

RECEIVED

AUG 23 1983

BEFORE THE MEDIATOR-ARBITRATOR

WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION

----- x

In the Matter of the Petition of

BROWN COUNTY NEVILLE PUBLIC
MUSEUM EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION

Case CLXXXCI
No. 31105 Med/Arb-2154
Decision No. 20458-A

to Initiate Mediation-Arbitration
Between said Petitioner and :

BROWN COUNTY

----- x

APPEARANCES: Parins, McKay and Mohr, S.C., Attorneys at Law,
by FREDERICK J. MOHR, appearing on behalf of the
Union.

JOHN C. JACQUES, Assistant Corporation Counsel,
appearing on behalf of the County.

ARBITRATION AWARD

Brown County, hereinafter referred to as the County or Employer, and Brown County Neville Public Museum Employees Association, hereinafter referred to as the Association, were unable to voluntarily resolve certain issues in dispute in their negotiations for a new 1983 Collective Bargaining Agreement to replace their expired 1982 Collective Bargaining Agreement and the Association, on January 28, 1983, petitioned the Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission (WERC) for the purpose of initiating mediation-arbitration pursuant to the provisions of Section 111.70(4)(cm)6. of the Wisconsin Statutes. The WERC investigated the dispute and, upon determination that there was an impasse which could not be resolved through mediation, certified the matter to mediation-arbitration by Order dated March 23, 1983. The parties selected the undersigned from a panel of mediator-arbitrators submitted to them by the WERC and the WERC issued an Order, dated April 18, 1983, appointing the undersigned as mediator-arbitrator. The undersigned endeavored to mediate the dispute on June 27, 1983, but mediation proved unsuccessful. Pursuant to agreement between the parties that a reasonable period of mediation had expired and that they did not wish to withdraw their final offers, a hearing was held on that same date, at which time the parties presented their evidence. Post-hearing briefs were filed and exchanged on July 25, 1983. Full consideration has been given to the evidence and arguments presented in rendering the award herein.

THE ISSUES IN DISPUTE

The only issues in dispute relate to the wage rates to be paid employees during the 1983 contract year and the question of whether the caretaker of an historic home maintained by the County should continue to pay rent for the portion of the home she occupies as a residence. There are a total of 14 professional and non-professional employees in the bargaining unit. They work in positions which are included in a total of 11 job classifications and all, except the recorder and docent, are full-time employees. The following table sets out the 11 job classifications in question, indicates the number of full-time equivalent employees occupying positions within those classifications, and their current wage rates, effective since the second increase under the terms of the 1982 agreement, which took effect on June 27, 1982.

<u>Non-professional</u>	<u>1982 Rates</u> <u>Effective since 6/27/82</u>
Typist (1)	5.73
Recorder (.5)	5.73
Technician (2)	6.64
Security Officer (1)	6.64
Bldg. Maint. Worker (1)	7.64
Exec. Secretary (1)	7.70
 <u>Professional</u>	
Registrar (1)	8.76
Curator I (2)	9.08
Curator II (2)	10.39
 <u>Hazelwood Staff</u>	
Docent (.5)	4.47
Caretaker (1)	9,266.00/yr.*

*Caretaker is required to pay \$110 per month rent

ASSOCIATION'S PROPOSAL

In its final offer the Association proposes that all of the above employees receive a cents per hour increase, effective retroactively to January 1, 1983, which in all cases amounts to slightly less than 5%. The actual percentage increases range from a low of 4.81% for the executive secretary to a high of 4.92% for the docent. In addition, the Association proposes cents per hour increases effective retroactively to July 1, 1983 for the two technicians and the five professional employees which also amounts to approximately 5% of the wage rates then in effect. These proposed increases range from a low of 4.89% in the case of the two technicians to a high of 5.05% for the two curator II's. In the case of the caretaker at Hazelwood, the Association proposes that she be given a 5% increase in her annual salary and that the monthly rental which she currently pays be waived. The percentage increase which the caretaker would receive under this proposal would amount to 19.25% of her 1982 annual salary, since the waiver of the \$110 per month would be equal to 14.25% of her 1982 salary.

COUNTY'S PROPOSAL

In its final offer the County proposes that the non-professional staff and the Hazelwood staff be granted 29 cents per hour across the board and that the professional staff be granted 39 cents per hour across the board. When analyzed on a percentage basis the County's offer would generate percentage increases ranging from a low of 3.77 in the case of the executive secretary, to a high of 6.50% in the case of the Hazelwood staff.

ASSOCIATION'S POSITION

According to the Association, the evidence indicates that the parties rely most heavily upon two of the statutory criteria in support of their position in this case. For this reason, the Association concentrates its arguments on those criteria, comparability and cost of living.

At the outset, the Association notes that the County has cited three comparable employee units, Oshkosh Public Museum, Milwaukee County, and the State Historical Society in support of its position with regard to proposed increases for the

technicians and the professional employees. On the other hand, the Association has cited four employee units deemed comparable in support of its position in this regard: Milwaukee County, City of Oshkosh, University of Wisconsin Art Museum and Milwaukee Art Museum. The Association analyzes the appropriateness of the analogies drawn by both parties and contends that certain County comparisons actually support the Association's position and certain other County comparisons are inappropriate.

Specifically, with regard to the Oshkosh Public Museum comparison, the Association argues as follows:

1. There is no substantiating evidence justifying the County's reliance upon certain comparisons drawn in its exhibit.

2. Nevertheless, the comparison of technician wage rates in the Oshkosh Public Museum to technician wage rates in this bargaining unit actually supports the Association's position in this case since it demonstrates that under either the County's proposal or the Association's proposal technicians would still be paid less in Brown County than they are in the City of Oshkosh.

3. The comparison of the "registrar" rates in Oshkosh are inappropriate and were not utilized by the Association in its comparison because of its belief that the "registrar" position there is not a comparable job in the Association's view. According to the Association, the registrar in Oshkosh performs duties roughly equivalent to those of the executive secretary in this bargaining unit.

4. While the duties of curator are performed by the assistant director in Oshkosh, they are performed on a part-time basis as part of the overall duties of that position and, in the opinion of the Association, the duties described in the job description relate more appropriately to the Curator I position in Brown County. This is so because the position description requires only one year of working experience in addition to a Bachelor's Degree, like the Curator I position in Brown County, rather than four years of experience. Further, according to the Association, the curator work performed by the assistant director in Oshkosh is performed under the supervision of the director, whereas a Curator II in Brown County is expected to perform curator work without close supervision.

In the case of the comparisons drawn to Milwaukee County, the Association argues as follows:

1. The Milwaukee County technician positions distinguish between technicians who work with photography and technicians who work with carpentry and both are paid substantially more than the two technicians in Brown County who do comparable work. Both the Association's proposal and the County's proposal would result in rates for technicians which remain substantially below the \$8.02 and \$13.30 earned by the two types of technicians in Milwaukee County.

2. An analysis of the job duties performed by curators and registrars in Milwaukee County and a comparison of those duties with the duties performed by curators and registrars in Brown County establishes that the Museum Educator III in Milwaukee County and the Curator II-Museum Educator position in Brown County are comparable. A Museum Educator III in Milwaukee County earns \$23,784.93 per year, according to the Association, and said salary would be closer to the annualized

salary which would be generated by the Association's proposal than that which would be generated by the County's proposal herein.

3. An analysis of the curator positions in Milwaukee County and a comparison of those positions with the other curator positions in Brown County establishes that a Curator I in Brown County is roughly equivalent to a Curator II in Milwaukee County and that a Curator II in Brown County is roughly equivalent to a Curator IV in Milwaukee County. Based on these comparisons the Association's proposal is far more reasonable than the County's proposal, even though both proposals would generate annual salaries or hourly rates substantially below those paid to Curator II's and Curator IV's in Milwaukee County.

A comparison of the hourly wage rates earned by professional employees at the Milwaukee Art Museum demonstrates that they receive pay which is substantially greater than that which is currently paid by the County or would be paid by the County under either parties' final offer, according to the Association. Similarly, the rates earned by professional employees employed by the University of Wisconsin Art Museum are higher than those earned by professional employees in this unit and would remain so, even if the Association's offer were accepted.

With regard to the comparisons drawn by the County to curators at the State Historical Society, the Association contends that an examination of the job descriptions of the Curator I, II, and III positions there demonstrates that they are not comparable to either of the curator positions in Brown County. A Curator I at the State Historical Society works under direction and supervision rather than independently, as do the curators in Brown County. For this reason it is the Association's contention that the Curator IV position in the State Historical Society is equivalent to a Curator I position in Brown County and that a Curator V position at the State Historical Society is equivalent to a Curator II position in Brown County. Based on the maximum rates for these job classifications, the Association's proposal is more reasonable.

In summary, with regard to both parties' attempts to draw comparisons to other museum employees, the Association argues that such comparisons are difficult at best but that, on balance, they support the Association's proposal. Perhaps more important than comparison with other museum employees, are the comparisons with other employees generally in public employment in the Green Bay and Brown County community.

The Association notes that the County has submitted comparisons with only one other county bargaining unit and one other city bargaining unit, whereas the Association has relied on two other county bargaining units as being primarily related and other settled county contracts as being secondarily related. According to the Association, the County's data with regard to proposed increases for building maintenance custodians at the County's Mental Health Center are irrelevant since they do not establish the size of the increases proposed and the County's data with regard to the wage rate earned by building maintenance custodians at the Green Bay City Hall is likewise irrelevant since it does not establish the percentage increase received by the person or persons in question.

On the other hand, the Association contends that the data it submitted with regard to comparisons to Brown County library employees and Brown County Social Service Department employees is relevant and persuasive with regard to the Association's position. Comparisons to the Brown County library are by far the most relevant comparisons that can be drawn, according to the Association. Both the museum and library function as an educational tool of government and both have professional staffs that are represented for purposes of bargaining. A media specialist who is required to catalog and review the media collection in the library and also has responsibility for audio visual displays, received \$9.09 per hour in 1982. According to the Association, a museum technician position is similar to a media specialist position in the library but received \$2.44 less per hour. Furthermore, according to the Association, the three degreed positions at the museum, i.e., Registrar, Curator I, and Curator II, are "very similar" to the professional positions in the library of Librarian I, Librarian II, and Librarian III. Nevertheless, the rates for those three positions in 1982 were \$8.55, \$9.63, and \$10.92 per hour, respectively and were "substantially higher" than at the museum. For these reasons the Association argues that the Association's proposal is much more reasonable because of its disparity between the museum and library rates, even though the library is by far the best comparable available.

The Association also argues that professional social workers working in the County's Department of Social Services provide a "good comparable." The employees in that department received pay increases ranging from 40 cents to 85 cents per hour, depending upon their position in the pay range provided for such employees. Based on the experience level of the professional staff at the museum, the placement of professional employees at the museum on the Social Service professional pay scale would establish that the employees in question are earning pay rates less than those which are received by the social workers. Further, when the museum employees are compared to the employees of the Department of Social Services, it would appear that the County was willing to offer a larger percentage increase as well as a larger dollar increase to its professional staff at the Department of Social Services than it was willing to offer to its museum staff. This is true even though the museum staff is "bridaled with a lower pay scale."

Three other county units have also settled or tentatively settled their labor agreements with the County, according to the Association. The non-professional staff of the Department of Social Services received an increase of 33 cents per hour. This compares with the proposed increase for non-professional staff at the museum ranging from 28 cents to 37 cents per hour in the Association's proposal. If the Brown County Sheriff's Department increase of \$120 per month is compared with the professional staff under the Association's proposal, the dollar increases generated during 1983 would be within the same range. While the 47 cents per hour granted to Highway Department employees cannot be compared readily to most employees in the museum, the Association argues that this increase is roughly comparable to the "average increase" for the technician which amounts to 49 cents per hour.

With regard to the data concerning changes in the Consumer Price Index which was introduced into evidence by the County, the Association acknowledges that such evidence is relevant under the statutory criteria but argues that the data actually supports its position. According to the Association, the relevant period for purposes of measurement is the one-year period immediately prior to January 1, 1983, during which the 1982 agreement was in effect. Furthermore, to anticipate what the

Consumer Price Index for the year 1983 will be is speculative, at best, according to the Association.

For purposes of evaluating the changes in the cost of living during 1982, the Association utilizes a simply arithmetic average of the annualized figures published for each month of the calendar year 1982. Using this method of computation the Association argues that the Consumer Price Index increase for 1982 was 6.19%. When this figure is compared to the Association's proposed wage increases, which it estimates to be approximately 6%, the Association's proposal more closely approximates the "cost of living" increase than does the County's. Furthermore, when the total package cost percentages utilized by the County of 6.77% and 4.85% are compared the Association's proposal is still more appropriate under the cost of living criteria, according to the Association.

Finally, with regard to the County exhibit purporting to show the relative indexed cost for consumer goods and services in Green Bay in 1982, the Association notes that the indexes relied upon increased during 1982. Thus, although the index remained less than the standard of 100 throughout the year, the index for the first quarter of 92.1 increased relative to the national average to 94.7 in the fourth quarter of 1982. This would indicate a "2.7 increase in the cost of consumer prices relative to the national average in the Green Bay community," according to the Association. When this information is taken in conjunction with the Consumer Price Index data, the apparent impact on Brown County residents due to inflation during 1982 tends to strengthen the Association's position.

COUNTY'S POSITION

The County contends that its final offer more nearly conforms to the statutory criteria primarily because it is closer to the wage rate prevailing for museum employees performing similar services and also because it more nearly conforms to the current changes in the cost of living.

First, with regard to its cost of living argument, the County asserts that the most recent (May 1983) figures indicate a 3.4% to 3.5% annualized rate of increase in the cost of living. Based on this projected rate of inflation the County argues that its offer is more reasonable under this statutory criterion. Further, purchasing power in the City of Green Bay, as measured by the American Chamber of Commerce Research Association's index for cities, has been and continues to be better than average. That index, which is based on an average of 100, demonstrates that the City of Green Bay's index has been consistently below 100 during the fourth quarter of 1981 and throughout the four quarters of 1982.

The County points out that the Association's final offer would grant percentage increases for the calendar year of 1983 alone which are more than double the most recent cost of living increase figures. The total wage and negotiable fringe benefit costs contained in the Association's final offer is 6.77% over 1982 and will have an impact of 8.5% for future years. Thus, even if the 6.77% cost increase is used for comparison purposes, there is a wide disparity between the Association's final offer and the cost of living criterion.

With regard to the comparisons relied upon by the County, the County notes that its data relates to positions it deems comparable in other public museums in the State located in Oshkosh, Madison, and Milwaukee. Some of these same comparisons

are made in exhibits utilized by the Association.

In particular, the County points to its Exhibit No. 8 which compares the rates of curators, registrars, technicians, recorders, and building maintenance custodians. The curator wage rates proposed in the County's offer are competitive relative to Milwaukee County rates for said position, according to the County. If one considers the cost of living differences that exist between the City of Green Bay and the City of Milwaukee, this comparison supports the reasonableness of the County's offer. The same is true when a comparison is drawn to the wage rates of curators at the State Historical Society in Madison, according to the Employer. The curatorial work at the Oshkosh Public Museum is performed by an assistant director who is paid \$10.52 per hour, which is less than the \$10.78 wage rate for Curator II contained in the County's final offer.

Thus, according to the County, the comparison of the wage rates for museum employees, as shown in its exhibits, clearly indicates that the wage rates contained in the County's final offer compare favorably with any prevailing in the State for 1983. On the other hand, it argues, the increases provided for in the Association's proposal would create a disparity with most other comparable museum positions. Because of the similar work performed and the similar skills and abilities necessary, the County's comparables should be given great weight under the comparability criterion.

With regard to the comparisons drawn by the Association to social workers and librarians employed in the County's Department of Social Services and library, the County argues that such comparisons have little validity considering the vast differences in the nature of the work performed and argues that they should be given little weight for this reason. The County acknowledges that the Association has also attempted to draw comparisons between museum positions and several other museums in the State but argues that in the case of Milwaukee County, the Curator I position in Brown County has been erroneously compared to the Curator II position in Milwaukee County. Similarly, the Curator II position in Brown County has been erroneously compared to the Curator IV position in Milwaukee County. It is the County's position, based on exhibits introduced at the hearing, that these comparisons are not valid and that this is especially true when one considers the fact that the Milwaukee County positions of Curator III and above require a PhD degree. Such a degree requirement is not a part of Brown County's qualifications for a Curator II.

In conclusion, the County argues that its final offer comports more closely to the relevant statutory criteria discussed above and that when the two proposals are compared, the County's proposal grants bargaining unit employees a wage rate comparing very favorably to those paid for similar services at other public museums in the State. The cost of living factor accentuates the disparity between the Association's proposal and prevailing economic conditions and the comparables used by the Association failed to justify the mid-year wage adjustment for seven of the fourteen employees and also the wage rates proposed in its final offer. For these reasons the County asks that the arbitrator find that its final offer is more in conformance with the statutory criteria and should be included in the parties' 1983 agreement.

DISCUSSION

It is true, as the Association argues, that the increases proposed in the County's final offer for this bargaining unit are smaller in a number of instances than are the increases voluntarily agreed to in several of the other county bargaining units, when compared on a cents per hour or percentage basis. Thus, on a cents per hour basis, the County highway employees received a 47 cents per hour increase. It is undisputed that the increase received by said employees, when measured on a wage increase or total package basis, was in excess of 5.3%. The average member of the bargaining unit here would get an increase of 4.6%, which is approximately .7 of a percent less than the percentage increase received by the County highway employees.

The employees in the paraprofessional bargaining unit of social service workers apparently received a 33 cents per hour increase. Here the non-professional employees would only receive a 29 cents per hour increase under the County's offer. The record does not disclose whether the average wage rate of the paraprofessional employees in the Department of Social Services is more or less than the average wage rate for the non-professionals in this bargaining unit, so it is not possible to determine whether the percentage increase received by the paraprofessional employees in the Social Services Department is greater than the percentage increase received by the non-professional employees in this bargaining unit.

The County's deputy sheriffs have tentatively agreed to increases of \$120 per month, which equates to approximately 71 cents per hour, if the Association is correct in its belief that their work week consists of 39 25 hours. The record here does not include evidence as to the average hourly rate for deputy sheriffs, so it is not possible to determine the actual percentage increase they received, but it presumably exceeded 4.6% (their 1982 hourly rates would have to exceed \$15.43 per hour if the percentage increase were less than 4.6%).

Finally, the professional employees in the Social Services Department apparently received hourly increases which ranged from a low of 40 cents per hour to a high of 85 cents per hour, depending upon their individual movement through the wage rate range for those employees. There is no evidence in the record to indicate the actual percentage increases received by these employees. The Association did introduce evidence indicating the wage rates received by social workers at five points in their wage rate schedule, for purposes of comparing those rates to the proposed rates for the five professional employees in this bargaining unit. It is the Association's contention that those rates (\$9.85, \$9.85, \$11.58; \$12.27; and \$12.27) are comparable but remain above the proposed July 1, 1983 rates contained in its final offer (\$9.65; \$10.00; \$10.00, \$11.45, and \$11.45). However, this comparison (which is fraught with difficulties discussed below) relates to the Association's "catch up" argument discussed below and does not in itself demonstrate an inequality in the cents per hour or percentage increases proposed for this bargaining unit when compared to other County bargaining units.

In summary, the above analysis suggests that, based solely on internal comparisons, the Association's proposal for January 1, 1983 increases, which range from a low of 4.81% to a high of 4.92% (and generate cents per hour increases ranging from a low of 28 cents per hour to a high of 55 cents per hour) are probably more reasonable than the County's proposal of 29 cents per hour and 39 cents per hour (which translate into percentage increases ranging from a low of 3.77% to a high of 6.51% and average 4.60%).

However, the Association also proposes to grant seven of the twelve full-time employees additional increases equal to an annualized rate of 5%, effective July 1, 1982 and to grant the Hazelwood caretaker a rental waiver which is equal to an additional 4.25% increase in salary for the entire year. These proposed increases would generate a 19.25% increase for the caretaker and would produce a "lift" of approximately 10% for a majority of the other full-time positions in the bargaining unit, including the five most highly compensated positions. Such increases are obviously not justified, based on the internal comparisons discussed above. If they are to be found to be justified, it must be on the basis of the Association's other arguments relating to the cost of living and "catch up."

With regard to the cost of living criterion, the undersigned must agree with the County. The available data in this regard supports its position, at least insofar as the overall cost of the Association's proposal is concerned. The Association, in its brief, has utilized a faulty method for calculating the percentage change in the Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index data. The actual percentage change in the relevant indexes for urban wage earners and clerical workers and all urban consumers, during calendar 1982 (from December to December) was 3.9%.^{1/} Further, the changes in that index since December 1982 project an annualized rate of less than 4% for 1983. While the County's exhibits, purporting to show the relative purchasing power enjoyed by residents of Green Bay, reflect an increase in Green Bay's relative position among the cities surveyed, Green Bay still remains "below average," according to that measurement device.

It would therefore appear that the Association's case, in support of the reasonableness of its final offer as it relates to the two criterion relied upon most heavily by the parties, must stand or fall on the "catch up" comparisons it seeks to draw to the library employees and social workers employed by the County and to the employees allegedly performing similar work in other areas of the State. For purposes of analysis, each of the job classifications for which the Association seeks additional mid-year adjustments will be discussed separately.

Probably the strongest case made by the Association relates to the two museum technician positions. First, the Association pointed out at the hearing that those positions, which require that the incumbent have the equivalent in education and experience to that of an associate degree related to the duties performed and requires the performance of a wide variety of duties ranging from research and construction of exhibits, to typing and record keeping, have traditionally paid less than the building maintenance position. Secondly, museum technicians in other areas of the State, such as Milwaukee County and the University of Wisconsin Art Museum, receive substantially more than the technicians in Brown County. However, the evidence suggests that the technicians employed by Milwaukee County and the State of Wisconsin are more highly specialized and may possess certain skills such as those of a carpenter, which explain why the rates are so much higher in certain cases. Finally,^{2/} the 1983 rates earned by the technicians employed at the Oshkosh

1/ Those indexes, for December 1981, stood at 281.5 and 281.1. By December 1982, they had increased to 292.4 and 292.0, for a numerical change of 10.9 points or 3.9%.

2/ The Association also relies upon a comparison between the technicians and the media specialist employed in the County's library, and argues that such a comparison is especially appropriate since one of the two technicians at the museum also works with photographic equipment. However, the undersigned deems this particular comparison to be very questionable since the degree to which the duties of the two job classifications in question overlap is not adequately demonstrated in this record.

Public Museum, an employer deemed to be quite comparable to Brown County in the view of the undersigned, ranged from a low of \$7.27 to a high of \$8.79, after the fourth year of employment. The two technicians here have apparently worked for the County for approximately 15 months. Therefore, their "comparable" rates in Oshkosh for 1983 would probably be \$8.01 per hour rather than \$6.93 per hour, as proposed by the County, or \$7.30 per hour, as ultimately proposed by the Association.

The Association's claim that the mid-year increases sought for the registrar are justified is based in part on comparisons it would draw to certain positions in Milwaukee County, the University of Wisconsin Art Museum, and the Milwaukee Art Museum. However, there is no backup data in this regard to establish the basis or the legitimacy of these particular comparisons. For this reason the undersigned has determined to review the comparisons for curator positions, for which there is some backup data available, and to treat all of these comparisons the same. The Association also relies upon comparisons to entry level librarian and social worker positions for purposes of justifying its proposals for the registrar position. Those particular comparisons are fraught with a number of difficulties including: (1) differences in educational background and training required for librarians and social workers, (2) differences in the labor market demand for their particular expertise and skills; and (3) differences in the compensation systems used to employ and retain librarians and social workers. Therefore, the undersigned has concluded that the reasonableness of the mid-year advancement proposed for the registrar should stand or fall on the basis of the reasonableness of the Association's proposed mid-year increases for the other four professional employees.

County Curator I and Curator II positions are comparable to Curator III and Curator IV positions in the employ of Milwaukee County, according to the Association. However, a review of five position descriptions for Curator I, II, and III positions in Milwaukee County demonstrates that the positions in question are highly specialized and, in general, require more specialized background knowledge and more education than do the positions in Brown County.

In order to qualify as a Curator I in Brown County, one need only have a Bachelor's Degree in "an area of study related to museum purpose" and a minimum of one year of experience working in a museum. One of the position descriptions for Milwaukee County, for a position as a Curator I vertebrate zoology-ornithology, requires a Bachelor's Degree with a major in zoology or biology with emphasis on ornithology and two years in the maintenance of bird collections in a museum. Another position, for a Curator I invertebrate zoology-lepidoptera, requires a Bachelor's Degree with a major in zoology or biology or entomology and two years of experience maintaining Lepidoptera collections for a museum. A third position, for that of a Curator II anthropology, requires a master's degree with a major in anthropology and two years' working experience in the anthropology section of a museum. In order to qualify for a Curator II history position in Milwaukee County, one must have a master's degree with a major in history and two years' experience working in the history section of a museum. Finally, in order to qualify for a Curator II history-European collections

position in Milwaukee County, one would need a doctor's degree with a major in some aspect of European history and culture and three years' experience in handling, describing, analyzing, and researching specimens or artifacts in the field of history-European collections.

For these reasons and because of the great disparity between the size of the City of Milwaukee and the City of Green Bay, the undersigned believes that it is difficult at best to draw analogies to the wages earned by curators in Milwaukee County, but that if such comparisons are to be drawn, they support the County's position. The rate range for a Curator I in Milwaukee is from \$8.05 per hour to \$9.03 per hour. The rate for a Curator II in Milwaukee County is \$9.03 per hour to \$10.23 per hour. These rates are clearly in line with the rates proposed by the County for Curator I's and Curator II's, which are \$9.47 per hour and \$10.77 per hour respectively.

The Association also argues that the Curator I and Curator II positions are similar to certain positions in the Milwaukee Art Museum, which currently pay \$15.58 per hour and \$18.46 per hour respectively. According to the 1983 salary schedule for Milwaukee County, the top rate for a Curator IV in Milwaukee County is \$14.44 per hour. Curator V's are not even listed on the schedule since their compensation is covered by an executive compensation plan. Based on the qualifications required by Milwaukee County to fill a position as a Curator III dealing with European history and the top compensation paid for such work, the undersigned finds it difficult to believe that the two positions at the Milwaukee Art Museum are comparable to the Curator I and Curator II positions in Brown County.

The Association contends that the evidence with regard to compensation paid to curators by the State Historical Society, which was introduced by the County, actually supports the Association's position, if one agrees that Curator I and Curator II positions in Brown County are comparable to the Curator IV and Curator V positions at the State Historical Society. The undersigned cannot agree that such comparisons are appropriate. A State document setting out the position standard for the curator series describes the Curator I, II, and III classifications as "three levels of professional curatorial work ranging from entry level to the basic objective level." Only general supervision is required once the objective level has been reached. The Curator IV classification is for "advanced professional curatorial work" which involves responsibility for a significant specialty area. The Curator V classification is for "program management work" where the occupant has responsibility for independent management of a program designated as a "section" or a "center." Based on a review of these documents, the undersigned is again persuaded that the drawing of analogies to State Historical Society curator positions is difficult at best, but that if such comparisons are to be drawn, the appropriate analogy would be between the Curator I, II, and III series at the State Historical Society and the Curator I and II positions in Brown County. The hourly rate for these positions compares favorably with the rates proposed by the County. At the State Historical Society a Curator I earns rates somewhere in the range from \$7.44 per hour to \$9.66 per hour, a Curator II earns rates somewhere in the range from \$7.90 per hour to \$10.39 per hour, and a Curator III earns rates somewhere in the range from \$8.47 per hour to \$11.16 per hour. Under the County's proposal the two Curator I's who have worked for the County for approximately 18 months and 42 months respectively, will earn \$9.47 per hour and the two Curator II's who have worked for the County for 144 months and 223 months respectively, will earn \$10.77 per hour.

The Association also indicates in its exhibits that curators allegedly comparable to the County Curator II positions are employed by the University of Wisconsin Art Museum and earn \$13.93 per hour. There is no backup data concerning these positions. However, the hourly rate in question is in excess of the maximum hourly rate for a Curator V at the State Historical Society (\$12.91 per hour). For this reason the undersigned is unwilling to rely upon this particular comparison.

Both parties included data comparing the rates of curators to the rates of employees employed by the City of Oshkosh at its public museum. According to the Association, to the extent that the assistant director of the Oshkosh Public Museum performs curatorial work, that work is more akin to the work performed by Curator I's at the Neville Museum in Green Bay. The Association bases this argument on that part of the job description for the assistant director which states that "general work assignments are received from the museum director" and that "work is checked during progress and reviewed upon completion for accomplishment." However, the job description also states that the assistant director position involves both professional curatorial work and supervisory work. The assistant director acts for the museum director in his or her absence and performs the other duties related to his or her professional and supervisory functions. The education and experience requirements include a degree in anthropology or a related field and one year of experience in museum work. Given this combination of duties, one would expect that the position would pay more than that of a curator position, whether it be designated a Curator I or a Curator II. Nevertheless, the incumbent in Oshkosh currently receives \$10.52 per hour, according to the County, which is 25 cents per hour less than the rate proposed for the Curator II's by the County.


As noted above, the Association also contends that the rates paid to Curator I's and Curator II's should be compared to the rates currently paid to professional librarians and social workers employed by the County and that such comparisons support its position. However, for the reasons noted above, the undersigned finds this proposed analogy unpersuasive.

The Association offered no specific arguments in support of its proposal to grant the caretaker at Hazelwood an additional increase, in the form of a rental waiver, which is equal to 14.25% of her 1982 salary. Similarly, the County did not address this specific aspect of the Association's proposal in its arguments. Given the absence of any evidence or persuasive arguments with regard to the nature of the work performed by this individual or the relative value of the portion of the premises provided to her for \$110 per month, the undersigned must conclude that this portion of the Association's proposal is unsupported under any of the statutory criteria. For the above and foregoing reasons, the undersigned concludes that, when the Association's final offer is analyzed under the statutory criteria and the evidence and arguments of the parties, it must be found to be less reasonable than the County's final offer. Therefore, the undersigned renders the following

AWARD

The County's final offer, submitted to the Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission, shall be included in the parties' 1983 Collective Bargaining Agreement along with all of the provisions which were agreed to by the parties for inclusion therein.

Dated at Madison, Wisconsin this 22nd day of August, 1983


George R. Fleischli
Mediator-Arbitrator