



Administrative Negotiations Meeting #2

Minutes

Tuesday, March 29, 2022, 6:30 a.m.

Professional Learning Lab

Negotiators Present:

Representing School Board - Board President Brent Seaks and Board Member Jason Rodakowski.

Representing Dickinson Administrative Council – Dickinson High School Assistant Principal Tad Schye, Dickinson Middle School Assistant Principal Dr. Sarah Ricks, and Berg Elementary Principal Tracy Lecoe.

Others Present – Superintendent Dr. Marcus Lewton, Business Manager Stephanie Hunter, Prairie Rose Elementary Assistant Principal Richard Smith, Human Resources Manager Meghan Ziegs, Shary Smith, Shawna Knipp, and Twila Petersen.

Call to Order – Board President Seaks, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 a.m.

Review Attitudes for Administrative Negotiations – The administrative negotiations team members reviewed the attitudes. Mr. Schye stated the administrative negotiators were satisfied with handouts shared 12 hours in advance of a meeting instead of 48 hours. The consensus was that 12 hours was enough time for either party to share handouts.

Review and Approve the March 22, 2022, Negotiations Meeting Minutes – By consensus, the March 22, 2022, meeting minutes were approved as presented and signed by both parties.

Discussion and Approval of Financial Documents – Dr. Ricks moved to approve the financials as presented at the March 22, 2022, Negotiations Meeting. Mr. Schye seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken on the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Add Topics for Discussion – On behalf of the Board negotiators, Mr. Seaks proposed two additional topics for discussion. The two topics were language cleanup and a one-year agreement. The administrative negotiators had no additional topics.

Prioritize Topics for Discussion – By consensus, the topics for discussion were prioritized as follows: 1) Language Cleanup, 2) One-year Agreement, 3) 2022-2023 Salaries, and 4) Formation of Salary Schedule Committee. Mr. Rodakowski noted that the Salary Schedule Committee was more of a long-term goal.

Rationale and First Proposals of Prioritized Topics

Language Cleanup – Proposed language cleanup from the Board negotiators had previously been emailed to the team. The language revisions included changing the dates from 2021-2022 to 2022-2023, adding the position of a CTE Director on the schedule, removing one of the directors (either student services or special education), the travel schedule in Appendix A for 2022-2023, and the proposed travel schedule for 2023-2024 in Appendix A. Administrative negotiators agreed to the modifications to the language as presented for the dates, director positions, and travel schedules in Appendix A.

One-year Agreement – The consensus was to negotiate a one-year agreement.

2022-2023 Salaries – On behalf of the Board, Chair Seaks stated the Board was proposing for the administrative agreement an increase of 1% (on the base). He added this was what will be proposed across all areas; certified, classified, and administrators. Mr. Seaks said for the District to be fiscally responsible, the District was using \$380,000 (as new money) for pay increases. He added that 1% across the Board was a little over the \$380,000. Mr. Rodakowski clarified the Board's proposal was 1% on the base with no education movement and no years of service movement.

Mr. Schye said one of the areas important to the administrative membership was the career advancement steps. He explained because of the process, it takes two years to recover that one year that was frozen. He said the administrators understand there is a finite amount of money. Administrators were considering .5% plus the career advancement. Dr. Ricks added the career advancement was less than 1% total. Mr. Seaks recognized the administrative salary schedule was not the same as the teachers' salary schedule adding perception was important. He said if the Board were to offer the same (.5% plus steps and lanes to the teachers) that would be significantly over the \$380,000.

Mr. Rodakowski explained the foreseeable goal for him was the District would go to bonding for a new high school and/or a new grade school. When going to bond, the District will get rated on its financials. Having 10% of the District's expenditures in cash reserves will assist with a positive rating. If the Board were to provide the education and career movements, it could utilize too much of the short-term cash (ending fund balance). That could affect the bond rating.

Mr. Schye said that he was coming to the table in good faith negotiating for the administrators but the message he was getting was that he was also negotiating for the teachers which he was not. He added perception versus reality were two different things. He expressed the administrators were not suggesting putting the District in financial difficulties. He added the administrators were looking for a solution to the Board's proposal that would meet the needs of the administrators and was revenue neutral to the Board's proposal.

Mr. Schye referenced a bond in the future and emphasized the administrators did not wish to jeopardize the financials of the District. He understood that anything on the base affects the matrix multipliers.

Mr. Schye noted the career advancements for the administrators was less than 1%. He would like to find the percent to the base as it moves across plus career advancement and what it would equal to what the District was proposing. Mr. Seaks understood what Mr. Schye was referencing with the advancement.

Mr. Rodakowski said it would be beneficial if the two salary schedules (administrators and teachers) were related. He inquired if the administrators would prefer less money on the base and be given service and education movement. Dr. Ricks said that was most important to the membership, to have the service years and education movement. She thought the 1% that was being offered by the Board (on the base), could be the equivalent possibly to 1/10th or 2/10th of a percent that could go on the base (plus the career advancement and education). That could potentially be a solution.

Dr. Ricks noted the matrixes in the schedules (administrator and teachers) were different. The flat schedule versus a percentage schedule is more sustainable. The movement on the administrator schedule is less than 1% versus 2% on another schedule. She knew this would be difficult for the Board to navigate. She noted the steps and lanes for the teachers were lumped into one large group and are not comparable to the administrators' schedule. She emphasized it was less than 1% on the administrator schedule. Mr. Seaks concurred.

Mr. Seaks appreciated the information shared and said they would need to take that into consideration. Mrs. Lecoe added it was important to honor the educators and administrators wanting to grow within their field. By consensus, this topic was tabled.

Formation of Salary Schedule Committee – Mr. Rodakowski felt it would be beneficial if the two salary schedules (administrative and teachers) could work together and find a system that was relatively comparable for both parties. He was not sure if that was one committee or two committees with the same goal so that in the long-term when the budget was done and an amount was set for an increase, that increase, or “X” amount, could be put on the base and it would populate through the salary matrix and give the certified and classified the same rough amount.

Mr. Seaks felt if the certified staff would also agree to a salary schedule committee, those meetings could begin in September or towards the end of summer. His goal would be to have the committee develop a salary schedule proposal to review before negotiations begin for the 2023-2024 negotiations.

Mr. Schye recommended separate committees (a separate committee from the teachers) since the administrators do not have union representatives to consult nor do they have attorneys to consult. Those paying dues for a group are going to potentially be rivaling for their own group.

Dr. Ricks said the administrators were not opposed to a salary schedule committee and would be willing to participate on the committee. She suggested more details including representation and if there would be one committee or two committees.

Mr. Rodakowski noted the educators are the bigger piece since they have a larger membership and more dollars tied into their schedule. He thought maybe the conversation could start with them and a sustainable schedule agreed upon. The raises and increases would need to be somewhat similar (with the administrators and teachers).

Schedule Third Meeting – By consensus, the next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, April 13, 2022, at 6:30 a.m. at the Professional Learning Lab.

Build Agenda for Third Meeting – The agenda for the next meeting will include reviewing the minutes from this meeting and to continue the discussion of the remaining two topics: 2022-2023 salaries and the formation of the salary schedule committee.

Debrief – Both parties agreed to the language changes and the one-year agreement.

Adjournment – Chair Seaks declared the meeting adjourned at 7:06 a.m.

Dated this 13th day of April 2022.

DICKINSON PUBLIC SCHOOLS



By: Board Negotiator

DICKINSON ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL



By: Administrative Negotiator

