

## **MEA Bargaining 2025-2026**

### **Session #2**

Wednesday, August 13, 2025

Those present: Pat Barber, Christina Britton, Valerie Finnegan, Silvana Ianinska, Derek Jensen, Helen King, Brian Kirchberg, Rob Lyons, Gina Malinak, Cathy Miley, Bruce Proud, Sharon Scarbrough, Rachel Sellers, Jon Syre, Evelyn Townsley, Dawn Walker and Mark West.

Meeting began at 6:01 p.m.

MW – Appreciate y'all coming in. Hope you had a good first week of school. Put some things for y'all to work out. Not sure if you wanted to start.

BP – This is a prelude to our proposal. Concern with salary schedule structure as it exists now. It's complicated, cumbersome. Other places moved away from structure to more individual-based after hired. Trend around state and in comparable counties. Move toward annual changes based on individual's base rate. Might be a good way to move as well. Change hiring schedule. Proposal to do that and other things that have been traditionally discussed for teachers. Paras are different in hourly rate, schedule is not as impacted by state rules and requirements. Have conversation about moving away from that kind of schedule.

MEA proposal distributed to management team. This is a beginning conversation about how this will work, not a perfect answer. Approach to making a change. Start with hiring schedule.

MEA hiring schedule proposal handed out. Current schedule has several levels that are the same. Minor increase, then same, etc. hiring currently stops at 12 years of outside experience. That has been a concern in the past. Has been modified in past moving from 8 to 12. Now starting is \$49,702. This would start at \$50,000. Still less than many comparable counties without the referendum. Referendum would be added to get final salary. Some comparables have referendum dollars added in. Simple math computation of 2.1 tenths of a percent between the levels. .21%, a fifth of a percent basically. Looked like it would get it to a place that would match in our schedule. Allow it to be smoother. Increase in hiring schedule for experience but wouldn't disrupt current employees depending on where we are with salary increases. Has monetary value between \$49,702 to \$50,000. Calculated 352 people but don't know the number. I might have used more thinking about those who are here but don't move because would not move because were hired in the middle of the year. Just people at 1<sup>st</sup> level currently and adding a guesstimate. Maybe HR could provide info to get to a better number to hone in on better number if we get to that point. At bottom – degree supplements calculated at 6%. Trend occurs in teacher salary proposal. Will see that proposing increase of 6%. No level movement in this proposal. Changes performance degree by 6% for equity. Consistent in grandfathered (GF) and performance pay (PP) as well as new hires. That's what we did in last few negotiations to be consistent. Estimated PP degree supplement of \$102,330 based on data provided in April. 743 people on PP who have degrees and 6% increase for those who have that. Nominal PP of \$100 for (effective) E and \$125 for highly effective (HE). Different than what we've done before. Completely different approach. Structural change. Has been done in other districts in

FL to make adjustments. Have small PP impacts. Retention at 16 and 25+ in teacher bargaining unit (BU). Estimated who might be newly in 16+ range for this year and 20 at 25+. Similar to what we've had in past and have been concurred with data in past of those currently receiving those amounts. New retention category – 10<sup>th</sup> year moving to 11<sup>th</sup>. Anyone with more than 10 years' experience in district would receive \$1000. Estimate of those in system. Used those currently at 16 and 25 because those would receive it as well. Cumulative impact of retention supplements. Didn't have hire dates on data we received. Would need that to see who has been hired for 10 years. Differentiated is what is in appendix B – duties, functions, athletics – increase 6%. Probably not accurate number because has different pieces of data from district. Some from April. Incomplete. Some include those attached to a position. Some had longevity. My guess is that it's higher than what is listed here. should have looked at what we had last year. for paras –

RS – what is dollar amount for 16+ and 25+?

BP - \$2100 and \$3600.

BP – paras – looking at more traditional approach. Have step schedule. Move a step. High priority for them to move forward to a higher salary step. Proposing 70 cents per hour increase. So, 70 cents per hour increase for each individual on the salary schedule (SS). Last para issue – concern that they need to be retained as well. Work longer. Looking for ways to keep them as employees rather than having so much turnover. As years go on, they are heavily loaded at bottom. Asking for longevity of 10+ and 20+. After 10 years - \$1000 and after 20+ - \$1500. Calculated at how many were at 10 and above based on data received. Total cost does not include benefits. Understand that that would be added to that.

MW – Don't have last years', how you did this. Thank you, that's helpful. This is the placement schedule?

BP – Correct.

MW – The increase of 6% of current salary. That's where you get \$8.8M?

BP – Based on people in data received on each level and schedules and what that would be. For all schedules combined. PP 10 and 11 as well as GF and all those schedules.

MW – Structure of SS now. Want to move away from Placement schedule and customized?

BP – Yes, individualized salary.

MW – Got it. Performance degrees supplements are down here. Performance pay is just what state required and want to throw a little bit of money at that. Retention is existing at 2100 and 3600 and retention at 10 year is new? That would be 1000 on top of 2100 and 3600?

BP – Correct.

MW – Paras – important that they show that they have advancement on step schedule and cost of living adjustment (COLA) to SS of 70 cents. Want longevity, would be new for 10 and 20+. Clarifying and want to make sure that's accurate.

BP – Issue is that there is a nickel between those at beginning because of getting to \$15/hour and because of compression.

Mw – HR, any questions?

CB – no, I get it.

BP – that's all I have for today at this point.

MW – This is going to be something we will have to go back and discuss as far as total amount. Higher than what we presented to you and what we have in budget. This is for base salary. We do need to move forward to discuss about the referendum supplement. That is a timely issue.

RS – Does this have the referendum built into it?

BP – No, it does not. Have not had full conversation around it. Considerable change and what we believe referendum was and whether it is the intent to move away from percentages completely and give sole responsibility to the board around how referendum is spent in total. Have had referendum MOU in place that has never been modified since 2018 that describes after passage of referendum and what that means as far as hours, planning time, has always been a conversation about how much money has been around for teacher BU. Don't know that's what the intent was but that's what was delivered to us today. It says school board will adjust annually with no further conversation. We get that that's the board's authority. However, constitution says we have the right to bargain and we intend to bargain as it has been approved as opposed to giving sole authority to school board. So, if that's the intent of the school board we need to know that to choose what we need to do. Already filed arbitration – you know that – reached agreement through arbitration. You know that?

MW – Resolution that was put out there. Looking at it in light of this year with other factors that came into play. School board is right to adjust it to your benefit in this case to say that I believe that the board – not schooled on the arbitration piece – is that recent?

BP – 2018

MW – Included resolution, was to look at 2024-2025 baseline amount. Use it as a positive for retention purposes. That was a year. \$9537 was that amount. Board doesn't want to hurt anybody moving forward. At this point we don't want to dip below that number. That's why we're talking.

BP – This document was regressive from what we talked about the other day. What the actual tax dollars were. Getting to point of what would have occurred then. This went to the board making that decision and what board decided and removes conversation about 51% and 5% and what purposes would be and how that works. That was negotiated.

MW – Board's intent I think of what the resolution was based on this baseline amount 2024-2025. Don't want to dip below that. If we did 51% it would dip below that. What we're looking at for this year is to keep it at that as opposed to dipping below that.

BP – So you want me to say I trust you? The board won't say we gave up our right to negotiate in future years by agreeing to this? That's what it says.

MW – This is a year by hear thing. That's why it is a MOU as opposed to Contract language. Doesn't want to be regressive this year.

BP – Happened to paras in the past. Made whole for the paras. This would be a drastic change in terms of tone and language. Referendum is 4-year language. Implication as to future referendum. Don't know who is going to be a school board member next year or superintendent next week. Shift in approach or written language.

MW – Can only speak to what we have right now. Not shift in language but recognition of where we are right now and actual adjustment to be made as you said about paras before.

BP – But it doesn't say that anywhere. Doesn't say calculated amounts. Clear and unambiguous language is that the board intends to do it on its own without calculating percentages. If what you say is true, we understand and that's a good gesture and one to consider but without the language it's hard to convince anyone of intent.

Reference document from MEA – referendum calculations sheet 2024-2025

MW – We were trying to come to agreement for this year. How do you want to proceed in doing what we want to do?

BP – If you have the language and something that says that calculations would not be favorable and for this year the intent is to hold harmless at last year's rate. Already there on this sheet. Not sure how hard it would be to say current board recommendation is to add. Include previous year and this year to show that it would not be advantageous.

MW – Can go back and look at that.

BP – What resolution are you talking about? I'm having a hard time understanding your resistance to the recommendation I gave.

MW -- ????

BP – This resolution comes from where?

MW – the board

BP – How different is it from previous resolutions for the same purpose?

MW – Don't have an answer. Just have what I have here.

BP – How different is this from what happened last year?

MW – Resolution is based on the referendum that was passed.

BP – So what you're saying is the board has the intent to change what they've done in the past. If you want me to come back with proposal, I'll do that.

MW – And I will get you a copy of the resolution.

BP – What about other things that were part of mou re: extra time? Is it the intent that those would change as well?

MW – No.

BP – Under same resolution

MW – We can get you a copy so you can take a look at that and make a proposal based on that. Anything else before we caucus?

BP – No.

Caucus at 6:47 p.m. Reconvened at 8:36 p.m.

MEA proposal distributed.

BP - We did find a couple of Scribner's errors going quickly trying to get done. 75,692.376.  
Balance for distribution – balance misspelled.  
period after 'amounts' should not exist.

RS – Total available for paras is it still 4,112,000. Is total available still the same?

BP – Yes, it did change. 4,263,858

RS – Fringe is 22.68 not 22.86. On previous day when we gave baseline one when you use 22.68 should be \$803,223. That changes total at bottom to \$4,344,775. And then instructional – that fringe should be \$7,711,117. That changes total cost with benefits to \$41,710,752.

BP – And how did you get that number?

RS – How you got \$7,711,000 – \$28,639,611 and additional cost of time and then multiply by 2268.

BP – And that becomes 7,711,117. And final number?

RS - \$41,710,752.

BP – Ok. One more referendum percent – in 3<sup>rd</sup> column under 24-25 the 51% is missing.

BP – I've never seen it go down. Why did it go down?

GM – Workers comp. The workers comp went down.

MW – So with the numbers we have here we feel comfortable going forward. We will clean it up.

BP – I'm doing it now. Feel free to check when we're finished.

SI – Scribner’s error – should be referendum pay using FY 2024-2025 baseline amounts and also fringe benefits there has to change

MW – Yes, we’ve got that in the actual paragraph.

BP – Still having trouble figuring out numbers to come out right in the actual instructional line item.

Rachel shared the formula she used.

MW – If you’re ok TAing this tonight then payroll can go ahead and start and get supplement in first paycheck.

GM – Wait, are we doing 9296?

RS – we’re not going with that.

BP and MW signed off.

MW – Alright so we can get in first paycheck so that takes care of a portion. What I’d like to do if it’s alright. Have proposal on base salary. Clarified each part. Going to say this. Know time is late. What you proposed here with totals \$11,755,000 what we had presented last time was \$5.5M for teachers and \$540,000 for paras. Discrepancy there. Looked at your numbers. Need to do deeper analysis of categories. What might you prioritize on this list? For example, paras realize a step at least. That’s helpful to know a priority. Help us prioritize what you want us to focus on.

BP – We did prioritize considerably to come up with this to get where we are. Knowing at bottom the steps are a nickel. That’s a concern that wouldn’t be sufficient to get ratification. Need to get dollars on schedule because of number of people at bottom levels on TAE and TA6 where bulk of people are. Major concern. Step is not sufficient.

MW – On instructional side – new things you’ve proposed. New retention. Recognize desire to recognize 10-year employees. Additional dollars?

BP- This year, yes. Not in following years. Much less future impact than that number. Same with paras longevity. First year is much more costly. I get that the money continues but it’s not an ongoing new cost.

MW – So we will need an opportunity to do a detailed analysis. You mentioned that this doesn’t include fringe. With that that probably will take us over \$14M dollars. Have to take a look at that. Will take that back. If have questions we will email you to clarify?

BP – Sure.

MW – Next Thursday scheduled. Do you need caucus time ahead of time as well?

BP – It probably won’t be as long but I like to have a few minutes to have conversations to make sure we are on the same page.

MW – Your caucus will start at 5?

BP – 4:45

MW – Hopefully you won't need as much time but if you do, you do. We will be ready at 5.

MW – Thank you. Feel like we got something accomplished.

Meeting adjourned at 9:27 p.m.