

Nampa Joint Negotiations Team
Interest-Based Bargaining Facilitation
February 13, 2019
8:30 a.m. to noon

Team Members: Mandy Simpson, Veronica Maple, Brian Coffey, Chad Longley, Seanna Ault, Jaimee Hoelsing, Chuck Silzly, Sandra Urbina, Diana Molino and Gregg Russell. Facilitators Kathy Yamamoto and Blas Telleria.

1. Approval of Minutes from February 8, 2019

A motion was made to add the language “The notes to administrator text box in absence management is no longer a requirement thanks to the discussion and help from HR” in section 4 following the paragraph that ends with the phrase mental health days.

The minutes were approved with the amended language.

2. Agree to Note-taking and Facilitation Protocol

The facilitators led the team in a discussion regarding communication to all staff.

The facilitators led the team in a discussion regarding the minutes. They discussed what some other districts have used for minutes. The team members felt that given the level of detail in past minutes and the questions that have come up regarding the new process it was beneficial to continue with detailed minutes. They are more detailed than what other districts use but much less detailed than they had been in the past.

The team members discussed what would constitute a quorum during negotiations. The teams discussed a number of scenarios. A vote was taken on 3 different options: option A was for 3 association members, 3 district members and 2 facilitators; option B was for 8 total members in attendance; and option C was to have six members in attendance to vote. Option C had the most positive votes. The teams discussed the option in detail. During discussion, option D for 6 total members at the table with at least 2 from the association and 2 from the district, was added.

The team discussed the ability to bring something back up to the team if there are questions regarding the decision making process and members were missing. The team would be able to do this if they chose to.

The team discussed dot matrix voting; they want to have an equal number present from the association and the district to use this voting method.

They used the dot voting process to determine quorum; there were 6 votes for option C and 14 for option D. The members discussed the vote. Several felt that they would like to use option C, but felt that since they had constituencies to be accountable to, the best option was D.

The teams came to consensus on option D, a total of 6 members in attendance with at least 2 from each team.

3. Communications – How and when are we communicating with staff/public?

The facilitators shared examples of joint communications from the Boise and Coeur d’ Alene school districts.

The team agreed to share a communication at the conclusion of the sessions.

4. Selection of Topic for IBB

Article 4.2 Superintendent Evaluation Team

Issue – The language in the contract is confusing. The language does not create a team to evaluate the superintendent, but instead speaks to the evaluation of certified teachers. There is board policy regarding the evaluation of all certified staff, which aligns with IDAPA Rule 08.02.02.120.04. The current contract language conflicts with law. All certified staff includes nurses, counselors, psychologists, SLPs, OTs and social workers as well as teachers.

Options discussed include – deal with just the title, dig deeper as a whole, dig deeper in a small group to create a white paper, re-evaluate the language as this is a board responsibility, as a negotiations team examine, delegate, or add language, or ask for more information.

Goal – Bring a broad group to the table, when the board creates this committee let the team review, reword the article, and then go to evaluation team to assist direction to the board. The team discussed the fact that the title and language in the article do not fit.

The team reached consensus on moving this topic to a smaller group to create a white paper. The team will reword the article, bring a broader group to the table to help determine what it should look like, then draft the white paper and straw design.

Veronica, Sandra and Diana will work on the language and will have a draft ready by the next meeting.

The team noted that check-in was not done at the beginning of the meeting; the team completed that process at this time.

Topic for IBB –

Article 5.8 – Protected time for association meetings

The language was taken back to NEA leadership following the last meeting; no revisions were suggested.

A suggestion was made to revise the language to end after “all legally required meetings may be held.” The team discussed removing the word “all” in 5.8.b and removing etc. at the end. The word “all” was replaced with “if no other times are available.”

The team tentatively agreed to the following language.

5.8 Protected Time for Association Meetings (new section)

During the assigned District Leadership Team times, no other district/building required meetings can be scheduled after contract time to allow for Association meetings.

- a. District Leadership Team meeting dates will be published by August 15 of the current contract year.
- b. While every attempt will be made to adhere to the provisions of 5.8, all if no other times are available, legally required meetings may be held including but not limited to: IEPs, 504s, state required mediation meetings, etc.

Next IBB Topic

Negotiations 9.1

Issue – Beginning negotiations sessions by March of the current school year doesn't give much time to process and find solutions, as well as have a tentatively agreed upon master contract before certified staff leave for the summer. The language currently lists specific years, requiring annual revision.

Interests – Certified staff are more engaged with ratification during a current school year, not having a master contract while trying to hire new staff is a problem and not having a master contract before the school year begins is a problem. It is a year-round, ongoing process.

Draft language was discussed by the team. The team discussed the possibility of listing Interest Based Bargaining specifically. The team preferred not to list this specifically in case there was a desire to use a different process. There was discussion of training and how that will work and expiration dates in the contract. The team discussed stating that a collaborative process will be used, but not specifically listing I.B.B. The team discussed possibly beginning meetings as early as September, but could defer to a later date. The team discussed using language of on or before October 15th or on or before November 1st.

A vote was taken to determine if the team was ready to continue discussion to finish this topic as it was approaching ending time. The team agreed to continue.

A motion was made to use the language of on or before October 15th.

A vote was used to reach consensus on the language change.

The teams set the next two meeting dates of February 20th 8:30 am to noon, and March 1st noon to 4:00 p.m.

Check-out was completed.

The meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m.