

ARTICLE	EEA Proposal	District Response
<p><b>ARTICLE 2.6</b> Length of Agreement</p>	<p>4/4 2-year proposal</p>	<p>4/18 3-year proposal</p>
<p><b>ARTICLE 4 NEW</b> <i>Elimination of PERS Pickup</i></p>	<p><i>4/4–The District would roll our PERS pickup into the salary schedule for the benefit of Tier 3 retirees. 9/5–EEA withdrew this proposal</i></p>	<p><b>5/9–REJECTED</b> <i>6/17–4J once again rejected this proposal 9/5–The District did not respond to this withdrawal</i></p>
<p><b>ARTICLE 4.1</b> COLA</p>	<p>4/4–9% (24/25) &amp; 9% (25/26) 6/11–8.75% (24/25) &amp; 8.75% (25/26) 6/18–8.5% (24/25) &amp; 8.5% (25/26) 9/5–8.25% (24/25) &amp; 8.25% (25/26)</p>	<p>4/18–COLA–3% (24/25), 3% (25/26), 3% (26/27) 6/6–COLA–3.25% (24/25), 3.25% (25/26), 3.25% (26/27) 6/18–COLA–3.5% (24/25), 3.5% (25/26), 3.5% (26/27) 6/18–COLA–4% (24/25), 3.75% (25/26), 3.5% (26/27) 9/5–The District did not respond to our movement</p>

<p><b>ARTICLE 5.7.1 Supervisor Pay</b></p>	<p>4/4–EEA proposed supervisor Pay increase from \$16.00 to \$35.00 6/11–EEA proposed an increase from \$16.00 to \$32.00 6/17–EEA proposed an increase from \$16.00 to \$28.00</p>	<p>Supervisor Pay increase from \$16.00 to \$18.00 6/6–The District proposed an increase from \$16.00 to \$21.00 6/17–In response to EEA's proposal, the District increased from \$16.00 to \$28.00</p>
<p><b>ARTICLE 5.9 IB COMPENSATION</b></p>	<p><i>ARTICLE 5.9 5/9–EEA rejected this proposal and reiterated our belief that this compensation is crucial for both students and members 6/11–EEA asked questions in response to their proposal and reiterated the importance of this compensation.</i></p>	<p><i>Proposed the elimination of IB Assessment compensation 6/11–The District reiterated it's stance that they feel this compensation is an equity issue and they equated the amount of work to being the same as AP. They also stated that while they are proposing the elimination of the compensation they are not eliminating the workload associated with IB assessments. 6/17–The District WITHDREW this proposal</i></p>
<p><b>ARTICLE 5 Athletics</b></p>	<p>4/4–EEA proposed rolling in current EEA/4J MOA for Athletics</p>	<p>6/17–Countered with MOA language and rolled cheerleading and dance into athletics and wanted to roll back some standards</p>

<p><b>ARTICLE 6 NEW Licensed Benefits Coordinator</b></p>	<p>4/4–EEA proposes to reinstate the Licensed Benefits Coordinator into our contract 9/12–EEA reiterated the significance of having the Licensed Benefits Coordinator in our contract and cited the job description which includes licensed responsibilities</p>	<p>6/17–From the start, EEA has maintained its proposal to add the licensed benefits coordinator position back into our contract. 4J maintains its stance that this position does not need to be a licensed position and should instead be converted to a classified position. 9/12–The District maintains their position</p>
<p><b>ARTICLE 6.1 Insurance Contribution</b></p>	<p>4/4 4.5% increase in 24/25 and 4.5% increase in 25/26 6/11–4% increase in 24/25 and 4% increase in 25/26 6/18–3.8% increase in 24/25 and 3.8% increase in 25/26</p>	<p>4/18–\$30 increase each year of the contract, equivalent of about a 3% increase 6/6–\$40 increase each year of the contract</p>
<p><b>ARTICLE 7 NEW Safety/Working Conditions</b></p>	<p>4/4 Increased health and safety in terms of the physical environment (i.e. environmental concerns, workplace safety, and building air quality, etc) 5/9–EEA requested a copy of the draft procedures the District claimed they have 5/29–EEA was provided with the draft policies and does not feel that the drafts adequately address the issues mentioned in our proposal. The draft policies only address outside work environments where our concern is with the interior building environment.</p>	<p>5/9–REJECTED District responded that they have this all covered through draft procedures that are ready to be implemented 5/29–The District maintained its previous stance 6/17–The District maintained its previous stance</p>

<p><b>ARTICLE 8.1</b> <b>Sick Leave</b></p>	<p><b>4/4–Add two more sick leave days</b> <b>6/6–EEA Withdrew this proposal as part of a package proposal</b></p>	<p><b>5/9–District rejects any increase in sick leave hours</b></p>
<p><b>ARTICLE 8.3</b> <b>Personal Days</b></p>	<p>5/9–EEA rejected the District’s offer on personal days</p>	<p>4/18–Proposed adding one personal leave day and allowing the accrual of a total of 4 days. This proposal comes with several stipulations: Personal leave requests for less than 5 days must be made 48 hours in advance Requests could be denied if more than 10% of licensed employees in the district or in your building have requested a personal day Must request and receive supervisor approval 5/29–The District reiterated its previous stance 6/17–The district maintained its proposal</p>
<p><b>ARTICLE 9.3.1</b> <b>Full-Time/Part-Time Leave</b></p>	<p><b>5/9–EEA Rejected this proposal</b></p>	<p><b>Proposed combining unpaid full-time and part-time leave, removing the ability to extend a part-time leave past one year</b> <b>6/6–The District withdrew this proposal as part of a package</b></p>

<p><b>ARTICLE 10.1.5 (TA) Prep Time</b></p>	<p><b>4/4–Increase to 450 minutes for all three levels &amp; increase daily portion to no less than 30 minutes, additional 30-minute block during the student day for elementary</b> <b>6/6–(TA) EEA agreed to an increase from 320 minutes to 420 minutes for all three levels and an additional 30-minute block during the student day for elementary, daily portions of prep for secondary will be no less than 25 minutes</b></p>	<p><b>4/18–Increase to 420 minutes for all three levels, daily portion remains at no less than 20 minutes, additional 30-minute block during the student day for elementary</b></p>
<p><b>ARTICLE 10.1.6 D Morning Break</b></p>	<p><b>4/18–EEA asked clarifying questions, including whether HS teachers would be exempt from supervising during the 10-minute passing periods for their break</b> <b>6/18–EEA maintained its stance that current language around every effort being made to schedule a morning break be maintained for all three levels.</b></p>	<p><b>4/18–Proposed the elimination of the morning break at the secondary level</b> <b>6/17–The District maintains its stance that language guaranteeing a morning break at the secondary level isn't needed because it has already been built into the new schedules at both MS and HS</b></p>
<p><b>ARTICLE 10.2 (TA) PD and Planning</b></p>	<p><b>4/4–Increased pay when assigned as a guest teacher or combining classes</b> <b>6/6–(TA) EEA accepted the District proposal to withdraw the proposal on the breakdown of PD/Planning, and in return, we will now have an additional 8 hours of planning guaranteed to us during in-service week in the form of two 4-hour</b></p>	<p><b>5/9–The District rejected this proposal citing that they had increased planning time with their prep time proposal</b> <b>5/29–The District maintained its previous stance, citing the importance of providing professional development</b></p>

	blocks of uninterrupted planning	
<b>ARTICLE 10.2 194-Day Contract</b>	<b>5/9–EEA Withdrew this proposal, kept the current 191-day contract</b>	<b>4/18–191 day contract</b>
<b>ARTICLE 10.5 Grading/Midterm</b>	<b>4/4–Specifying a full-day mid-term grading day per semester, as well as guaranteeing a transition day after the first semester 6/6–EEA withdrew this proposal as part of a package proposal</b>	<b>5/9–REJECTED 5/29–The District claims that locking this into the CBA would be restrictive to the calendar process</b>
<b>ARTICLE 10.5 Transition Day for K, 6, &amp; 9</b>	<b>6/6–EEA Withdrew this proposal as part of a package proposal</b>	<b>5/9–REJECTED 5/29–The District claims that locking this into the CBA would be restrictive to the calendar process</b>
<b>ARTICLE 10.8.2 Counselor Work Days</b>	<b>4/4–Proposed 10 additional work days per counselor at each high school and 5 at the middle level</b>	<b>5/9–District proposed 6 additional days per comprehensive high school, no change to counselor days for ECCO Middle School Counselors per building increased by 2 5/29–The District remained firm in its stance that 20 days to divide among counselors at each building is sufficient 6/17–The District maintained its previous proposal</b>
<b>ARTICLE 10.8.2 ELD Teachers</b>	<b>4/4–Proposed three additional work days per ELD teacher 6/18–EEA responded with one additional work day per ELD teacher</b>	<b>5/9–District responded with 1 proposed day 6/17–The District maintained its previous proposal</b>

<p><b>ARTICLE 10.8.2 Teacher Librarians/Media Specialists</b></p>	<p>4/4–Proposed 10 additional days allocated per teacher librarian per assigned school. 6/18–EEA countered with 10 days for each elementary teacher librarian/media specialist per building assigned to and 15 days for each secondary teacher librarian/media specialist per building assigned to</p>	<p>5/9–District proposed 4 additional work days for each elementary media specialist and no change in middle/high school 6/17–The District maintained its previous proposal</p>
<p><b>ARTICLE 10 NEW Sub Shortage</b></p>	<p>4/4–Increased pay when assigned as a guest teacher or combining classes 6/6–EEA rejected the District’s offer to withdraw this proposal in exchange for a package 6/18–EEA proposed the sub rate of pay when teachers are assigned as a guest teacher or have their classes combined 9/12–EEA revised its proposal, providing compensation for members assigned as a guest teacher, adding compensation for SSD unit members covering staffing shortages</p>	<p>5/9–District claims this does not happen very often 5/29–The District maintains its stance that this does not happen often and that this would be considered “double pay” because classroom supervision is part of our job duties 6/17–The District maintained its previous stance, in particular on the "double pay" 9/12–The District countered, not agreeing to paying SSD members FTE for covering staffing shortages, instead offering to pay per diem for additional hours worked</p>
<p><b>ARTICLE 11 Posting Positions</b></p>	<p>5/9–Rejected their offer and remain firm on maintaining current posting rights 5/29–Your EEA team reiterated our previous stance on maintaining posting rights for our members</p>	<p>4/18–Proposed the elimination of the exclusive 5-day posting period for unit members &amp; requirement to fill vacancies with a qualified unit member if at least 2 qualified members apply 5/29–The District reiterated its previous stance</p>

<p><b>ARTICLE 13.7.4 IEP/504 Compensation and Release Days</b></p>	<p>4/4–EEA Proposed per diem rate pay for IEP/504 meetings during planning days, prep time, or outside the workday 4/18–EEA responded to 4J's proposal with clarifying questions 6/18–EEA pulled its proposal for per diem pay and countered with an increase to the IEP pool from \$120,000 to \$220,000 and proposed an increase in the maximum hours of compensation from 12 to 20 hours. 9/5–EEA reiterated its proposal for increasing the IEP pool from \$120,000 to \$220,000 and an increase in the maximum hours of compensation from 12 to 20 hours <b>9/12–EEA proposed an increase in the IEP/504 Pool to \$190,000, and a maximum of 15 hours of compensation</b></p>	<p>4/18–Proposed eliminating release days for SSD and replacing them with a stipend 5/29–The District reiterated its stance that they would like stipends rather than release days. 6/17–The District maintained its previous proposal 6/18–The District countered EEA's proposal with an increase to the IEP pool from \$120,000 to \$150,000 and an increase in maximum hours of compensation to 15. 9/5–The District continued with their counter of \$150,000 and an increase to 15 hours <b>9/12–The District conceptually agreed to EEA's proposal</b></p>
<p><b>ARTICLE 13.7.7 Case Management</b></p>	<p>4/18–EEA's proposal guarantees one case management period per day at the secondary level 6/18–EEA reiterated its stance that we are not willing to give up the daily case management period. 9/5–EEA reiterated its stance that we are not willing to give up the daily case management period <b>9/12–EEA adjusted its proposal, providing a weekly class period where</b></p>	<p>4/18–Proposed guaranteeing one case management period of the full schedule at the secondary level 5/9–District reiterated their previous stance 5/29–The District reiterated its previous stance citing that it did not intend to reduce the amount of time educators spend with students to 50%</p>



	<p><b>case managers will address specific school-wide systemic needs related to special education</b></p>	<p><b>6/17–The District maintained its previous proposal</b>  <b>9/5–The District, once again, maintains their position</b>  <b>9/12–The District conceptually agreed to EEA’s proposal</b></p>
<p><b>ARTICLE 17 NEW Proposed Class Size and Caseload Caps</b></p>	<p><b>4/4–EEA proposed class sizes caps for all classrooms at all levels &amp; Caseload Caps for all specialists</b>  <b>9/12–EEA withdrew this proposal, contingent on District’s acceptance of package currently on the table</b></p>	<p><b>5/9–District claimed this is permissive language, EEA responded with the assertion that it is a mandatory subject of bargaining</b>  <b>5/29–The District reiterated its previous stance. They cited financial, space, and logistical concerns</b>  <b>6/17–The District maintained its previous stance</b></p>
<p><b>Contract APPENDIX D Affinity Group Pay</b></p>	<p>4/4–Increase to affinity group pay at all levels &amp; language adding more advisors if groups are over 30 students at elementary and 35 at secondary  6/11–\$3,250 for HS, \$2,750 for MS, \$1,750 for elementary and maintained language on adding more advisors  6/18–\$3,000 for HS, \$2,500 for MS, \$1,500 for elementary and maintained language on adding more advisors  9/5–EEA reiterated \$3,000 for HS, \$2,500 for MS, \$1,500 for elementary and maintained language on adding more advisors</p>	<p>5/9–REJECTED  6/6–The District has proposed increasing Affinity Group Advisor stipends by \$500 at all levels but does not agree with adding more advisors–\$3,000 for HS, \$2,000 for MS, \$1,500 for elementary  6/17–The District maintained its increases from 6/6, but added the language that would add additional advisors if groups got larger than 30 at elementary or 35 at secondary  9/5–The District remains at \$3,000 for HS, \$2,000 for MS, \$1,500 for elementary and</p>

		maintained language on adding more advisors
<b>Contract APPENDIX D Dual Immersion Stipend</b>	4/4–from \$2,500 to \$5,000 6/18–EEA counter with a \$4,000 stipend 9/5–EEA countered with a \$3,500 stipend	5/9–REJECTED 6/17–The District proposed an increase in the stipend to \$2,750 9/5–The District countered with a \$3,000 stipend
<b>Contract APPENDIX D ELD/Bilingual Differentials</b>	4/4–EEA Proposed ESOL and bilingual pay differentials 9/5–EEA reiterated ESOL and bilingual pay differentials	5/9–REJECTED 9/5–The District did not provide a written proposal, but shared that they are not interested in the ESOL differential
<b>NEW ARTICLE Safe Learning Environment</b>	4/4–Proposed language around creating a safe learning environment for students 6/6–EEA revised our proposal to include reference to 4J’s Major Behavior Definitions and Discipline Matrix documents, and to include classified staff participation in training and implementing support plans. 6/18–EEA made some revisions to its proposal that addresses some of the concerns that the District had expressed, but maintained our position and the importance of including classified staff as an integral part of the team supporting students. <b>9/12–EEA adapted the Safe Learning Article, maintaining all key aspects</b>	5/9–District said this issue is already addressed through the Discipline Matrix and the Student Rights & Responsibilities Handbook & they claimed that they need District-wide data collection 6/11–The District response was that they already have processes/procedures in place to address these issues and that they are all permissive subjects of bargaining. They cited the Leadership MOA, which contains components of this work through the following required teams: Equity/Inclusion, Intervention, & Climate/Culture. They cited that they have added a team of specialists through MTSS to continue this ongoing work and stated that our proposal could

	<p><b>of the proposal, and addressing some District concerns</b></p>	<p>conflict with some established procedures. They also stated their concern with referencing Classified employee rights in the licensed CBA.</p> <p>6/17–The District maintained its previous stance</p> <p>9/12–The District largely agreed to EEA’s Safe Learning Article, making some language changes</p>
--	--	--