RECEIVED

BEFORE THE MEDIATOR-ARBITRATOR

JUL 3 0 1985

WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petition of WAUSAUKEE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

To Initiate Mediation-Arbitration Between Said Petitioner and

SCHOOL DISTRICT OF WAUSAUKEE

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 <u>James A. Morrison</u>, 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)(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:

- 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 $\underline{2}$ /.
- 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.

^{1/} The parties waived notice of intent to arbitrate.

^{2/} During the hearing, the Employer interpreted the term "clarification" to mean "renegotiation".

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 statistically 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 O 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 BA 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 A13 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 O 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

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 definitive set of comparables. The parties have agreed upon the M and O 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 O 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

		1.703-04 4114	1704-03	
RANK	BA MIN 83-84 SCHOOL NAME	VALUE	BA MIN 84-85 RANK SCHOOL NAME	VALUE
1	Marinette	\$14,094	Crivitiz	\$16,204
2	Shawano	\$14,019	Marinette	\$15,012
_			Coleman	\$15,000 (BFO)
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 9	Oconto	\$13,760	Gillet	\$14,648
	Crivitz	\$13,739	Marion	\$14,500
10	Florence	N/S	Florence	N/S
11	Bondue1	\$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 (BFO)
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

	BA 7TH 83-84			BA 7TH 84-85	
RANK	SCHOOL NAME	VALUE	RANK	SCHOOL NAME	VALUE
1	Shawano	\$17,705	1	Crivitz	\$20,301
2	Florence	N/S	2	Florence	N/S
3	Niagara	\$17,664	3	Shawano	\$18,856
4	Oconto Falls	\$17,550	4	Marinette	\$18,615
5	Crivitz	\$17,533	5	Oconto Falls	\$18,562
6	Marinette	\$17,477	6	Peshtigo	\$18,482
		•		Wausaukee	\$18,444 (AFO)
7	Wittenberg	\$17,349	7	Wittenberg	N/S
8	Peshtigo	\$17,330	8	Niagara	\$18,342
9	Tigerton	\$17,136	9	Tigerton	\$18,337
10	Pembine	\$17,106	10	Pembine	N/S
11	Bonduel	\$17,031	11	Bonduel	N/S
12	Coleman	\$17,020	12	Coleman	N/Info
13	Oconto	\$16,910	13	Crandon	\$18,047
14	Crandon	\$16,808	14	Oconto	\$17,950
15	Gillet	\$16,790	15	Bowler	\$17,856
16	Bowler	\$16,771	16	Gillet	\$17,848

^{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	Clintonville	\$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 (BFO)

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

BA MAX 83-84

Goodman

Laona

25

26

BA MAX 84-85

RANK	SCHOOL NAME	VALUE	RANK	SCHOOL NAME	VALUE	
1	Crivitz	\$23,222	1	Crivitz	\$25,286	
				Coleman	\$22,057	(AFO)
2	Peshtigo	\$23,000	2	Peshtigo	\$24,530	(AFO)
				Wausaukee	\$23,629	(AFO)
3	Marinette	\$21,9 87	3	Oconto Falls	\$23,451	
4	Florence	N/S	4	Florence	N/S	
5	Wausaukee	\$21,929				
6	Oconto Falls	\$21,750	6	Marinette	\$23,419	
7	Pembine	\$21,604	7	Pembine	N/S	BF O
8	Wittenberg	\$21,582	8	Wittenberg	N/S	\$23,160
9	Niagara	\$21,418	9	Shawano	\$22,484	
10	Coleman	\$21,180		Niagara	\$22,314	
11	Shawano	\$21,112	11	Coleman	\$22,280	(BFO)
12	Menominee Tchrs	\$20,489	12	Menominee Tchrs	\$21,862	
13	Tigerton	\$20,372	13	Tigerton	\$21,799	
14	Gillet	\$20,360	14	Gillet	\$21,643	
15	Bonduel	\$20,328	15	Bonduel	N/S	
16	Clintonville	\$20,198	16	Crandon	\$21,586	
17	Crandon	\$20,148	17	Clintonville	\$21,490	
18	Oconto	\$20,060	18	White Lake	\$21,372	
19	White Lake	\$20,040	19	Bowler	\$21,312	
20	Bowler	\$20,017	20	Suring	\$21,164	
21	Suring	\$19,906	21	Oconto	\$21,100	
22	Wabeno	\$19,625	22	Wabeno	\$21,000	
23	Lena	\$19,475				
24	Marion	\$19,468	24	Laona	\$20,930	
25	Laona	\$19.360	25	Goodman	\$20,784	

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

25

26

\$19,360

\$18,875

Lena Lena

Goodman

Marion

\$20,930 \$20,784 \$20,779- AFO \$20,775- BFO \$20,545

	MA MIN 83-84			MA MIN 84-85		
RANK	SCHOOL NAME	VALUE	RANK	SCHOOL NAME	VALUE	•
1	Marinette	\$16,067	1	Crivitz'	\$17,676	
2	Florence	N/S	2	Florence	N/S	
3	Coleman	\$15,250				
4	Shawano	\$15,154	4	Marinette	\$17,114	
5	Bonduel	\$15,109	5	Bonduel	N/S	
				Coleman	\$16,350	BF0
				Coleman	\$16,241	AF0
6	Crivitz	\$15,102	6	Shawano	\$16,139	
7	Niagara	\$15,021	7	Niagara	\$16,002	
8	Oconto Falls	\$14,950	8	Tigerton	\$15,901	
9	Wittenberg	\$14,935	9	Wittenberg	N/S	
10	Gillet	\$14,905	10	Oconto Falls	\$15,895	
11	Tigerton	\$14,859	11	Peshtigo	\$15,895	
12	Peshtigo	\$14,770	12	Gillet	\$15,844	

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	BF O
23	Laona	\$13,830	23	White Lake	\$14,992	
24	Lena	\$13,700			•	
25	Goodman	\$13,371	25	Laona	\$14,860	
		•		Lena	\$14,632	AF O
26	Wausaukee	\$12,800	26	Goodman	\$14,157	

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

MA MAX 83-84 SCHOOL NAME VALUE RANK SCHOOL NAME VALUE

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

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

SCHED MAX 83-84 SCHED MAX 84-85

RANK	SCHOOL NAME	VALUE	RANK	SCHOOL NAME	VALUE
1	Florence	N/S	1	Florence	N/S
2	Marinette	\$27,263	2	Marinette	\$29,039
3	Crivitz	\$26,086	3	Crivitz	\$28,434
4	Niagara	\$26,037	4	Niagara	\$28,287
5	PemĎine	\$25,578	5	Pembine	N/S
6	Peshtigo	\$25,235	6	Peshtigo	\$27,155
7	Bonduel	\$24,726	7	Bonduel	N/S
				Wausaukee	\$26,665 (AFO)
				Coleman	\$25,992 (AFO)
8	Wittenberg	\$24,441	8	Wittenberg	N/S
9	Coleman	\$24,340		•	•
10	Clintonville	\$24.327	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		(BF0)
14	Oconto Falls	\$23,765	14	Oconto	\$25,400	
15	Suring	\$23,600	15	Suring	\$25,120	
				Lena	\$25,082	(AFO)
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, 21 3/4 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 BA maximum. One person at the MA + 10 level, 7 at the MA 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	В	B6	B12	B18	B24	B30 M	M6	M12
Crivetz	В	B6	B12	B18	B24	MB30	M6,M36	M12,B42
Gillett	В		B12		B 2 4	MB36		M15
Lena	В	B8	B15		B 2 4	M	M8	M15
Niagara	В	B 6	B12	B18	B 2 4	MB36	M6,M42	M12,18,24,30 48,54,60,66
Peshtigo	В	B6	B12	B18		MB30	M6	• •
Suring	В	B 6	B12	B18	B24	М	M6	M12
Mausaukoo						·		

Wausaukee								
Assoc. Position	В	B6	B12	B18	B 2 4	MB30	M6,B36	B42,48,54,30
Employer Position	В		B12		B 2 4	М	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

، ہم ک≨

Wausaukee Wausaukee Wausaukee 1984-85 1984-85 1981-82 1982-83 1983-84 Ass'n CESA 8 CESA 8 CESA 8 Board Ass'n Rank Board Ranl Rank Fin.Offer Fin.Offer Change Change Rank Benchmark Rank BA+7 Min 18 18 19 20 25 +7 BA-7th Step 26 +10 -8 5 8 18 8 BA-Max 2 5 3 8 +2 -3 1 MA-Min 25 26 14 14 +12 +12 25 5 5 13 7 +2 -6 MA-Max 4 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
School District	Rank		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%
		Family Monthly	Percent Paid By
School District	Rank	Premium	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.

OVERLOAD PAYMENTS

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.

Stanley H. Michelstetter II

Mediator-Arbitrator

SALARY SCHEDULE 1984 185 APPENDIX B A, Association Proposal Schodule A prondek B+6 B+12 B+18 B+24 B+30 B+36 B+42 B+48 B+54 M+6 M+12 M+24 M M+18 M+30 14000 14350 14700 15050 15400 15750 15829 15908 15987 16066 16145 14741 15100 15460 15819 16179 16539 16622 16705 16788 16870 16953 15481 15851 16220 16589 16958 17327 17414 17501 17588 17675 17762 16222 16601 16980 17358 17737 18116 18207 18298 18389 18479 18570 16963 17351 17740 18128 18516 18905 19000 19094 19189 19284 19379 3 5 6 17703 18101 18499 18897 19295 19693 19792 19891 19990 20088 20187 7 18444 18852 19259 19667 20075 20482 20585 20688 20790 20893 20996 8 19185 19602 20019 20436 20854 21271 21378 21484 21591 21698 21804 19926 20352 20779 21206 21633 22060 22170 22281 22391 22502 22613 9 20666 21103 21539 21975 22412 22848 22963 23077 23192 23307 23421 21407 21853 22299 22745 23191 23637 23755 23874 23993 24111 24230 22148 22603 23059 23514 23970 24426 24548 24671 24793 24916 25038 22888 23354 23819 24284 24749 25214 25341 25467 25594 25720 25847 10 11 12 14 23629 24104 24579 25053 25528 26003 26133 26264 26394 26525 26655

Ĉ . .

8-13: St

Page 20F2

Appendix B, Employer Proposed Schedule

	BS	BS+12	BS+24	MS	MS+12	MS+24	
1.00	14000.00	14525.00	15050.00	15750.00	16045.00	16340.00	>
1.50	14184.00	14709.00	15234.00	15934.00	16229.00	16524.00	
2.00	14368.00	14893.00	15418.00	16118.00	16413.00	16708.00	63
2.50	14552.00	15077.00	15602.00	16302.00	16597.00	16892.00	\sim \sim
3.00	14736.00	15261.00	15786.00	16486.00	16781.00	17076.00	
3.50	14920.00	15445.00	15970.00	16670.00	16965.00	17260.00	30 2
4.00	15104.00	15629.00	16154.00	16854.00	17149.00	17444.00	~ ~
4.50	15288.00	15813.00	16338.00	17038.00	17333.00	17628.00	^ >1
5.00	15472.00	15997.00	16522.00	17222.00	17517.00	17812.00	1
5.50	15656.00	16181.00	16706.00	17406.00	17701.00	17996.00	_
6.00	15840.00	16365.00	16890.00	17590.00	17885.00	18180.00	00.
6.50	16297.50	16822.50	17347.50	18047.50	18342.50	18637.50	4
7.00	16755.00	17280.00	17805.00	18505.00	18800.00	19095.00	g / -=
7.50	17212.50	17737.50	18262.50	18962.50	19257.50	19552.50	~
8.00	17670.00	18195.00	18720.00	19420.00	19715.00	20010.00	2
8.50	18127.50	18652.50	19177.50	19877.50	20172.50	20467.50	5 W
9-,00	18585.00	19110.00	19635.00	20335.00	20630.00	20925.00	-
9.50	19042.50	19567.50	20092.50	20792.50	21087.50	21382.50	E - L
10.00	19500.00	20025.00	20550.00	21250.00	21545.00	21840.00	ν - '
10.50	19957.50	20482.50	21007.50	21707.50 "	22002.50	22297.50	
11.00	20415.00	20940.00	21465.00	22165.00	22460.00	22755.00	0
11.50	20872.50	21397.50	21922.50	22622.50	22917.50	23212.50	Z.
12.00	21330.00	21855.00	22380.00_	23080.00	23375.00	23670.00	
12.50	21787.50	22312.50	22837.50	23537.50	23832.50	24127.50	, a
13.00	22245.00	22770.00	23295.00	23995.00	24290.00	24585.00	
13.50	22702.50	23227 . 50	23752.50	24452.50	24747.50	25042.50	
14.00	23160.00	23685.00	24210.00	24910.00	25205.00	25500.00	
Sub Total	389622.00	282348.90	90435.00	167050-00	25205.00	74212.50	4

No Teacher shall receive in 1984-1985 less than 198% of that teacher's 1983-1984 salary.

APPENDIX C SALARY SCHEDULE 1983/84

itep	В	B+6	B+12	B+18	B+24	B+30	B+36	B+42	B+48	B+54	B+60
						М	M+6	M+12	M+18	M+24	M+30
1	12200	12320	12440	12560	12680	12800	12849	12897	12946	12994	13043
2	12948	13088	13228	13367	13507	13646	13698	13750	13802	13854	13902
3	13697	13856	14015	14174	14334	14493	14548	14603	14658	14713	14762
4	14445	14624	14803	14982	15160	15339	15397	15456	15514	15572	15621
5	15194	15392	15590	15789	15987	16186	16247	16308	16370	16431	16480
6	15942	16160	16378	16596	16814	17032	17097	17161	17226	17291	17339
7	16690	16928	17166	17403	17641	17878	17946	18014	18082	18150	18199
8	17439	17696	17953	18210	18467	18725	18796	18867	18938	19009	19058
9	18187	18464	18741	19017	19294	19571	19645	19720	19794	19868	19917
10	18935	19232	19528	19825	20121	20417	20495	20573	20650	20728	20776
1.7	19684	20000	20316	20632	20948	21264	21345	21425	21506	21587	21635
12	20432	20768	21103	21439	21775	22110	22194	22278	22362	22446	22495
13	21181	21536	21891	22246	22601	22957	23044	23131	23218	23305	23354
14	21929	22304	22679	23053	23428	23803	23893	23984	24074	24165	24255