

**IBB Quarterly Meeting**  
**June 4<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

**Members Present:** *Randy Glenn, Steve Reed, Dan Strom, Harold Oliver (for David Taphorn), Jenneen LeMay, Daniel Dickerson (for Janie Brokenicky)*

**Visitors Present:** *Nancy Knorp, Janeil Sullivan, Sue Graver, Kelly Allen*

- 1) The teachers would like to thank the board for offering the column/2 step movement, as well as the 2% increase for those bottomed out in any column—not just 7 & 8. There are several teachers who have been concerned about this and appreciate the Board recognizing this as a concern. The team also appreciated the dialogue regarding all of the teachers' concerns.
  
- 2) The team did want to discuss some general information related to the number of contract days. LeMay presented information to the board comparing days and base salary of schools in surrounding districts. We are at the top as far as number of contract days; however, other schools are close behind (190 RC—189.5 Rock Creek, 189 Manhattan, 187 Clay Center). Rock Creek and Riley County are the lowest paid per day (\$165/167). The discussion was directed towards the days in the negotiated agreement. The board stressed that they would like to keep the days on the calendar separate from the negotiation process—the team asked/pointed out that that is difficult to do, but recognized the Board's rationale as far as compensation. The Board would only like to use it as an emergency situation where no other compensation would be available. The topic then became about hard data would be needed to show how days affect the performance of students. It was also brought up about what if a new teacher would be offered a job in 4 of the school districts in the area, how would they view the days vs. salary? The Board recognizes that we need to continue to look at how we compare to other districts—can see how this information would be important to new/younger teachers in their decision as to where to work. It was noted that other features such as start time, incentives, contact days with students, how days are counted, etc. all play a part in the equation. The Board appreciated having the information and felt it was something to continue to look at next year; however, they are hesitant to lower the contract days, as there is concern that they may need those to negotiate in the future if things do not go well legislatively in the next year or so. Discussion followed.
  
- 3) Flex days were discussed: Teachers felt the concept was good, but clarification needed to be made. Discussion followed. Team proposed possible ways to utilize the flex day(s). Contact vs. contract days were discussed: the board asked about the importance of inservice days and how the teacher valued them. Starnes explained how some of the inservice days could be used as student contact days—it's all in how the days are counted. Would the teachers prefer more inservices? The team suggested that they valued the importance of working in their classroom but would like more inservices if they are "quality" inservices. Right now we have very lean "professional development" days because of calendar constraints. Areas of concern: technology

4) The offer:

- a. The teachers appreciate the offer and the days might be discussed further down the road—return to 190 contract days as stated in current negotiated agreement.
- b. 2 Steps and Column for those who qualify.
- c. The teachers who have bottomed out would receive 2% added to what they currently make (all columns) (for each year it would be figured on the previous year's salary)
- d. Board will pay for up to 5% increase in insurance
- e. Next year: look at step and column looking to restructure the entire the whole step/column/days.
- f. No real changes in teacher evaluation process--KEEP vs. Danielson model was discussed
- g. Teacher accepted the board agreement in principal.

**Next meeting:** No meeting scheduled at this time.

**Adjournment:** 6:02 p.m.