

RECEIVED

STATE OF WISCONSIN  
BEFORE THE ARBITRATOR

JUN 7 1983

WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT  
RELATIONS COMMISSION

In the Matter of Mediation/Arbitration

between

WRIGHTSTOWN COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

and

WRIGHTSTOWN EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

CASE VIII  
No. 30488  
MED/ARB - 1949  
Decision No. 20009-A

Appearances

Al Christensen, Chief Negotiator, on behalf of the School Board

Lawrence J. Gerue, Program Director, Bayland Teachers United, on behalf of the Association

BACKGROUND

The undersigned was notified by an October 28, 1982, letter from the Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission of his selection as Mediator/Arbitrator in an interest dispute between the Wrightstown Community School District (hereinafter Board) and the Wrightstown Education Association (hereinafter Association). The dispute concerns certain of the terms to be included in the parties' 1982-1983 Agreement. Pursuant to statutory responsibilities, mediation was conducted on January 27, 1983. A settlement did not result. The matter was advanced to arbitration later that same day for final and binding determination. Both parties filed timely post-hearing briefs and reply briefs and the record was closed on April 13, 1983. Based upon a detailed consideration of all the evidence and argument submitted, and relying upon the criteria set forth in Section 111.70 (4) (cm), Wisconsin Statutes, the Arbitrator has formulated this Award.

ISSUES

There are essentially four issues facing the Arbitrator:

1. What are the appropriate comparable districts to be utilized in this case?
2. What is the appropriate salary schedule for the 1982-1983 school year?
3. What is the appropriate Board payment for health insurance premiums?
4. What is the appropriate Board payment for long term disability insurance (LTD) premiums?

The comparability issue has a significant impact on other substantive issues in dispute. Accordingly, it will be considered first. Thereafter, the merits of each remaining issue will be discussed individually. An evaluation of the

overall relative merit of the parties' offers will follow. The parties' final offers are attached hereto as Attachments 1 a & b (Board) and Attachments 2 a, b, & c (Association).

## DISCUSSION

### Comparability

Board Position. The Board believes that the Olympian Athletic Conference should be used as the pool of comparable districts. The Conference includes the following districts:

Brillion  
Denmark  
Freedom  
Gibraltar  
Hilbert  
Mishicot  
Reedsville  
Sevastopol  
Valders  
Wrightstown

However, the Board believes that Gibraltar and Sevastopol should be excluded from consideration as comparables for three reasons: (1) they are geographically separate and distinct from the remainder of the Conference districts, (2) they participate in only one Conference sport - football, and (3) the Wisconsin Interscholastic Athletic Association has tentatively eliminated them from the Conference beginning in the 1984-1985 school year.

In support of its claim that the Olympian Conference is the appropriate group of comparables, the Board points to a 1981-1982 consent award as a past practice.

Association Position. The Association believes that the appropriate comparables are contained in what it has characterized as the "Green Bay-Appleton Corridor." The following districts are included in this configuration:

Appleton  
Ashwaubenon  
De Pere  
Freedom  
Green Bay  
Kaukauna  
Kimberly  
Little Chute  
West De Pere  
Wrightstown

The Association argues that four of the districts in the Olympian Conference are geographically distant from Wrightstown (Mishicot and Valders - more than 30 miles; Sevastopol and Gibraltar - more than 60 miles) and that the Corridor districts are between eight to fifteen miles from Wrightstown. It also asserts that 80% of the Wrightstown teaching staff lives within the Corridor. In contrast, only three of the staff live in Olympian Conference school districts (excluding Wrightstown).

Thus, the Association argues, the Arbitrator should give consideration to both the Olympian Conference and the Green Bay - Appleton Corridor. It acknowledges that Arbitrator Rothstein used the entire Olympian conference in the 1981-1982 consent award, but points out that since it was indeed a consent award, that Arbitrator did not address the

issue of expanded comparables for Wrightstown.

Analysis. Absent an ability to pay issue, which was not raised by the parties to this matter, the most objective and measurable criteria for selecting comparable employee-employer relationships are (1) similarity in the level of responsibility, services provided by, and training and/or education required of employees, (2) geographic proximity, and (3) similarity in employer size (MED/ARB-1851, Decision No. 19849-A, Arbitrator Yaffe, 1983).

Comparison of districts cited in the above two lists to maps of the general area (Assn. Exhibits 4 & 6) clearly eliminates Gibraltar and Sevastopol from the list of comparables. The Arbitrator was persuaded to exclude them on the basis of geography alone and not by the Board's submission of a "proposal" from the Wisconsin Interscholastic Athletic Association, that they be eliminated from the Olympian Athletic Conference.

The Table below was constructed to facilitate comparison among the remaining districts along the size and responsibility dimensions:

TABLE I  
District Comparisons  
Olympian Conference and Appleton/Green Bay Corridor

<u>District</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Pupils (81-82)</u>	<u>Pupils/ Teacher</u>	<u>Eq. Value/ Member</u>
Olympian Conference				
Brillion	51.8	871	16.2	\$166,896
Denmark	75.7	1585	20.2	\$100,298
Freedom	68.9	1279	17.5	\$104,697
Hilbert	31.4	519	15.8	\$150,829
Mishicot	58.1	1204	19.8	\$105,649
Reedsville	39.9	805	18.9	\$147,831
Valders	60.0	1173	18.7	\$123,435
Wrightstown	42.0	787	17.9	\$117,160
Appleton/Green Bay Corridor				
Appleton	570.2	10917	18.3	\$135,229
Ashwaubenon	174.9	3417	18.9	\$112,182
De Pere	119.5	1908	15.5	\$121,734
Freedom (see above)				
Green Bay	929.2	17222	17.8	\$127,802
Kaukauna	159.5	3022	18.1	\$117,046
Kimberly	115.3	2087	17.7	\$83,438
Little Chute	68.9	1204	16.5	\$83,423
West De Pere	110.5	1852	16.3	\$108,627

Sources: Assn. Exhibits 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 16

In addition to the comparisons reflected in Table I, the Arbitrator evaluated the districts' respective levy rates. Using all of these criteria produced the following list of appropriate comparables:

Brillion  
Denmark  
Freedom  
Hilbert  
Little Chute  
Mishicot  
Reedsville  
Valders

The districts of Appleton, Ashwaubenon, De Pere, Green Bay, Kaukauna, Kimberly, and West De Pere were eliminated from the list due to their significantly larger size than that of Wrightstown. Little Chute was included in part because it is comparable in size to Wrightstown, Denmark, Valders, and Freedom, and because of its geographical proximity to Wrightstown.

It should be emphasized that selection of comparables, while as objective as possible, is not a matter of mathematical precision. It is very difficult, for example, to generate an exact measure of teacher responsibility and qualification. District size, measured in terms of student and teacher complements, has been characterized as an acceptable measure of employment conditions. Ratio of pupils per teacher also sheds some light on teacher responsibility levels, and the comparables selected are generally similar on this criterion as well.

#### Salary Schedule

The Board's Offer. Before discussing the parties' specific positions on salary amounts, a brief general discussion of the Board's offer is in order. Its certified offer on salary (Attachment 1 a) contains specific figures for the various steps and lanes. It also includes a maximum monthly Board contribution (specified in dollars) for health insurance. The health insurance offer includes the sentence: "If insurance premium is increased, it is to come out of the total wage package." At the arbitration hearing the Association maintained that such language made the Board's offer ambiguous and variable. The Board argued that it was not variable and offered to submit into the record a revised salary schedule, reflecting lesser amounts at the various steps and lanes to account for increases in the insurance premiums. The Association refused to allow the Board to amend the salary schedule submitted to and certified by the W.E.R.C. Counsel for the Association noted at the hearing that during negotiations he had advised the Board that its offer was ambiguous.

In its post-hearing brief, the Board submitted a revised salary schedule containing salary amounts at the various steps and lanes different from those contained on its certified final offer. It is the Board's position that the new schedule is a mere clarification of the former one, reflecting the Board's intent in adding the above-quoted sentence to its health insurance offer.

The Arbitrator has carefully considered both arguments on this important issue and concludes that the salary schedule initially submitted by the Board as its final offer (Attachment 1 a) is the only one which can be considered here. The Arbitrator is limited by the controlling statute. He can accept only one or the other of the two certified final offers. It is beyond the scope of the Arbitrator's authority to consider an additional salary schedule bearing amounts different from those included on a party's certified final offer. Moreover, Section 111.70 (4)(cm) 6 a & b Wis. Stats. clearly indicates that neither of the

parties' certified final offers may be modified without permission of the other party. Accordingly, the Arbitrator did not use the revised salary schedule submitted by the Board with its post-hearing brief for salary comparison purposes.

Board Position. The Board's certified final offer would increase the BA base to \$12,900 from \$12,000 and the MA base to \$13,900 from \$13,000. Increments among vertical steps within each lane would remain unchanged.

The Board points out that such a schedule would maintain existing relationships among steps and lanes. Moreover, the Board asserts, it offers the highest BA base in the Conference. It continues to recognize long term service through longevity payments with no cap (i.e., \$150 annually for each year of experience past twelve). This is especially important since almost 1/3 of the 45 teachers in the district are eligible for longevity payments in 1982-1983. And with respect to the top end of the salary schedule, it is reasonable for Wrightstown to be in about the middle of the Conference comparables because it is the only district in the Conference with an indefinite longevity schedule to compensate for the difference.

With the Board's salary offer the total contract cost would remain at the Conference average. That average is \$784,736; the total cost of the Board's offer is \$783,843.

Finally, the Board believes that the 3.9% inflation rate and the 11% unemployment rate should be seriously considered.

Association Position. The Association's salary offer would increase the BA base to \$12,800, or \$100 less than the Board's offer. It would increase the MA base to \$13,800, also \$100 less than the Board's offer. It also provides for a \$150 annual longevity increase for each additional year after twelve years. Unlike the Board's offer, however, it includes adjustments in the vertical increments. The Association's offer would increase increments in the BA lane from \$465 to \$530, in the BA+15 lane from \$485 to \$555, in the MA lane from \$505 to \$580, and in the MA+15 lane from \$525 to \$605.

The Association believes that a comparison of benchmark data for seven settled comparables (i.e., the Association's comparables) with the parties' final offers points out the validity of the Association's offer. Except for the BA and MA benchmarks, the Association's proposal would mean a higher than average increase in salary; however, none of the increased amounts would be excessive - just \$101 to \$156 over the average. In contrast, the Board's offer (except for the BA and MA base salary levels) would require teachers to accept an amount significantly under the area average, ranging from \$189 to \$742 under average across the benchmark points. Put another way, the Association's proposal would increase teacher salaries a maximum of 11% at any one benchmark; the Board's offer at each of the benchmarks would be significantly below the average (i.e., -17.4%; -32.9%; -43.8%; and -45.2%).

Analysis. The comparables identified by the Arbitrator in a preceding section will be used for the purposes of this discussion. Table II has been developed to compare the 1981-1982 Wrightstown salary schedule against those of comparable districts. It illustrates salary amounts at commonly accepted benchmark levels. Table III compares the 1982-1983 Wrightstown offers with salaries in comparable districts which have settled their 1982-1983 contracts.

TABLE II  
1981-1982 Salaries

<u>District</u>	<u>BA Base</u>	<u>BA + 7</u>	<u>BA Max</u>	<u>MA Base</u>	<u>MA + 10</u>	<u>MA Max</u>
Brillion	11750	14378	17620	11150	16916	19470
Denmark	12150	15795	19440	13050	18792	20880
Freedom	12150	16038	19683	14337	19683	23814
Hilbert	12150	14760	16065	13350	17805	20775
Little Chute	12775	16097	19164	14308	19745	21462
Mishicot	11975	15029	18082	13172	17752	19759
Reedsville	12000	14820	17640	12900	17130	19950
Valders	11925	14730	18670	12725	16970	20075
Average	12109	15206	18295	13312	18099	20773
Wrightstown	12000	14790	17580	13000	17545	19060
+/- Average \$	-109	-416	-715	-312	-554	-1713
Rank Among 9	5	6	8	6	9	9

TABLE III

Benchmark Level Salary Comparison of  
Selected Comparable Districts (82-83 data)

<u>District</u>	<u>BA base</u>	<u>BA + 7</u>	<u>BA Max</u>	<u>MA base</u>	<u>MA + 10</u>	<u>MA Max</u>
Brillion						
81/82	11750	14378	17620	12650	16916	19470
82/83	12475	15376	19244	13598	18341	21503
(% incr.)	(6.1)	(6.9)	(9.2)	(7.5)	(8.42)	(10.44)
Denmark						
81/82	12150	15795	19440	13050	18792	20880
82/83	12875	16738	20600	13775	19836	22040
(% incr.)	(6.0)	(6.0)	(6.0)	(5.6)	(5.6%)	(5.6%)
Mishicot						
81-82	11975	15029	18082	13172	17752	19759
82-83	12800	16064	19328	14080	18976	21120
(% incr.)	(6.9)	(6.9)	(6.9)	(6.9)	(6.9)	(6.9)
Average						
81-82	11958	15067	18380	12957	17820	20020
82-83	12717	16059	19724	13818	19051	21554
(% incr.)	(6.3)	(6.6)	(7.3)	(6.6)	(6.9%)	(7.7%)
\$ incr.	759	992	1345	861	1231	1534
Wrightstown						
81/82	12000	14790	17580	13000	17545	19060
82/83 (Bd)	12900	15690	18480	13900	18445	19960
incr. (%)	(7.5)	(6.1)	(5.1)	(6.9)	(5.1)	(4.7)
incr. \$	900	900	900	900	900	900
+ or - avg. \$	+141	-92	-445	+39	-331	-634
+ or - avg. (%)	(+1.2)	(-.5)	(-2.2)	(+.3)	(-1.8)	(-3.0)
82/83 (Assn)	12800	15980	19160	13800	19020	20760
incr. (%)	(6.7)	(8.0)	(8.9)	(6.1)	(8.4)	(8.9)
incr. \$	800	1190	1580	800	1475	1700
+ or - avg \$	+41	+198	+235	-19	+244	-166
+ or - avg. (%)	(+.4)	(+1.4)	(+1.6)	(-.5)	(+1.5)	(+1.2)

As illustrated in Table II, Wrightstown teacher salaries are below average at all benchmark levels, and increasingly so as individual teachers accumulate seniority within a lane. In general, increments between vertical steps at Wrightstown have historically increased from contract to contract (Assn. Exhibit 19). Still, the District lags behind the comparables on this particular dimension of salary. And from Table III, it is evident that the Board's offer would perpetuate, indeed widen this gap between Wrightstown and comparable districts. It would cause them to lose even more ground. The Board's proposed increase of \$900 across the lanes would increase the already existent salary compression for Wrightstown teachers above the BA and MA base levels. That is, a flat increase would provide smaller percentage increases to those teachers whose seniority has already entitled them to salaries higher than the base levels.

From Table III it can be seen that the Board's offer would provide high seniority Wrightstown teachers (i.e., seven years or greater) with percentage increases lower than the average of the three settled comparables. On the other hand, the Association's offer would provide the same teachers with percentage increases above the average of the three settled comparables. Ideally, some salary schedule between the two offers would be appropriate with respect to the comparables, but the Arbitrator does not have that option. He must choose one or the other. In comparing the two, it is evident that the Association's offer is closer to the comparables' average than is the Board's at 4 of the 6 benchmark levels (i.e., BA Base = Assn. +.4%, Board +1.2%; BA Max = Assn. +1.6%, Board -2.2%; MA + 10 = Assn. +1.5%, Board = -1.8%; MA Max = Assn. +1.2%, Board = -3.0%) And at the MA Base level the Association's offer is lower than the Board's.

It appears from the above analysis that the Association's offer would permit modest relative gains above the base levels, while not moving Wrightstown teacher salaries above the three district average except at the BA base level.

The Arbitrator recognizes that the outcome of 1982-1983 negotiations in other comparable districts remains to be seen. And the fact that very high seniority Wrightstown teachers enjoy a small annual longevity increase with no cap tends to support adoption of the Board's offer. But that is only one part of the overall salary package. Under the Board's offer Wrightstown teachers who have accumulated some years of seniority would fall back on their comparative status. The Arbitrator therefore concludes that the Association salary offer more nearly, but narrowly, meets the criterion of comparability with other districts.

Both of the parties' offers advance salary in percentage terms beyond most conventional measures of the cost of living. But again, it appears from the record that the Board's offer would cause many Wrightstown teachers to lose ground with respect to teachers of like seniority in comparable districts. The Arbitrator is mindful of the fact that exclusive reliance on comparables can result in what have been called "orbits of coercive comparison," but such exclusive reliance was not used here. All statutory criteria were considered carefully. There is no mathematical formula which specifies the appropriate weight to be attached to each criterion. It is a matter of judgment. In this case it appears to the Arbitrator that the Association's offer more closely approximates the standards specified in the statute.

## Health Insurance

Board Position. The Board's final offer would provide a maximum district contribution of \$42.14 per month for single coverage and \$110.22 per month for family coverage. As noted earlier, it also contains the following written statement:

If insurance premium is increased, it is to come out of the total wage package.

According to the Board, this sentence reflects the Board's intent to pay the full premium should it rise beyond the above-specified contributions.

Association Position. The Association's offer would require the district to pay the full premium expressed in dollar amounts to a maximum of \$49.70 per month for single coverage and \$130.06 per month for family coverage. These amounts reflect the cost of the full premium for the 1982-1983 school year. And historically, the district has paid the full premiums. Thus, the Association merely wishes to maintain the status quo with respect to district payments for health insurance premiums.

Furthermore, the Association believes that the Board's offer on health insurance is vague and would generate interpretation problems depending upon the extent to which insurance premiums might rise.

The current cost for single coverage is \$49.70. The Board's offer includes a maximum contribution of \$42.14, the same as that provided in the 1981-1982 agreement. Essentially then, the Board wants to pay 84.8% of the premium. This would be the lowest contribution of any comparable district. The same results are obtained by similar calculations on the family coverage premium.

To compound the problem, the district has been paying the increased premium thus far in the 1982-1983 school year. If the Arbitrator finds for the Board, each teacher with family medical coverage would have to repay the district \$19.34 per month for each month of coverage until the arbitration award were implemented. And in view of the Arbitrator's latitude under the Board's offer to put salary dollars toward insurance premium contributions, if the Arbitrator should decide to put enough into the health insurance premium contribution to cover the entire \$19.84 per month, those teachers who elected single coverage would be treated discriminatorily (they would receive an increment of only \$7.56 per month instead of \$19.84). Yet all staff would be penalized by having their salaries reduced.

Analysis. The record clearly indicates that the Board has provided fully paid medical insurance in the past, up to and including the 1981-1982 school year. Table IV has been constructed to compare monthly health insurance contributions among comparable districts.



TABLE IV

## Monthly Health Insurance Contributions (1981-1982)

<u>District</u>	<u>Board Payment</u>		<u>% of Premium</u>	
	<u>Single</u>	<u>Family</u>	<u>Single</u>	<u>Family</u>
Brillion	\$33.94	\$95.64	100	100
Denmark	30.42	80.50	86	86
Freedom	45.84	120.00	100	100
Hilbert	35.50	99.04	100	100
Little Chute	40.16	110.56	100	100
Mishicot	33.42	75.62	100	80
Reedsville	30.92	92.02	93	97
Valders	33.94	94.00	100	98
Average	35.51	95.92	97	95
Wrightstown	42.12	110.22	100	100

For 1982-1983 the Board offers to pay amounts equivalent to its 1981-1982 contributions (\$42.12 for single coverage and \$110.11 for family coverage). According to the record, the 1982-1983 premiums have risen to \$49.70 and \$130.06 respectively. The Association translates the Board's offer into a contribution of 84.8% for single coverage and 84.8% for family coverage.

In its post-hearing brief, the Board explained that its intent in adding the sentence "If insurance premium is increased, it is to come out of the total wage package" was to pay the full premiums. But that is clearly not the case with the Board's offer. If premium increases are taken from teacher salaries, it is not the Board but the teachers who are paying for such increases. No other conclusion is justified by the facts.

The Arbitrator also recognizes that health insurance premiums for Wrightstown teachers are higher than those for most of the comparables. The Board's offer to contribute \$42.12 for single coverage and \$110.11 for family coverage is still well above the average employer contribution among the comparables (\$35.51; \$95.52). But it is also true that the Board's offer would take Wrightstown teachers from a position just above average among the comparables to a spot in the basement, at least in terms of percentage of employer contribution. Thus, there is some merit to both positions on this issue.

Long Term Disability Insurance (LTD)

Board Position. The Board's offer includes payment of the full cost of LTD, not to exceed \$2250 for the contract year. This retains the status quo from the 1981-1982 agreement.

Association Position. The Association's offer includes Board payment of the full cost of LTD, not to exceed \$2700 for the contract year. It notes that of the ten comparable districts (i.e., the Association's comparables) that had LTD in 1981-1982, all were fully paid by their respective Boards.

Even if the full amount of \$2700 became a reality due to premium increases, the cost would average \$4.79 per month per teacher. The Board's offer would provide a maximum of \$3.90 per month. Thus, if the Arbitrator finds for the Board, each teacher might have to pay a maximum average of

89 cents per month for LTD. This amount would vary up or down depending upon the premium for each teacher.

Analysis. Table V has been constructed to compare employer LTD premium contributions across the comparable districts.

TABLE V

1981-1982 LTD Premium Payments

<u>District</u>	<u>% Paid by Board</u>
Brillion	None
Denmark	100
Freedom	100
Hilbert	None
Little Chute	100
Mishicot	None
Reedsville	None
Valders	None
Wrightstown	100%

Only four of the nine comparable districts (including Wrightstown) provided fully paid LTD insurance coverage in 1981-1982. Therefore, the Board's 1982-1983 offer still appears quite reasonable.

The Arbitrator also notes for the record that Wrightstown teachers receive paid life insurance and dental insurance at an amount approximately equivalent to the average coverage received by teachers in the comparables pool.

The Total Package

The salary issue is clearly the most significant of the three substantive issues before the Arbitrator. It represents a significantly greater dollar impact on both parties than does either medical or LTD insurance contributions.

On balance, and for all of the reasons discussed herein, the Arbitrator concludes that the Association's final offer is the more reasonable of the two submitted to and certified by the W.E.R.C.

After careful consideration of the parties' respective positions on the issues and evaluation of same against the statutory criteria, the Arbitrator makes the following Award:

AWARD

The Association's final offer attached hereto as Attachments 2(a), (b), and (c) shall be incorporated into the parties' 1982-1983 collective bargaining agreement along with all of the provisions of the 1981-1982 collective bargaining agreement which are to remain unchanged and along with the stipulated changes agreed to by the parties.

Dated at Cedarburg, Wisconsin this 3rd day of June, 1983.

*Steven Briggs*

---

Steven Briggs, Ph.D.  
Mediator-Arbitrator

*Employer*

	8A00	8A15	8A30	8A45
.0	12900.00	13400.00	13900.00	14400.00
1.0	13265.00	13885.00	14405.00	14925.00
2.0	13630.00	14370.00	14910.00	15450.00
3.0	13995.00	14855.00	15415.00	15975.00
4.0	14360.00	15340.00	15920.00	16500.00
5.0	14725.00	15825.00	16425.00	17025.00
6.0	15090.00	16310.00	16930.00	17550.00
7.0	15455.00	16795.00	17435.00	18075.00
8.0	15820.00	17280.00	17940.00	18600.00
9.0	16185.00	17765.00	18445.00	19125.00
10.0	16550.00	18250.00	18950.00	19650.00
11.0	16915.00	18735.00	19455.00	20175.00
12.0	17280.00	19220.00	19960.00	20700.00
12.0 + 1.0	17645.00	19370.00	20110.00	20850.00
12.0 + 2.0	18010.00	19520.00	20260.00	21000.00
12.0 + 3.0	18375.00	19670.00	20410.00	21150.00
12.0 + 4.0	18740.00	19820.00	20560.00	21300.00
12.0 + 5.0	19105.00	19970.00	20710.00	21450.00
12.0 + 6.0	19470.00	20120.00	20860.00	21600.00
12.0 + 7.0	19835.00	20270.00	21010.00	21750.00
12.0 + 8.0	20200.00	20420.00	21160.00	21900.00
12.0 + 9.0	20565.00	20570.00	21310.00	22050.00
12.0 + 10.0	20930.00	20720.00	21460.00	22200.00
12.0 + 11.0	21295.00	20870.00	21610.00	22350.00
12.0 + 12.0	21660.00	21020.00	21760.00	22500.00
12.0 + 13.0	22025.00	21170.00	21910.00	22650.00

*Base changed  
everything else  
same*

RECEIVED  
OCT 8 1982

WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT  
RELATIONS COMMISSION

*gw*

*10/5/82*

## ARTICLE XII - PROFESSION COMPENSATION

The Board proposes to pay the following dollar amount coverages for 82-83. Any increases in premiums would be picked up by the employee.

F. Other Considerations

1. Insurance Payments

- a. Health Insurance - The Board shall pay the full premium expressed in dollar amounts to a maximum of \$42.14 per month for the basic health and accident insurance policy, including Major Medical Coverage for single coverage. In the event the teacher desires family coverage, the Board shall pay the full premium to a maximum of \$110.22 per month of the cost for such a policy. Family coverage shall include the Major Medical Coverage as in the single policy. In no case shall any special and/or optional "rider" clauses be paid for by the Board. If the rate for coverage changes during the school year, the teacher shall absorb such increased costs. The Teacher Education Association has the right to select their insurance carrier with the final approval of the Board of Education. *\* If insurance premium is increased, it is to come out of the total wage package.*
- b. Group Life Insurance - The State Plan of Group Life Insurance as adopted by the Board shall be available to all teachers with the teachers paying the regular individual premiums as designated by the policy, and the Board paying the percentage (41) as required by law for participation in the program.
- c. Disability Insurance - The Board shall pay the full cost, not to exceed \$2250, of long term disability insurance for the contract year. If the rate for such coverage changes during the school year or exceed \$2250, the teacher shall absorb such increased costs until such time as these costs can be budgeted for the following year. The Association has the right to select their insurance carrier with the final approval of the Board.
- d. Dental Insurance - The Board shall pay 90% of the premium (21.63 Family/6.19 Single) per month for the basic dental insurance program coverage. This dental program will be implemented by March 1, 1982.

2. Expense Reimbursement *change from 18¢ to 20¢ per mile*

*Letter  
offer of  
the Association*

WRIGHTSTOWN

OCT 8 1982

ARTICLE XVI - SALARY SCHEDULE

WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT  
RELATIONS BOARD  
*Received*  
*APC*

STEP	BA	BA+15	MA	MA+15
0	12,800	13,300	13,800	14,300
1	13,330	13,855	14,380	14,905
2	13,860	14,410	14,960	15,510
3	14,390	14,965	15,540	16,115
4	14,920	15,520	16,120	16,720
5	15,450	16,075	16,700	17,325
6	15,980	16,630	17,280	17,930
7	16,510	17,185	17,860	18,535
8	17,040	17,740	18,440	19,140
9	17,570	18,295	19,020	19,745
10	18,100	18,850	19,600	20,350
11	18,630	19,405	20,180	20,955
12	19,160	19,960	20,760	21,560

*JF-3*

Plus \$150/yr. experience for each year after 12 years experience.

The above figures are those included in the basic salary schedule for the 1982-83 school year. These amounts are established on the basis of a \$150 per year payment or increment. These amounts are not to be considered a part of the base salary schedule and are even treated differently in the Master Agreement than is the salary schedule.

NOTE: Effective with the beginning of the 1982-83 school year.

final offer of the  
Association

ARTICLE XIV - PROFESSIONAL COMPENSATION

Article XIV will remain as printed in the 1981-82 Agreement except as modified below for the 1982-83 contract term:

GENERAL NOTE: All dates referring to 1981-82 will be changed to 1982-83 where appropriate in order to update the collective bargaining agreement.

F. Other Considerations

1. Insurance Payments

- a. Health Insurance - The Board shall pay the full premium expressed in dollar amounts to a maximum of \$49.70 per month for the basic health and accident insurance policy, including Major Medical Coverage for single coverage. In the event the teacher desires family coverage, the Board shall pay the full premium to a maximum of \$130.06 per month of the cost for such a policy. Family coverage shall include the Major Medical Coverage as in the single policy. In no case shall any special and/or optional "rider" clauses be paid for by the Board. If the rate for coverage changes during the school year, the teacher shall absorb such increased costs. The Teacher Education Association has the right to select their insurance carrier with the final approval of the Board of Education.
- c. Disability Insurance - See the final offers of the parties.

Jay D. Wingfield  
Signed

10/5/82  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signed

FINAL OFFER OF THE  
WRIGHTSTOWN EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

The 1981-83 Collective Bargaining Agreement will remain in effect until June 30, 1983 except as modified by stipulation of the parties and by the following final offer:

ARTICLE XIV - PROFESSIONAL COMPENSATION

F. Other Considerations

1. Insurance Payments

- c. Disability Insurance - The Board shall pay the full cost, not to exceed \$2,700, of long term disability insurance for the contract year. If the rate for such coverage changes during the school year or exceeds \$2,700, the teacher shall absorb such increased costs until such time as these costs can be budgeted for the following year. The Association has the right to select their insurance carrier with the final approval of the Board.