

NPS Response

1/28/2024 9 pm

The School Committee continues to bargain in good faith. As our students have been out of school for 6 school days and the NTA announced to the public this afternoon that teachers and other NTA members will not report to work on Monday, January 29, 2024, our students will be out of school for the seventh strike day tomorrow. The Committee remains disappointed that the NTA has repeatedly declined to end the strike while mediation continues. The Committee has offered repeatedly to release the NTA's core bargaining team members from work so they can engage in continued mediation while teachers and support staff return to work.

The parties have been in mediation each day for more than 110 hours since this strike started. The Committee has increased its wage proposals, negotiated parental leave, increased hours for paraprofessionals, and communicated a shared commitment to add social workers. However, the NTA's most recent package remains unaffordable and unsustainable and is approximately \$25 million more costly than the proposal that the Committee presented this afternoon. The Committee's proposal increases the cost of the current contracts by approximately \$48 million dollars over the four-year period. The NTA's proposal is approximately \$72 million dollars over the cost of the current contract over the four-year period.

Responses to the NTA Cover page (Received at approximately 7:15 PM on January 28, 2024)

Responses match the numbered items on the NTA's cover page.

# on NTA List	NPS Responses
1.	The NTA lowered its COLA demand effective on the last day of the 4 <sup>th</sup> year from 4% to 3.75% to be added if no successor agreement is reached by the last day of the contract. This is a back door attempt to achieve an illegal 5 <sup>th</sup> year on this contract and disincentivizes good faith bargaining for the successor contract as no agreement would result in an automatic 3.75% increase for the first year of the successor contract. In addition, this 3.75% increase would be on top of the 4% increase that the NTA is demanding in the same contract year. This proposal is rejected as unaffordable, unsustainable, and ill advised.
2.	The School Committee appreciates the NTA's withdrawal of its longevity proposal. However, the withdrawal of the longevity proposal was coupled by the NTA with an increase in the COLA proposal for Units C and D. This change reduced the cost of the NTA 's overall package by \$770,000 over the four-year period This means that instead of the parties being approximately \$26 Million apart we are now approximately \$25 Million apart. Moreover, the School Committee's current COLA proposals for Units C and D are market competitive. In fact, the hourly rate for our Unit C top step employees is more than \$10.00 per hour greater than the top step hourly rates in other school districts.
3.	With respect to the NTA's Unit C hours proposal (current proposal #29), the Committee accepted the NTA's proposal to add 10 minutes each day to Category 1 aides in exchange for acceptance of the Committee's full sick leave bank proposal (see pages 8-9 of NPS 1/28/24 proposal). That agreement also included adding the 10 minutes one year earlier than in the

	<p>Committee’s prior proposal. The Committee rejects the NTA’s proposal #29 part 2 which would add an additional 150 minutes per month for Category 1 members. As we explained to the NTA earlier, this additional time would cost approximately \$231,000 per year and principals do not need this additional time.</p>
4.	<p>The NTA proposal #4 was withdrawn previously in its most recent package.</p>
5.	<p>The NTA’s proposal #10 (Time and Learning)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Elementary: <p>The NTA added a new first sentence to the introductory paragraph. This new sentence is acceptable to the NPS provided that the word “charges” is replaced with the word “goals”. The NTA deleted the language from the Committee’s proposal in paragraphs 5 and 5f which needs to be included. The Committee will only agree to the deletion of what should be 8 (currently mislabeled as 5) on page 11 if the NTA accepts the language from NPS in paragraph 5.</p> </li> <li>○ Middle Schools: <p>NPS is only willing to accept NTA’s proposed changes to paragraph 5A if the NTA accepts NPS’s proposed changes to paragraph 10.</p> <p>With respect to paragraph 12, NPS reasserts its proposed edits to that paragraph in exchange for accepting the edits made by the NTA to paragraph 12 because the NPS changes are necessary to avoid disruption to the current school year’s schedules and class assignments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● High School: <p>With respect to #8, the parties have negotiated extensively about high school class caps which equate to staffing levels. NPS is unwilling to contractually commit to class caps. Because the parties have been unable to agree on this provision, we will revert to the existing language in this section. We are willing to add to the Time and Learning Agreement that the High School Joint Oversight Committee will meet to discuss ways to create equitable class sizes.</p> <p>In #10, NPS requested to add the word “members” to make the following sentence make sense: “The High School Joint Oversight Committee <b>members</b> shall then vote...”</p> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>
6.	<p>In response to #6, NPS has consistently rejected the NTA proposal on mandating staffing levels for social workers. However, the Superintendent has publicly committed to adding more social workers at the elementary level as part of the FY25 budget process.</p>
7.	<p>#7 was an agreement in the prior proposal.</p>
8.	<p>As you will recall, the School Committee withdrew this proposal. Therefore, the Committee is no longer looking for your agreement.</p>