



Collaborative Bargaining Session
Pinellas County Schools
301 4th Street SW, Largo, FL



PCTA Bargaining
September 15, 2015
PCTA Offices

Meeting called to order at 5:10 p.m.

Topics of Discussion included:

- **IB/CAT/PCCA**
- **Virtual School**
- **Evaluations**
- **Planning Time**
- **Leaves**
- **Salary and Benefits**

IB/CAT/PCCA

Judy Vigue, Director, Advanced Studies and Academic Excellence stated that she was tasked identify the specific duties for the IB/CAT/PCCA teachers to receive a supplement. She reached out to current teachers in the specific programs and developed drafts of the duties for the IB counselors and the IB teachers to meet the supplement criteria. Some of the duties included – coordinating, working with students on essays and coaching, internal assessments students are required to complete; academic advising and training or serving as a task coordinator and upon rare occasions a teacher may teach another class instead.

Ms. Vigue met with the IB coordinators, counselors, and teachers for input on this process. The supplement is received for duties above and beyond their normal duties.

Copies of draft documents provided were just “off the press” and review and edits are needed to ensure the pieces are accurate with the purpose of the program.

Mike Gandolfo asked what the purpose of PCTA is in the IB process? Dr. Corbett stated that we are clarifying what the teachers are doing to receive the supplement. Anytime we do language we bring it back to the PCTA.

Question from PCTA about which teachers were involved in this process. Ms. Vigue indicated that she would need to ask the coordinators which teachers were involved. Mr. Vasallo worked with his teachers, there were a couple from Palm Harbor, nothing from Largo teachers. The Board wanted accountability as it is a large supplement – 14 percent – so it was decided that 80 hours needed to be logged.

Because of the structure being different at each school, each teacher could have a 90-minute block for academic coaching – is the log that they are going to have to keep is it what they are doing after the 220 or during the day. The district responded that it would be the combination of any additional

time with students when they are not scheduled. Ms. Vigue explained the process during the blocks and skinny for Carnegie Units to grant credit for the class.

The teachers would not keep a log during their normal instructional time, but keep it for the 45 minutes planning to make up that 14 percent. Colleen Parker stated that the 14 percent supplement originated because the IB teachers were required to give up a planning period to do coaching that seems to have changed. Ms. Vigue confirmed that the original purpose was to compensate for giving up planning but not intended to compensate for all of the extra duties expected for which there should be accountability.

Bruce Proud indicated that the issue will be the training and their duties and responsibilities. Dr. Corbett stated that if you see something that you don't agree with in the documents, then we can talk about it more. From verbal presentation there were no questions.

Virtual Schools –

Mandy Perry discussed the changes in the makeup of the responsibilities for full-time Pinellas virtual school teachers. The district changed the format for when the virtual school teachers are meeting to 5.5 hours, once a month, this allows for two hours for the teachers to make phone calls to students for their normal 7.5 hour day. These meetings are staff meetings just like other teachers attend at regular schools and are held at the administration building or Coachman Service Center. Currently there are 15 teachers who come at 9 a.m. and leave at 3:30 p.m. that provides them time to make phone calls.

The teachers also travel around the county to Panera Bread two times a month in April, May, June and July which are the enrollment periods by FVS. Panera Bread was selected since it would be a public place and we asked the teachers to volunteer their time to help recruit their students to keep enrollment up for their programs.

There is also a help sessions from 5:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m. in the evening in the computer lab and teachers have been asked to sign up two at a time so there are always two teachers in the room with a student. They are encouraged to flex their time during the those days. Students are provided face to face time for 32 weeks.

Mike Gandolfo asked about guidelines or policies written that includes prep to have a template? It was stated that we need to have accountability and may need to come up with a log that shows what the teachers are doing during their 7.5 hours. Currently there are 282 full-time students and 700 part-time students, so it depends on how many students they have.

Florida Virtual School teachers have 300-350 students and in Pinellas our teacher have about 200. We try to limit their preps.

It was asked about the number of preps for social science and the response was there are 10 preps currently with 185 students. Some teachers ask for specific classes that they want to teach in addition to the regular classes. Some of those classes may only have a small number of students. The more students we enroll, the less preps we have. We want to keep our students here and not in Florida Virtual School.

Evaluations –

Laurie Dart shared the changes that were made in Article XXXIII Teacher Evaluation contract language as discussed in the previous meeting. Everyone reviewed the updated language. Questions – Section C, Paragraph 1 – the last sentence – “the teacher could have three formal observations before the third grading period.” Discussion took place. The district shared that this was based on best practice and suggested through the evaluation committee.

More than three observations can usually occur when there are concerns with a teacher. PCTA asked if there was anything in the contract if a teacher wants to have another observation completed? It was stated that teachers can request that when they are reviewing the observation with the administrator that they want to be observed more formally. It has always been a part of that process. The sentence was changed to – A minimum of three of these observations must occur no later than the end of the third grading period.”

PCTA stated that the definitions are fantastic – thanks to all those who had input. The recommended change was made on two copies and executed by both parties.

Planning Time

Dr. Corbett stated that we at the last meeting we were marching down a path and we were not on the same path. Elementary, middle, and high have very different needs and we need to discuss it further.

PCTA is asking for uninterrupted planning time daily. Mike Gandolfo stated that he had a lesson plan from one of the five schools and it was six and a half pages. He doesn't know how they can get it done unless working at home, and we know that they will work at home. How long does it take to do a lesson plan in a week? Some teachers can get it done quickly, some may take days.

There are different definitions for planning time which would include grading papers. Dr. Corbett asked what are you proposing. Mike Gandolfo stated that the district doesn't touch their planning during the week. How to do accomplish this? Have morning or afternoon meetings, shortened Wednesdays, which we don't have. When I was in the classroom, during our planning, we weren't interrupted. We're asking for relief.

Dr. Corbett asked for PCTA to give us a proposal that is workable. Mike Gandolfo stated that we need to cut some of the things out. Discussed the different meetings PLC, data chats, coaching, etc. PCTA stated that coaches should be modeling during instruction not sitting with them in a meeting. Dr. Corbett stated that we're not interested in rewriting the contract and say there is no uninterrupted planning time. We know that it is vague with no definition and that needs to be clear.

It was suggested that they break up in groups –elementary, middle, high to discuss definitions and what is needed at each level.

Read the clause in the contract regarding planning time. Have to come to some agreement and limit how often. The problem is that everybody doesn't do PLCs the same. Discussed the various ways each level/site schedules meetings and options for the teachers.

Bruce Proud shared a proposed change in Article XXVII – Planning Periods and Lunch Time. It was reviewed and discussed. Question regarding who number 4 pertained to – PCTA responded to teachers on block schedules; regarding number 5 pertained to work-related activities was crossed off so we don't confuse it with PCL, coaching and adding "not restricted to any single location which meant in the "data" room for instance; question regarding number 6 are you opposed to adding "inside"/outside and limit it to once a week?; regarding number 9 professional development – if we provide subs – does that have to be voluntary? Bruce stated that it was not for TDE, unless agreed upon by a percentage of the staff as stated in number 1; regarding number 11 lesson plans – don't want to turn in and want to follow the board policy. Some schools are trying to do it electronically. Some teachers don't want to put it on the computer and continue to write them out.

We will work on condensing to put all time in one section of the contract – let us take it back and share with staff and add definitions. There is one sticky point that we see in number 6 – it needs to be inside/outside.

PCTA stated that during testing in spring being teachers were pulled to proctor on a regular basis. This is a huge issue at the high school. Hoping to be resolved if outside individuals are used to proctor. Dr. Corbett stated that the law allows proctors to be a non-employee as long as they are trained. It does not eliminate a teacher in a computer class to have to leave their room due to needing more computers. Question arose if guidance counselors can assist with testing, they cannot be the coordinator, but can proctor. Request to change the minimum minutes for elementary to 40 instead of 30 in number 2. Discussion took place and the district will review all of the suggestions.

Leaves

Dr. Corbett stated that the district reviewed the information provided by Bruce Proud regarding leave and provided it to the lawyers who provided some feedback. Going to look-back period our thinking is that we would very rarely have to pay insurance other than FMLA, but we may have to pay a penalty – no sure.

Bruce – the look-back period - not taking it from us, then we take a \$3,000 penalty. What about the policy that we are using now that would need to be changed? We are working on making the changes necessary.

Question from PCTA asking if the district could increase the number of days to be used for personal from 4 to 5? Discussion and it was indicated that it would be a big expense which would come from the pot of raises.

Personal leave – Subparagraph 2, item B when do supervisors have a right to do request reasons for personal leave and deny such leave only on a pre- or post-service day or inservice day. It was suggested that we add a comma before when.

Ron Ciranna stated that we have a high rate of absenteeism using personal days and that's why some administrators are asking for reasons.

Regarding FMLA – currently FMLA is looked at as a separate leave and employees are being charged for two leaves. FMLA and then extended sick leave for another.

Laurie Dart stated that the contract regarding leaves is poorly written. She shared that FMLA is federal law and various scenarios regarding the leave process. PCTA questioned the process that HR is following regarding leaves.

The parties need to bargain over the number of leaves. PCTA doesn't feel that the district has the unilateral right to determine leaves. That's why we have to update the contract to update those situations as FMLA law was effective after the contract was written.

Ms. Dart will work on rewriting this section and provide definitions; look at leaves and how they dovetail together or running separately.

Personal leave - add 5 personal/sick – with their being no traction, no additional action is being taken at this time.

Supplements

We will put a committee together to do a study all of the supplements and pick a percentage this year and then do an extensive study for 2016/2017.

Salary and Benefits -

Bruce shared a grandfathered schedule – \$1651 and 75 percent of that. It is intended to maintain that structure and to continually try to push money down to the bottom of the schedule and at the top to smooth the schedule. The far left-hand number is the number of teachers moving to that level, and the steps where they are, obviously the others are on the performance schedule – receive increases through performance with a highly effective or effective rating – he can manipulate of dollar values through the schedule with the eye toward being close the performance amounts – but some are less than the \$1,258 but maintains costs as much as possible. In this case it is \$7.13M which I have estimated the cost to be – performance pay \$3.7M based on previous number of people – no better way to do it. Used highly effective percentage of 27 and remainder at effective, but there will be a few outliers. Basically a 3.22 percent overall increase on this schedule; some are 3.06 as a percent on the other schedule.

Didn't make sense to pay supplements at the same level so used \$2.5 million total for supplement increase, but it's just a number – better way to approach it by giving them a bigger increase just to let them know we are thinking about them. Opportunities to put more in the bottom, not a lot, but make it close to the percentage increase and not impacting some of the schedule. Not a real big way to move that step value down much – more of an adjustment – trying to give you more money.

That aspect of the performance pay – provide a cost of living – a specific dollar amount and not paying anyone more than anyone else – same as the referendum. This schedule is without referendum calculations.

Raises

Dr. Corbett summarized how the district's proposal to give a 4 percent raise was rejected by EWBS led by Mike Gandolfo. That group wanted a more generous healthcare package instead of raises. He shared what was discussed with the Board and their direction to raise salaries in this district. Talked out loud about salaries and what we spend on healthcare. Teachers in another county hit the top of their scale at step 18 – average salaries. The handout shows that the average salary in Pinellas both with and without the referendum is way behind what it should be. The average teacher salary is \$47,950 in the state and we are at \$47,041 with referendum. We should be a head of everybody with the referendum, but we are not because we have historically put more money into healthcare and we need to reverse that trend to be competitive.

The district shared the long-term effect of having the increase in the salary and not healthcare – real concern is that all the districts with exception of Pinellas all do their salaries without the referendum. Look at w/o referendum and we are at \$43,825, \$4,000 under other counties. Second is the model we shared last week. In Ted Pafundi's model, the fourth column from right – annual increase to each employee on the model we proposed last week. The next page is a table and condenses it. Go to fourth column on the right and the CDHP is \$460 and goes to \$760. This is what we proposed last week and you rejected it. We keep talking about all of our employees with the Board. Kevin Smith went over the calculations that were provided on two types of employees. Looked at the proposal from last week and see what impact it would have after a 4 percent increase.

Showed net increase in both examples of employees. Not saying that it is right, wrong or indifferent – just a fact.

Mike Gandolfo stated that 80 percent of the employees are not on the vitality. The district also explained the handout which shows that employees who have family coverage are being compensated \$9,240 more than their single counterparts (\$14,900 paid by board for family coverage v. \$5,660 paid by board for single coverage = \$9,240). This is a fairness issue. People with a more generous plan can always buy up.

We talked to the Board. The board stated that if we cannot continue to do what we are doing. We are offering \$91.6 with 4 percent increase retroactive. When can we do it? We have been notified that the FSA scores are valid and we will receive the VAM scores in about two weeks, but it will take 6-8 weeks to process from TIS so probably December we would be ready to get the teacher evaluations completed for 14/15 for pay for performance schedule. The district would like to tentatively agree on this tonight. The district really wants a 4 percent raise for all employees.

Self-Funding – actuaries tells us that we are in a good position as we go through self-funding, but we have to close the gap.

PCTA asked what we looked like at the state-level with everything? Kevin Smith stated that typically, we have ranked number 1 compared to 13 other counties w/size, geographically, etc. We are among the top 5 compared to the 13 other counties. Is it all explained by the benefits package or are there other things that need to be chipped away at. It's the healthcare that drives everything. Premiums that the board pays is rich. PCTA stated that the plan is not that good, we're paying above national average. Point about average compensation – where do we compare with the rest of the state and how other districts are allocating their pots? Are there other areas to give up? Kevin Smith stated that we are number 5 of the 13 counties in salary and number 2 out of the 13 counties for benefits. The only variable is healthcare.

Ron Ciranna explained the process of how we have to distribute the funds for each of the unions.

Dr. Corbett stated again that we have to get the average teacher salary up.

Mike Gandolfo said that looking at Bruce's salary plan the top get \$1,650 going for the long-term. PCTA stated that teachers are not staying around through retirement any more. Dr. Corbett said he would disagree if you look at the range in the middle of the number of teachers in those levels. Everybody would receive an average of 4 percent increase. All bargaining groups are looking at doing their salary distribution in different ways. Each bargaining group is given 4 percent and they develop their structure. PCTA wants to flatten the schedule.

Bruce stated that the last union proposal was for health insurance for annual increases to be a lower amount – \$200 – \$400 dollars. We have worked on this and any number you can give me we can calculate. The self-insured plan is setting a monthly premium and doesn't change by who pays for it. You have to have the splits correctly and it doesn't change what you are asking the employee to pay. The district stated that the claims figures we gave you are from Humana. PCTA stated if you believe their claims data are correct. You will get data every month and can determine your actuaries. PCTA stated – understand that Humana doesn't want to share information based on HIPPA regulations. Bruce Proud stated that he gets these numbers, he can shift all money out of health insurance, but it has to come from other money. If we are going to meet this proposal for salary, then it has to come out from somewhere else. You're asking for \$700 - \$800 more in premiums – needs more equity. Taking it out of insurance and putting in salary, paying more out-of-pocket. Dr. Corbett stated that four percent is the amount that is being settled throughout the state. Next year we won't be close to that. Last year we took ½ percent and this year you're asking to do that or more and we would rather see it in salaries. We cannot keep putting more and more money in healthcare to the detriment of salaries. Dr. Corbett suggested that they caucus and seriously reconsider not rejecting a 4 percent raise.

No, it won't be necessary – PCTA cannot agree to this. PCTA feels that what we gave you is more than fair.

Dr. Corbett stated that we don't want to come up more than \$3 million offered. You are short about 300 people on your proposal. The numbers shifts every day.

Bruce Proud stated that not is going to shift that much. How many people have shifted away by percentage choosing the spouse plan? If we could get some current number of what the actual healthcare costs, how many are participating – considerable number of people/money.

Dr. Corbett stated that we won't have revised numbers until we have open enrollment. The figures are a snapshot a few weeks ago before we have done our hiring. We can't figure that as it changes daily.

Dr. Corbett asked so you can't agree on the structure until the healthcare is agreed to for the payroll model.

PCTA stated that very few people in PESPA make those salaries. 80 percent of the bargaining unit makes less than \$22,000. They would not take a pay cut.

The only way would be to make across the board COLA.

District offered a 4 percent with \$91.6M for healthcare and for the record you have rejected that and no counter offer. The district went from \$90.5M to \$91.6M.

PCTA stated that they could do \$93.4M.

Ron Ciranna stated that you haven't bent – you are telling us we can't.

Bruce Proud - \$91.6M – doesn't change it – Mike Gandolfo – Don't we have something for SEIU and PESPA? Ron Ciranna stated you can't bargain for those other unions. Mike Gandolfo stated, but we are all doing the same for health insurance.

They understand that it is the salary given at the sake of insurance. Not everyone is on the family plan.

PCTA stated that they don't see teachers going from a 4 percent increase to 3 percent increase with the extra percent going to help reduce health insurance that a big deal.

The district is receiving complaints that the teachers can't make ends meet and would like an increase in their paycheck.

Teachers have the option of changing health plans.

Short – caucus

Provided a counter proposal for payroll model for healthcare - \$93.1M

Right hand column where the conversation started about how much an employee increase would receive on an annual basis and going to the board contribution to make that work out. The total amount is \$93.1 in this model.

District - Do you have a salary percent that you would connect with this?

PCTA - Didn't produce a salary to it.

District - \$91.6 is the figure. The board did not have any appetite to go above the \$91.6. The district wants to raise salaries.

Discussed the payroll model. Blue column, left of half way is the proposed board contribution from PCTA.

District - The programmers have set that amount up for CDHP; it's difficult to do for each group, better if all of those numbers are the same.

Bruce Proud stated the he knows that it is easier for the programmers – if they didn't then, Ted Pafundi made a mistake; Terms is an issue.

District - The highest valued program is NPOS if you keep the board contribution the same the increase is less and doesn't jive with how this works from a plan standpoint. Creates some additional issues in being a sound plan from a self-insured standpoint.

Dr. Corbett stated that we would really like to settle tonight, but can't do that after the executive session. It's was pretty clear that the board wants \$91.6M which allows for a 4 percent raise. Can you go \$92M even and call it a night. At 92 we can do a 3.75 percent raise.

PCTA - This is the only one we can go with.

Mike Gandolfo stated that they need to contact the other unions to see if they agree to \$92M. Ron Ciranna stated that you can only bargain for yourself. If you agree, then the others usually follow.

Bruce Proud - connect to salary at 3.75 percent. We'll argue about it later. Then we'll bargain.

Dr. Corbett said no it is one package \$91.6 and 4 percent and then talk about the distribution and we'll talk with individual groups.

We are offering 3 percent, ½ percent for healthcare and 2.5 percent in salary.

Board – 8 m increase offering to pay 4.9 and Bill - we're offering to throw in \$22.

\$92M flat and 3.75 percent salary

Mike Gandolfo stated he wants to hear it from them (board). Dr. Corbett and Ron Ciranna stated that we are their (board) voice.

Bruce Proud - why go to \$92M and 3.75 percent when we can get \$91.6M and 4 percent.

Dr. Corbett - We have to plan for next year and DOE is requesting 1.47 percent increase.

Mike Gandolfo stated it's late we're not going to settle anything tonight.

Dr. Corbett stated \$92M and 3.75 percent?

Caucus – Bruce Proud

Mike Gandolfo – let's go home.

PCTA went to caucus

Returned – 8:30 p.m.

Mike Gandolfo – We need to go home – the \$91.6M and \$92M – we will discuss and put in formula and see what it looks like and discuss with other unions and get back with you.

District - Several of the unions were happy to do the 4 percent. Let us – do two payroll models. Some people want a 4 percent raise.

Bruce Proud - willing to do two total schedule?

Dr. Corbett – yes we will need to look at that.

Meeting concluded with no resolution to health payroll model or salary increase percentage.

Average teacher salaries for 2014-2015 in the State of Florida

DISTRICT NAME	Rank	AVERAGE SALARY
MONROE	1	\$58,309
SARASOTA	2	\$57,026
BROWARD	3	\$55,983
COLLIER	4	\$54,446
DADE	5	\$53,304
WASH SPECIAL	6	\$52,915
FLAGLER	7	\$52,646
OKALOOSA	8	\$51,306
HILLSBOROUGH	9	\$50,192
FL VIRTUAL	10	\$48,651
SUMTER	11	\$48,593
SUWANNEE	12	\$48,410
PALM BEACH	13	\$48,166
FLORIDA		\$47,950
CHARLOTTE	14	\$47,782
MANATEE	15	\$47,387
GLADES	16	\$47,298
ST. JOHNS	17	\$47,266
DEAF/BLIND	18	\$47,255
PINELLAS w/ referendum	19	\$47,041
SEMINOLE	20	\$47,028
PUTNAM	21	\$46,775
LEE	22	\$46,660
INDIAN RIVER	23	\$46,473
GILCHRIST	24	\$46,444
BRADFORD	25	\$46,395
BREVARD	26	\$46,266
OSCEOLA	27	\$46,211
NASSAU	28	\$46,170
CITRUS	29	\$46,032
LAFAYETTE	30	\$45,894
CLAY	31	\$45,830
MARTIN	32	\$45,786
HERNANDO	33	\$45,633
OKEECHOBEE	34	\$45,530
POLK	35	\$45,522
WALTON	36	\$45,443
DESOTO	37	\$45,416
ORANGE	38	\$45,344
MARION	39	\$45,176
WASHINGTON	40	\$44,930
DUVAL	41	\$44,853
SANTA ROSA	42	\$44,813
HARDEE	43	\$44,808
HIGHLANDS	44	\$44,681
LEVY	45	\$44,651
ESCAMBIA	46	\$44,562
VOLUSIA	47	\$44,250
TAYLOR	48	\$44,097
GULF	49	\$43,964
BAY	50	\$43,918
ENDRY	51	\$43,875
PINELLAS without referendum	52	\$43,825
ST. LUCIE	53	\$43,823
PASCO	54	\$43,555
BAKER	55	\$43,524
FAU LAB SCH	56	\$43,186
LEON	57	\$43,160
LAKE	58	\$43,147
UF LAB SCH	59	\$42,672
ALACHIA	60	\$42,572
JACKSON	61	\$42,517
JEFFERSON	62	\$42,390
FRANKLIN	63	\$42,166
FAMU LAB SCH	64	\$41,986
FSU LAB SCH	65	\$41,702
WAKULLA	66	\$41,393
COLUMBIA	67	\$41,234
DIXIE	68	\$41,224
MADISON	69	\$40,980
LIBERTY	70	\$40,761
HAMILTON	71	\$40,314
CALHOUN	72	\$40,243
UNION	73	\$39,073
GADSDEN	74	\$36,420
HOLMES	75	\$33,190

91.5

	75.67%	24.33%
\$7,349,924.40		
\$1,730,840.00		
\$5,619,084.40		
6.47%		

2016 Payroll Model

Plan	Deduction W/O Vitality				Ann Inc	Deduction After Vitality		
	EE Deduction	% Board	% EE	PP Inc		PP Credit	PP Inc	Ann Inc
<u>CDHP</u>								
Employee	\$53.00	84.23%	15.77%	\$23.00	\$460.00	\$10.00	\$13.00	\$260.00
EE plus Child(ren)	\$146.00	75.30%	24.70%	\$31.00	\$620.00	\$15.00	\$16.00	\$320.00
EE plus Spouse	\$159.00	76.23%	23.77%	\$39.00	\$780.00	\$15.00	\$24.00	\$480.00
Family	\$215.00	77.60%	22.40%	\$37.00	\$740.00	\$20.00	\$17.00	\$340.00
2Board Fam	\$120.00	87.50%	12.50%	\$35.00	\$700.00	\$20.00	\$15.00	\$300.00
<u>Staff</u>								
Employee	\$71.00	79.94%	20.06%	\$23.00	\$460.00	\$10.00	\$13.00	\$260.00
EE plus Child(ren)	\$182.00	70.97%	29.03%	\$31.00	\$620.00	\$15.00	\$16.00	\$320.00
EE plus Spouse	\$195.00	72.34%	27.66%	\$37.00	\$740.04	\$15.00	\$22.00	\$440.04
Family	\$266.00	73.69%	26.31%	\$36.00	\$720.08	\$20.00	\$16.00	\$320.08
2Board Fam	\$171.00	83.09%	16.91%	\$34.00	\$680.08	\$20.00	\$14.00	\$280.08
<u>NPOS</u>								
Employee	\$80.00	77.96%	22.04%	\$17.00	\$340.00	\$10.00	\$7.00	\$140.00
EE plus Child(ren)	\$200.00	68.99%	31.01%	\$25.00	\$500.00	\$15.00	\$10.00	\$200.00
EE plus Spouse	\$213.00	70.54%	29.46%	\$31.00	\$620.04	\$15.00	\$16.00	\$320.04
Family	\$302.00	71.16%	28.84%	\$40.00	\$800.00	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$400.00
2Board Fam	\$207.00	80.23%	19.77%	\$38.00	\$760.00	\$20.00	\$18.00	\$360.00

	2015	2016	2016 W/Vitality
	22,000	22,880	22,880
NPOS - Family	(5,240)	(6,040)	(5,640)
Taxable wages	16,760	16,840	17,240
W/T 10%	(1,676)	(1,684)	(1,724)
FICA	(1,282)	(1,288)	(1,319)
3% Retirement	(660)	(686)	(686)
Net	13,142	13,181	13,511
Difference		39	369

\$22,000 Employee

	Net Annual Increase	Net Increase W/ Vitality		Net Annual Increase	Net Increase W/ Vitality
Single			Family		
NPOS	418	583	NPOS	39	369
Staff	319	484	Staff	105	435
CDHP	319	484	CDHP	89	418
EE Plus Child			EE Plus Spouse		
NPOS	286	534	NPOS	188	435
Staff	188	435	Staff	89	335
CDHP	188	435	CDHP	56	303
2 BD					
NPOS	72	402			
Staff	138	468			
CDHP	121	451			

\$50,000 Employee

	Net Annual Increase	Net Increase W/ Vitality		Net Annual Increase	Net Increase W/ Vitality
Single			Family		
NPOS	1,307	1,472	NPOS	928	1,258
Staff	1,208	1,373	Staff	994	1,323
CDHP	1,208	1,373	CDHP	978	1,307
EE Plus Child			EE Plus Spouse		
NPOS	1,175	1,422	NPOS	1076	1,323
Staff	1,076	1,323	Staff	978	1,225
CDHP	1,076	1,323	CDHP	945	1,192
2 BD					
NPOS	961	1,291			
Staff	1,027	1,356			
CDHP	1,011	1,340			

Board Cost for Family Coverage Compared to Single:

	Family	Single	Difference
NPOS	14,900	5,660	9,240
Staff	14,900	5,660	9,240
Family	14,900	5,660	9,240

PCTA Proposal Pinellas County Schools Payroll Model \$93.1 M BC

DRAFT

6.47% Renewal

2016 Plan	2015 Enr	MONTHLY PREMIUM	PREMIUM EXPENSE	PP COST	PP BC	TOTAL BC EXP	TOTAL EMP EXP	EMPL DEDUCT	% Pd BOARD	% Paid EE	PP Inc	Ann Inc
CDHP												
Employee	1,198	\$560.00	\$670,880.00	\$336.00	\$291.00	\$348,618.00	\$53,910.00	\$45.00	86.61%	13.39%	\$15.00	\$300.00
EEPlus Ch(ren)	269	\$985.00	\$264,965.00	\$591.00	\$456.00	\$122,664.00	\$36,315.00	\$135.00	77.16%	22.84%	\$20.00	\$400.00
EE Plus Sp	287	\$1,115.00	\$320,005.00	\$669.00	\$524.00	\$150,388.00	\$41,615.00	\$145.00	78.33%	21.67%	\$25.00	\$500.00
Family	494	\$1,600.00	\$790,400.00	\$960.00	\$757.00	\$373,958.00	\$100,282.00	\$203.00	78.85%	21.15%	\$25.00	\$500.00
2Board Fam	105	\$1,600.00	\$168,000.00	\$960.00	\$850.00	\$89,250.00	\$11,550.00	\$110.00	88.54%	11.46%	\$25.00	\$500.00
Total	2,353		\$2,214,250.00			\$1,084,878.00	\$243,672.00					
			\$26,571,000.00			\$21,697,560.00	\$4,873,440.00					
						81.66%	18.34%					
Staff												
Employee	1,832	\$590.00	\$1,080,880.00	\$354.00	\$291.00	\$533,112.00	\$115,416.00	\$63.00	82.20%	17.80%	\$15.00	\$300.00
EEPlus Ch(ren)	427	\$1,045.00	\$446,215.00	\$627.00	\$456.00	\$194,712.00	\$73,017.00	\$171.00	72.73%	27.27%	\$20.00	\$400.00
EE Plus Sp	301	\$1,175.00	\$353,675.00	\$705.00	\$512.00	\$154,112.00	\$58,093.00	\$193.00	72.62%	27.38%	\$25.00	\$500.00
Family	666	\$1,685.00	\$1,122,210.00	\$1,011.00	\$756.00	\$503,496.00	\$169,830.00	\$255.00	74.78%	25.22%	\$25.00	\$500.00
2Board Fam	117	\$1,685.00	\$197,145.00	\$1,011.00	\$849.00	\$99,333.00	\$18,954.00	\$162.00	83.98%	16.02%	\$25.00	\$500.00
Total	3,343		\$3,200,125.00			\$1,484,765.00	\$435,310.00					
			\$38,401,500.00			\$29,695,300.00	\$8,706,200.00					
						77.33%	22.67%					
NPOS												
Employee	2,561	\$605.00	\$1,549,405.00	\$363.00	\$285.00	\$729,885.00	\$199,758.00	\$78.00	78.51%	21.49%	\$15.00	\$300.00
EEPlus Ch(ren)	422	\$1,075.00	\$453,650.00	\$645.00	\$450.00	\$189,900.00	\$82,290.00	\$195.00	69.77%	30.23%	\$20.00	\$400.00
EE Plus Sp	743	\$1,205.00	\$895,315.00	\$723.00	\$516.00	\$383,388.00	\$153,801.00	\$207.00	71.37%	28.63%	\$25.00	\$500.00
Family	878	\$1,745.00	\$1,532,110.00	\$1,047.00	\$760.00	\$667,280.00	\$251,986.00	\$287.00	72.59%	27.41%	\$25.00	\$500.00
2Board Fam	137	\$1,745.00	\$239,065.00	\$1,047.00	\$853.00	\$116,861.00	\$26,578.00	\$194.00	81.47%	18.53%	\$25.00	\$500.00
Total	4,741		\$4,669,545.00			\$2,087,314.00	\$714,413.00					
			\$56,034,540.00			\$41,746,280.00	\$14,288,260.00					
						74.50%	25.50%					
Total Health												
Total Health	10,437		\$121,007,040.00			\$93,139,140.00	\$27,867,900.00					
Total Annual Premium												
Total Annual Premium			\$121,007,040.00			\$93,139,140.00	\$27,867,900.00					
Averages			\$11,594.04	\$579.70	\$446.20	\$8,923.94	\$2,670.11	\$133.51				
% Paid												
% Paid						76.97%	23.03%					
2015 Enroll.			2016 Prem Inc.	\$113,657,115.60		\$7,349,924.40						
Employee	5,591	53.57%	BC Inc	\$89,838,020.00		\$3,301,120.00	44.91%					
EE plus Child(ren)	1,118	10.71%	EE Inc.	\$23,819,095.60		\$4,048,804.40	55.09%					
EE Plus Sp	1,331	12.75%	% Increase			6.47%						
Family	2,038	19.53%										
2Board Fam	359	3.44%										
Total	10,437	100.00%	BC Budget Amt.	\$90,000,000.00								
	10171		BC Inc.	-\$3,139,140.00								
	266											

8/27/15