

RECEIVED

JUN 17 1986

STATE OF WISCONSIN
BEFORE THE MEDIATOR/ARBITRATOR

WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT
RELATIONS COMMISSION

In the Matter of the	:	
Mediation/Arbitration Between	:	Case 7
	:	No. 35443 Med/Arb-3423
DODGEVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT	:	Decision No. 23091-A
	:	
and	:	Sharon K. Imes
	:	Mediator/Arbitrator
DODGEVILLE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION	:	
	:	

APPEARANCES:

David J. Westhoff, District Administrator, appearing on behalf of the Dodgeville School District.

Paul R. Bierbrauer, Executive Director, South West Teachers United, appearing on behalf of the Dodgeville Education Association.

ARBITRATION HEARING BACKGROUND AND JURISDICTION:

On December 19, 1985, the undersigned was notified by the Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission of appointment as mediator/arbitrator in the matter of impasse identified above under Section 111.70(4)(cm)6 of the Municipal Employment Relations Act. Pursuant to statutory requirement, mediation proceedings were conducted between the Dodgeville School District, hereinafter referred to as the District, and the Dodgeville Education Association, hereinafter referred to as the Association, on February 10, 1986. Mediation failed to resolve the impasse and the parties proceeded to arbitration on February 11, 1986. During the hearing, the parties were given full opportunity to present relevant evidence and make oral argument. Post hearing briefs were filed with and exchanged through the arbitrator on March 24, 1986.

THE FINAL OFFERS:

The remaining issues at impasse between the parties concern the salary schedule, the co-curricular schedule and health insurance premiums. The final offers of the parties are attached as Appendix "A" and "B".

STATUTORY CRITERIA:

Since no voluntary impasse procedure was agreed upon between the parties regarding the above-identified impasse, the undersigned, under the Municipal Employment Relations Act, is required to choose the entire final offer on the unresolved issues of one of the parties after giving consideration to the criteria identified in Section 111.70(4)(cm)7, Wis. Stats.

POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES:

The District argues its offer is clearly the more reasonable based upon economics alone. Citing differences between its offer relative to wage increases, health insurance premium increases, and total package costs, the District concludes its offer, which it states represents a 7.78% increase in salaries, a 7.78% increase in additional wages paid and a maintenance of position relative to health insurance premium payments, is more reasonable at an 8.03% increase than is the Association's at an 11.73% increase.

In further defense of its position, the District directs attention to two stipulations reached by the parties, the increase in contribution to the Wisconsin Retirement System and the increase in the hourly wage for the behind-the-wheel instruction. It declares the WRS contribution is a significant contribution given the fact that the legislation which increased the employee's contribution did not require the Employer to bargain the increase. It adds the increase in the hourly wage for the behind-the-wheel

instruction, consistent with its proposed salary increase, must be a fair, "if not generous," increase, since the Association stipulated to the percent increase.

Comparing itself to the Southern Eight Conference schools and to selected area schools, the District posits its offer more accurately represents the increases granted among the comparable schools. In support of its position it states its offer will maintain its historical position at the benchmarks among the conference schools and continues that the Association's offer exceeds the average package increase as well as the package increase settled upon in Lancaster. To further demonstrate the reasonableness of its offer, the District considered the package increases within the District in the past five years and concludes its final offer is still very close to previous settlements and is much greater than the percentage the consumer price index has grown. The District adds that an award which would allow a double digit increase given the reduced state aids and the growth in the Consumer Price Index is unjustified.

Focusing on the actual increase which would be received by an individual teacher, rather than benchmarks or averages, the District posits a significant increase in wages will occur for those not at the top of their lanes. Further, the District notes that for those teachers, in the final cell of their lane, who must make a horizontal movement in order to experience the same increase those will who have not reached the final cell, there is ample incentive for lane movement but the option is not exercised. The District continues that the number of staff located in the final cells of their respective lanes significantly affects the composite increase which is used for comparison purposes.

In regard to the co-curricular rate increase proposed by the Association, the District argues the proposal will represent a 27.4% increase in these costs and will cause a change in the format which determines compensation. Stating it ranks favorably with the Southern Eight Conference Schools in the amounts it pays for co-curricular activities, the District concludes there is no reason for change.

Addressing its contribution to the premium costs of health insurance, the District asserts it is difficult to determine the actual value of a health insurance plan since the benefits of each plan are not summarized. It argues, however, that since its plan has a very low deductible for major medical and a co-insurance plan which results in a maximum out of pocket dollar cost of \$1,000 for a family and \$400 for an individual, its plan is excellent.

The District continues that based upon its financial condition, its offer is more reasonable than the Association's. Referring to its annual meeting budget document, it declares its enrollment is declining and as it declines, so will its state aids. It adds its equalization aid level has been frozen at the 1985-86 level for 1986-87 thus, it will receive less in state aid/tax credits in the 1986-1987 school year. Finally, the District concludes that if the Association's offer is implemented, given these conditions, it would cause the District to increase the tax levy in 1986-87 not only to accommodate the Association's offer but to make up for the reduced state aids the District will receive.

In regard to its ability to pay the proposed increases as it affects the interest and welfare of the public, the District posits that relative to the comparable districts, it has a below average pupil/teacher ratio and an above average per pupil cost and adds it also receives less general state aid than the average district. It continues that based upon the fact that nearly 10% of its population was below poverty level in 1980 and that economic conditions have deteriorated since then with farm foreclosures becoming commonplace, the general financial conditions of the district's tax base should be considered in determining which offer is more reasonable. In further support of this position, it also notes the level of delinquent property taxes has increased, as well as have the number of bankruptcies. Given these conditions, it concludes its offer is more than reasonable.

Addressing the Association's proposal, the District objects to including CESA #3 as a comparable since is it not a local educational institution and since the District only uses the non-administrative staff a few hours of time for occupational/physical therapy. The District also rejects the Association's evidence regarding statewide comparables stating "It is my understanding that

the arbitrator will not use state wide comparables.

In reference to the Association's data regarding comparability, the District re-asserts it must be remembered that only 14 of the District's 93,495 staff members are represented in the benchmark comparisons made by the Association and therefore they should be given little weight in determining the reasonableness of the offers. It adds that even if the benchmarks are used, however, under its offer, the District will retain its historical position among the comparables.

Further, objecting to the Association's wage proposal, the District declares the Association's offer should not prevail since it contains a number of changes, a deviation from the status quo without reason. In support of its position, it states the Association's offer not only represents an increase in the base salary but an increase in the increments which is a change in the salary schedule. The District continues that the Association proposes a second change, a major structural change, when it seeks to modify the method in which part-time teachers are compensated. Noting the current method of advancement for less than full time teachers is an experience step proportionate to the percentage of time the teacher spends teaching, the District objects to the Association seeking to secure a full step advancement for part-time teachers. Finally, the District rejects the Association's exhibits regarding a survey conducted by the Association concerning the advancement of part-time staff on the salary schedules by defining problems with each exhibit submitted.

The District asserts another structural change would occur under the Association's proposal concerning co-curricular compensation since it requires a modified index system and creates compensation for positions which did not previously exist. Opposed to this change, the District states it believes the Association's evidence regarding co-curricular pay supports the District's position since it shows the District ranks high among the comparables in compensation for these activities.

Addressing the Association's evidence concerning the insurance issue, the District declares the evidence indicates the District is one of four districts among the comparables to provide dental insurance; that the District has been able to maintain a premium structure below the average for those districts within the conference; that the District has been consistent in the level of its contribution toward the cost of the premium and that it is one of five school districts among the comparables to provide long term disability insurance for the professional staff. Given these facts, it believes the District compares well in the fringe benefit area and there is no need for an increase in health insurance premiums paid by the District.

The Association, uncertain as to the comparables which the District would utilize, proposed the Southern Eight Athletic Conference and CESA #3 as the appropriate set of comparables. In support of its position, the Association cited a number of arbitration decisions in the conference which have concluded the Southern Eight Athletic Conference was an appropriate set of comparables. It also cited another arbitrator who had concluded it was appropriate to consider school districts within an area served by a CESA as appropriate comparables when determining wages within a CESA since those districts purchase services from the CESA and dominate its Board of Control. The Association rejected, however, any attempt which the District might make to compare itself with districts within CESA #2 and CESA #3 arguing there is insufficient evidence submitted on any of these districts.

Stating the salary schedule dispute is the primary issue in dispute between the parties, the Association declares the parties' proposals must be weighed by comparing benchmarks among the comparables in terms of relative rank, history and instant increases. It also posits considerable weight should be given comparisons with the statewide average at seven proposed benchmarks over a four year period since it shows a continuing relative decline from the average.

Continuing that the District will probably raise the issue of the interest and welfare of the public as it relates to the District's ability to pay, the Association argues the interest and welfare of the public must balance the cost of public services with the quality of those services as they affect the standard of living of the citizens in the community and cites at least two arbitrators who have made statements to that effect. Declaring the District has not denied its ability to meet the cost of the Association's proposal nor

has it shown its economic conditions to be unique to the District, the Association posits districts more rural than this District have been able to reach voluntary settlement at a salary increase similar to the Association's proposal.

When it compares seven benchmark positions in the District with those among the comparables, the Association states the relative rank of the Dodgeville benchmarks among the comparables is the first critical measurement to apply. When rank is considered, the Association argues its offer is more reasonable since the District's offer would result in the lowest or near lowest ranking among the comparables while its offer, although slightly improving the salary schedule and the rankings, does not provide benchmarks which are above any previous rank the District has held. Continuing that a second measurement is comparison of increases, the Association concludes this comparison shows the District's offer is inadequate since it is below the comparable group average at every benchmark. It states its offer, however, is more reasonable since it makes certain improvements although it too falls below the average at two benchmarks.

Recognizing its offer results in a 10.63% increase, the Association asserts that although this is a sizable percentage increase, it is more in accord with the percentage given by comparable employers and cites percentage increases at Platteville (8.53%); at Darlington (11.73%); at Iowa-Grant (10.41%); at CESA #3 (12.61%) and at Southwestern (7.90%) and continues that compared to the average of these percentages, its offer is only slightly above the average. Stating that while it would expect the percentage increase it seeks to be compared to the Consumer Price Index, the Association posits the cost-of-living is also reflected by the settlement pattern established within an area and asserts the settlement pattern more closely approximates its offer than the District's. It concludes, then, its offer, although a higher percentage than the Consumer Price Index has grown, is reasonable and consistent with the cost-of-living increases.

Conducting an historical comparison of wage increases, the Association argues the District has lagged behind average increases granted when three year and four year benchmark increases have been compared. It continues that since its current offer also lags behind the average increase in all but one benchmark, it can only be concluded the Association's offer is more reasonable. In further support of its position, it compares its benchmark increases to increases in the statewide average benchmarks and declares the comparison shows the continuous erosion of the District's benchmarks to the state average. Finally, asserting the differences are too great, the Association urges consideration of this comparison declaring that at least one arbitrator has determined further erosion compared to the statewide averages to be an appropriate measurement when considering the reasonableness of the parties' offers.

The Association also compares the dollar differential between the BA Minimum and MA Minimum stating this is a sub-issue of the salary question. It posits the differential must be increased since the trend among the majority of the comparables has been to expand the differential and since there has been a "devaluation of an advanced degree caused by a static increment." The Association notes that among the comparables the average size increment differentiating between the BA Minimum and MA Minimum has increased since 1981-82. It notes, further, that among the comparables only three districts, including Dodgeville, still remain at less than \$1,000 differential and argues, consequently, there is a definite need to increase the differential in this district. It adds the decreasing differential between the two lanes is "counter productive and economically debilitating," where it leads to a devaluation of pay for attaining an advanced degree since the expense involved in graduate study has risen over the years and the pressure to obtain a graduate degree has increased. It continues that because of this devaluation, it is imperative to increase the differential between the two lanes.

Addressing the District's policy of advancing part-time teachers a portion of a salary cell for each year they are employed, the Association argues the practice is a "unilateral creation of salary schedule cells at a variety of points between negotiated cells on an ongoing basis;" is "a form of double jeopardy that ties part-time salaries to partial cell/increment/dollar advancement" and "is contrary to the practice of nearly every school district in the area." Continuing that the structure of a salary schedule is a negotiated provision in a collective bargaining agreement, the Association

asserts the structure is not subject to unilateral change as has been the District's practice. Further, it states the part-time teacher is "not unequal to the full-time teacher with the same amount of experience, and posits, therefore, both should be paid the same instead of being placed upon the schedule according to the amount of time the part-time teacher is teaching. Finally, in regard to this issue, the Association declares the District's practice is contrary to general practice in the other districts and cites a survey it conducted to support its position.

Addressing the co-curricular schedule, the Association asserts this issue is secondary in importance to the salary schedule issue. Rejecting the District's offer, the Association posits the District's offer is a continuation of its practice to bargain individually and ignores the concepts developed by the previous joint committee on extra-duty pay. The Association asserts, historically, the extra-duty pay schedule has consisted of a range of pay levels consisting of maximum and minimum wage levels and the actual pay was determined by agreement between the District and the employee. The Association's conflict with this practice is that individual employees and the District have established the rate to be paid within the range without the participation of the bargaining agent at the time the agreement was reached. It contends the practice is contrary to Section 111.70(3)(a)4 and the exclusive right encompassed in the Recognition provision of the collective bargaining agreement. Recognizing the Union has participated in this procedure in the past, the Association asserts that while the practice has existed in the past, it can no longer continue without consent of the Union. The Association also posits that the District's offer, which provides for payment outside the ranges for certain positions, is a violation of the contract and is, therefore, deficient.

In regard to its proposal for co-curricular pay, the Association declares its offer is more reasonable since it changes the compensation structure so there is a sum certain for each position, an approach similar to that used in one of the comparable districts. It contends its offer does not significantly modify the District's position among the comparables and implements the work of the joint committee on extra-duty pay. It concludes, consequently, that its offer in this area is more reasonable than the District's.

Relative to health insurance, the Association states either proposal leaves the District's position among the comparables unchanged. Its objection to the District's offer, however, is that it provides no new dollars for insurance benefits while three of the four settled comparables do. It argues this, in itself, is not crucial, except that the District-paid portion of the fringe benefit package has not grown in proportion to the total costs of those benefits as it has in the comparable districts but, in fact, is becoming a "drastically smaller share," a factor which significantly affects the relative well-being of the employees in the district compared to those in similar districts.

In conclusion, the Association asserts the primary issue, the salary schedule, should be easily determined in favor of the Association since it is within the range of and supported by the comparables. It continues its position on health insurance is also supported by the comparables. The Association adds the reasonableness of the co-curricular pay offers should be determined by legal concepts and equity rather than by comparability even though its offer does not affect the comparability question. Finally, it asserts the total package cost of its offer, expressed as a percentage, should not be determinative since it is "difficult, if not impossible, to put (it) to a comparison and (is) far less significant than other comparisons." It continues that little weight should be attached to the total percentage figure since the parties differ in the method used to compute total costs and that total package costs represent a measurement against total previous costs which can cause the percentage to vary substantially.

DISCUSSION:

Although the Association asserts CESA #3 should be used as a comparable in the instant matter and the District proposes to add several districts including Barneveld, Boscobel, Fennimore, Highland, North Crawford and Prairie du Chien, it is determined the comparables will consist of those districts which comprise the Southern Eight Conference as established by previous arbitration decisions affecting districts in this area. There was no evidence submitted to show any of the additional proposed comparables were any more comparable than the

conference schools which have been previously used. In fact, of the several districts proposed, only Boscobel, Fennimore and Prairie du Chien have demographics which could be considered similar to either the District or the conference, although, even there, the concept of geographic proximity is stretched. Further, although the Association argued the CESA district should be considered comparable based on another arbitrator's reasoning regarding comparables for CESA districts, the differences in how CESA districts are governed (represented by a small number of school board members throughout a multi-county area), causes the CESA districts to be somewhat less similar than school districts for the purposes of school districts comparisons and should not be considered when sufficient comparables already exist. Among the conference schools, four of the seven districts (half of the districts) have already settled for 1985-86, thus, there is no reason to expand the comparables.

Prior to deciding which offer should be implemented, the financial ability of the District to pay increases as it relates to the interest and welfare of the public was considered. As is happening throughout rural areas of the state, the financial status of the farming community is cited as support for the position that the interest and welfare of the public is such that districts' offers should be implemented. There is no question that the farming community is experiencing financial difficulties and that does affect the ability, and, more importantly, the desire of school districts to fund increases sought by associations. This district is no different. The important questions, however, are to what extent does this district rely upon agricultural property as a source of its income and are farmers within this district experiencing any greater financial stress than farmers in school districts considered comparable? To that end, no evidence was submitted which indicated this district's taxpayers were experiencing any greater financial difficulties than were taxpayers in other districts which are considered comparable nor that the financial conditions within the District were any different than those among the comparables. Further, the evidence did establish that at least three of the comparable districts were more dependent upon agriculture as an industry and that four of the districts had a greater percentage of persons living below the poverty level. Consequently, while it is recognized that the farm financial stress in this state is real and deserves to be considered with compassion, based upon the status of this district compared to those deemed comparable, such stress cannot be considered the sole criteria in determining the financial ability of this district. Thus, in determining which offer should be implemented, other statutory criteria was considered.

At issue between these parties is health insurance premiums, co-curricular pay and the salary schedule. In deciding the Association's offer should be implemented, it was determined the District's offer regarding health insurance premiums was more reasonable; the Association's offer regarding the salary schedule was more reasonable and there was merit in the position by taken by both parties relative to the co-curricular pay, although the District's offer was preferred slightly. Of these three issues, the salary schedule issue was most pertinent in deciding the matter.

In regard to the health insurance premium issue, the Association argued all the districts considered comparable paid not only a higher percentage of the family premium but a higher dollar amount than that which is paid in this district. The Association is correct. However, a review of the data provided regarding health insurance premiums indicates the District's offer is no different than its previous agreement with the Association and does not change its status among the comparables. Among those districts which have settled for 1985-86, insurance premiums payments remained relatively constant except in Darlington where the premium decreased as did the premium payment which the district was willing to pick up. While the Association stated the dollar amounts increased in three of the four districts, the evidence indicated the dollar amounts remained constant but were higher than that paid in this district. A review of the remaining benefits which exist among the comparables indicates the employees within the District fair well with the provision of dental insurance, a payment toward long term disability insurance and similar sick leave, sick leave payout and retirement benefits. While it is true there are better benefits than those enjoyed by this district in some areas, the benefits are by no means the standard among the comparables and therefore it cannot be concluded that other districts have substantially better benefits than the employees of this district.

The District argued that although it provides no increase in the co-curricular ranges established in previous agreements, the pay it compensates employees for the extra duties they perform is consistent with the pay received by others performing similar duties in comparable districts. The District is correct. A comparison of the offers with the rates settled upon in 1985-86 shows the District's offer, which increases specific rates rather than the ranges, does compensate each position well. The Association argues that the manner in which the District proposes to increase the pay for extra duty activities is a form of individual bargaining and, as such, violates the Recognition clause of the contract. It continues that the reason for its proposal is to correct this situation and to put the District on notice that the Association does not intend to participate in this arrangement any longer. The Association also argues the District's offer is flawed since it provides for payment in certain positions which are outside the ranges and, thus, results in a violation of the contract. While there is merit in these Association arguments, the factor most significant in deciding which offer is more reasonable is the Association seeks to change the extra-duty schedule and to create a position which has not previously existed without demonstrating the its effort to change the status quo through other means has created a need for change via interest arbitraton. Thus, while there is merit in each party's position, the District's offer is considered slightly more preferable.

The remaining issue, the salary schedule offers, is resolved in favor of the Association. Compared to the Consumer Price Index increases in the period of time covered by the 1985-86 contract, both offers, at whatever percentage increase they cost out to, are reasonable since both exceed the CPI increase. Further, compared solely to the CPI, the District's offer, whether its costing is accurate or not, is more reasonable. However, cost-of-living increases are also compared to the pattern of settlement within an area to determine the reasonableness of the offers.

In regard to the actual cost-of-living increase each offer represents, there is a considerable amount of dispute with each party refuting the other party's calculated costs of the proposals. There was not enough ancillary evidence to support the position taken by either side, consequently, it is difficult to determine the accuracy of either party's costing. Since there was insufficient data to accurately calculate the costs, the data was examined as it related to percent and dollar increases within the schedule and compared with other settlements. On that basis, it is determined that while the District's offer more closely approximates the increase in the CPI, the Association's offer more closely approximates the increases which were granted among the comparable districts. Thus, relative to the cost-of-living criterion, there is merit in both parties' proposals.

The District argues that individual increases instead of benchmark comparisons should be considered in determining the reasonableness of the offers. If such a comparison is made, the undersigned is convinced the average cost per teacher will be higher in this District than it is in the comparable districts since there are a significant number of teachers within the District who continue to move through the schedule and thus receive not only the negotiated rate increase but an experience step increase, a factor which can result in a higher average cost per teacher and, consequently, a higher total package cost. However, if it is accepted that comparability means teachers at the same step in comparable districts should be compensated similarly, it is imperative that benchmark comparisons be made in order to determine whether teachers in comparable positions would receive comparable increases. Based upon the benchmark comparisons, it is concluded the Association's offer is more reasonable.

When the benchmark comparisons were made, they were analyzed as they related to rank; to dollar and percent above and below the average and to dollar and percent increases over the previous year among the comparables. In all instances, the Association's offer was more reasonable. Since it was determined that only those settled districts among the Southern Eight Conference would be used for comparison purposes, the historical relationship of this district compared to those settled districts was reviewed in order to determine whether or not the numbers might be skewed based upon whether or not the settled districts were wage leaders or wage followers. An analysis of this district's relationship to the four settled districts compared to its historical relationship among the seven conference districts indicates both sets of comparisons are similar.

Based upon rank, this district has historically placed below the mean and frequently near the bottom of the comparables in almost all benchmark comparisons whether those comparisons were made with the four settled districts or with the seven conference districts. In 1985-86, compared to the settled districts, the Association's offer maintains the historical relationship which has existed while the District's offer results in further deterioration of position. Under the District's offer, rank remains the same in three benchmark positions, the MA Minimum, the MA/Step 10 and the Schedule Maximum positions, and deteriorates in four, the BA Minimum, the BA/Step 7, the BA Maximum and the MA Maximum positions. Most significant is a two step drop in position in the BA Minimum and MA Maximum positions. Under the Association's offer, rank remains the same in all but two benchmark positions. At the Schedule Maximum position, the Association's offer results in an increase in rank by one step and at the BA Minimum position, there is a decrease in rank by one step. Further, if the offers are compared at the positions which would be maximum if other schedules maximums were at the same step as this district's maximums, the Association's offer maintains rank at all three positions, the BA/Step 11, the MA/Step 14 and the Schedule Maximum/Step 14 positions, while the District's offer drops two steps at the MA/Step 14 position and one step at the Schedule Maximum, Step 14 position, an additional indication that wages paid teachers in this district are deteriorating compared to wages paid in other districts.

When the benchmarks are compared to the average established by the settled district, it is again determined the Association's offer is more reasonable. Historically, the District has been slightly below the average at all benchmark positions except the BA Maximum position. Under the District's offer, the relationship continues to deteriorate while under the Association's offer, there is slight improvement when the relationship is not maintained. The District's offer, reflecting a dollar decrease from \$303 to \$703 per benchmark, drops between 1.8% and 2.3% more below the average compared to its position in the previous year. The Association's offer, however, maintains the percent relationship established in the previous year at three benchmark positions and improves the percentage by .5 to .8 of a percent in the remaining four positions. Of the four positions, three still remain below average. In dollars, the positions are improved from \$42 to \$139, also increases more similar to those granted in previous years than those which occur under the District's offer.

1984-85	<u>BA</u> <u>Minimum</u>	<u>Step 7</u>	<u>BA</u> <u>Maximum</u>	<u>MA</u> <u>Minimum</u>	<u>Step 10</u>	<u>MA</u> <u>Maximum</u>	<u>Schedule</u> <u>Maximum</u>
Average	13,593	16,758	18,468	14,747	19,885	22,331	24,131
District							
Dollars	- 43	- 362	+ 367	- 297	- 522	- 78	-1,185
Percent	- .3	- 2.2	+ 2.0	- 2.0	- 2.6	- .3	- 4.9
.							
1985-86							
Average	14,746	18,176	20,024	15,990	21,551	24,194	26,143
District							
Dollars	- 346	- 752	- 8	- 690	-1,049	- 632	-1,888
Percent	- 2.3	- 4.0	- .04	- 4.3	- 4.9	- 2.6	- 7.2
Association							
Dollars	- 46	- 389	+ 409	- 240	- 446	+ 61	-1,079
Percent	- .3	- 2.1	+ 2.1	- 1.5	- 2.1	+ .3	- 4.1

At the comparable positions to the District's maximums, the District's offer results in a drop in percentage from 1.7% to 2.5 % while the Association's offer results in maintenance of percent variation at the BA Maximum and an approximate one half percent improvement at the MA Maximum and Schedule Maximum positions. Some of this improvement is the result of the Association's proposal to expand the increment differential between the BA and MA lanes, which will be discussed later.

In regard to the dollar and percent increase on the previous year's salary

which the offers represent, the Association's offer is more similar to the percentages agreed upon among the comparable districts. The District's offer at 6.3% in the BA lanes, 5.9% in the MA, Step 10 and MA Maximum lanes and 5.7% at the Schedule Maximum lane is most similar to the percentage increases settled upon at Southwestern, although it is slightly lower than Southwestern in the MA lanes and the Schedule Maximum lane. The remaining districts settled between approximately 2.2% and 3.7% more than the proposed lane increases under the District's offer. The Association's offer at 8.5% in the BA lanes, 9.0% in the MA, Step 10 and MA Maximum lanes and 9.2% at the Schedule Maximum lane, is more similar to the increases of the remaining districts. At 8.5% increase in the BA lanes, the Association's offer is the same as the percentage increase in Platteville and less than the increases in Iowa Grant and Darlington. At 9.0% in the MA lanes, the Association's offer is .1% and .5% higher than the increases in these lanes in Platteville and Iowa Grant but still less than the increase in Darlington. At 9.2% in the Schedule Maximum lane, the Association's offer is .8% less than the settlement in Darlington at this lane and .3% and .7% less than the increases in Platteville and Iowa Grant. Further, the dollar amounts, under the Association's offer, are quite similar to the dollar amounts which were increased in three of the four comparables.

The Association also proposes to increase the differential between the BA and MA lanes. While this modifies the schedule some, the Association's proposal is more similar to that of the comparable districts, including those which are not settled. A review of the data indicates only three districts within the conference have remained at the same differential between the BA and MA lanes since 1981 and this district is one of them. The Association proposes to increase the spread by \$150 over its previous position to a differential of \$1,050. At \$1,050, the differential is still much smaller than that which exists and/or has been increased among the majority of the comparables. In 1984-85, five of the eight districts had a differential spread of \$1,200 or more. In 1985-86, three of the settled districts have increased this differential even more. Based upon this comparison with both settled and unsettled districts, it is concluded the Association's proposal regarding the differential is more reasonable than the District's.

In addition to improving the salary schedule, the Association seeks to change the District's practice of granting experience increment status to part-time employees on the basis of the amount of time the employee teaches. In order to demonstrate a need for change in the status quo, the burden is placed upon the party seeking change to demonstrate that either the status quo creates a problem within the District or that the comparables support its position. In this instance, the comparables support the Association's proposal. Based upon a survey, which understandably is hearsay, there is nonetheless a showing that the majority of districts, both among the comparables and among non-comparables in the area, grant a full step increase for experience and compensate the part-time teacher according to the time spent teaching. Of the two options, it is more reasonable to grant part-time teachers the experience step since they do teach an entire year than it is to grant them only that part of an experience step which equates to the amount of time they spend teaching. Consequently, it is determined the Association's proposal on this aspect of the salary question is also preferred.

In summary, having concluded the Association's offer on salary is more reasonable than the District's offer as it compares to cost-of-living established by the settlement pattern and as it compares to maintenance of rank; maintenance of relationship to the average and dollar and percent increase over the previous year, and as it compares to the increment differential between the BA lanes and the MA lanes, it is determined the Association's salary schedule proposal is more reasonable than the District's salary schedule proposal. Having also concluded the salary schedule issue carries more weight than the combined issues of health insurance premiums and co-curricular pay, it is determined the Association's offer should be implemented.

The following decision is based upon review of the evidence and arguments presented and upon the relevancy of the data to the statutory criteria as stated in the above discussion. Accordingly, the undersigned issues the following

AWARD

The final offer of the Association, attached as Appendix "A", together

with the stipulations of the parties which reflect prior agreements in bargaining, as well as those provisions of the predecessor agreement which remained unchanged during the course of bargaining, shall be incorporated into the 1985-86 collective bargaining agreement as required by statute.

Dated this 15th day of June, 1986 at La Crosse, Wisconsin.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Sharon K. Imes".

Sharon K. Imes
Mediator/Arbitrator

SKI:ms

RECEIVED

NOV 22 1985

WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT
RELATIONS COMMISSION

ASSO

In the Matter of Mediation/Arbitration

Dodgeville Education Association :

vs. :

Dodgeville School District

FINAL LAST OFFER OF THE ASSOCIATION

Submitted by:

Paul R. Bierbrauer
Executive Director
South West Teachers United

LAST BEST OFFER
DODGEVILLE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

The attached are proposals set forth as the Last Best Offer of the Dodgeville Education Association to be effective as of July 1, 1985, and be effective through June 30, 1986. The current agreement between the parties shall remain unchanged except by stipulations reached and as modified by this offer.

November 13, 1985
~~October 28, 1985~~

Paul R. [Signature]
On Behalf of the
Dodgeville Education Association

Dodgeville Education Association
October 28, 1985

ARTICLE XV - Salary (page 22)

A. Compensation

39. 6. There shall be \$60.25 payment on the premium of the single plan
40. and \$148.00 payment on the premium of the family plan per policy-
41. holder for Health and Hospitalization Insurance.

Dodgeville Education Association
October 28, 1985

ARTICLE XV - Salary (page 28)

D. Professional Improvements

157. 6. The school district will make full payment of the teacher's
138. share of the WRF assessment. Effective January 1, 1986, full
 payment will mean 6% of gross salary.

Dodgeville Education Association
October 28, 1985

ARTICLE XV - Salary (page 28)

163. F. Driver Education Teacher Pay

164. 1. Behind-the-wheel instruction will be compensated at ^{8.63}~~8~~ per

165. hour for 6 hours per student.

DODGEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE 1985-1986

STEP	BS	4-9	10-15	16-21	22-29	30+	MS	4-8	9-13	14-18
0.0	14700	14875	15050	15225	15400	15575	15750	15925	16100	16275
1.0	15141	15321	15502	15682	15862	16042	16223	16403	16583	16763
2.0	15582	15768	15953	16139	16324	16510	16695	16881	17066	17252
3.0	16023	16214	16405	16595	16786	16977	17168	17358	17549	17740
4.0	16611	16809	17007	17204	17402	17600	17798	17995	18193	18391
5.0	17199	17404	17609	17813	18018	18223	18428	18632	18837	19042
6.0	17787	17999	18211	18422	18634	18846	19058	19269	19481	19693
7.0	18375	18594	18813	19031	19250	19469	19688	19906	20125	20344
8.0	18963	19189	19415	19640	19866	20092	20318	20543	20769	20995
9.0	19698	19933	20167	20402	20636	20871	21105	21340	21574	21809
10.0	20433	20676	20920	21163	21406	21649	21893	22136	22379	22622
11.0	---	---	21672	21924	22176	22428	22680	22932	23184	23436
12.0	---	---	---	---	---	---	23468	23728	23989	24250
13.0	---	---	---	---	---	---	24255	24525	24794	25064

ALL TEACHERS WILL ADVANCE ONE FULL STEP ON THE SALARY SCHEDULE, BEGINNING IN THE 1986-1987 SCHOOL YEAR, FOR EACH YEAR OF EMPLOYMENT, WHETHER HE/SHE IS EMPLOYED PART-TIME OR FULL-TIME DURING THE YEAR.

Dodgeville Education Association
October 28, 1985

Appendix B - Extra Curricular Pay

Schedule is attached.

*Note: Any individual who would receive less in 1985-86 than received in 1984-85 for the same duty will be frozen at his/her 1984-85 rate of pay until the scheduled amount surpasses the 1984-85 rate.

Appendix B

Dodgeville School District
Extra-Curricular Pay Schedule

		Base Salary				
		1985-86 1600				
Years of Experience		<u>0-1</u>	<u>2-3</u>	<u>4-6</u>	<u>7-8</u>	<u>9+</u>
% of base salary		<u>70%</u>	<u>75%</u>	<u>85%</u>	<u>90%</u>	<u>100%</u>
A.	Head: Basketball	\$1120	1200	1360	1440	1600
	Wrestling					
	Gymnastics					
	Football (weights)					
		<u>50%</u>	<u>55%</u>	<u>65%</u>	<u>70%</u>	<u>80%</u>
B.	Head: Baseball	\$800	880	1040	1120	1280
	Cross Country					
	Golf					
	Softball					
	Volleyball					
	Track					
		<u>45%</u>	<u>50%</u>	<u>55%</u>	<u>65%</u>	<u>75%</u>
C.	Soph: Basketball	\$720	800	880	1040	1200
	Asst: Football					
	Asst: Gymnastics					
	J.V. Wrestling					
		<u>35%</u>	<u>40%</u>	<u>45%</u>	<u>55%</u>	<u>65%</u>
D.	9th: Basketball	\$560	640	720	880	1040
	Soph: Football (9th also)					
	5-8: Basketball (R.E.)					

1		Years of Experience	<u>0-1</u>	<u>2-3</u>	<u>4-6</u>	<u>7-8</u>	<u>9+</u>
2		% of base salary	<u>35%</u>	<u>40%</u>	<u>45%</u>	<u>55%</u>	<u>65%</u>
3	H.S.:	Band (extra)	\$560	640	720	880	1040
4	H.S.:	Musical Production Coord.					
5	Asst:	Baseball					
6	Asst:	Softball					
7	Asst:	Volleyball					
8	Asst:	Track					
9			<u>30%</u>	<u>35%</u>	<u>40%</u>	<u>50%</u>	<u>60%</u>
10	E.	7th: Basketball	\$480	560	640	800	960
11		8th: Basketball					
12		7-8th: Wrestling					
13		9th: Track					
14	M.S.:	Band (extra)					
15	H.S.:	Vocal (extra)					
16	Asst:	9th Football					
17			<u>25%</u>	<u>30%</u>	<u>35%</u>	<u>40%</u>	<u>50%</u>
18	F.	Asst: 9th Track	\$400	480	560	640	800
19		Asst: 7-8th Wrestling					
20		7-8th: Track					
21		7-8th: Cross Country					
22		7-8th: Volleyball					
23	H.S.:	Musical Director (Vocal & Drama)					
24	Asst:	Musical					
25			<u>10%</u>	<u>15%</u>	<u>20%</u>	<u>25%</u>	<u>35%</u>
26	G.	Elem: Music	\$160	240	320	400	560
27	H.S.:	Class Advisor					
28	H.S.:	Student Council					

		Years of Experience				
		<u>0-1</u>	<u>2-3</u>	<u>4-6</u>	<u>7-8</u>	<u>9+</u>
1	% of base salary	<u>10%</u>	<u>15%</u>	<u>20%</u>	<u>25%</u>	<u>35%</u>
	U.N.: Club Advisor	\$160	240	320	400	560
3	H.S.: Musical Director (orch)					
4		<u>10%</u>	<u>15%</u>	<u>20%</u>	<u>25%</u>	<u>30%</u>
5	H. Class: Advisor (M.S. & R.E.)	\$160	240	320	400	480
6	M.S.: Student Council					
7	H.S.: Fall Cheerleading					
8	H.S.: Winter Cheerleading					
9	H.S.: AFS Advisor					
10	H.S.: Annual					
11	Special Olympics Coach					
12	M.S.: Intramurals					
13		<u>10%</u>	<u>13%</u>	<u>17%</u>	<u>20%</u>	<u>25%</u>
14	I. Cheerleading (M.S. & R.E.)	\$160	208	272	320	400
15	Dramatics					
16	DECA					
17	FHA					
18	FFA					
19	Photo Club Advisor					
20	Head Forensics					
21	Weightlifting					
22		<u>10%</u>	<u>13%</u>	<u>17%</u>	<u>20%</u>	<u>24%</u>
23	J. Department Heads	\$160	208	272	320	384
24	Gifted & Talented Coor.					
25	Prep. Coor.					
26	Co-Chairmen (as needed)					
27	Chairperson K-6 Level					
28	Chairperson 7-12 Level					



Appendix "B" *Rob Stein*
DODGEVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT

DODGEVILLE, WISCONSIN 53533

David J. Westhoff
District Administrator
812 W. Chapel St. N.
935-3910

Larry Dunning
High School Principal
012 W. Chapel St. N.
935-3307

Bruce Rundle
Middle School Principal
325 W. Chapel St.
935-3388

Paul Godfrey
Dodgeville Elementary
Principal
404 N. Johnson - 035-3311

Richard Grimoskas
Ridgeway Grades
Ridgeway, WI
024-3461

TO: David Shaw - Impasse Investigator
Rod Stein - D.E.A. Negotiator

RECEIVED

FROM: David J. Westhoff

NOV 12 1985

RE: Dodgeville School District Board of Education Final Offer . WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT
RELATIONS COMMISSION

DATE: November 1, 1985

Please find enclosed the following documents:

- 1) WASB Settlement Report Form marked Exhibit I. Please note that the Board's proposal includes a \$14,400.00 base salary which results in a 7.91% increase in salary. This same 7.91% increase is applied to each line item under Sub-section A SALARIES. Administrative assignments would increase from \$6.50/hour to \$7.01/hour. Driver education would increase from \$ 8.00/hour to \$8.63/hour. Sub-section B FRINGE BENEFITS has a rate increase in 2.b employee's share of retirement paid by Board. The increase is from 5% to 6% effective January 1, 1986.
- 2) SALARY SCHEDULE - \$14,400.00 base marked Exhibit II.
- 3) APPENDIX B - marked Exhibit III. Please note that the ranges will remain the same in 1985-86 as they were during 1984-85.
- 4) Extra/Co-Curricular assignment compensation schedule - marked Exhibit IV. Please note that the 1985-86 schedule of payments is 7.91% above the 1984-85 schedule. It is assumed, for the purpose of comparison, that the 1984-85 incumbents all remain in their assignments during 1985-86.
- 5) Article XV of the Master Agreement, page 28, line 157, is revised to read as follows:

Effective January 1, 1986, the school district will contribute the 6% payment to the Wisconsin Retirement System which reflects the required employee's contribution.

- 6) The last component of the Board's final offer is the language addressing the concept of less than a full time teacher equivalency. This is enclosed; marked Exhibit V.

Thank You. November 15, 1985

- 7) This agreement shall become effective when the two parties either mutually consent or upon the award of an arbitrator retroactive to the first teacher contract day - August 23, 1985. It shall remain in effect through the day prior to the start of the 1986-87 school year or until a successor agreement is reached.

RECEIVED

BOARD'S FINAL OFFER - LIPASSE INVESTIGATION Dodgeville

11:40 P.M.
10/28/85

1985-86 WASH TEACHER SETTLEMENT REPORT FORM

NOV 04 1985

EMPLOYMENT
SALARIES
RELATIONS

	1984-85 Contract Costs 13,550 Base	1985-86 Contract Costs 14,400 Base	New Money Contract Costs
1. Total Salary Schedule (Including experience increment)	1,737,713	1,875,166	137,453
a. Extended Contract	3,607	3,892	285
b. Department Heads	3,425	3,696	271
c. Other			
2. Longevity			
3. Extra-Curricular Salaries	34,322	37,037	2,715
4. Extra Duties			
a. Summer School	12,122	13,081	959
b. Athletic Events	6,060	6,539	479
c. Noon Duty Admin. Assg.	9,175	9,901	726
d. Other Behind the Wheel	7,296	7,873	577
Sub-Total	1,813,720	1,957,185	143,465
B. FRINGE BENEFITS			
1. Social Security	127,867	137,982	10,115
2. Retirement			
a. Employer's Share	116,078	125,260	9,182
b. Employees' Share (Pd. by Bd.)	90,686	110,907	20,221
3. Health Insurance	99,109	99,109	
4. Dental Insurance	13,691	13,691	
5. Disability Insurance	2,310	2,310	
6. Life Insurance	2,175	2,751	576
7. Vision Insurance			
C. OTHER EMPLOYER COSTS			
1. Credit Reimbursement-Total Cost			
2. Mileage - Total Cost			
3. Other			
D. GRAND TOTAL	I 2,265,636	II 2,449,195	III 183,559 New Money
Avg. Teacher Contract Cost:	24,233		
1. Number of Teachers (Full Time Equivalency) Used in Calculation	93,495	F.T.E. (This must be the same for both years-see instructions.)	
2. Average Salary & Fringe Benefit Increase Per Teacher	\$ 1,963	(II - I) ÷ F.T.E. above	
3. Total Package Percentage Increase of New Contract	8.10	Z [(II-I) ÷ I] x 100	
E. EDUCATIONAL LANE ADVANCEMENT-Total Cost			

PERSON COMPLETING THIS FORM

EXHIBIT II

**SALARY SCHEDULE
DODGEVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Step	Index	B.S.	4-9	10-15	16-21	22-29	30+	M.S.	4-8	9-13	14
0.1	1.00	14,400	14,550	14,700	14,850	15,000	15,150	15,300	15,450	15,600	15,750
1.1	1.03	14,832	14,987	15,141	15,296	15,450	15,605	15,759	15,914	16,068	16,223
2.1	1.06	15,264	15,423	15,582	15,741	15,900	16,059	16,218	16,377	16,536	16,695
3.1	1.09	15,696	15,860	16,023	16,187	16,350	16,514	16,677	16,841	17,004	17,168
4.1	1.13	16,272	16,442	16,611	16,781	16,950	17,120	17,289	17,459	17,628	17,798
5.1	1.17	16,848	17,024	17,199	17,375	17,550	17,726	17,901	18,077	18,252	18,428
6.1	1.21	17,424	17,606	17,787	17,969	18,150	18,332	18,513	18,695	18,876	19,058
7.1	1.25	18,000	18,188	18,375	18,563	18,750	18,938	19,125	19,313	19,500	19,688
8.1	1.29	18,576	18,770	18,963	19,157	19,350	19,544	19,737	19,931	20,124	20,318
9.1	1.34	19,296	19,497	19,698	19,899	20,100	20,301	20,502	20,703	20,904	21,105
10.1	1.39	20,016	20,225	20,433	20,642	20,850	21,059	21,267	21,476	21,684	21,893
11.1	1.44			21,168	21,384	21,600	21,816	22,032	22,248	22,464	22,680
12.1	1.49							22,797	23,021	23,244	23,468
13.1	1.54							23,562	23,793	24,024	24,255

WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT
RELATIONS COMMISSION

NOV 11 1985

RECEIVED

APPENDIX B

DODGEVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT
EXTRA CURRICULAR PAY SCHEDULE

WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT
RELATIONS COMMISSION

<u>CLASS</u>	<u>RANGE</u>
A Head Basketball Head Wrestling	\$800--1600
B Head Football Head Gymnastics Head Baseball	\$700--1400
C Head Cross Country Head Track Head Volleyball Sophomore Basketball Assistant Football (2) JV Wrestling	\$500--1300
D Head Golf Freshman Basketball JV Football 5--8 Basketball Assistant Track 7--8 Basketball JV Gymnastics JV Baseball High School Band Extra-Curricular Musical Director	\$400--1100
E 7 Basketball 8 Basketball Freshman Football 7 & 8 Wrestling 9 Track Assist Golf Middle School Band Extra-Curricular Assist 5--8 Basketball High School Vocal Extra-Curricular JV Volleyball	\$300--900
F 7 & 8 Track 7 & 8 Cross Country 7 & 8 Volleyball Assistant Freshman Football	\$250--700

**APPENDIX B (Cont.)
Payment of Activities**

<u>FOOTBALL</u>	<u>NIGHT SATURDAYS</u>
Ticket Seller	\$11.00
Timer	\$11.00
Announcer	\$11.00
Grounds Supervisor	\$14.50
Building Supervisor	\$12.00
Concession Supervisor	\$14.50
 <u>BASKETBALL</u>	
Ticket Seller	\$11.00
Ticket Taker	\$11.00
Timer	\$14.50 (one game)
Scorekeeper	\$14.50 (one game \$10.50)
Announcer	\$14.50
Usher	\$14.50
Supervisor	\$14.50
 <u>WRESTLING</u>	
Ticket Seller	\$11.00
Ticket Taker	\$11.00
Usher	\$14.50
Timer	\$14.50
Score Announcer	\$14.50
Supervisor	\$14.50
 <u>TRACK</u>	
Timer	\$ 9.50
Place Pickers	\$ 9.50
Field Events	\$ 9.50
 <u>VOLLEYBALL</u>	
Tickets	\$11.00
Scorer	\$14.50
Linesman	\$12.00
Supervisor	\$14.50
 <u>GYMNASTICS</u>	
Scorer/Announcer	\$14.50
Ticket Seller	\$11.00
Supervisor	\$14.50
 <u>BUS CHAPERONE</u>	
	\$16.00
 <u>BASEBALL</u>	
	\$14.50
 <u>CROSS COUNTRY</u>	
Cards	\$ 7.50
Judge	\$ 7.50

APPENDIX B (Cont.)

<u>CLASS</u>	<u>RANGE</u>
G Department Heads Head Forensics Class Advisors (7) Student Council (HS) Intramurals Asst. Coaches 7 & 8	\$150--500
H Assistant Musical (2) Cheerleader Advisor MS & RES Student Council (MS) Cheerleader Advisor (FB) Cheerleader Advisor (BB) Cheerleader Advisor (W)	\$150--400
I Assistant Forensics AFS Advisor Dramatics PHA FFA UN Club Annual DECA	\$100--300

Procedure for Evaluation and Setting Salaries for All Extra-Curricular Activities

- A) The Building Principal will set appointments with the extra-curricular persons, beginning with the heads of the activities, and inform them what will be discussed.
- B) The head of the activity will be asked to evaluate the entire program including all assistants and to make recommendations.
- C) The Athletic Director will be asked for input.
- D) Salary will be negotiated based primarily on two considerations
 1. Merit - dedication, loyalty, time spent, pressure, discipline, respect of community and students, job accomplished.
 2. Limits of budget.
- E) Recommend salaries to the School Board.

Department heads will be appointed by the Board with the assistance of the District Administrator. Recommendations will be taken from the Building Principals and the staff of the department.

NOV 6 1985

Impasse Investigation

10/28/85

Board/s Final Offer

WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT
RELATIONS COMMISSION

		1984-85	+7.91% 1985-86
Sharon Anderson	7th Grade Advisor	\$ 200.00	\$ 216.00
*Sarah Behnke	Elementary Intramurals	162.50	175.00
Robert Buck	Head Basketball Coach	1,525.00	1,646.00
	Spring Weightlifting	150.00	162.00
	Head Football Coach	1,300.00	1,403.00
	P.E. Dept. Chair.	150.00	162.00
Richard Burris	Band	225.00	243.00
Richard Bushby	Asst. Cross Country Coach	300.00	324.00
Ted Chitwood	7th & 8th Wrestling	750.00	809.00
	7th & 8th Track	800.00	863.00
	Flag Football Intramurals-M.S.	300.00	324.00
	Basketball Intramurals-M.S.	300.00	324.00
Ken Clough	Softball Coach	750.00	809.00
Phil DeKok	Musical Assistant	400.00	432.00
	Extracurricular Vocal	400.00	432.00
Janet Egbert	7th & 8th Grade Volleyball	300.00	324.00
*David Fry	Ridgeway Boys Basketball	450.00	486.00
	Forensics		
	Intra-	81.25	88.00
*Mark Gillen	Elem. Intramurals	65.00	70.00
David Grunow	Social Studies Dept. Chair.	250.00	270.00
	Asst. Basketball Coach	1,225.00	1,322.00
	U.N. Club Advisor	200.00	216.00
	Asst. Track Coach	650.00	701.00
Jodean Grunow	M.S. Student Council Advisor	200.00	216.00
Deb Haag	7th & 8th Girls Track	250.00	270.00
Rick Hugill	Head Cross Country Coach	1,040.00	1,122.00
	Head Golf Coach	1,040.00	1,122.00
	Forensics	400.00	432.00
	Athletic Director	1,850.00	2,000.00
	Math Dept. Chair.	325.00	351.00

		1984-85	1985-86
Terri Iverson	Library/Media Dept. Chair	\$ 275.00	\$ 297.00
	Library Coordinator	1,200.00	1,295.00
	Forensics	180.00	194.00
David James	45 days extended (80%)	3,607.00	3,892.00
	F.F.A. Advisor	200.00	216.00
	Head Baseball Coach	700.00	755.00
Jeanette Jordan	Guidance Counseling Dept. Chair	150.00	162.00
*Mike Knoedler	Intramurals	273.00	295.00
Anna Kopmeier	Art Dept. Chair	150.00	162.00
	Junior Class Advisor	350.00	378.00
	Fall Cheerleader Advisor	225.00	243.00
	Winter Cheerleader Advisor	375.00	405.00
Anne Massey	Home Ec. Dept. Chair.	200.00	216.00
	F.H.A.	125.00	135.00
John Mingst	Musical	700.00	755.00
	Extra Band	725.00	782.00
	Music Dept. Chair.	375.00	405.00
Wayne Mork	8th Grade Advisor	275.00	297.00
*Gary Olson	Lang. Arts 7-12 Dept. Chair	200.00	216.00
	Head Girls Basketball Coach	1,315.00	1,419.00
	7th & 8th Grade Forensics		
Leta Reddell	D.M.S. Cheerleading - Fall	150.00	162.00
	D.M.S. Cheerleading - Winter	150.00	162.00
	8th Grade Class Advisor	150.00	162.00
Eleanor Reynolds	Bus. Ed/Dist. Ed Dept. Chair	200.00	216.00
	Annual	225.00	243.00
Daniel Roble	Musical Assistant	500.00	540.00
	Extra Band and Orchestra	725.00	782.00
Richard Rothenbueler	9th Grade Advisor	200.00	216.00
Kathy Rundle	Gymnastics	1,000.00	1,079.00
Nikki Rundle	Lang. Arts K-6 Dept. Chair	200.00	216.00
Karen Schilling	Varsity Volleyball Coach	700.00	755.00
Kevin Schoenmann	J.V. Girls Basketball	600.00	647.00
	Dramatics	100.00	108.00

		1984-85	1985-86
Daniel Schwarz	Freshman Basketball	\$ 700.00	\$ 755.00
	Junior Varsity Football	600.00	647.00
	9th Grade Advisor	150.00	162.00
Kathy Schwarz	Musical Assistant Forensics	400.00	432.00
Janette Steger	Cheerleader Advisor	150.00	162.00
	Intra	81.25	88.00
Rod Stein	Assistant Football	1,000.00	1,079.00
	Industrial Arts Dept. Chair	175.00	189.00
	Asst. Jr. High Wrestling	500.00	540.00
Marjoan Strahota	F.H.A.	125.00	135.00
Barb Thompson	7th Grade Basketball	475.00	513.00
	Special Services Dept. Chair	225.00	243.00
Dale Thoreson	Head Wrestling Coach	1,050.00	1,133.00
	Head Girls Track Coach	850.00	917.00
	DECA Club Advisor	150.00	162.00
Evelyn Thoreson	7th & 8th Grade Track	350.00	378.00
	7th & 8th Grade Volleyball	250.00	270.00
	Advisor Middle School Photo Club	300.00	324.00
Julie Van Epps	9th Grade Girls Basketball	725.00	782.00
	8th Grade Girls Basketball	475.00	513.00
	Health Dept. Chair	175.00	189.00
*Bill VanSchyndel	Ridgeway Intramurals	178.75	193.00
*Gari Walz	Sophomore Advisor	350.00	378.00
	Forensics	40.00	43.00
	Science Dept. Chair	375.00	405.00
Robert Willis	7th & 8th Boys Track	250.00	270.00
*Knight Wynn	Senior Class Advisor	375.00	405.00
	Student Council Advisor	350.00	378.00
	Forensics	75.00	81.00
	Head Track Coach	1,105.00	1,192.00
*Lynn Wynn	AFS Advisor	200.00	216.00
	Forensics	465.00	502.00
		\$45,208.50	\$48,797.00

N.B. 1985-86 compensation figures assume 1984-85 incumbents have remained in assignment.

RECEIVED
NOV 01 1985

WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT
Dodgeville Education Association
October 28, 1985
COMMISSION

ARTICLE XV - Salary (page 25)

A. Compensation

16. A less than full time teacher's equivalency shall be determined by dividing the number of minutes per day in his/her contract by 450 minutes. The minutes per day are inclusive of student contact, preparation time, and student passing time.

10-28-85
Rodney R. Sten
Mary Mueller