



Testimony before the
House Committee on Commerce, Labor and Economic Development
on
HB 2326 - Contract negotiations for certain professional employees

by

Mark Tallman, Associated Executive Director for Advocacy

Also representing:

**Kansas National Education Association
United School Administrators of Kansas
Kansas School Superintendents Association**

February 19, 2015

Mr, Chairman, Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to testify in opposition to **HB 2326**. As we understand the bill, it amends the PNA in several areas but would mainly eliminate the “exclusive” representation of professional employee organization and allow individuals to negotiate for themselves. It also removes evaluation procedures from the list of mandatory topics. It makes employment incentive or retention bonuses mandatorily negotiable, but also appears to remove the ability of parties to negotiate other topics by mutual consent. Finally, it specifies the length and number of periods are not subject to negotiations.

Two years ago, legislation in this committee brought the issue of professional negotiations to the forefront. All four organizations I am representing today agreed the chairman of the committee that the issue should be delayed for at least one session to determine if compromise could be reached with all parties to negotiations.

An agreement was reached approximately one month ago. The KASB Board of Directors, under authority from the Delegate Assembly, voted unanimously to approve that agreement, and to support no other changes in the Professional Negotiations Act. The agreement was also approved by the Board of KNEA, USA and KSSA. That compromise was introduced as **SB 136** in the Senate, and **HB 2257**, currently in the House Education Committee.

We appear today as opponents of this bill, **HB 2326** for the following reasons.

First, it goes far beyond the terms of the agreement reached with the Kansas National Education Association, United School Administrators and Kansas School Superintendents Association.

Second, the bill removes the exclusive representation by the teacher bargaining unit, which our members have never voted to support. In fact, in extensive discussion many school leaders believe that individual teacher negotiations would significantly complicate the process, reducing district efficiency.

Third, the bill appears to preclude negotiations over any topics other than the minimum amount of salaries and wages, including pay for duties under supplemental contracts. (Page 3, lines 24-26) The position adopted by our members specifically supports allowing boards and teachers to mutually agree to additional topics. At the same time, making incentive and retention bonuses mandatorily negotiable, rather than permissive, would likely be more difficult for districts to adopt these compensation options.

All four organizations are committed to giving the process adopted in the compromise proposal a chance to succeed before considering further changes such as those represented in **HB 2326**.

We request that you not pass **HB 2326**, or amend the provisions of **HB 2257**, the compromise proposal, into this bill.

Thank you for your consideration.