

MEA Bargaining 2026-2027

Session #4

Thursday, July 23, 2026

Those present: Pat Barber, Christina Britton, Willie Clark, Valerie Finnegan, Silvana Ianinska, Derek Jensen, Julie Kerber, Helen King, Brian Kirchberg, Rob Lyons, Bruce Proud, Sharon Scarbrough, Rachel Sellers, Jon Syre, Mark West, and Mercedes Wildman.

Meeting began at 5:15 p.m.

Mark West (MW) – I looked at your proposal from last night in regard to your totals. Just to confirm the 3% to all teachers is in addition to the 2.7664. The retention is the same. You have TSIA ineligible that for the teachers that don't qualify with \$9,023,584, \$11,030,428 with benefits. We see the discrepancy and the correction now. Let me say we've called around and asked about the FES funds. What we talked about is we don't want that to be a sticking point. We sent an email I noticed you had \$2,317,664. Our calculation is \$2,438,265. Which is based on the total TSIA minus the charter school allocation. This amount represents the TSIA dollars from the state. We've been pretty consistent that that will go to the teachers that are eligible and that it would be a set amount. We would determine when the total number of eligible teachers would be determined. When you take in new hires that may qualify, we recognize we won't have that definite number until September 1st. With that in mind let us look at our proposal and what we are looking at.

Everybody should have 2 pages. SDMC Increases Offer of 7/23/2026. The original number we had for teachers was \$4,205,859, less the TSIA of \$2,980,538 and Not Eligible for TSIA of \$1,225,323. Classroom teachers with 10 yrs+ = 1,178 that will equate to \$2,567 added to base with benefits (Net \$2,100). Classroom Teacher with less than 10 years not eligible for TSIA (1357) 2% raise on base salary with benefits range \$1,215 - \$1,440 (Net \$994 - \$1,178), Non-Classroom Teachers do not meet definition per statute (351) 2% raise on base salary benefits range \$1,135 - \$2,264 (Net \$994 - \$1,852). Capping any raise with benefits at \$2,444 (Net \$2,000).

Also, Paraprofessionals will receive 1 step advance and a \$0.21 per hour that equates to a 2% raise. Cost of increase without benefits \$380,608 and with benefits \$465,255.

Since we've been consistent our purpose is to distribute evenly, we have this MOU. Memorandum of Understanding was distributed with details of equal distribution of the TSIA funds. That amount will be divided evenly not to exceed \$3,000. The allocation was \$2,980,536 after charter schools. After benefits are deducted, the total for distribution is \$2,438,265. Will be divided equally among eligible classroom teachers with 10 or more years in the state of Florida as dictated by Florida law. (Law language continued)

We do have a Scribner's error at the bottom of the spread sheet our total should be \$5,966,167

Bruce Proud (BP) - One question about the proposal. Capping the amount why?

Rachel Sellers (RS) – That was due to one member an ROTC person who would be above the 2%

MW – So there is an ROTC person that is classified as a teacher?

RS – (RS & SI conferring)

MW – We can look at that individual one and let you know.

RS – No, correction it is a media specialist who is a TOA. That one I just looked up and with benefits he would be a little above the 2%

BP – Okay, I think I understand your proposal. You've chosen Sept. 1st. Is there a reason you've chosen that date?

MW – To give us ample time to get that information from them to be as accurate as possible. Anyone hired after that would not be eligible. If you have a different date.

BP - Do you plan to survey all teachers.

MW - We would only survey the ones basically on the list that we gave you of ineligible ones.

BP – We will need a caucus.

Caucus 5:40 p.m.

Reconvened at 6:54 p.m.

BP – We have a counter proposal that looks at 2 ½ % I believe with the retention we are in agreement and the distribution of TSIA. I think the MOU language needs a little work. We've still included the individuals for increases. We don't believe that it was the intent of the state to use the TSIA fund as the sole increase in salary for those experienced individuals. We think that people who are in positions that would make them ineligible should not be penalized because they don't qualify by the state. Particularly, don't agree with the capping and don't see the financial reasoning. We also think that the 2 1/2 % is a reasonable amount. It will have an effect on the budget.

We know that the 10% insurance increase will exceed the increase in salaries. We need to know numbers of teachers and paras that have reached thresholds in the plan. We know you can't share specifics of people but you can share the numbers. This would help determine movement within the plan. I think we had the same conversation last year.

We recognize that a majority of the employees are receiving a \$0.05 step and we need to address this. We talked about making it more equitable. We've always talked about the need to address this later to make a more equitable distribution on the salary schedule and make it more easily understandable. Your proposal would be \$0.26 for the majority of the bargaining unit in those two schedules through step 12. We're talking more than half of the bargaining unit. Just to verify you said 2%. It's closer to 1.9 rather than 2%.

MW - Yes, with benefits.

BP - It's closer to 1.9 rather than 2%. I gather you have done the same everywhere else – have included the benefits. This seems to be a trend. This issue has come up before – not fixing the schedule – and getting an accumulation of nickels through the years. Para's wonder why they are not recognized for continued employment as the teachers are. There's a place in the schedule between 19 and 21 years but not earlier. It would be nice if paras would stay, we think that's what the district would want. At least 100 new paras in the first step in two categories, a turnover of 20 to 25%. There needs to be a way to retain those individuals.

The other important issue to talk about the legislature there is no standard amount. In their calculation it does differentiate between length of work year.

BP - If you have any questions, I'm happy to answer.

MW – I think I understand.

BP – Your good?

MW – Yes

BP - One more proposal. (Distributed a draft of Article V – Working conditions) This is adding a new subsection in article V. This is concerning mostly elementary schools, where different schools are handling it in different ways. There are some schools where individuals are assigned as Case Managers, those assigned by the principal and do not have time to do the work that is a requirement for those individuals. In the middle schools it's handled, part of the day they work in one capacity and then the other part as the case manager. This is not the case in all schools. The expectation is that they are to complete the work during the day – filling out long forms, requiring them to write multiple things in a specific way and maybe even contacting or meeting with parents. Some, as with ESE pre-k teachers, do not have planning time and they are told they can do their planning while students are taking a nap. Proposing they find time for these individuals to plan. I

don't know that the 4 days will be well received by these individuals. They may not like this as they will have to prepare to be out of the classroom and there will be disruptions to the class environment. However, they are anxious to find alternatives. Ideally, they would like it to be like at other schools where they have someone else complete those functions.

CB – (Asked for clarification about the Pre-K teachers specifically.)

BP – (He provided clarification)

CB - I wanted to understand the umbrella of Case Manager.

MW – You said specifically that the MOU needs some work. We still have time.

BP – No surprises as to when this will occur. How you identify what the end result will be and what our involvement will be and providing the information as to who is eligible. Process of surveying teachers. How to calculate what the teachers will be receiving. Distribution of the amount of money. Providing the information as to who is eligible.

MW – Went through the above requirements to edit the MOU

CB – How would you want it to be distributed.

BP – I think it says over the year.

CB - Do you have a date in mind. We're still hiring.

MW – Ok, we can look at a date.

CB – On our current contract teachers have 30 days to provide their certification.

MW - We will take some time and get back to you.

Caucus: 7:20 p.m.

Reconvened at 7:52 p.m.

MW – First we will start with the working conditions. We don't really have a definition of a case manager for ESE. We feel all ESE teachers are case managers. You did bring up an important point of giving teachers the time to do their work. We really want to talk about what this would mean because there would be a cost and we would just like some more information on that.

BP - We would have to think of how to collect more information and if you would want me to do that.

MW – Would you like us to do that?

BP – What we do know is that the ESE Pre-K teachers are given as a case manager. If management isn't aware of this document this is problematic.

MW – Is this specifically for the ESE Pre-K. In respect to your proposal. The numbers in our previously gave you is the funds we have been authorized to offer. With the Para Schedule, we can look at that, but those funds would have to come from somewhere.

With regards to that, you mentioned the TSIA part and added it to the MOU. (Distributed) What we attempted to do is modified under the distribution. Verification by September 1, 2026 with a review for MEA by September 15, 2026.

BP – In number 1, I have a problem with the language not being clear about verification of teaching experience.

MW & CB – We agree, it's teaching experience.

BP – Teacher is broad. How would 2 & 3 work with 11 month employees.

CB – It would be retroactive. We would pay it by distributing it evenly.

MW – It means we would retroactive

BP – Probably need to add another sentence.

CB - The amount would be applied.

MW – We can move forward with the process because we are in agreement. What we have to have a tentative agreement

BP – From what you just said about the paras we are not in agreement. As for the teachers were not even close.

MW - With the deadline of next Friday, we need to move forward with ratification of the TSIA issue.

BP – We are not going to agree to your proposal. We aren't ready to ratify anything based on your last proposal.

MW – I meant a TA.

BP – You threw me off when you said ratification.

New Language for MOU was constructed by CB and copies made and distributed.

BP – We'd like a few minutes to discuss.

Caucus at 8:22 p.m.

Reconvened at

BP – During the caucus we had a conversation about the MOU and about bargaining as a whole. We are prepared to schedule dates for next week. We have availability on Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday.

MW - Are we available during the day on Friday, in the morning. 8:00 a.m. or 9:00 a.m.

BP - Caucus at 8:00 a.m. Bargain at 9:00 a.m.

MW - That's the only date I have availability.

BP - We have concerns about signing off of this and not continuing to bargain. For us we have a state of urgency once we reach TA status on the TSIA .

MW – I concur with you on that but I'm scheduled to be out of state.

BP – Most of us have changed our schedules too. So maybe Friday isn't a good day. Let's look at the next week. Monday 3rd? Any day that week is fine with me.

PB – You all tell us when you're available. Pat listed what next week is for teachers. Monday, Wednesday and Thursday and Friday. Discussion for dates occurred. We will caucus on Monday the 8/3rd at 4:45 and bargain at 5:30p.m.

MW - I know during covid we had teams meetings, it that something you would be interested in.

BP - I don't see how that would work at this point.

MW – If your not interested. I believe we can go another route.

BP – Are we talking about Monday 7/27. Caucus at 4:00 p.m. and Bargain at 5:00 p.m.

MW – Thank you for accommodating me on that.

(The MOU was signed by Bruce, Pat and Mark, except for the superintendent's signature will be obtained on Monday)

MW – Once again thank you for accommodating me on Monday.

Adjourned 9:09 p.m.