In the Matter of the Petition of WAUSAUKEE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

To Initiate Mediation-Arbitration Between Said Petitioner and

SCHOOL DISTRICT OF WAUSAUKEE

RELATIONS COMMISSION

Case No. 20
No. 33374 MED/ARB-2763
Decision No. 21970-A
Stanley H. Michelstetter II, Mediator-Arbitrator

## APPEARANCES:

Jabas and Morrison, S.C., Attorneys at Law, by James A. Morrison, appearing on behalf of the Employer.

Robert Arends, UniServ Director, appearing on behalf of the Association.

## MEDIATION-ARBITRATION AWARD

The Wisconsin Employment Relations Commisssion, having on, September 13, 1984, appointed the Undersigned as mediator-arbitrator, pursuant to Sec. $111.70(4)(\mathrm{cm}) 6$ Wis. Stats., with respect to the above-entitled dispute and pursuant to said statute, mediation having been conducted on December 17,1984 , without a resolution of the dispute; and the Undersigned having conducted hearing in the matter on January 24, 1985, in Wausaukee, Wisconsin, and each party having filed briefs and post-hearing briefs the last of which was received March 29, 1985 1/.

## ISSUES

The following is a summary of the issues presented by the final offers of the parties:

1. 1984-85 Salary: The proposed schedule of the Association (Appendix A) and Employer (Appendix B) and current schedule (Appendix C) are attached as Appendices $A, B$, and $C$.
2. Extra Curricular: The parties have stipulated that this issue not be considered.
3. The Association proposes to change the current $\$ 500.00$ per semester payment to each teacher assigned to teach over five periods per day to $\$ 550.00$ and the current $\$ 7.50$ per hour payment to elementary teachers who do not receive preparation time equal to high school staff to $\$ 8.20$ per hour. The Employer proposes no change.
4. The Association proposes a one year term August 1,1984 to July 31, 1985. The Employer proposes a two year term, August 1,1984 to July 31,1986 with three articles being open for "clarification" effective August 1, 1985 2/.
5. The Employer propose that the current fully paid health and dental insurance language be changed to provide dollar amount maximums equal to the premiums it paid in 1984-85. The Association wishes to keep the current language.
6. The Employer proposes to change the last date by which it contractually may notify a teacher of layoff for the following year from February 9, to the statutory date. The Association proposes to keep the February 9 date.
[^0]
## WAGES <br> POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES

The essence of the Association's position is that it seeks to regain its 1982-83 favorable relative position in CESA 8 at all the benchmarks relating to existing employees, while retaining all benefits levels. The essence of Employer's position is to limit its total package cost while establishing a good bargaining position for the next agreement.

The Association relies upon wage comparisons in the state as a whole and benchmark comparisons to salary schedules of teachers in the school districts of CESA 8; Florence, Marinette, Crivetz, Niagara, Pembine, Peshtigo, Bonduel, Wittenberg, Coleman, Clintonville, Shawano, Oconto, Oconto Falls, Suring, Gillett, Lena, Menominee Indian, Laona, Crandon, Marion, White Lake, Wabeno, Tigerton, Bowler, Goodman. It urges the use of the whole state as a comparison because it is a statisically larger sampling, state fiscal policies affect all schools, the "trickle down" effect will continue to operate and the labor market for teachers is state wide. It relies upon CESA 8 as a comparison because other mediator-arbitrators have used it; it is a much larger data base for comparison; the school district and CESA 8 all share the same regional and political ties; Wausaukee is among the upper quarter of the school districts "in term of effort to educate their children and local economic wherewithall." It notes teachers earn substantially less than other professions. It also argues personal income has grown by $9.8 \%$ in 1984 , inflation for 1984 was $4 \%$ and unit teachers wages have been substantially eroded by inflation over the last decade. The Association objects to the deletion of the lanes in its salary schedule for which it made significant sacrifices in the last negotiations. It notes college degree lanes of its schedule are far more comparable to any set of comparisons the Employer offers. It also agrues the Employer's schedule results in employees at step BA +7 receiving a salary rate lower than any district in CESA 8. It agrues that wausaukee should have at least average increases at each given benchmark because other schools have longevity. It also argues that its salary schedule level per step increase is $9.6 \%$, while the Employer's is $3.2 \%$, compared to $6.8 \%$ average in CESA 8.

The Employer takes the position that its total package percentage increase is more appropriate than the Association's. It argues its increase is well within the state wide averages while the Union's exceeds state, CESA 8 and $M$ and 0 athletic conference averages. It also argues its increase is designed to remedy serious imbalances in the salary structure and the health cost spiral. The Employer urges the use of the $M$ and 0 athletic conference because it includes schools in Marinette and Oconto Counties which share the same economic base while CESA 8 includes larger schools and schools with a more industrial or different agricultural base. It argues that athletic conferences share a closer community of interest. The primary data supplied by the parties related to benchmark analysis. On this basis, the Employer argues that its $B A$ and MA base offer is designed to correct the low wages at this level while its proposal at the BA maximum, MA maximum and schedule maximum are adequate to keep these very high wage rates at an appropriate level. It argues that the Association's exhibit Al3 demonstrates the Association's offer is more unreasonable (Association per sell increase $9.62 \%$, Employer $3.2 \%$, CESA 8 average $7.6 \%$ or $6.8 \%$ ). It argues the foregoing analysis ignores the minimum $5 \%$ increase guarenteed to each teacher by the Employer. It argues that its offer gives wage increases to unit employees which are generally more nearly equal to each other than the Association's.

## DISCUSSION

1. Comparability

The Association relied on CESA 8 as its comparability group, the Employer relied upon the $M$ and 0 Athletic Conference which includes Niagara, Crivetz, Suring, Wausaukee, Gillett, Peshtigo, Lena, and Coleman, all of which school districts are in the CESA 8. The surrounding school districts (occasionally used by the Association) are Crivetz, Marinette, Pembine, Oconto, Wabeno, and Goodman, all of which are in CESA 8.

Neither party submitted data with respect to either the number of students or number of teachers in any of the other districts. The Association submitted data with respect to spending per pupil, total
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equalized valuation and levy rate. Both parties submitted information as to location of the districts and comparison of the wage rates. The wage rate comparison data demonstrates that in any set of comparables there is a substantial difference between the wages paid among the districts. 1) The data submitted is otherwise insufficient to establish a defiñitive set of comparables. The parties have agreed upon the $M$ and 0 Athletic Conference which shall be used as the primary set of comparables. Because there is a substantial similarity of the wage rates in the $M$ and 0 Conference and CESA 8 , CESA 8 is also used as a secondary set of comparables.

The following is a set of comparisons in CESA 8 (including the athletic conference):

RANKINGS OF CESA \#8 BENCHMARKS
1983-84 and 1984-85

| RANK | BA MIN 83-84 |  | NK | MIN 84-85 | VALUE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SCHOOL NAME | VALUE | RANK | SCHOOL NAME |  |  |
| 1 | Marinette | \$14,094 |  | Crivitiz | \$16,204 |  |
| 2 | Shawano | \$14,019 |  | Marinette | \$15,012 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Coleman | \$15,000 | (BF0) |
| 3 | Oconto Falls | \$13,950 |  | Shawano | \$14,930 |  |
| 4 | Niagara | \$13,908 |  | Oconto Falls | \$14,890 |  |
| 5 | Tigerton | \$13,900 |  | Tigerton | \$14,875 |  |
| 6 | Coleman | \$13,900 |  | Coleman | \$14,804 | (AFO) |
| 7 | Gillet | \$13,780 |  | Oconto | \$14,800 |  |
| 8 | Oconto | \$13,760 |  | Gillet | \$14,648 |  |
| 9 | Crivitz | \$13,739 |  | Marion | \$14,500 |  |
| 10 | Florence | N/S |  | Florence | N/S |  |
| 11 | Bonduel | \$13,735 |  | Bonduel | N/S |  |
| 12 | Wittenberg | \$13,725 |  | Wittenberg | N/S |  |
| 13 | Marion | \$13,570 |  | Niagara | \$14,495 |  |
| 14 | Peshtigo | \$13,550 |  | Peshtigo | \$14,450 |  |
| 15 | Bowler | \$13,525 |  | Bowler | \$14,400 |  |
| 16 | Suring | \$13,450 |  | Suring | \$14,300 |  |
| 17 | Clintonville | \$13,100 |  | Clintonville | \$14,000 |  |
| 18 | Menominee Tchrs | \$13,050 |  | AFO \& BFO | \$14,000 |  |
| 19 | Crandon | \$12,800 |  | Menominee Tchrs | \$13,925 |  |
| 20 | Wabeno | \$12,750 |  | Lena | \$13,900 | (BF0) |
| 21 | Pembine | \$12,609 |  | Pembine | N/S |  |
| 22 | Lena | \$12,600 |  | Wabeno | \$13,850 |  |
| 23 | White Lake | \$12,525 |  | Crandon | \$13,800 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Lena | \$13,457 | (AFO) |
| 24 | Laona | \$12,380 |  | Laona | \$13,310 |  |
| 25 | Wausaukee | \$12,200 |  | White Lake | \$13,089 |  |
| 26 | Goodman | \$12,066 |  | Goodman | \$12,913 |  |

RANKINGS OF CESA \#8 BENCHMARKS 1983-84 and 1984-85

| RANK | BA 7TH 83-84 SCHOOL NAME | VAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| 1 | Shawano | \$17,705 |
| 2 | Florence | N/S |
| 3 | Niagara | \$17,664 |
| 4 | Oconto Falls | \$17,550 |
| 5 | Crivitz | \$17,533 |
| 6 | Marinette | \$17,477 |
| 7 | Wittenberg | \$17,349 |
| 8 | Peshtigo | \$17,330 |
| 9 | Tigerton | \$17,136 |
| 10 | Pembine | \$17,106 |
| 11 | Bonduel | \$17,031 |
| 12 | Coleman | \$17,020 |
| 13 | Oconto | \$16,910 |
| 14 | Crandon | \$16,808 |
| 15 | Gillet | \$16,790 |
| 16 | Bowler | \$16,771 |

3/ School District of Crandon (Decision No. 20171-A) 6/85, Haferbecker, and Florence County (19382-A) 9/83, Rothstein, cannot be evaluated without full data.

| 17 | Menominee Tchrs | $\$ 16,704$ | 17 | Menominee | Tchrs | $\$ 17,824$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 18 | Wausaukee | $\$ 16,690$ | 18 | Wabeno | $\$ 17,750$ |  |
| 19 | Suring | $\$ 16,678$ | 19 | Suring | $\$ 17,732$ |  |
| 20 | Wabeno | $\$ 16,500$ | 20 | White Lake | $\$ 17,607$ |  |
| 21 | Marion | $\$ 16,412$ | 21 | Lena | N/Info |  |
| 22 | Lena | $\$ 16,350$ | 22 | Marion | $\$ 17,405$ |  |
| 23 | White Lake | $\$ 16,283$ | 23 | C1intonville | $\$ 17,210$ |  |
| 24 | Clintonville | $\$ 16,142$ | 24 | Goodman | $\$ 17,206$ |  |
| 25 | Laona | $\$ 15,870$ | 25 | Laona | $\$ 17,120$ |  |
| 26 | Goodman | $\$ 15,780$ | 26 | Wausaukee | $\$ 16,755(B F 0)$ |  |

## RANKINGS OF CESA \#8 BENCHMARKS 1983-84 and 1984-85

BA MAX 83-84
RANK

| 1 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 |  |


| SCHOOL NAME | VALUE |
| :---: | :---: |
| Crivitz | \$23,222 |
| Peshtigo | \$23,000 |
| Marinette | \$21,987 |
| Florence | N/S |
| Wausaukee | \$21,929 |
| Oconto Falls | \$21,750 |
| Pembine | \$21,604 |
| Wittenberg | \$21,582 |
| Niagara | \$21,418 |
| Coleman | \$21,180 |
| Shawano | \$21,112 |
| Menominee Tchrs | \$20,489 |
| Tigerton | \$20,372 |
| Gillet | \$20,360 |
| Bonduel | \$20,328 |
| Clintonville | \$20,198 |
| Crandon | \$20,148 |
| Oconto | \$20,060 |
| White Lake | \$20,040 |
| Bowler | \$20,017 |
| Suring | \$19,906 |
| Wabeno | \$19,625 |
| Lena | \$19,475 |
| Marion | \$19,468 |
| Laona | \$19,360 |

## RANKINGS OF CESA \#8 BENCHMARKS

 1983-84 and 1984-85MA MIN 83-84
RANK
1
i...

| 13 | Oconto | $\$ 14,660$ | 13 | Oconto | $\$ 15,800$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14 | Marion | $\$ 14,638$ | 14 | Wausaukee | $\$ 15,750$ |  |
| 15 | Bowler | $\$ 14,607$ | 15 | Wabeno | $\$ 15,580$ |  |
| 16 | Menominee Tchrs | $\$ 14,486$ | 16 | Marion | $\$ 15,568$ |  |
| 17 | Wabeno | $\$ 14,450$ | 17 | Bowler | $\$ 15,552$ |  |
| 18 | Suring | $\$ 14,450$ | 18 | Menominee Tchrs | $\$ 15,457$ |  |
| 19 | Clintonville | $\$ 14,410$ | 19 | Clintonville | $\$ 15,410$ |  |
| 20 | White Lake | $\$ 14,404$ | 20 | Suring | $\$ 15,300$ |  |
| 21 | Pembine | $\$ 14,366$ | 21 | Pembine | N/S |  |
| 22 | Crandon | $\$ 14,050$ | 22 | Crandon | $\$ 15,150$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | Lena | $\$ 15,000$ | BF0 |
| 23 | Laona | $\$ 13,830$ | 23 | White Lake | $\$ 14,992$ |  |
| 24 | Lena | $\$ 13,700$ |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | Goodman | $\$ 13,371$ | 25 | Laona | $\$ 14,860$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Lena | $\$ 14,632$ | AF0

## RANKINGS OF CESA \#8 BENCHMARKS

 1983-84 and 1984-85MA MAX 83-84
MA MAX 84-85

| RANK | SCHOOL NAME | VALUE | RANK | SCHOOL NAME | VALUE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Florence | N/S | 1 | Florence | N/S |  |
| 2 | Peshtigo | \$25,075 | 2 | Crivitz | \$27,140 |  |
| 3 | Marinette | \$25,065 | 3 | Peshtigo | \$26,980 |  |
| 4 | Crivitz | \$24,690 | 4 | Marinette | \$26,697 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Wausaukee | \$26,003 | (AF0) |
| 5 | Niagara | \$24,034 | 5 | Niagara | \$25,620 |  |
| 6 | Coleman | \$23,890 |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Wausaukee | \$23,803 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Coleman | \$25,443 | (AF 0) |
| 8 | Shawano | \$23,747 | 8 | Shawano | \$25,291 |  |
| 9 | Clintonville | \$23,642 | 9 | Clintonville | \$25,090 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Coleman | \$24,990 | (BF0) |
| 10 | Bonduel | \$23,570 | 10 | Bondue 1 | N/S |  |
| 11 | Pembine | \$23,531 | 11 | Pembine | N/S |  |
| 12 | Wittenberg | \$23,479 | 12 | Wittenberg | N/S |  |
| 13 | Oconto | \$23,410 | 13 | Oconto Falls | \$25,054 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Wausaukee | \$24,910 |  |
| 14 | Oconto Falls | \$23,335 | 14 | Oconto | \$24,900 |  |
| 15 | Suring | \$23,120 | 15 | Suring | \$24,480 |  |
| 16 | Lena | \$22,660 |  | Lena | \$24,201 | (AF 0) |
|  |  |  |  | Lena | \$23,960 | (BF0) |
| 17 | Menominee Tchrs | \$22,446 | 17 | Menominee Tchrs | \$23,951 |  |
| 18 | Gillett | \$22,265 | 18 | Gillett | \$23,668 |  |
| 19 | Marion | \$22,171 | 19 | White Lake | \$23,549 |  |
| 20 | White Lake | \$21,919 | 20 | Laona | \$23,380 |  |
| 21 | Tigerton | \$21,778 | 21 | Crandon | \$23,329 |  |
| 22 | Laona | \$21,630 | 22 | Tigerton | \$23,293 |  |
| 23 | Crandon | \$21,585 | 23 | Marion | \$23,293 |  |
| 24 | Wabeno | \$21,325 | 24 | Wabeno | \$22,950 |  |
| 25 | Bowler | \$21,099 | 25 | Goodman | \$22,694 |  |
| 26 | Goodman | \$20,384 | 26 | Bowler | \$22,464 |  |

RANKINGS OF CESA \#8 BENCHMARKS
1983-84 and 1984-85
SCHED MAX 83-84

| RANK | SCHOOL NAME | VALUE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Florence | N/S |
| 2 | Marinette | \$27,263 |
| 3 | Crivitz | \$26,086 |
| 4 | Niagara | \$26,037 |
| 5 | Pembine | \$25,578 |
| 6 | Peshtigo | \$25,235 |
| 7 | Bonduel | \$24,726 |
| 8 | Wittenberg | \$24,441 |
| 9 | Coleman | \$24,340 |
| 10 | Clintonville | \$24,327 |


| RANK | SCHOOL NAME | VALUE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Florence | N/S |
| 2 | Marinette | \$29,039 |
| 3 | Crivitz | \$28,434 |
| 4 | Niagara | \$28,287 |
| 5 | Pembine | N/S |
| 6 | Peshtigo | \$27,155 |
| 7 | Bonduel | N/S |
|  | Wausaukee | \$26,665 |
|  | Coleman | \$25,992 |
| 8 | Wittenberg | N/S |
| 10 | Shawano | \$25,828 |


| 11 | Wausaukee | \$24,255 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 | Shawano | \$24,252 | 12 | Clintonville | \$25,800 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Wausaukee | \$25,500 | (BF0) |
| 13 | Oconto | \$23,810 | 13 | Oconto Falls | \$25,489 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Coleman | \$25,443 | (BF0) |
| 14 | Oconto Falls | \$23,765 | 14 | 0conto | \$25,400 |  |
| 15 | Suring | \$23,600 | 15 | Suring | \$25,120 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Lena | \$25,082 | (AF0) |
| 16 | Gillett | \$23,535 | 16 | Gillett | \$25,018 |  |
| 17 | Lena | \$23,485 |  |  |  |  |
| 18 | Menominee Tchrs | \$22,968 | 18 | Crandon | \$24,788 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Lena | \$24,782 | (BF0) |
| 19 | Laona | \$22,860 | 19 | Laona | \$24,700 |  |
| 20 | Crandon | \$22,660 | 20 | Menominee Tchrs | \$24,508 |  |
| 21 | Marion | \$22,599 | 21 | White Lake | \$24,289 |  |
| 22 | White Lake | \$22,545 | 22 | Wabeno | \$23,745 |  |
| 23 | Wabeno | \$22,005 | 23 | Marion | \$23,721 |  |
| 24 | Tigerton | \$21,778 | 24 | Tigerton | \$23,293 |  |
| 25 | Bowler | \$21,640 | 25 | Goodman | \$23,126 |  |
| 26 | Goodman | \$20,685 | 26 | Bowler | \$23,040 |  |

There are 48.04 full time equivilent teachers. Of these, $213 / 4$ are in the areas of the schedule which I conclude are most heavily influenced by the BA plus 7 increase, while 14.8 are in areas influenced by the $B A$ maximum. One person at the $M A+101 e v e l, 7$ at the $M A$ maximum and 3 influenced by the schedule maximum. At the BA +7 level there simply is no justification for the Employer's proposal, while the BA maximum level, the Association's proposal tends to increase the unit's relative rank while the Employer's reduces it.

The Employer has costed the Association's total salary increase at $12.55 \%$ and total package increase at $13.79 \%$. It did not offer a costing of its own package. The Association's data provides a wage increase of $5.6 \%$ for the Employer's and $12.5 \%$ for the Association's offers. No comparisons of comparable calculations were offered. The 1983-84 CPI-U percent charge was $4.7 \%$. As evidenced by Schedule comparisons the Association's offer is definitely higher that the trend in the area and the Employer's offer is obviously low. The Undersigned is not aware of any voluntary settlements at the Association's total package level without significantly unusual considerations not present here. On this record, it is not possible to tell who is more out of line. One Method of estimating, favoring the Employer, by substituting the $5.6 \%$ figure in the Association's equalized level wage per cell increase (Exhibit 3), suggests the Employer's offer is equally as disparate as the Association's, when compared to CESA 8.

In the last collective bargainnging agreement between the parties the Association obtained an increased number of lanes in its schedule. At the higher masters level, this is a model among the Athletic Conference schools but at the BA and early MA levels, this schedule is clearly comparable to most of the Athletic Conference. The following is a comparison.

| Coleman | B | B6 | B12 | B18 | B24 | B 30 | M | M6 | M12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crivetz | B | B6 | B12 | B18 | B24 | MB30 |  | M6,M36 | M12,B42 |
| Gillett | B |  | B12 |  | B24 | MB36 |  |  | M15 |
| Lena | B | B8 | B15 |  | B24 | M |  | M8 | M15 |
| Niagara | B | B6 | B12 | B18 | B24 | MB36 |  | M6,M42 | $\begin{array}{r} M 12,18,24,30 \\ 48,54,60,66 \end{array}$ |
| Peshtigo | B | B6 | B12 | B18 |  | MB30 |  | M6 |  |
| Suring | B | B6 | B12 | B18 | B24 | M |  | M6 | M12 |

Wausaukee

| Assoc. Position | B | B6 | B12 | B18 | B24 | MB30 | M6, B36 | B42,48,54,30 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Employer position | $B$ |  | B12 |  | B24 | M | M12 | M24 |

The Employer's proposals return the schedule to the worst in the Conference. Again, with respect to where the bulk of the teachers are placed in the schedule, there is no comparison justification for the Employer's proposal. The following historical comparison to CESA 8 at the benchmarks establishes that there has been a steady erosion of the once favorable position of the unit held among the comparables.

HISTORICAL RANK ANALYSIS OF CESA \#8 BENCHMARKS COMPARED TO WAUSAUKEE

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Wausaukee } \\ & 1981-82 \\ & \text { CESA 8 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Wausaukee } \\ 1982-83 \\ \text { CESA } 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Wausaukee } \\ \text { 1983-844 } \\ \text { CESA } 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1984-85 \\ & \text { Ass'n } \end{aligned}$ | 1984-85 <br> Board | Ass'n Rank | Board Ranl |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Benchmark | Rank | Rank | Rank | Fin.Offer | Fin.Offer | Change | Change |
| BA+7 Min | 19 | 20 | 25 | 18 | 18 | +7 | +7 |
| BA-7th Step | p 5 | 8 | 18 | 8 | 26 | $+10$ | -8 |
| BA-Max | 1 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 8 | +2 | -3 |
| MA-Min | 25 | 25 | 26 | 14 | 14 | +12 | +12 |
| MA-Max | 4 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 13 | +2 | -6 |
| Scheduled Maximum | 8 | 8 | 11 | 10 | 12 | +1 | -1 |

The Association's position restores its rank at 1982-83 while, the Employer's proposal continues the erosion at the benchmarks most heavily inhabited by the unit. Based on the available evidence it appears the Association's offer is to be slightly preferred.

HEALTH AND DENTAL INSURANCE

## POSITIONS

The Employer seeks to change the existing fully paid health and dental insurance premium payment language to a dollar amount fixed at the amount it will pay in 1984-85. It seeks this change because its health care costs have risen, by, its example, $\$ 112.98$ per month per family in 1981-82 to $\$ 231.38$ per month per family in 1984-85. It argues that its increases have been larger and its ultimate premium far higher than any of its Athletic Conference. It attributes this to its inability to change carrier and the Association's unwillingness to bargain changes in health insurance carriers or reduced coverage. It notes that health insurance increases account for $2 \%$ of total cost, in its final offer package. It argues that pursuant to its final offer, the Association will be able to bargain with respect to 1985-86 health insurance increases.

The Association argues that comparable districts pay full health insurance benefits. It offered testimony that the Employer never sought in negotiation to change carriers or otherwise offer a quid pro quo. It notes that other Wisconsin schools pay more in fringe benefits than Wausaukee.

## DISCUSSION

The comparative data in the athletic conference is as follows:

| School District | Rank | Family Monthly Premium | Percent Paid By Employer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Coleman | (7) | -126.30 | - $100 \%$ |
| Crevitz | (6) | 130.17 | 100\% |
| Suring | (5) | 161.38 | 100\% |
| Niagara | (4) | 168.74 | 100\% |
| Lena | (2) | 179.69 | 100\% |
| Pesgtigo | (1) | 189.26 | 100\% |
| School District | Rank | Family Monthly Premium | Percent Paid By Employer |
| Gillett | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Wausaukee | (3) | 180.80 | 100\% |

Excluding Dental
For comparison purposes the average premium in CESA 8 is \$162.81, no comparative data is available as to dental.

The evidence indicates that the Employer's costs are high. However, the testimony and the position of the Employer strongly suggests the Employer has not yet seriously studied cost cutting measures or attempted to bargain these with the Association. Although the Employer's position appears premature, the nature of its position, making health insurance cost cutting bargainable, appears to be the preferable position under the circumstances.

## POSITIONS

The Association seeks to increase the amount specified in Article XV Sections $A$ and $H$. It notes that a $\$ 500.00$ payment per semester for overloads above five classes has remained since the 1976-77 contract period. It seeks a $10 \%$ increase to $\$ 550.00$ per semester. With respect to the amount paid for lost preparation time in elementary schools, it notes the $\$ 7.50$ amount has been in effect since 1979-80. It seeks an increase of $9.6 \%$ to $\$ 8.20$.

The Employer did not address this issue in its brief.

## DISCUSSION

No comparative data was offered on this subject. Based on changes
in the cost of living the position of the Association is preferable.

## EXTRA-CURRICULAR

The parties stipulated that this issue should not be given any weight by the arbitrator.

> LAYOFF DATE

## Positions of the Parties

The Employer proposes to change the February 9 date specified in Article XVII by which the Employer must notify a teacher of a proposed layoff for the next school year to the statutory date, March 15, /1. It offered no argument as to this issue. The Association Proposes keeping the current provision because it better inables teachers to plan for the insuing year.

## DISCUSSION

A party proposing changed language bears the burden of proving the need for change. The Employer has not met it's burden. Therefore this issue favors the Association.

## TERM

The Employer has proposed a two year agreement, 1984-86, with a 1985-86 reopener for "clarification of three items" for each party. The Association proposed a one year, 1984-85, agreement. The Employer's proposal type of reopener appeared in the parties' last agreement. No comparative data was offered on this subject. In view of the fact that the 1984-85, agreement will expire depending of the rendering of this award, the use of the longer term is to be preferred.

## WEIGHT

The mediator-arbitrator must select a total final offer of one party or the other without modification. It is clear in this case that neither offer of the parties is particularly appropriate. The principle issue in this case is the wage rate. The available information and my experience suggests the total cost of the Associations offer is high, while that of the Employer's is low. Based on the analysis on the available evidence, I conclude the Association's offer on wages is to be preferred as being closer to an appropriate increase. I note that in the succeeding contract a less than comparable total package might be appropriate, because the Association will have a windfall uder this award.

## AWARD

That the final offer of the Association is adopted herein and shall be incorporated in the parties' collective bargainning agreement for the 1984-85 school years.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin this 29th day of July 1985.
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No Toachor shall receive in 1984-1905 less tian 105\% of that toacier's 1303-790r, salary.

APPENDIX C SALARY SCHEDULE $1983 / 84$
itep

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

| $B$ | $B+6$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| $\cdots$ |  |
| 12200 | 12320 |
| 12948 | 13088 |
| 13697 | 13856 |
| 14445 | 14624 |
| 15194 | 15392 |
| 15942 | 16160 |
| 16690 | 16928 |
| 17439 | 17696 |
| 18187 | 18464 |
| 18935 | 19232 |
| 19684 | 20000 |
| 20432 | 20768 |
| 21181 | 21536 |
| 21929 | 22304 |


[^0]:    1/ The parties waived notice of intent to arbitrate.
    2/ During the hearing, the Employer interpreted the term "clarification" to mean "renegotiation".

