

**MERCER COUNTY TRANSPORTATION
EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
FINAL/LAST OFFER AS OF
MAY 21, 2013**

GENERAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Mercer County Transportation Education Association finalized a first contract prior to November 20, 2013. The agreement covered a time span from July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2013. During the term of the agreement, on Sept. 12, 2012, the School District provided a Notice of Intent to Subcontract transportation services to the MCTEA. During these negotiations the board never discussed the issue of subcontracting, nor did it bring forth any proposals that dealt with the subcontracting issue.

BRIEF HISTORY OF NEGOTIATIONS

On or about November 20, 2013, the MCTEA president contacted the School Board through the superintendent with a request to begin bargaining a successor contract. The school board was offered more than 30 bargaining dates by the MCTEA. The board declined all dates except for seven from January, 2013 through April, 2013. The parties held their first and only mediation session on May 14, 2013. At the conclusion of the mediation session, the federal mediator informed the parties that she did not believe any further progress was possible given the parties current mindset regarding a successor contract.

SUMMARY OF MCTEA PROPOSALS, RATIONALE, COSTS

The MCTEA is fully aware of the challenging financial times of the school district. Our goal simply has been to negotiate an agreement that treats employees and the school district fairly while maintaining a quality transportation staff. Quality of staff is essential to the safety of the students. During negotiations, in an effort to meet the test of fairness, the MCTEA issued only a single proposal which was to rollover the current contract for one year with all terms and conditions remaining the same except that **wages and benefits would be frozen at their current rates for one year**. Throughout negotiations, the school board refused every opportunity to respond in good faith to bargain a successor contract agreement. The school board NEVER offered a counterproposal to the MCTEA's offer.

The MCTEA repeatedly offered to bargain a successor contract in whole or in parts. The board refused to engage in any discussion of a successor contract. The School Board unfairly demanded that MCTEA match an illegal subcontracting bid, for which no public hearing was held, nor was there a legal Request for Bid made. The MCTEA had no other option but to suggest mediation.

The MCTEA's last and final offer is as follows:

To rollover (or extend) the current contract for one year with all terms and conditions remaining the same except that wages and benefits would be frozen at their current rates for one year, 2013-2014.

Rationale for the MCTEA's Proposal

MCTEA initially had proposed dates to bargain a successor contract on November 20, 2012. At that time, all prior issues of subcontracting were removed from the table as an initial contract had been bargained and ratified by both the MCTEA and the school board. Since the first contract had taken almost one year to negotiate, the MCTEA found it in the best interest of all parties to place a demand to bargain and submit dates early enough to provide time for a successor contract to be agreed upon.

The MCTEA's Proposal Cost Summary

For the 2013-2014 school year, the school district would save approximately \$2,000. This is verified by school board documentation.