

Garvey Education Association
Response to the Salary Proposal from the Garvey School District
March 19, 2012

The Association agrees that California is in the midst of an unprecedented financial crisis and this affects the District, but the rationale for your request for a salary reduction and furlough days is both flawed and outdated.

Historically the multiyear projections made by the Garvey School District have been inaccurate. Despite the hardships endured by many in this recession, the District has been growing its ending balance. One of the primary reasons for the inaccuracy in budgeting is the inclusion of data regarding lower ADA without including the correlated decline in certificated, classified and management staff.

Once again the same approach has been used. The multiyear projection has the District down 255 students next year. The same document also assumes a loss of only 5 teachers next year. This is based on the termination of ARRA funds, not a loss in ADA.

The District reduced GEA by 32.1 positions at the Board meeting on March 8, 2012. We feel this was a gross overestimate of the number of teachers who should be reduced due to declining enrollment. Nevertheless, until there is a move from the District to rescind any or all of these layoffs, we must address the effects of these cuts on the District's bottom line. Using the data provided by the District at our first bargaining session, the average salary for a Garvey teacher is \$73,042. We will use this number since we are not privy to the actual salaries of the RIFed teachers. We welcome the use of more accurate information based on the actual compensation paid to these unit members. This figure also does not include all costs, just salary.

On page 2 of the Initial Bargaining Proposal presented to the Association on March 12, 2012, the District asserts, "The District needs to realize \$1.15 million in savings, per year, from negotiations with GEA – through any combination of cuts, including but not limited to savings from possible furlough days and/or salary reductions."

We do not agree with this assertion, but if we use it as a point of reference, $32.1 \text{ FTE} \times \$73,042 = \$2,344,648$. This is more than double the alleged shortfall created by GEA. Until there is a forthright discussion concerning the reduction of unit members and action is taken in regards to the rescission of layoffs, there is no need to discuss monetary concessions from GEA. The District has already taken action.