	**0.50% + step	Step only	Step only	2.00%

*All employee groups had the following furlough days cut from their salaries: 2010-11, 12 days; 2011-12, 6 days; 2012-13, 5 days. Most administrators worked the furlough days without pay.

**In addition, the licensed group received an increase of between 2.00-7.60% in 2014-15, due to an additional step and column realignment.

***Administrators do not receive steps.

See the [Attachment](#) showing the increases between steps and columns on the current licensed salary schedule.

Licensed on Step 15

This discussion also included concern around the 67 teachers who are currently on step 15. Statements were made indicating that this specific group of teachers is not being treated with the respect and appreciation that they deserve for their longevity of service to the District. Superintendent Steve Boynton explained that unless there is additional funding provided by the State Legislators, the District is not in a position to offer additional salary schedule adjustments. Following is the data on the 60 licensed staff who have been impacted by no increases for three years and the number of years they have been on step 15, as well as the increase data taken from the table above (with the addition of 2006-07 and 2007-08):

Step 15	Licensed	Increase Data
1st yr (2014-15)	7	**0.50% (see note above)
2nd yr (2013-14)	4	No increase
3rd yr (2012-13)	0	No increase; 5 furlough days (all staff)
4th yr (2011-12)	4	No increase; 6 furlough days (all staff)
5th yr (2010-11)	3	2.00%; 12 furlough days (all staff)
6th yr (2009-10)	5	2.70%
7th yr (2008-09)	9	3.90%
8th yr (2007-08)	10	2.50%
9th yr (2006-07)	25	2.50%
	<hr/>	
	67	

The District agrees philosophically that teachers should receive increases each year. However, the fact that the current salary schedule has larger than average step and column increases, the District is unable to sustain continued salary schedule adjustments. The District is open to looking at other ideas to address this concern, as long as the ideas fit within the current financial situation.

Teacher Retention

Teacher retention was brought up as a concern on a number of occasions by the Association. In comparison with other districts across the state, hiring has been going on statewide for the past two years at an increasing rate due to retirements and other reasons. We are experiencing a teacher shortage in certain content and endorsement areas, and with more districts hiring in the past couple of years, teachers have options to move closer to friends and families. The District has been collecting data on the various reasons over the past four years based on exit survey data and personal testimonies, as shown below:

2014-15

Reason	Number	Percent
Retirement	7	21.21%
Move/family	9	27.27%
Performance	8	24.24%
Job Change	10	30.30%
Education	2	6.06%

*36

*36 teachers have resigned to date. The District is hiring for 40.5 positions, based on the need for Kindergarten teachers and other positions added due to program needs.

The 2014-15 data may change based on exit surveys still in process. Reasons collected were submitted via personal testimonies or through principals.

Corvallis School District hired 49 teachers last year and is looking at hiring 48 this year; Greater Albany Public Schools hired 88 teachers last year and is looking at hiring 39 teachers this year.

2013-14

Reason	Number	Percent
Retirement	16	36.36%
Move/family	21	47.73%
Performance	1	2.27%
Job Change	3	6.82%
Temporary	3	6.82%
	<u>44</u>	
	*44	

*44 teachers resigned from their positions in 2013-14, but due to hiring back temporary teachers and other added positions, 67 teachers were hired for the 2014-15 school year.

2012-13

Reason	Number	Percent
Retirement	4	17.39%
Move/family	10	43.48%
Performance	4	17.39%
Job Change	3	13.04%
Temporary	1	4.35%
Deceased	1	4.35%
	<u>23</u>	

2011-12

Reason	Number	Percent
Retirement	12	63.16%
Move/family	4	21.05%
Performance	3	15.79%
	<u>19</u>	

The Association provided a memo to the District stating that they no longer wish to discuss the proposal by the District to exclude nurses from Article 1 (see [Attachment](#)). The reason the District had proposed excluding nurses from the contract is due to most of the contract language not applying to them, and the District’s ability to recruit and retain nurses to serve the medical needs of students.

2014-2015 Licensed Salary Schedule

Step	BA	Increase between Steps	BA+24	Increase between Steps	BA+45	Increase between Steps	BA+60	Increase between Steps	MA	Increase between Steps	MA+45	Increase between Steps
1	\$ 35,579		\$ 37,179		\$ 38,777		\$ 40,380		\$ 41,982		\$ 45,183	
2	\$ 37,180	4.50%	\$ 38,778	4.30%	\$ 40,378	4.13%	\$ 41,983	3.97%	\$ 43,581	3.81%	\$ 46,782	3.54%
3	\$ 38,779	4.30%	\$ 40,379	4.13%	\$ 41,981	3.97%	\$ 43,583	3.81%	\$ 45,185	3.68%	\$ 48,387	3.43%
4	\$ 40,380	4.13%	\$ 41,982	3.97%	\$ 43,581	3.81%	\$ 45,186	3.68%	\$ 46,785	3.54%	\$ 49,988	3.31%
5	\$ 41,983	3.97%	\$ 43,582	3.81%	\$ 45,185	3.68%	\$ 46,786	3.54%	\$ 48,389	3.43%	\$ 51,588	3.20%
6	\$ 43,583	3.81%	\$ 45,186	3.68%	\$ 46,784	3.54%	\$ 48,391	3.43%	\$ 49,991	3.31%	\$ 53,193	3.11%
7	\$ 45,187	3.68%	\$ 46,785	3.54%	\$ 48,389	3.43%	\$ 49,992	3.31%	\$ 51,591	3.20%	\$ 54,794	3.01%
8	\$ 46,850	3.68%	\$ 48,390	3.43%	\$ 49,991	3.31%	\$ 51,592	3.20%	\$ 53,242	3.20%	\$ 56,443	3.01%
9	\$ 48,574	3.68%	\$ 50,050	3.43%	\$ 51,645	3.31%	\$ 53,243	3.20%	\$ 54,945	3.20%	\$ 58,142	3.01%
10	\$ 50,361	3.68%	\$ 51,766	3.43%	\$ 53,355	3.31%	\$ 54,947	3.20%	\$ 56,704	3.20%	\$ 59,892	3.01%
11	\$ 52,353	3.95%	\$ 53,980	4.28%	\$ 55,121	3.31%	\$ 56,705	3.20%	\$ 58,518	3.20%	\$ 61,695	3.01%
12	\$ 52,353	0.00%	\$ 53,980	0.00%	\$ 56,945	3.31%	\$ 58,520	3.20%	\$ 60,391	3.20%	\$ 63,552	3.01%
13	\$ 52,353	0.00%	\$ 53,980	0.00%	\$ 58,855	3.35%	\$ 60,392	3.20%	\$ 62,323	3.20%	\$ 65,465	3.01%
14	\$ 52,353	0.00%	\$ 53,980	0.00%	\$ 58,855	0.00%	\$ 62,325	3.20%	\$ 64,318	3.20%	\$ 67,435	3.01%
15	\$ 52,353	0.00%	\$ 53,980	0.00%	\$ 58,855	0.00%	\$ 62,325	0.00%	\$ 66,376	3.20%	\$ 69,465	3.01%

Step	BA		BA+24	Increase between Columns + 1 Step	BA+45	Increase between Columns + 1 Step	BA+60	Increase between Columns + 1 Step	MA	Increase between Columns + 1 Step	MA+45	Increase between Columns + 1 Step
1	\$ 35,579		\$ 37,179		\$ 38,777		\$ 40,380		\$ 41,982		\$ 45,183	
2	\$ 37,180		\$ 38,778	8.25%	\$ 40,378	7.92%	\$ 41,983	7.64%	\$ 43,581	7.35%	\$ 46,782	10.26%
3	\$ 38,779		\$ 40,379	7.92%	\$ 41,981	7.63%	\$ 43,583	7.35%	\$ 45,185	7.09%	\$ 48,387	9.93%
4	\$ 40,380		\$ 41,982	7.63%	\$ 43,581	7.35%	\$ 45,186	7.09%	\$ 46,785	6.84%	\$ 49,988	9.61%
5	\$ 41,983		\$ 43,582	7.35%	\$ 45,185	7.09%	\$ 46,786	6.85%	\$ 48,389	6.62%	\$ 51,588	9.31%
6	\$ 43,583		\$ 45,186	7.09%	\$ 46,784	6.85%	\$ 48,391	6.63%	\$ 49,991	6.41%	\$ 53,193	9.03%
7	\$ 45,187		\$ 46,785	6.84%	\$ 48,389	6.62%	\$ 49,992	6.42%	\$ 51,591	6.20%	\$ 54,794	8.76%
8	\$ 46,850		\$ 48,390	6.62%	\$ 49,991	6.41%	\$ 51,592	6.21%	\$ 53,242	6.10%	\$ 56,443	8.60%
9	\$ 48,574		\$ 50,050	6.39%	\$ 51,645	6.30%	\$ 53,243	6.11%	\$ 54,945	6.10%	\$ 58,142	8.43%
10	\$ 50,361		\$ 51,766	6.17%	\$ 53,355	6.19%	\$ 54,947	6.01%	\$ 56,704	6.10%	\$ 59,892	8.26%
11	\$ 52,353		\$ 53,980	6.70%	\$ 55,121	6.09%	\$ 56,705	5.91%	\$ 58,518	6.10%	\$ 61,695	8.09%
12	\$ 52,353		\$ 53,980	3.01%	\$ 56,945	5.21%	\$ 58,520	5.81%	\$ 60,391	6.10%	\$ 63,552	7.92%
13	\$ 52,353		\$ 53,980	3.01%	\$ 58,855	8.28%	\$ 60,392	5.71%	\$ 62,323	6.10%	\$ 65,465	7.75%
14	\$ 52,353		\$ 53,980	3.01%	\$ 58,855	8.28%	\$ 62,325	5.57%	\$ 64,318	6.10%	\$ 67,435	7.58%
15	\$ 52,353		\$ 53,980	3.01%	\$ 58,855	8.28%	\$ 62,325	5.57%	\$ 66,376	6.10%	\$ 69,465	7.41%

May 5, 2015

To: Lincoln County School District Bargaining Team

From: LCEA Bargaining Team

Re: Refusal to Negotiate Permissive Terms

This purpose of this memorandum is to notify the LCSD bargaining team of an issue with the current District proposal for Article 1 Recognition. The LCEA is hereby notifying the District that it will not negotiate over the proposal to add "nurses" to the list of employees that are "specifically excluded from the bargaining unit."

The exclusion of an established group of employees from a bargaining unit is a permissive subject of bargaining. We will no longer negotiate over the exclusion of nurses in Article 1.

We do, however, remain interested and open to proposals that seek to address the needs of our bargaining unit members such as nurses. Please direct any questions or concerns to Jason Foltz.