

DISTRICT'S RESPONSE TO ASSOCIATION 12/20/16 OFFER
First Meeting of January 2017

ASSOCIATION SALARY PROPOSAL:

- **Previous: Salary:** Current (and only) Association demand: 3%, 4%, 4% ,5% on current matrix with a \$12,000 jump step. Eliminates a large number of steps to get to the highest salary sooner. **This is the only demand the Association has placed on the table to date.**
- **December 20th Salary:** Association demand: 3%, 4%, 4% ,5%, 3% and 3% on a revised matrix with a split \$12,000 jump step. Eliminates a large number of steps to get to the highest salary sooner. **THE NEW DEMAND ADDS TWO MORE YEARS TO THE PREVIOUS OFFER AT APPROXIMATELY 3% INCREASE PER YEAR. THE ASSOCIATION'S DEMAND TOTALS 22% INCREASE OVER THE 6 YEAR PERIOD NOT COUNTING ADDITIONAL INCREASES FOR TAKING CONTINUING EDUCATION COURSES.**

DISTRICT RESPONSE TO SALARY:

The District rejects the Association's latest salary offer as the Association's most expensive offer to date. After all of this time bargaining the Association has just now made its second salary proposal and it did nothing more than add on 2 more years at 3% each year, totaling a disproportionately high 22% salary increase. Of course, as the Association is well aware, this demand does not account for the uncalculated salary increases for taking continuing education courses, which are also paid for by the District. The revised matrix compresses the schedule and makes everyone earn more money for a longer period of time. The District is also opposed to the current matrix because it continues to distribute the money unfairly. Instead of having one \$12,000 jump step that only a few receive (which eats up the rest of the money put into the matrix) this matrix reduces steps and divides the jump steps to the last two steps in the matrix. The District's offer, on the other hand, offers even money (3.25% per year) to each and every member regardless of the placement on the scale. Overall, this is a counterproductive matrix which continues to discriminate against some of the membership and adds compounded money to the scales as it continues. As such it is too costly and philosophically divergent from the District's goals. Finally, the economic uncertainty makes a 6 year offer unacceptable on its face, especially given the increases sought by the Association.

ASSOCIATION HEALTH PROPOSAL:

- **Previous: Health:** PPO with \$350 single/\$700 family deductible. Zero premium share. Must be included in Berks Health Trust which is managed 50/50 with the unions. Benefits cannot be changed without a 75% majority vote. Dr. office copays: \$15 Family Practitioner, \$30 specialist, \$40 Urgent care, \$100 ER. RX: Generic-\$5, Brand Preferred \$35, Non-preferred \$70; Mail order double. Although the terms of this plan matches the

terms of the District's offer, except for a modest premium share, the Association has rejected the District's offer.

- **December 20th Health:** Association demand:
 - Reduce Deductible offer from \$350/700 to **\$200/400**
 - Reduce Dr. Copays offer to: **\$15** Family Practitioner, **\$25** Specialist, **\$30** urgent care, and **\$100** emergency room.
 - Reduce Prescription co-pays offer as follows: Generic **\$15**, Formulary **\$25**, and Non-formulary **\$45**.
 - Increase premium share as follows: 2016-17 and 2017-18 **No increase**; 2018-19 and 2019-20 average increase of **\$5** per pay; 2020-21 and 2021-22 average increase of **\$2.50** per pay.

DISTRICT'S RESPONSE TO HEALTH:

The District rejects the Association's current health care proposal as both regressive and too costly. The Association's last proposal on health care was accepted by the District except for the provider. The plans are identical with the sole exception of the plan not being in the Berks Trust. The District's plan offered similar savings as the Berks Trust, yet the Association rejected the proposal and responded with freezing the current health care plan dating back to 2012-13. This proposal calls for reductions from the Association's previous offer in deductibles, doctor co-pays and prescription co-pays. The meager increases suggested in premium shares will result in a net loss in percentage of premium. No business or school entity would ever agree to take an already dated plan out to 2022 with such low deductibles and copays. Such a decision would be reckless in addition to unaffordable.

OTHER ISSUES

- The remainder of the proposal, Hourly Services and Extracurricular Rates are subject to further discussion.
- The District also rejects the elimination of some of its managerial and economic proposals such as the elimination of furlough rights beyond the statute, as well as the elimination of emergency sick days beyond what the statute already provides.