The Board of Directors of the Little Rock School District held a special meeting on Thursday, December 8, 2005 in the Boardroom of the Administration Building, 810 West Markham Street, Little Rock, Arkansas. President Micheal Daugherty presided.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Micheal Daugherty  
Larry Berkley  
Baker Kurru  
Katherine Mitchell  
Tony Rose

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Bryan Day  
Sue Strickland

**ALSO PRESENT:**

Roy G. Brooks, Superintendent of Schools  
Beverly Griffin, Recorder of Minutes

**I. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL**

Dr. Daugherty called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Five members of the board were present at roll call; Mr. Day and Ms. Strickland were absent.

**II. PURPOSE OF THE MEETING**

The agenda for the special meeting listed the following items:

A. Approval of Contract Proposals for School Psychologists, Custodians and School Nurses  
B. Approval of Revised Child Nutrition Salary Schedules  
C. Employee Hearings
III. **ACTION AGENDA**

A. **Approval of Contract Proposals for School Psychologists, Custodians and School Nurses**

The board was provided with information regarding the contract proposals for School Psychologists, Custodians and School Nurses. These employees will receive the same benefits provided through other group contract negotiations, including a step increase for those eligible, $263.00 toward their health insurance plan, and .5 percent to the previous year's salary schedule. As with other employee groups, the Board will review the recommendation should the District receive an increase in per-pupil State funding.

Mr. Berkley moved to approve the recommendation of the administration. Dr. Mitchell seconded the motion and it **carried unanimously**.

B. **Approval of Revised Child Nutrition Salary Schedules**

Salary schedules for employees of the Child Nutrition Department underwent a full review and conversion to ensure a salary schedule more consistent with other employees of the District. The board was asked to approve the converted salary schedules with pay increases retroactive to July 1, 2005.

Mr. Berkley moved to approve the recommended salary schedule conversion and the retroactive increase in pay; Mr. Rose seconded. The motion **carried unanimously**.

C. **Employee Hearing**

The board convened an executive session for the purpose of hearing an employee grievance. The employee was represented by Attorney John Walker. Khayyam Eddings represented the Board and administration.

Mr. Eddings opened by providing a packet of documents for the Board’s review. The issue for consideration was limited to a salary discrepancy and the employee’s contention that she was paid at a rate less than other clerical employees in her department.

Robert Robinson, Director of Classified Personnel, verified information regarding the past work history of the employee at a school. A principal testified to the accuracy of statements that the employee performed clerical duties in the school office while assigned to his school, but that she was considered an aide and was paid on the aide salary schedule. The employee admitted that she did not contact Human Resources regarding any
discrepancies in pay or work responsibilities while classified as an aide at the school.

Mr. Eddings reviewed the salary placement for the employee who held the position in the district department prior to the employee’s appointment to that position. The former employee was placed at Grade 35; the current employee was placed at Grade 37 when she was hired, but was recently upgraded to a Grade 40.

*The board recessed briefly at 7:20 p.m. and returned at 7:35 p.m.*

The Department Director testified that she supported efforts by the secretarial staff in her department to receive additional compensation for their current positions. She noted that two of the clerical staff members work 12 months; two of them work 11-month contracts. The employee who is subject to this proceeding was one of the 11-month employees.

Mr. Walker called a department employee as a witness. This witness holds the second 11-month clerical position in the Department. She testified that she had been in that position since March 2002, and was placed at a Grade 40 on the pay schedule. Both she and employee subject to the hearing were assigned similar responsibilities.

*The board recessed for deliberations at 9:00 p.m. They returned at 9:15 p.m. and reported that no action had been taken.*

Mr. Berkley made a motion that the District provide a differential salary adjustment between salary grade 37 and 40 for the time frame when both employees were in the same position doing the same work. Dr. Mitchell seconded the motion. There was discussion among board members to clarify the intent of the motion:

Mr. Kurrus stated that the intent of the motion was simply to provide the same pay (the same daily rate of pay) for two employees who were performing the same work during the same time period. The differential would be based upon step 37 compared to step 40 and would redress the inequity between two employees who were doing the same job for the same period of time prior to the district’s reorganization. The employee would be assigned to grade 40 effective as of her colleague’s date of hire.

Mr. Rose offered an amendment to the original motion that stated the employee would be entitled to the difference between her daily rate of pay and the daily rate of pay as her colleague. Mr. Berkley seconded the motion, but it **failed 2-3**.
Mr. Rose asked Mr. Walker if he would like to restate the motion for clarity. Mr. Walker declined. The original motion carried unanimously.

V. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m. on a motion by Mr. Berkley and seconded by Mr. Rose.
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