

Valley View Council Local 604 IFT/AFT AFL-CIO IELRB Public Posting



Most Recent Offer Union Submission

August 18, 2025
Submitted by: Renee Calabrese IFT
Field Service Director



Components

- Introduction
- History of Bargaining in VVSD
- Negotiations Overview
- Mediation
- Board-Proposed Changes
- Union-Proposed Changes
- Tentatively Agreed Upon Items
- Items Remaining
- Compensation
- Insurance
- Sick Day Multiplier
- Daily Schedule
- Stakeholder Voice
- Economic Contingency Reopener
- Stipends
- Longevity Pay for Paraprofessionals and Security
- District Financial Status
- Cost Analysis of Union and District Salary Increases
- Conclusion



<u>Introduction</u>

The Valley View Council(VVC) is the Illinois Federation of Teacher's second largest council in the state supporting over 1,800 members that consist of teachers, nurses, paraprofessionals, security, and maintenance employees that serve almost 15,000 students in one of the most diverse PreK-12 Unit School Districts in the state. Within the council there are over 100 different unique roles that support the needs of every learner throughout the district.

VVC is overall very disappointed with Valley View School District 365U (VVSD) poor effort to reach a tentative agreement(TA) with the Union. VVSD came to the table not to reach a TA with the Union but to play games, waste our time, and to attempt to stick it to the Union for past settlements that they felt the Union got the better half ($\frac{1}{2}$) of the deal.

To say that the Board of Education(BOE) has been stalling our work and has not been receptive to the Union bargaining team since the start would be an understatement. The BOE has given clear directives to their lead negotiator to do everything to impede the work that needed to get done and has made negotiations extremely difficult. The BOE has shown no interest in working with the Union nor in working collaboratively with the Union or Administration to bring the VVC a fair and adequate contract.

VVC has always maintained a positive and collaborative working relationship with administration and the BOE, but things have certainly taken a turn for the worse over the last year. VVC wants a fair contract to remain as an appealing district for others to work in, to retain our current workforce, and maintain a living wage for themselves and their families. Since the last contract inflation has soared over 15% making things extremely difficult for our staff, especially our hourly compensated Education Support Professionals(ESP's) who provide essential support services in our schools.



History of Bargaining in VVSD

Over the last decade the VVC and VVSD have engaged in Interest Based Bargaining(IBB) because of the strong relationships that the Union and District Administration have had. In the past both parties valued one another and worked collaboratively daily which led to much smoother negotiations when it was time to bargain. In the history of the VVC we have never had to initiate the Public Posting Process until now.

The past two Superintendents of VVSD set the tone for the working relationships that were established between the Union and the District and it led to much greater success of our students, happier employees, and a negotiation process that was not easy by any means, but smoother. Both parties always walked away knowing that we all put in our best efforts to reach those previous agreements with our council and students at the forefront of our minds.

It is extremely unfortunate that VVC can't say the same for this current negotiation process that has been going on since January. With more than eighteen(18) sessions held we couldn't even reach a tentative agreement due to the lack of leadership in VVSD and the BOE high jacking the whole process.

Negotiations Overview

- ➤ The Union submitted a demand to bargain letter to the Superintendent on 12/4/2024.
- The Union suggested that we continue with IBB for bargaining as we had done over the past decade, but the District said "NO."
- The District wanted to engage in Traditional Bargaining instead and the Union agreed but was not in favor of changing this approach.
- The Union requested several pieces of information from the district prior to negotiations starting. Items included salaries, insurance information about plans, cost, and coverage, stipend salaries being paid out, and for a financial overview of the district. The Union also asked for options within the insurance plan that could offer cost savings to the plan as a whole.
- Bargaining began in January of 2025.
- At our first session where we agreed to define the norms, the District called for a caucus after five(5 minutes) because the Union asked for no cell phones to be out during the process and that we all would have to step out of the room to handle things that came up. The district refused to agree to this until the Union had to point out it is an expectation that we have for our students in the classroom, so we expected that all parties could practice what we preach to our students.

Negotiations Overview

- ➤ The parties agreed each team would have a lead negotiator, we would proceed Article by Article with our proposals, each team would send proposals electronically prior to sessions, what a quorum would look like for each party, and we would sign TAs along the way.
- > The Union brought a total of 22 proposals to the table whereas the District brought 41.
- The Union brought in six(6) members to the negotiating table. This included their Executive Officers, an Executive Board member, and their Field Service Director from IFT.
- The Lead Negotiator for the Union was the Council President.
- In January the District presented a financial overview to the Union as well as bringing in a representative from Blue Cross to explain the self-insured plan.
- The Union asked several questions about the insurance plan including what options we potentially had for cost savings and was offered no suggestions or options for our consideration.
- The Union made it very clear to the District that we would not be supporting proposals that would divide our membership and/or proposals that changed the working conditions for a certain group of staff or particular level.

Negotiations Overview

- The District had eight(8) members on their team that included two(2) to three(3) BOE members, two(2) attorneys, and members of their Administration team.
- The Lead Negotiator for the District was one of their attorneys that had just started working with the district two months prior to negotiations starting.
- The Administration team for the District consisted of three(3) former middle school administrators with only one of them having any upper administration experience. Two of those three had never been at a bargaining table ever in their careers, including the Superintendent.
- The BOE members changed multiple times throughout negotiations without giving notice to the Union, even though we requested to know who would be present for their team once they started changing players.
- After an absurd stunt the District pulled in May where the Union was given an ultimatum with a financial proposal the Union declared an impasse.
- The Union and the District filed the 90-day status of bargaining with IELRB jointly, but the 45- and 15-day status was filed by the Union on its own.
- The parties mutually agreed to bring in a well-known mediator from IELRB to support the negotiation process after an impasse was declared by the Union in May.
- On Monday August 11, 2025, the Union initiated the Public Posting Process.



Mediation

- The Union and the District agreed to use a mediator from the IELRB roster to mediate our next two sessions and to split the cost.
- Both parties had submitted the most recent offers to the mediator prior to them joining us in June.
- Our first session was seven(7 hours long) with our mediator, which included an hourlong caucus with certain team members from both sides to show the District how we could add an additional period at the high school without increasing the work day for staff.
- At the end of the first mediation session the mediator felt that the parties were not that far off and requested that the district send a counter to the Union within a few days.
- The counter that was presented from the District completely ignored all the work and time that the Union had spent creating a schedule for the high school to add that period in the previous negotiating session with the mediator.
- The counter also divided the membership by changing the working conditions for our high school level staff and no one else. This had not been on the table since the very beginning of negotiations where the Union made it clear that it would not entertain such.

Mediation

- At our second session with the mediator the Union expressed a situation that had occurred in between our sessions with the District.
- ➤ The District changed the terms of our agreement about using a mediator when the Union went to file the 45-day status of bargaining. The District wanted to say the parties were using a "facilitator" instead of mediator.
- The Union refused to sign the terms collaboratively with the District.
- This was another stunt on behalf of the District to delay the Union being able to exercise its right to begin the Public Posting Process.
- The mediator agreed with the Union and required that the District acknowledge that the parties had been engaging in mediation and demanded they send that acknowledgement in writing to the Union.
- During our last negotiation session with the mediator the District's final offer was regressive bargaining with the compensation. They stated it was due to the time only being added to one level, again.
- The mediator recommended to the Union that it was in our best interest to walk away at that point and we agreed.
- There are no further sessions scheduled with the mediator at that time.



Board-Proposed Changes

- > Table of Contents Restructure
- > Formatting
- Board meetings
- ➤ Ombudsperson
- > Economic Contingency Reopener
- ➤ Data Request
- ➤ District Policies
- Posting Positions
- > Personnel Files
- > Educational Duty
- > Student Medication
- > Seniority-PEL
- Reassignment of RSP
- ➤ Voluntary Transfer- Certified Staff
- Mentoring
- > Seniority- Paraprofessionals
- > Voluntary Transfer- ESPs
- > Job Classification
- ➤ Double Schedules
- > Traveling Employees
- > Employee Meetings
- > Community Activities

- Daily Schedule
- > Early Childhood Center
- Workdays/Parent Teacher Conference
- ➤ Employee Meetings-Paraprofessionals
- > Daily Schedule
- ➤ ESP/ Workdays
- > Paid Holidays-Maintenance
- > Religious Holidays
- > Leave
- Grievances
- Arbitration
- > Scope
- Staffing Reassignments
- Degree Programs
- > Salary Advancement
- Non-Tenured Mentoring
- Key Leaders
- > Stipends
- > Arbitration



Union-Proposed Changes

- ➤ Meeting Dates
- > Ombudsperson
- > Statistical data
- ➤ Economic Contingency Reopener
- > Other Duties as Assigned
- Property Damage
- Safety
- > Traveling Employees
- ➤ Early Release Days
- > Meetings- ESPs
- > Specials Committee
- ➤ Early Childhood Center
- ➤ Sick Leave
- ➤ Personal Days
- ➤ Sick Day Multiplier
- ➤ Compensation
- ➤ Salary Provisions
- > Stipends
- ➤ ESP's
- > Tuition Reimbursement
- National Boards-Nurses



Tentatively Agreed Upon Items

- > Table of Contents Restructure
- > Formatting
- Board meetings
- ➤ Ombudsperson
- Data Request
- District Policies
- Posting Positions
- ➤ Personnel Files
- Educational Duty
- > Student Medication
- > Seniority-PEL
- ➤ Reassignment of RSP
- ➤ Voluntary transfer- Certified Staff
- Mentoring
- Seniority- Paraprofessionals
- > Voluntary transfer- ESPs
- Job Classification
- ➤ Double Schedules
- > Traveling Employees
- > Employee Meetings

- ➤ Employee Meetings-Paraprofessionals
- ➤ ESP/ Workdays
- ➤ Paid Holidays-Maintenance
- > Religious Holidays
- > Leave
- Grievances
- Arbitration
- > Scope
- ➤ Degree Programs
- Salary Advancement
- > Non-Tenured Mentoring
- ➤ Key Leaders
- Arbitration



Items Remaining

- Daily Schedule
- Compensation
- Insurance
- Sick Day Multiplier
- Economic Contingency Reopener
- > Stipends
- Longevity Pay for Paraprofessionals and Security



Daily Schedule

- The Distict had an interest to add twenty(20) minutes to the high school day from the very beginning of bargaining.
- The intent of these additional minutes was to add an 8th period at the high school, which currently has 7 periods.
- The Union made it clear that we would not be entertaining changes to one level in our PreK-12 Unit District nor agreeing to different financial proposals for certain members.
- From March-June the District presented proposals for adding the twenty(20) minutes to each level. The Union asked multiple times to present us with a schedule of what the time would be used for at each level. The District could not produce a schedule to show the Union until July when they went back to only adding the extra time to the high school level.
- At no point prior to negotiations, during negotiations, nor up to this point has the District spoken to the community about these additional minutes. They have been unable to produce data showing that parents, students, or staff were surveyed about the need for these 20 extra minutes. The Union asked for research to show how this could be benefical for our students and staff and no data was produced.
- The District asked for this time to be added to the day during the second year of this agreement to allow them time to come up with a "plan" for this extra time. The Union expressed we do not stand a chance in ratification of an agreement with no real plan in place for this extra time.
- The District has a slogan of "Every Student, Every Day," but they fail to realize that adding twenty(20) minutes to the day for high school students is not what every student wants nor needs.
- Hundreds of our high school students in the District have jobs, are involved in several extra curricular activities, help take care of and pick up younger siblings, and the District failed to take any of this into consideration while proposing this extra time.



Daily Schedule

- ➤ The District's proposal would have students starting at 7:10 in the morning. All while several districts in Illinois and across the country are switching high school and other level start times due to the research supporting that high school students should start later in the day, not earlier.
- One of the top Medical Journals, JAMA(Journal of the American Medical Association) consistenly ranks among the leading journals in the medical field and has done studies to show how the lack of sleep for adolecents can negatively affect their learning https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamapediatrics/fullarticle/2765038
- ➤ The <u>American Academy of Pediatrics</u>, recommend a start time of 8:30 a.m. or later for middle and high schools.
- Research consistently suggests that high schools should ideally start later in the day to better align with adolescents' natural sleep patterns and improve their overall well-being.
- According to the University of Utah Health puberty causes a shift in adolescent's sleep-wake cycles, making them naturally inclined to fall asleep and wake up later.
- The General Assembly has yet to approve any decision to require school districts across the state to have a later start for high schools, but legislation and research has led to these conversations occurring, because of the benefits that this would present for high school students.

Daily Schedule

- The District acknowledged it would only be able to add the additional time to the beginning of the day due to the current bus system in place in VVSD.
- The District also failed to realize that they could not increase the work day of the bus drivers without a contractual change to their daily work schedule and no discussions with that bargaining unit has occurred either.
- ➤ During our June bargaining session with the mediator present, the Union spent over an hour creating a scheudle for the hight school to show the District that we could add an 8th period without extending the school day for staff.
- This would mean **NO** additional cost for the District to pay our members for this increase of time. The Union showed them they could do what they wanted without having any extra cost and they completely ignored that suggestion.
- The District can not afford the additional time based on their financial presentation and the Union stated this multiple times throughout bargaining to the District.

Below are some other factors that support the claim that students should start later.

- ➤ **Insufficient Sleep: Many** teens don't get enough sleep due to early school start times, leading to chronic sleep deprivation.
- > Improved Health Outcomes: Adequate sleep is crucial for physical and mental health. Later start times can reduce the risk of obesity, depression, and car accidents.
- **Better Academic Performance: Well-rested** students are more alert, have better concentration, and perform better in class.
- > Increased Safety: Drowsy driving is a serious concern and later start times can help reduce the number of accidents.



Stakeholder Voice

The District was asked to provide data to support the need, want, and rationale for why twenty(20) minutes needed to be added to the high school day and they were not able to produce any. The Union collected voice of its own from parents and students about an earlier start time for students.

"Behind every thriving student is a dedicated teacher who shows up day after day and not just to educate, but to nurture, guide, and stand in the gaps when we can't be there ourselves. This is why I stand with our teachers and their union. "

VVSD Parent

"Literally everyone is pushing their start times later. 7:10 is horrendous " VVSD Parent "This is absurd! Studies have shown that school starting LATER not only has a better effect on grades, but also on mental health and well-being of students. I don't know what happened over the course of the last 3 years in VVSD, but I'm EXTREMELY disappointed in this administration."

VVSD Parent

"I don't believe that any teaching that could happen in those 20 added minutes is worth the life and future of any student. If the board really cared abut students the education they wish to provide, they would not implement this early start and look at the research that states a later start is more beneficial."

VVSD HS Student

"If we start at 7:10 are we at least going back to 2:00 dismissal."

Staff: NO
"What? Are they crazy?"
VVSD HS Student

"I ain't doing that."
VVSD HS Student

"I think it's barbaric to start school 20 minutes earlier. I know countless people who skip first period just to get some adequate sleep. Our mental health will suffer. It will affect out ability to do clubs/sports and the effort we put into our jobs."

VVSD HS Student



Compensation

<u>District Proposal</u>

June Proposal

Year 1: 4.5%

Year 2: 5% (additional 20 minutes)

Year 3: 4.75%

July Proposal

Year 1: 4.25%

Year 2: 5% (additional 20 minutes)

Year 3: 4%

- REGRESSIVE bargaining from June to July with no change in working conditions.
- > 1% decrease in wages for the years that weren't adding time.
- To add 20 minutes costs 3.2% alone.
- Current inflation is 2.7% alone, so that would equate to a .5% increase for staff with the additional time.
- Since the last contract inflation rose over 15%.

Union Proposal

July Proposal

Year 1: 5% Year 2: 5% Year 3: 5% Year 4: 5%

- ➤ The Union had no financial proposal for June because the District didn't provide a counter to the Union until June 27th ten(10) days after we had a seven(7) hour bargaining session with mediator.
- ➤ The Union has agreed to add one (1) additional day to the work year for staff.
- ➤ The Union has agreed to have one(1) less staff workday to the year.
- ➤ The Union has proposed to maintain the current workday schedules for ALL VVC members since our first proposal.
- ➤ The Union acknowledges that the District cannot afford to add twenty(20) minutes to the workday.

<u>Insurance</u>

From the very beginning stages of bargaining the Union inquired about any potential cost saving opportunities through our self-insured plan with Blue Cross Blue Shield(BCBS). The District provided a presentation overview of our plan but did not offer any cost savings opportunites to the Union until the thirteenth(13th) bargaining session where a representative from Alliant came back for the 2nd time to explain Blue Choice Options. The District intentionally sat on millions of dollars in cost savings thinking they were going to back the Union into a corner with accepting the change in exchange for adding twenty(20) minutes to the work day. The District also proposed 3 sessions to help the Union educate our members on these changes.

Facts/Benefits about switching to Blue Choice Options(BCO)

- > BCO network has the same providers as the current PPO network
- > The providers classify as either Tier I Network or Network providers
- > Tier I Network providers contract at a lower discount that creates a reduction in claims paid by the plan member and the plan
- > 94.5% of the providers currently utilizied by the Union are Tier I Network providers in BCO
- ➤ The Union represents 72% of the plan population under the self insured plan of the District
- > 72% equates to a \$3,185,164 MINIMUM in cost savings
- ➤ Contributions to the plan funding: 80% paid by the BOE, 20% paid by plan member(Union members who take District insurance)
- > Estimated change to switching to BCO plan would proivde the District with a \$2,548,131 in cost **SAVINGS** annually
- > 97% of the Union members would likley not see any impact to their coverage, cost, or provider access

The Union gladly accepted this option to switch to BCO to offer cost savings to the District to help support raises. We asked for support in having BCBS present this information to our members. At first, we were told that we couldn't get this cost savings option for the <u>DISTRICT</u> unless we accepted the additional twenty minutes to the workday. That is when an impasse was called by the Union. The Union then reached out to the District to discuss the plan for educating and received correspondence stating that the Union would need to sign a Memorandum of Understanding(MOU) first. That was not part of the discussion nor proposal by the District. The following day the District changed their tune after "reflection."

All information above was provided in writing to the Union directly from Blue Cross Blue Shield

Sick Day Multiplier

The Union proposed a Sick Day Multiplier to be added to the current contract for two reasons. One, to reward staff for not using their bargained sick days and two, to help to offer a cost savings to the District with this incentive as it would lead to the utilization of less guest teachers and potentially help the most veteran staff closer to retirement and help reduce salary costs.

Union Proposed

➤ Every year each Union member receives fifteen(15) sick days per the current contract. For every day that is NOT utilized by the member would be multiplied by .5 and added to the annual allotment for the following year.

Example: 15 sick days, member has 10 unused days at the end of the school year 10X.5= 5 additional days added to the members' sick day total. Starts the following year with 20 sick days

District Proposed

Level	# of Accumulated Sick Days	Annual Sick Day Allotment for Start of Next Year	Days/Year
1	1-100	1 day for 12 days of work	15
2	101-150	1 day for 10 days of work	18
3	151-200	1 day for 9 days of work	20
4	201+	1 day for 8 days of work	23



Economic Contingency Reopener

Since 2018 the current Economic Contingency Reopener clause has been in the Collective Bargaining Agreement(CBA). After three(3) previous contracts the District proposed a change to lower the amount of revenue that would negatively impact the District and therefore allow them not to have to pay wage increases, step increases, and lane increases if the District was negatively impacted during the duration of the CBA. Either party would have the right to demand to re-bargain the terms of wages if this situation would occur.

- ➤ Current Language: If the General Assembly or federal funding structure enacts property tax freeze legislation that negatively impacts the District's property tax levy, or requires the District to pay the normal cost of earned pension benefits in excess of two million dollars (\$2,000,000) per year, then the District shall not be required to pay for any percentage in wage increases, step increases, and lane increased granted to the bargaining unit members in the fiscal year in which the District is negatively impacted.
- District Proposal: (\$2,000,000) 6.5% in the aggregate revenues (federal, state, and local sources combined)

Union Counter Proposal: (\$2,000,000) 7% in the aggregate revenues (federal, state, and local sources combined)



<u>Stipends</u>

In 2022 the Union and District agreed to add language to the CBA that would create a stipend committee to review current stipends and proposals for new stipends for sports/activities/clubs and make recommendations to the Union President and Superintendent for final approval. The District and Union have engaged in three(3) sub-committee meetings to work on shifts to stipends. Currently the Union has agreed to several components of the shifts that the District has brought to the table. The item that still has not been agreed upon is the year in which the salary would be capped for those receiving a stipend.

District Proposal: 8 year cap

Union Counter Proposal: 20 year cap



Longevity Pay for Paraprofessionals and Security

Currently our Paraprofessionals and our Security members both receive an hourly rate of \$19.32 for a new employee with 0-29 hours of college credit. Security members work multiple different shifts and full time eployees work 8 hour shifts. Our paraprofessionals currently work 7 hours and 15 minute shifts. The Union brought a proposal to the table to help support our lowest paid members by allowing them to receive the same longevity bonues that our Maintenance and Mechanic staff receive. The District has repeatedly **REJECTED** this proposal. These are the two most outsourced jobs in the District and they continue to outsource these positions because they can not fill them with full time employees This is costing the district thousands in wasted tax payer dollars.

Current Language: Security and Paraprofessionals with 30 or more years of service will receive a longevity increases of \$0.20 cents per hour.

<u>Union Proposed:</u> Security and Parprofessionals will receive the following longevity increases alligned to our other hourly members, Maintenance and Mechanics.

Years 5-9: \$0.15 cents per hour

Years 10-14: \$0. 20 cents per hour Years 15-19: \$0.25 cents per hour

Years 20 and over: \$0.30 cents per hour



District Financial Status

- The District currently has a 3.70 profile score out of 4.0 from ISBE based on their financial profile.
- > The District has its lowest rating in Long Term Debt due to the amount of projects they continue to take on that they cannot afford.
- > The Education Fund, the largest of the District's eight(8) funds, makes up 69% of the budget.
- The Education Fund is primarly funded by property taxes(65%), state revenue(22%), federal revenue(7%), and other local sources(6%).
- > Salaries and Benefits make up 77% of the expenditures in the Education Fund.
- ➤ ISBE recommends that a district's fund balance(savings account) be a minimum of 25% of its annual expenses. VVSD is currenlty sitting on a fund balance of 35%.
- ➤ The Disitrct is rolling over \$3,155,469 in 2025 from leftover ESSER funds. The District is stating that this money will be used for technology, but technology has their own budget, and ESSER money was to go to the retention of staff and requried building improvements. **NOT** new chromebooks. Those funds belong in the Education Fund to support salaries and benefits.
- ➤ The District is currenlty operating under an unbalanced budget, but no Defecit Reduction Plan is required by ISBE at this time.
- ➤ The District is currenlty bleeding money in attorney fees due to all the pending litigation and lawsuits against the District.
- ➤ The District brought two attorneys to every bargaining session, a practice that the District has never done in the history of bargaining with VVC.
- During negotiations the Union questioned why \$3,000,000 was moved from the Education Fund and was told it was for the Early Childhood addtion. When we asked if it was going to be moved back into the Education fund we were told "no."



District Financial Status

- > Shifting money from funds is a typical process for a District to engage in, however the funds should then be subsequently replaced.
- ➤ As a point of reference on average \$1,500,000 equates to a 1% increase in pay for the entire VVC membership.
- > During negotiations at a BOE meeting a sitting BOE member(who was at the bargaining table for multiple sessions) stated that they have "plenty of money," during a live BOE meeting.
- > The picture that was painted at the negotiating table was that the District was broke.
- > The District spends money on vendors and captial projects like it grows on trees.
- ➤ Until the 2023-2024 school year the District wasn't in compliance with holding public finance meetings and all financial moves were done in private committees with no notes for the public to view the items being approved, addressed, or brought up.
- ➤ The District has continued to show how irresponsible they are with the tax payer dollars.
- ➤ The District has footed the bill for TRS penalities for administration(which they would never do for Union members) and payouts for administration that were completely unnecessary during the duration of the current CBA.
- ➤ The insurance savings that were presented to the Union would save over \$3,000,000 for the District at minimum annually. Again that equates to a 3% increase for VVC annually with no effect towards the unbalanced budget of VVSD.



District Financial Status

- The District tried to dangle the cost savings plan for insurance in the Union's face for the additional twenty(20) minutes that they wanted to add to the highschool day for staff and students.
- > The Union created a plan to show them they could achieve what they wanted to do with no additional cost and it was rejected.
- The District outright tried to use a cost savings that they clearly need as a bargaining chip against the Union.
- ➤ The Union is currenlty asking for a four(4) year deal with 5% increases annually, so a total of 20% over four(4) years.
- ➤ With the projected insurance savings it will cover 12% of that increase alone over the duration of four(4) years.
- > The District presented that any raise over 2.5% annually would put them in the hole.
- With the projections that were given to the Union a 2.5% increae for four(4) years is 10%. Plus the cost savings of 12% with the insurance plan changes. That is 22% that should be available to the Union for raises over four(4) years. We are asking for 20% over 4 year.
- > The District is not resourceful with it's funds. Spends way to much money on capital projects, legal fees, and administration salaries.
- ➤ The District is in no financial position based on their own budget, the financial presentation that was given, and their Annual Financial Report(that is completed by an auditor) to have even brought extending the staff work day by 20 minutes to the table. This is an increase in pay by 3.2%.



Cost Analysis

Union Salary Proposal

	2024-2025	2025-2026	2026-2027	2027-2028
Salary Cost	\$139,484,804.38	5%	5%	5%
Total		\$146,459, 149.60	\$153,782,107.08	\$161,471,212.43
Increase		\$6,974,345.22	\$14,297,302.70	\$21,986,408.00

District Salary Proposal

	2024-2025	2025-2026	2026-2027	2027-2028
Salary Cost	\$139,484,804.38	4.25%	5%	4%
Total		\$145,413,012.82	\$152,683,663.46	\$158,791,010.00
Increase		\$5,928,353.85	\$13,198,859,10	\$19,306205.60
		2025-2026	2026-2027	2027-2028
<u>Difference</u>				
(Union minus District)		\$1,046,136.78	\$1, 098,443.62	\$2,680, 202.44



Conclusion

In conclusion the bargaining team for VVC spent over a year talking with their members, surveying their members, and have continued to update members after every one of our negotiation sessions. The Union came to the table in good faith, ready to problem solve with the District, agreed to several of their proposals, and was left with outright rejection from almost all our proposals.

From day one we were met with resistance from the District and it was made very clear to the Union that we were not bargaining with District Administration but with an attorney and the BOE. The Union feels strongly that the one main factor that prevented us from reaching a TA with the District is the BOE. The BOE states its committed to transparency, collaboration, and implementation. The BOE had four(4) different members show up to negotiations without notifying the Union, brought in three(3) BOE members at our last session and had to be told it could be a violation of OMA, refused to collaborate with the Union on their "want" of adding an 8th period to the high school day, and fails with the implementation of everything that they have tried to do over the last three years because they aren't transparent with the Union nor involve the necessary stakeholders when making crucial decisions.

The Union has been more than accommodating and fair with our proposals. The forty(40) proposals that were agreed to during bargaining were because the Union agreed to most of them. The Union countered or conceded on almost all our proposals in good faith to help the parties reach a TA. The District was just unwilling to meet us anywhere in the middle and showed no desire to want to reach a TA.

The Union awaits the District bringing realistic proposals for the remaining items that are left to be negotiated that they can afford. The Union is committed to working collaboratively with the District to bring the members of the VVC a TA for their approval in the near future.