

PSEA FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

April 3, 2015

For the last month, there has been a lot of information/misinformation going out to employees, generating a LOT of questions. To help provide clarity on PSEA's position on recent statements and claims, we have prepared this FAQ sheet. If you have any questions, you should contact the PSEA office at 858.859.7968.

- **The PFT says that our recent 1% increase is because they got a 1% increase (a "me too"). But they have to work two more days and we don't. Is this true?**
 - The PFT agreed to work two more work days (professional learning days) in 2014-15. That equated to a value of about a 1% increase, maybe slightly more.
 - The District offered PSEA a 1% increase in August of 2014 and did not say anything about it being parity with the teachers' increase in days. We assumed that the PFT and SEIU were also offered 1%. The District did not mention that the offer was to be parity for two extra days for PFT.
 - We do not feel that the offer should be a "me too." Our position is that if a unit is asked to work extra hours/days/weeks, it is not being given a raise; there should be no "me too" increase due to other units because of it. In fact, if the PFT were to negotiate 1% as a "me too" to our recent salary increase, PSEA would not oppose it nor try to gain an additional increase because of it.
- **Why did we file a PERB charge against the District? What are the issues?**
 - The District consistently told that there was no money for any of the inequities we identified (Health & Welfare costs; restoration of positions; vacation accrual).
 - In November we decided to accept the District's proposal of 1% and come back in January to continue our push for equity. We put in a "me too" clause so that if any other unit got an increase more than 1%, so would we. "Me too" language has been a standard practice.
 - At the end of January, the District still wasn't ready to sign off, and told PSEA that it was because there was more money in the budget. They asked us to wait until they negotiated with the teachers first.
 - More money? Shouldn't we be talking about fixing the inequities with classified employees before we talk about District-wide salary increases? What about restoration of positions and healthcare costs?
 - We realized that the District had not sunshined proposals with the PFT to officially open negotiations, and yet they were asking us to wait. This caused us to speculate that the "extra money" that might be used for parity could be spent before we get to the table!
 - PSEA decided we must file a PERB charge against the District for not legally sunshining their proposal to the PFT, effectively stopping District negotiations with the PFT. This way, we could come back to the table and not be told that there was no money to resolve the inequities we face.
- **The PFT says that they haven't sunshined with the District since 2006. PSEA never complained about it before, so why now?**
 - We probably never would have noticed they weren't in compliance with the law if the District hadn't delayed PSEA's settlement.
- **Teachers at my site say that they were negotiating for more than a 1% increase. They say if we wouldn't have stopped the PFT's negotiations, we'd have a salary increase more than 1% right now.**
 - It is not clear that there is more money in the budget. At negotiation meetings and at school board meetings, the reports show large deficits in the 2015-16 year. No information/data has been presented to PSEA showing anything different.
 - If there *is* more money, then let's all talk about fixing the inequities in our out-of-pocket health care costs or restoring our hours and positions that were so greatly diminished during the state budget crisis.
- **For every 1% increase in salaries for PUSD employees, how much does it cost the District's general fund?**
 - For PSEA, 1% equals \$473,040
 - For SEIU, 1% equals \$181,466
 - For APSM, 1% equals \$300,084
 - For PFT, 1% equals \$1,371,185
 - For District-wide salary increases of 1%, it would cost the District's general fund **\$2,325,775**.

- **PSEA says that equalizing our Health & Welfare out-of-pocket costs with APSM/PFT is a primary goal of the PSEA Negotiation Team. Why?**

- The disparity between what we pay and what APSM/PFT pays is HUGE! Take a look at these examples:

Ex. 1: 8 Hour School Admin Asst.
w/ family, choosing Aetna Value

PSEA	APSM/PFT
991.30	991.30
495.00	1,130.37
1,486.30	2,121.67
2,653.47	2,653.47
(1,167.17)	(531.80)
(635.37)	

Ex. 2: 6 Hour Instructional Asst. I
w/ family, choosing Kaiser

PSEA	APSM/PFT
912.00	991.30
191.13	420.10
1,103.13	1,411.40
1,760.90	1,760.90
(657.77)	(349.50)
(308.27)	

↑ PSEA employee pays this much more ↑

- **What would it cost to bring Health & Welfare out-of-pocket costs equal to APSM and PFT costs?**
 - Approximately \$2.2 million (coincidentally about 1% of total employee salaries).
 - We think the Board of Education should look at fixing this inequity before a 1% wage increase is considered for all employees. Would you prefer to have an increase of one percent of your base pay per month (maybe \$30 before tax) in your paycheck, or pay \$787 less per month for your healthcare?
- **What would it cost to bring back hours and positions to the 2003 levels?**
 - Hard to say because classified staff had over 370 positions completely eliminated and another 209 reduced in either work hours or work year. That loss was so huge, and the data so far back, the dollar value has not been calculated.
 - In 2014, we asked to restore just a few positions: Library Media Techs, LANS, Middle and High School Accounting Techs, Office Assistant II's, and Computer Resource Assistants. That cost was about \$1.8 million.
- **Is PSEA opposed to the Interest-based Problem Solving (IBPS) method of bargaining?**
 - No. In fact, we've used the IBPS method with the District for some issues, such as jury duty and CPR/First Aid compensation. It worked well for these low-impact types of issues.
 - The PFT has had great success with IBPS and every month they meet and are provided with budget and other data that drives their decision-making. We would *love* to be involved in that, but haven't been invited.
- **Why don't we negotiate with the District using IBPS?**
 - While we were successful with jury duty and CPR/First Aid, we haven't always been successful. We tried to have IBPS sessions to discuss the 3+3 contract situation and bargain for more benefitted positions. However, after many months of various delays and then an admission by the District that we could talk, but there was no money to do anything, we decided it was not a good use of time.
 - For IBPS, the fundamental relationship between the parties must be based on mutual respect, trust and honesty. PSEA and the District are not there yet. We look forward to a day when we can be involved in a productive IBPS session with the District.
- **Why does the District pay our CalPERS contribution when they do not pay STRS contributions for teachers?**
 - Way back in the early 1990's, our unit (then CSEA) negotiated a contract that said instead of giving us an approximately 5% pay increase, the District would pay our CalPERS employee contribution.
 - Pension Reform has made many changes to the law regarding the District's ability to pay the employee's contribution. We have it in our contract now, but we know this benefit will go away soon. When it does, we will likely see a 5% increase in salary, but the current CalPERS employee contribution rate is at 7%.
- **When will we see our 1% increase?**
 - We should see it in our May pay warrant, although that has not been confirmed.
 - Any retroactive calculations will be in our June warrant.

Strength in Unity!