

STATE OF WISCONSIN
BEFORE THE MEDIATOR/ARBITRATOR

RECEIVED

JUN 17 1985

RECORDS SECTION
EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION

In the Matter of the
Mediation/Arbitration Between

WESTBY AREA EDUCATION
ASSOCIATION

and

WESTBY AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT

Case 11
No. 33577 Med/Arb-2849
Decision No. 22087-A

Sharon Imes
Mediator/Arbitrator

APPEARANCES:

Thomas C. Bina, Executive Director, Coulee Region United Educa-
tors, appearing on behalf of the Westby Area Education Association.

Karl L. Monson, Consultant, Wisconsin Association of School
Boards, Inc., appearing on behalf of the Westby Area School District.

ARBITRATION HEARING BACKGROUND AND JURISDICTION:

On December 3, 1984, the undersigned was notified by the Wis-
consin Employment Relations Commission of appointment as mediator/
arbitrator pursuant to Section 111.70(4)(cm)6 of the Municipal Em-
ployment Relations Act in the matter of impasse between the Westby
Area Education Association, hereinafter referred to as the Associa-
tion, and the Westby Area School District, hereinafter referred to
as the District or the Employer. Pursuant to statutory require-
ment, mediation proceedings were conducted between the parties on
February 12, 1985. Mediation failed to resolve the impasse and the
parties agreed to proceed to arbitration the same day. At that
time the parties were given full opportunity to present relevant
evidence and make oral argument. Post hearing briefs were filed
with and exchanged through the arbitrator on March 21, 1985.

THE FINAL OFFERS:

The remaining issue at impasse between the parties is salary.
The final offers of the parties are attached as Appendix "A" and
"B".

STATUTORY CRITERIA:

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

POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES:

While both parties agree the Coulee Athletic Conference should
be the appropriate set of comparables, each proposes additional
districts since only three of the athletic conference districts were
settled at the time of hearing. The Association proposes the com-
parables consist of the three settled conference districts; three
contiguous non-conference districts, La Farge, La Crosse and Viroqua,
and the Sparta School District. Initially, the Association also
proposed Richland Center be included among the comparables but with-
drew it from consideration in the brief. The District proposes the
comparables be expanded to include Viroqua, Blair and Melrose-
Mindoro.

The District argues the inclusion of Sparta and Richland Center as comparables is inappropriate since their size and geographic location make them less similar in comparability to Westby. The District also contends La Crosse and La Farge should not be considered comparable districts. It argues La Crosse is an urban industrialized area which is significantly different from districts like Westby and it posits La Farge's financial situation is so unique its settlements are "out-of-line with the comparable settlements." Finally, the District suggests Arcadia should be dropped from the comparables for purposes of this arbitration since its 1984-85 settlement may yet be adjusted, dependent upon the conference settlements, a condition which creates a "statistically unsound" basis for comparison purposes.

The Association states, in its brief, the parties agreed, during the hearing, to the inclusion of La Farge, La Crosse and Viroqua as comparables, but notes the District will probably argue the La Crosse and La Farge districts should be given less consideration as comparables. The Association argues the five-year trend in salary and fringe benefit adjustments comparison among these districts shows their relative positions have remained the same, thus, there is no reason to exclude them as comparables. The Association also urges, however, the rejection of Blair and Melrose-Mindoro as comparables. As support for its position, it states even the District did not believe they were comparable since it did not include them in the data presented at hearing but proposed them later.

As to the merits of the dispute, the Association argues that to properly evaluate the final offers the teaching staff, its experience, its training and its placement upon the salary schedule must be considered. Noting 69% of the staff are at their column maximums and that the majority of them receive only residual longevity acquired before 1980-81, the Association concludes it is justified in making an effort to provide more equity at the top of the schedule this year, particularly, since no health insurance cost increases accrue to the District.

Stating the 1979-81 collective bargaining agreement was settled by an arbitrator in favor of the Association with a finding that the Association's offer did not substantially change the prior ranking of the District among the comparables, the Association asserts more than a single year must be considered in order to properly evaluate the quality of the final offers and because of the arbitrator's finding it is appropriate to use 1979-80 as the base year for comparison purposes. The primary argument of the Association is that the veteran staff in Westby, as the result of the 1981 arbitration award, is no longer keeping pace with the comparables. Stating it does not believe it is good public policy to structure salary offers which discourage teachers from improving their educational backgrounds, the Association posits the District's offer continues the erosion which has occurred at the top of the scale since 1981. It continues it has no option but to raise the BA base column in order to halt the erosion in the masters' lanes since the re-opening in the 1983-85 contract only allows consideration of the salary base.

Primarily relying upon comparisons, the Association ranks the seven districts it proposes as comparables considering both salary only and salary and fringe benefit costs. Making such comparisons, it concludes the situation in Westby has deteriorated over the past five years and that the District's proposal would further erode the relationship to the average among the comparables while the Association's offer would maintain the previous year's ranking. In its overall compensation comparisons, the Association states the comparisons show fringe benefit payments to have fallen more dramatically in Westby than among the comparables and argues this drop in compensation at the benefit level, together with the decrease in wages, causes such a significant deterioration that it is incumbent upon the Association to take steps to correct the situation now.

Stating neither offer will remedy the loss experienced when the longevity provision was removed, the Association continues its offer attempts to reduce the level of erosion which has occurred for the veteran teachers. It adds that with only the BA base to negotiate

5

this year, it is extremely difficult to provide this equity. Because of the restriction, the Association argues the situation can only be corrected by inflating the compensation at the BA and beginning levels of the schedule. The Association adds it believes this inflation to be a fatal flaw in its proposal since 73.9% of the teachers are at the top of the schedule and very few are at the BA base. It continues, however, that while "there are cheaper ways to provide the equity", the employer's reluctance to consider any new approach has prevented such consideration. In support of its argument that there are "cheaper ways," it cites actions taken in Viroqua and Black River Falls where the parties agreed to apply an across-the-board salary increase and forego advance of an increment for a year.

The Association, citing wage losses compared to the cost-of-living increases since 1979-80, declares it realizes the impossibility of gaining an actual cost-of-living raise during periods of high inflation but argues that it must make some inroads during low inflationary periods in order to break even, thus, its salary cost increase should not be rejected although inflation is low this year. It also states that at least one arbitrator has taken the position that a better criterion for measuring the cost-of-living is the amount of wage increases offered by comparable employers during the same period of time and continues that if this method is used, its offer is consistent with the increases among the comparables. The Association concludes its offer is supported by either standard.

In addition to its arguments in support of its position, the Association objects to the inclusion of several District exhibits and urges they not be considered. Among the exhibits are documents presented in testimony by the District Superintendent and the exhibit relating to the recent history of La Farge. Other objections are made as to the inclusion or exclusion of certain data in other exhibits also.

The District, citing the criteria set forth in the statute, argues its offer is particularly supported by the interest and welfare; the cost-of-living, and the comparables criteria. Stating the rural economy, particularly the dairy-farming industry, has been steadily decreasing, a factor which impacts on other businesses in the area, the District contends that while it is not making an "inability to pay" argument, it believes a "difficulty to pay" concept should be considered. In regard to the cost-of-living criterion, the District posits the cost-of-living increase in calendar year, 1984 was 3.5% under the U.S. Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers index and that the inflation rate from the time the 1983-84 salary provision expired until January 1, 1985, was only 1.5%. Consequently, the District asserts its offer sufficiently satisfies the cost-of-living criterion.

Relying upon comparables, the District asserts the dollar and percent increases among its proposed comparables compared with the final offers of the parties in this District leads to the conclusion that the District's offer is most comparable when compared with the average at the standardly accepted benchmark positions. It continues that if other benchmarks toward the top of the schedule are compared because the majority of teachers in the District are at the lane maximums, its offer is still most comparable. The District adds that when rankings are considered, the rankings show the District's staggered increment system benefits those teachers who are either at or approaching the maximums, thus, it concludes its offer is the one which is more reasonable.

DISCUSSION:

Although the parties each agree the Coulee Athletic Conference is the appropriate set of comparables, each has reason for adding other districts. The undersigned concludes the districts used for comparison purposes shall be Arcadia, Black River Falls, Onalaska, West Salem, Holmen and Viroqua. Among these districts, Arcadia, Black River Falls, Onalaska and Viroqua are settled. The remaining two districts, both among the conference schools, have final offers certified. While it is recognized final offers do not determine the actual outcome within a district, it is assumed that settlement, if it does occur, will be somewhere between the two final

offers and that if the parties proceed to arbitration, one of the final offers will be selected. In making comparisons to determine the reasonableness of the final offers in this matter, the Association's positions in the other final offers were used since the figures sought by the Association represent the probable maximum benchmark dollar amounts likely to be achieved in any of the districts.

While various arguments were advanced for the inclusion of La Crosse, La Farge, Sparta, Melrose-Mindoro, and Blair, it was determined these districts should not be included among the comparables. The La Crosse School District was excluded from comparison, even though the Association asserts the relationships between the La Crosse School District and the Westby School District has remained constant over a five-year period, because La Crosse is demographically different. While it is tempting to insert La Farge as a comparable, since it is a conference school and shares many demographic characteristics, it is determined the district is substantially different from the rest of the conference schools in the manner in which it has compensated its teachers. Sparta was excluded from the comparables because it is much larger than most of the districts considered comparable. While it is recognized that the communities like Sparta, Blair and Melrose-Mindoro are quite similar to the Westby District demographically and, in fact, are contiguous to some of the conference schools, it is determined the three settled districts and the final offers in two other districts in the conference, together with Viroqua, a district both parties agree is comparable, are a sufficient number of districts to provide a data base for making comparisons in determining which final offer is reasonable.

One final comment should be made about comparisons as they relate to the Arcadia School District. It is understood the Arcadia School District has reached a settlement wherein its benchmarks may increase as the result of settlements with the conference districts. Thus, when comparisons are made, the comparisons are made taking into consideration there may be a slight variance in the final outcome.

Before determining which of the final offers is more reasonable, the background regarding how the parties have arrived at their current positions should be considered. The parties in this District have been to mediation/arbitration at least two times prior to the instant matter, once in 1979 to determine the 1979-81 collective bargaining agreement and once in 1981 to determine the 1981-83 collective bargaining agreement. The 1979-81 collective bargaining agreement decision was awarded to the Association and the 1981-83 collective bargaining agreement decision was awarded to the District. In both instances, the salary was determined for two years and longevity was an issue. The longevity provision was removed from the 1981-83 contract as the result of the arbitration decision. In 1983-84, the parties reached a voluntary agreement on a 1983-85 collective bargaining agreement. In their voluntary agreement, the parties not only agreed upon the language provisions for 1983-85 and the salary in 1983-84, they also agreed to a 1984-85 re-opener on the salary base only. It is this re-opener which is the subject of the instant arbitration.

The Association argues that since the arbitrator, in the 1979-81 decision, found the Association's offer made very little impact upon its relationship with the conference districts, it is appropriate to use the position established in the 1979-81 agreement as the basis for making comparisons to date. Consequently, it submits data over a five-year period and argues the change in relationship during this period of time justifies its current final offer. While the District does not specifically dispute the five-year comparison, it only submits data for the past three years. The undersigned, in determining which of the final offers is more reasonable, has chosen to look at the benchmark positions established as the result of the 1979-81 collective bargaining agreement, the benchmark positions established as the result of the 1981-83 collective bargaining agreement and the benchmark positions established as the result of the voluntary agreement in 1983-84. Conclusions drawn in this compari-

son relate to the graph which is provided at the end of this decision and attached as Appendix "C". When a comparison of the average benchmark positions established in the 1979-81 agreement is made with the average benchmark positions established as a result of the 1981-83 agreement, it is determined the District lost ground among the comparables at the following benchmarks: the BA Minimum, the BA Maximum, the MA Minimum, the MA Maximum and the Schedule Maximum.

AVERAGED BENCHMARK POSITIONS
COMPARED TO THE COMPARABLES AVERAGE SALARY

1979-81*

Benchmarks	Relationship to the Comparables Average	Rank**
BA Minimum	Averaged 0.7% below	6
BA/Step 7	Averaged 1.4% above	5
BA Maximum	Averaged 4.8% above	2
MA Minimum	Averaged 2.5% below	6
MA/Step 10	Averaged 1.2% above	4
MA Maximum	Averaged 1.5% above	3
Schedule Maximum	Averaged 1.2% below	5

* In addition to maintaining similar comparability, the teachers at the maximums within the District also received a longevity payment.

** The number identifying rank refers to the rank of the District during the second year of the two year agreement.

* * * * *

AVERAGED BENCHMARK POSITIONS
COMPARED TO THE COMPARABLES AVERAGE SALARY

1981-83*

Benchmarks	Relationship to the Comparables Average	Rank**
BA Minimum	Averaged 1.4% below	6
BA/Step 7	Averaged 1.4% above	3
BA Maximum	Averaged 4.4% above	3
MA Minimum	Averaged 3.4% below	7
MA/Step 10	Averaged 1.1% above	5
MA Maximum	Averaged 0.4% above	4
Schedule Maximum	Averaged 3.0% below	6

* As a result of this collective bargaining agreement, not only did the maximum positions begin to decline but the teachers at the maximums lost ground in relationship to the previous year within the District since there was no increase in the longevity provision.

** The rank is that maintained at the during 1983.

Further, even at the MA/Step 10 benchmark, where the decision resulted in the benchmark averaging approximately the same as it did in 1979-81, the rank dropped. This means that while the relationship to the average remained the same, more districts among the comparables improved this position to a greater extent than did the District during this period of time. In addition, it should be remebered the longevity provision for those teachers at the top end

of the schedule was removed from the schedule so that the majority of teachers, while they continued to receive their previous longevity increase, no longer received additional increases in longevity. This means that while they may have lost some ground in comparison with other teachers who have similar experience and training, they lost even more ground in comparison with teachers in their own district since the increases they received were less than the increases received by teachers who were still able to move within the schedule.

In 1983-84, the parties voluntarily reached agreement. The agreement had the following impact upon the benchmark comparability.

EFFECT OF THE 1983-84 AGREEMENT ON THE RELATIONSHIP AMONG THE COMPARABLES

Benchmark	Relationship to the Comparables Average	Rank
BA Minimum	0.7% below	5
BA/Step 7	1.8% above	3
BA Maximum	4.7% above	2
MA Minimum	3.0% below	5
MA/Step 10	1.0% above	3
MA Maximum	0.3% below	5
Schedule Maximum	2.0% below	5

As a result, it is noted the District improved its position at the following benchmarks: the BA Minimum, the BA/Step 7, the BA Maximum, and the Schedule Maximum. At the MA Minimum and the MA/Step 10 positions, while there was no improvement over the positions established in 1981-83, the rank improved which means this District, while it did not change its relationship to the average, gave a larger increase at these benchmarks than did several of the districts. At the MA Maximum position, while there was no change in the relationship established in 1981-83, the rank dropped, an indication of further deterioration at this benchmark position.

In comparison to the 1979-81 collective bargaining agreement, the 1983-84 voluntary agreement improved upon the BA/Step 7 benchmark. Further, it closely approximated the BA Minimum, the BA Maximum, the MA Minimum and the MA/Step 10 positions. In the remaining positions, there is still need for improvement in order to return the district to the position it maintained at the MA Maximum and Schedule Maximum positions in 1979-81.

Considering the parties' final offers, it is determined that in relationship to the positions established in 1979-81, together with the improvement agreed upon voluntarily in 1983-84, the District's offer is the more reasonable. The District's offer improves its position among the comparables at the BA Minimum, the BA/Step 7, the BA Maximum, the MA Minimum, and the MA Maximum positions and maintains the position agreed upon in 1983-84 at the MA/Step 10 and the Schedule Maximum positions. While it would be desirable that the District's offer improve upon the maximum positions, particularly at the Schedule Maximum position, since the teachers in the District no longer receive longevity increases and the majority of the teachers are at the maximums, the failure of the District to address this improvement in any greater capacity is not sufficient to determine the Association's final offer is preferable.

The Association's offer returns the District to its 1979-81 positions at both the MA Maximum and Schedule Maximum benchmarks. In order to do so, however, it makes more substantial improvements at all of the other benchmarks. The Association argues it is justified in doing this since the salary base is the only item subject to negotiation and since the health insurance costs are not a significant factor in the District's cost this year. There is no argument that teachers in the District have not fared well, compared to their previous improvements. Not only have they lost ground at the maximum positions compared to the other districts within the confer-

ence, but they have lost their longevity increases so the individual increases among the teachers within the District at the maximums is less. This loss, however, is not sufficient to justify a finding of reasonableness in regard to the Association's offer when the result would be a substantial modification in the benchmark relationships among the comparables.

EFFECT OF THE FINAL OFFERS ON THE RELATIONSHIP*
AMONG THE COMPARABLES

<u>Benchmark</u>	<u>District's Final Offer</u>	<u>Association's Final Offer</u>	<u>Rank</u>
BA Minimum	1.4% above	2.4% above	3
BA/Step 7	3.3% above	4.4% above	2
BA Maximum	6.2% above	7.2% above	2
MA Minimum	2.3% below	1.3% below	6/4
MA/Step 10	1.1% above	2.1% above	4/3
MA Maximum	0.5% above	1.4% above	5
Schedule Maximum	2.0% below	1.1% below	4/5

* In determining the average for the comparables, the Association's final offers were used. When the rank is indicated as 6/4, the first number indicates rank under the District's final offer and the second number indicates rank under the Association's final offer.

While the undersigned would concur with the Association that teachers should be compensated for their education and their experience, the purpose of establishing comparables is that teachers at similar steps in education and experience should be paid somewhat similar in districts which are comparable. In this case, the District's proposal more closely approximates the comparability established in the past. It is a shame that the base salary is the only item which is open for negotiations in 1984-85 since it would be preferable to accomplish a salary compenstion which is more equitable for those teachers at the maximums within the schedule. It must be noted, however, that the parties reached this agreement themselves on this matter, specifically, in 1983-84. It cannot now be used as the basis for achieving a wage increase which would not only achieve equity for those teachers at the maximums but would significantly modify the schedule. It is the opinion of the undersigned that limited re-openers should not be used to attempt to redress major failings within a salary schedule. If this is allowed, it creates its own multi-headed monster and effectively negates the intent of the statutory criteria.

Although the Association demonstrates a significant increase in the salary schedule would not be any more costly to the District than settlements in the comparable districts have cost those districts and that it has fewer benefits or benefits for which the District pays less than the comparables, these facts cannot justify a wage increase which is larger than other wage increases among the comparables just because the cost to the District is not as great. While it is true that overall compensation is a factor to be considered when determining the comparability, when parties agree to benefits such as life insurance, health insurance, vision insurance, etc., they do so taking into consideration the cost of these benefits as they relate to wage rate increases and oftentimes opt for lesser wage rate increases in order to secure such benefits or in other instances opt for less benefits in order to secure greater wage increases. It is not appropriate, therefore, in a year when wage re-opener is the only re-opener, that the parties look to the benefits and argue fewer benefits or less costly benefits is reason sufficient for providing a larger than normal increase in wages when it is the parties' policy to bargain wages and benefits similar to those in other districts.

Based upon the foregoing arguments and discussion, and a finding that the District's offer is preferable at the BA Minimum, BA/Step 7, BA Maximum, MA Minimum and MA/Step 10 benchmarks and based upon a review of the data in relationship to the statutory criteria and after having reviewed the arguments, the undersigned issues the following:

AWARD

The final offer of the District regarding the 1984-85 salary increase shall be incorporated into the 1983-85 collective bargaining agreement as required by statute.

Dated this 11th day of June, 1985, at La Crosse, Wisconsin.



Sharon K. Imes
Mediator/Arbitrator

SKI:mls

APPENDIX "A"

Name of Case: Westby Area School District
Case No. 33577 Med/Inf. 2547

The following, or the attachment hereto, constitutes our final offer for the purposes of municipal interest arbitration pursuant to Section 111.77 of the Municipal Employment Relations Act. A copy of such final offer has been submitted to the other party involved in this proceeding, and the undersigned has received a copy of the final offer of the other party. Each page of the attachment hereto has been initialed by me.

10/16/84
(Date)

Karl E. Johnson
(Representative)

On Behalf of: Westby Area School District

501 - 0 111

0144

C
335

	Y	Z	AA	AB	AC	AD	AE	AF	AG
24									
25									
26									
27									
28									
29									
30	-----								
31	1669070	54538	49876	1773484	122572	202178	91792	1299	417841
32	-----								

Grand Total: 2191325

10/16/84
10/18/84 KX 111

Printed. 07/31/84

1985 SALARY SCHEDULE

Step	BA	BA+6	BA+12	BA+18	BA+24	BA+30	NA	NA+6	NA+12
0	14355	14480	14605	14730	14855	14980	15105	15230	15355
1	14929	15059	15189	15319	15449	15579	15709	15839	15969
2	15503	15638	15773	15908	16043	16178	16313	16448	16583
3	16078	16218	16358	16498	16638	16778	16918	17058	17198
4	16652	16797	16942	17087	17232	17377	17522	17667	17812
5	17226	17412	17563	17713	17863	18013	18164	18314	18464
6	17872	18028	18183	18339	18494	18650	18806	18961	19117
7	18482	18643	18804	18965	19126	19287	19448	19609	19770
8	19092	19258	19425	19591	19757	19923	20090	20256	20422
9	19702	19874	20045	20217	20388	20560	20732	20903	21075
10	20348	20525	20703	20880	21057	21234	21411	21589	21766
11	20994	21177	21360	21543	21725	21908	22091	22274	22457
12	21640	21829	22017	22205	22394	22582	22771	22959	23148
13							23451	23645	23839

APPENDIX "B"

Name of Case: Westby Area Sch. District
Case X 77 11-77 Med 11/16/84

The following, or the attachment hereto, constitutes our final offer for the purposes of municipal interest arbitration pursuant to Section 111.77 of the Municipal Employment Relations Act. A copy of such final offer has been submitted to the other party involved in this proceeding, and the undersigned has received a copy of the final offer of the other party. Each page of the attachment hereto has been initialed by me.

10/16/84
(Date)

Thomas C. Berni
(Representative)

On Behalf of: Westby Area Education Assn.

YEAR 1985
BASE 14502

PRINTED
10/15/84

SALARY SCHEDULE

Handwritten notes:
4... 11

BA		MA		STEP	BA	BA+6	BA+12	BA+18	BA+24	BA+30	MA	MA+6	MA+12
0	14502	0	15252	0	14502	14627	14752	14877	15002	15127	15252	15377	15502
6	14627	6	15377	1	15082	15212	15342	15472	15602	15732	15862	15992	16122
12	14752	12	15502	2	15662	15797	15932	16067	16202	16337	16472	16607	16742
18	14877			3	16242	16382	16522	16662	16802	16942	17082	17222	17362
24	15002			4	16822	16967	17112	17257	17402	17547	17692	17837	17982
30	15127			5	17439	17589	17739	17890	18040	18190	18341	18491	18641
0	1.04	0	1.04	6	18055	18211	18366	18522	18677	18833	18989	19144	19300
1	1.08	1	1.08	7	18671	18832	18993	19154	19315	19476	19637	19798	19959
2	1.12	2	1.12	8	19288	19454	19620	19786	19953	20119	20285	20451	20618
3	1.16	3	1.16	9	19904	20076	20247	20419	20590	20762	20933	21105	21276
4	1.2025	4	1.2025	10	20557	20734	20911	21088	21265	21443	21620	21797	21974
5	1.245	5	1.245	11	21209	21392	21575	21758	21940	22123	22306	22489	22672
6	1.2875	6	1.2875	12	21862	22050	22239	22427	22616	22804	22992	23181	23369
7	1.33	7	1.33	13							23679	23873	24067
8	1.3725	8	1.3725										
9	1.4175	9	1.4175										
10	1.4625	10	1.4625										
11	1.5075	11	1.5075										
12		12	1.5525										

FICA .07
STRS .114

NAME	DEGREE B=1M=2	CREDITS	FTE	YRS EXP	SALARY STEP	BASE SALARY	LONGEVITY	EXTRA	TOTAL SALARY	FICA	STRS	HEALTH INSUR.	LIFE INSUR.
TOTALS:			78.5000			1685343	54538	50712	1790593	123756	204128	91792	1299

GRAND TOTAL: 2211567

Handwritten notes:
B 10/14/84
A/S in 10/16/84

COMPARISON OF COMPARABLES AVERAGE SALARY*

	<u>BA MINIMUM</u>						<u>BA/STEP 7</u>						<u>BA MAXIMUM</u>					
	<u>79-80</u>	<u>80-81</u>	<u>81-82</u>	<u>82-83</u>	<u>83-84</u>	<u>84-85</u>	<u>79-80</u>	<u>80-81</u>	<u>81-82</u>	<u>82-83</u>	<u>83-84</u>	<u>84-85</u>	<u>79-80</u>	<u>80-81</u>	<u>81-82</u>	<u>82-83</u>	<u>83-84</u>	<u>84-85</u>
Average	10,064	10,869	11,876	12,890	13,500	14,159	12,262	13,222	14,385	15,596	16,388	17,295	14,309	15,521	16,930	18,328	19,293	20,386
Westby	10,035	10,700	11,800	12,610	13,400		12,494	13,322	14,691	15,699	16,683		15,128	16,130	17,789	19,010	20,201	
District Association						14,355						17,872						21,640
						14,502						18,055						21,862
Difference	29	-169	-76	-280	-100	196/343	232	100	306	103	295	577/760	819	609	859	682	908	1254/1476
Percentage	0.2%	-1.6%	-0.6%	-2.2%	-0.7%	1.4%/2.4%	1.9%	0.8%	2.1%	0.7%	1.8%	3.3%/4.4%	5.7%	3.9%	5.1%	3.7%	4.7%	6.2%/7.2%
Rank	5	6	5	6	5	3	2	5	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	2

	<u>MA MINIMUM</u>						<u>MA/STEP 10</u>						<u>MA MAXIMUM</u>					
	<u>79-80</u>	<u>80-81</u>	<u>81-82</u>	<u>82-83</u>	<u>83-84</u>	<u>84-85</u>	<u>79-80</u>	<u>80-81</u>	<u>81-82</u>	<u>82-83</u>	<u>83-84</u>	<u>84-85</u>	<u>79-80</u>	<u>80-81</u>	<u>81-82</u>	<u>82-83</u>	<u>83-84</u>	<u>84-85</u>
Average	10,939	11,867	12,896	13,933	14,595	15,458	14,490	15,681	16,945	18,258	19,231	20,507	16,316	17,709	19,300	20,807	21,906	23,345
Westby	10,785	11,450	12,550	13,360	14,150		14,802	15,715	17,225	18,337	19,421		16,744	17,776	19,484	20,741	21,968	
District Association						15,105						20,732						23,451
						15,252						20,933						23,679
Difference	-154	-417	-346	-573	-445	-353/-206	312	34	280	79	190	225/426	428	67	114	-66	62	106/334
Percentage	-1.4%	-3.5%	-2.7%	-4.1%	-3.0%	-2.3%/-1.3%	2.2%	0.2%	1.7%	0.4%	1.0%	1.1%/2.1%	2.6%	0.4%	1.0%	-0.3%	0.3%	0.5%/1.4%
Rank	6	6	5	7	5	2/4	2	4	3	5	3	2/3	3	3	4	4	4	5

	<u>SCHEDULE MAXIMUM</u>					
	<u>79-80</u>	<u>80-81</u>	<u>81-82</u>	<u>82-83</u>	<u>83-84</u>	<u>84-85</u>
Average	16,854	18,494	20,193	21,664	22,809	24,133
Westby	16,938	17,970	19,678	20,935	22,356	
District Association						23,839
						24,067
Difference	84	-524	-515	-729	-453	-494/-266
Percentage	0.5%	-2.8%	-2.6%	-3.4%	-2.0%	-2.0%/-1.1%
Rank	4	5	5	6	5	5

*Districts: Arcadia
Black River Falls
Onalaska
Viroqua
West Salem (Assn.)
Holmen (Assn.)