EDWARD B. KRINSKY, INC.
EDWARD B. KRINSKY, ARBITRATOR
2021 CHAMBERLAIN AVENUE
MADISON, WISCONSIN 53705
(608) 257-1060 OR 231-1898

* *

In the Matter of Mediation-Arbitration Between

The School District of Campbellsport

-and-

Campbellsport Education Association

Case 9 No. 33916
MED/ARB-2971
Decision No. 22465-A

* *

Appearances:

Mulcahy & Wherry, by James R. Macy, for the District.

Armin Blaufuss, UniServ Director, Winnebagoland UniServ Unit-South for the Association.

On April 15, 1985, the Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission notified the undersigned of his appointment as mediator-arbitrator in the above-captioned matter. On May 24, 1985 a public hearing was conducted, pursuant to statute. It was attended by some twelve persons and lasted about forty minutes. After brief presentations of the issues by the parties, one person addressed the hearing.

At the conclusion of the public hearing, mediation commenced. It took approximately six hours and resolved some, but not all, of the issues in dispute.

On June 24, 1985 an arbitration hearing was conducted. No transcript of the proceedings was made. At the hearing both parties had the opportunity to present evidence, testimony and arguments. The record was completed with the exchange by the arbitrator of the parties' post-hearing reply briefs on September 6, 1985.

The final offers of the parties, as modified as a result of mediation by the mediator-arbitrator are appended to this AWARD.

SALARY

Comparables

The parties differ about which other districts should be used for the purpose of salary comparisons. It is undisputed that in earlier negotiations

the parties used twelve districts for comparisons. They disagree about whether their agreement to use those districts has any precedent value. They disagreed subsequently, and in his 1984 Award Arbitrator Michelstetter considered the parties' arguments about comparisons and defined a subset which he regarded as most comparable. In the current negotiations neither side has adopted Michelstetter's comparisons as the appropriate ones. The Association has maintained that the twelve districts used earlier are most appropriate. The District argues that some of them are appropriate and some are not.

The salary offers of the parties in the current dispute are so close to one another for 1984-85 as to not cause any significant differences between them, whichever comparisons are used. For reasons stated more fully below, the arbitrator's decision on salary is not based on comparisons with a particular district or set of districts. For that reason he does not feel it necessary to further define which set of comparisons is best. The parties can attempt to agree on that in future negotiations.

Salary

The parties' salary offers for 1984-85 are very close to one another. They agree on the structure of the salary schedule. The Association's cost figures indicate that the District's salary offer exceeds the Association's offer by $4050. The Association cost figures indicate that the total package cost of the District's offer exceeds the Association's offer by $1431. This difference between the parties' positions, as calculated by the Association, represents .0007 of the 1983-84 total costs, and .0027 of the 1983-84 salary. The District calculates the cost difference in salary between its offer and the Association's offer for 1984-85 as $4090, and the difference in total package costs as $1201.

Given that there is very little disagreement between the parties' calculations of costs, and that the cost differences are so small, it is the arbitrator's opinion that there is nothing to choose from among the 1984-85 offers, regardless of which districts are used for comparison purposes.

The major difference between the parties' salary offers is the question of what the salary schedule should be for 1985-86. The District has presented a salary schedule. The Association has not. The Association has offered instead that there be a 1984-86 Agreement, but that economic issues, and limited non-economic issues be reopened for 1985-86.

As of the close of the hearing record in this case there was only one district among those the parties have used for comparison purposes that had reached an agreement for 1985-86. Moreover, that agreement was not a newly negotiated one; rather, it represents the second year of a previously negotiated two year agreement. Thus, whichever districts are used for comparison purposes, there are not an adequate number of comparisons to make for the purpose of judging the reasonableness of the District's second year offer.

The Association's offer enables the parties to bargain with greater knowledge than they had at the time of the negotiations leading to this proceeding concerning current economic conditions and what other districts are arriving at in the way of settlements. In the abstract, the arbitrator would prefer that the parties have a two year agreement completely settled, especially since the second school year has already begun. However, given their inability to agree about what should happen in the second year, and given the absence of comparables on which to base a decision, the arbitrator prefers the Association's final offer on salary.

Duration

Both final offers provide for a two-year agreement. The Association's offer differs from the District's in that it provides that there be a reopener "for 1985-86 for the purpose of negotiating all economic issues and up to two language items proposed by each party."

There is no dispute that in the face-to-face portion of negotiations for a 1984-86 agreement neither party presented a second year salary proposal. Witnesses for both parties testified that there was some discussion of the possibility of there being a two-year agreement. Superintendent Bertone testified that a two-year agreement was discussed during mediation. Union negotiator Meyer did not recall whether it was discussed in mediation but she testified that the first presentation of a two-year salary proposal was made by the District when it submitted its final offer.

In arguing in favor of its proposal the Association asserts that there has not been good faith bargaining on a two-year salary proposal. The second year salary proposal did not occur prior to the submission of the Board's final offer, after face-to-face negotiations. In addition to the need for meaningful bargaining on the economic package, the Association argues, there should be the opportunity to bargain on a limited number of non-economic issues which may not have been fully addressed. With regard to the need to have more bargaining on the salary in the second year, the Association points out also that the Board's proposal is not merely a continuation of what is proposed in the first year. Rather, it is a "significant salary structure revision." (Assn. brief, p. 20).

The District views the duration issue as a critical one. It argues that for five years the parties have been involved in constant negotiations, and the District's proposal offers the first opportunity for stability and labor peace. The District views the Association's reopener proposal as in effect, requiring the reopening of the entire Agreement for 1985-86.

The Association does not dispute the fact that negotiations have occurred during the past five years. The Association views this as the parties' appropriate exercise of their respective bargaining rights, which it notes, included the Board's filing of a declaratory ruling petition which took some twenty months to resolve. The Association argues that there is no evidence that this exercise of bargaining rights has resulted in disruption of the educational process. In its view, labor peace is not an issue.

Discussion

Both final offers propose a two-year agreement. It appears to be the case there there was not meaningful bargaining about a second year economic proposal prior to the submission and certification of final offers for arbitration. However, since there were several modifications of final offers, there surely was opportunity for the Association to consider and even propose a second year salary schedule. Thus the arbitrator does not consider the lack of bargaining prior to the initial presentation of final offers as a persuasive basis for favoring the Association's offer. On the other hand, the arbitrator is also not persuaded that a needed respite from bargaining, which the District emphasizes should occur, should take precedence over the substance of the issues existing between the parties.

If there were a more sound basis for considering the reasonableness of the District's second year salary offer than exists in this record, the arbitrator would prefer it to the Association's position. As mentioned earlier, however, given that there is only one settlement among the comparable districts for 1985-86 evidenced in this record, and also that there is no pattern of two-year agreements between the parties, it is the arbitrator's opinion that the Association's offer is preferable with respect to duration.

Class Size

In response to what it viewed as a problem of increased teacher workload caused by increasing class sizes due to staff cutbacks, the Association proposed class size language in bargaining during 1982-83. It had previously proposed class size language in 1977 and 1978 negotiations. In 1978, the Association alleges,the parties operated under a "gentlemen's agreement" with the District governing class size. The 1982-83 class size proposal was the subject of a declaratory ruling by the Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission in August, 1983 which found that the Association's proposal was a mandatory subject of bargaining.

The Association included a class size provision in its final offer for the 1982-84 Agreement which was arbitrated by Arbitrator Michelstetter. The class size provision had an effective date of the 1984-85 school year. Since Arbitrator Michelstetter selected the Association's final offer, the Association's class size provision (which is the subject of the current dispute) was included in the contract. The following statements made by Arbitrator Michelstetter are germane to the present dispute:

> "The comparative and other data offered by the Association leaves no doubt that this Employer has tended to have a high class size and that particularly in 1982-83, as a result of layoffs, the class size situation worsened.
>
> Thus, it is entirely reasonable that the Association has consistently brought its concerns to the bargaining table, and that the parties have mutually attempted to deal with the issue. Although considerable litigation effort has been directed to establishing class size differences, no evidence at all has been offered to show the relationship between class

size and the amount of extra work performed by a teacher (effects on wages, hours and working conditions). For this reason, the Association has failed to meet its burden of proof as to the existence of a problem which reasonably requires contractual language and that its offer is reasonably designed to remedy the problem.[1]

A fundamental reason stressed by the Association for the adoption of this language is the parties' bargaining history. In fact, it is rather apparent from the positions of the parties and testimony at hearing that this issue has been at the forefront of a marked deterioration of relationship of the parties and its adoption appears to have meaning well beyond the actual terms.

At the center of this issue is the so-called "gentlemen's" agreement on secondary school class sizes allegedly reached in the negotiations for the 1977-78 collective bargaining agreement. The majority of testimony in this matter dealt with the parties' sharply differing views as to whether this agreement ever existed and, if so, what its terms really are. It appears this "agreement" was more in the nature of an assurance of intentions. Unwritten unenforceable agreements and assurances are a fundamental part of the negotiation process which by means of their unenforceable nature facilitate the negotiation of agreements, by avoiding unnecessary conflict. This, in turn, furthers both the interests of the public and the parties. The use of these agreements can be frustrated by penalizing a party for having, in good faith, attempted this approach. Accordingly, in the absence of bad faith in the creation of an unenforceable agreement, or clear evidence the parties intended otherwise, the only inference properly drawn from the failure of such agreement is that the parties have unsuccessfully attempted to resolve the issue. Accordingly, in this case, the Undersigned finds the failure of the "gentlemen's agreement" does support the need for contractual language on class size, but does not compel such a result. Accordingly, I conclude the Employer's position is favored on this issue.

---

[1] While the experience of the Undersigned would support a conclusion that in the absence of special help, a larger class size would affect a teacher's wages, hours and working conditions, evidence is necessary to quantify the relationship."

During the 1984-85 school year the parties sought to agree on the interpretation and implementation of the class size language. There is correspondence in the record documenting that disagreement arose over the formula for calculating what benefits are due to teachers whose classes exceed the numbers contained in the contract provision. The arbitrator notes the ongoing disagreement, but it is not his task in this proceeding to decide the merits of that dispute.

The Association presented the following data to demonstrate the existence of the class size problem:

- From 1980-81 to 1981-82 there was an enrollment decline of 17 students accompanied by a reduction in teaching staff of 1.31 FTE, which is a ratio of 1 teacher per 13 pupils.

- From 1981-82 to 1982-83 there was an enrollment decline of 8 students accompanied by a reduction in teaching staff of 4.7 FTE, which is a ratio of 1 teacher per 1.7 students.

- Association Exhibit 41 indicates that in 1982-83 there were 8 K-6 teachers who had classes with more than 27 students in them, and 8 7-12 teachers who had more than 160 teachers per day. In 1983-84 those numbers were reduced to 6 K-6 teachers and 3 7-12 teachers.

- Association Exhibit 42-44 derived from teacher gradebooks shows the following average class sizes per K-6 teacher, 7-8 and 9-12.

81-82(sem 2)	23.7	130.8	121.6
82-83 (1)	26.1	154.7	120.7
(2)		160.3	
83-84 (1)	24.9	136.9	124.6
83-84 (2)	25.2	138.8	121.1
84-85 (1)	25.3	134.1	117.1
84-85 (2)	24.7	133.1	116.6

- Using data provided by the Department of Public Instruction, the Association constructed Exhibit 45 showing the relative ranking of the District with the other 12 districts which the Association views as comparable, with respect to pupil teacher ratios (the arbitrator is aware that pupil-teacher ratio is not synonymous with class size) It shows that in grades K-12 Campbellsport had the following ranking among the 13 districts, with a "13" being the highest pupil/teacher ratio, and a "1" the lowest:

1980-81: 10
1981-82: 8
1982-83: 13
1983-84: 10
1984-85: 11

- Several Association witnesses testified concerning the overwork associated with their having students in their class(es) above the numbers contained in the contract provision. These teachers estimated the extra time by keeping track of time when grading an assignment(s) and projecting the number of assignments given during the semester which required grading outside of regular class time.

- Ditterman estimated that a 28th pupil in her 2nd grade class accounted for 31 extra hours of grading. That student was a low-skilled student, she testified. On cross-examination she testified that 28 was the highest number of students she ever had. She has had enrollments as low as 18.

- Ledman testified that having a 28th and 29th pupil in her fourth grade class required her to do an estimated 67 1/2 extra hours of work. She testified that 29 was the largest class she had ever had.

- Pelischek testified that having a 28th pupil in her fifth grade class caused her to do an estimated 30 hours of additional work.

- Baker had 163.3 students in her high school bookkeeping/accounting and typing classes. She estimated that those extra 3.3 students accounted for 11.8% of the work that she did outside of the class in bookkeeping/accounting, and 9.1% in typing.

- Spielbauer estimated that having a 28th student in her second grade class, and a 29th student during reading resulted in 13.2% of her outside of class work being attributed to those extra students, or about 27 hours of additional work. On cross-examination Speilbauer testified that two years ago she had 30 students, and has had classes as small as 23 or 24 students. She acknowledged that she could make some adjustments in the numbers of assignments and tests given to students so long as she covered certain things in the process.

- The Association put into evidence language from the Agreements in the comparable districts which address the question of excessive workloads. None of the districts provides additional compensation for exceeding class size. Three of the comparable districts make some provision for payment for extra classes taught. Two districts provide for elementary teachers being given a teacher aide if the class size exceeds 30 pupils.

The District presented data on pupil enrollments and class sizes in the District since 1981-82. They vary slightly from the figures shown above presented by the Association, and are not repeated here, for purposes of brevity.

The District takes issue with Association figures re teacher ratios and class size. It notes that the DPI no longer publishes pupil-staff ratios comparing one district with another. The District sees this as an indicator that there are many factors that influence teacher workload, only one of which if class size. The District argues that the class size data presented by the Association is based on a WEAC compilation of incomplete survey responses, and is therefore not entitled to weight establishing what the class sizes are in other districts. The District argues also that the workload figures presented by Association witnesses are self-serving and do not show that these teachers have a workload that is higher or different than the normal workload of other teachers in the District. The District concludes, "The Association has presented no empirical data which unequivocally links student achievement with class size or which links additional teacher workload with class size."

The District argues also that the so-called "problem" of class size dealt with by Arbitrator Michelstetter was caused by an aberration in enrollments in 1982-83. The enrollment problem has since corrected itself, and in the District's view there is no class size problem which is in need of addressing. Moreover, the District states:

> "The District is not a large urban school district. The District has two elementary schools and one combined junior-senior high school. The District does not have the luxury of transferring one or two children who constitute an "overload" into another classroom on the same grade level within the District. Nor does the District have the luxury of hiring an additional teacher to handle what may be, under the Association's offer, a perceived overload situation. Rather, the District must rely on the semester to semseter or year-to-year fluctuations that are normally attendant on school enrollments to balance the teachers' workloads over a period of time, thus insuring that no one teacher consistently maintains a significantly greater workload than other teachers in the District. The District avers that this is the case in all districts of similar size and the Association has provided no proof to the contrary. No evidence whatsoever was introduced which could establish that class load assignments were made imprudently or unfairly by the District."

The District's final offer would eliminate the existing class size provision from the Agreement. The District presented no testimony in support of its proposal, other than to note than there has been disagreement with the Association over its interpretation and implementation.

In its brief the District asserts that the Association has the burden of proof to justify the continuation of the class size provision. In addition the District makes several arguments in support of its position that the class size language should be eliminated. First it points out that no comparable district has class size language according any payment to teachers based on classroom enrollment. Second it points out that the class size language was placed in the Agreement as a result of an arbitration award in which the arbitrator chose the Association's final offer , while at the same time stating that he did not support the Association's class size proposal. The District points out also that under the terms of the selected final offer, the class size provision was not to take effect until the 1984-85 school year, which is part of the current arbitration covering 1984-86. Third, the District points out that the class size ratios which existed in 1982-83 and on which Arbitrator Michelstetter based his award were higher than those which existed before and subsequently. Fourth, the District points out that the parties have not been able to agree on the meaning and/or implementation of the class-size language. There has been a grievance filed, and continuing controversy. Lastly, the District argues that there is no evidence demonstrating that the work load of teachers whose class size exceeds the numbers in the contractual provision is of any necessity greater than the workload of teachers whose enrollments do not exceed the contractual numbers. The District objects to payments to these teachers which might better be used toward more important needs, including higher salaries for all teachers.

The Association argues that the whole problem with class size arose in 1982-83 when class sizes rose significantly as a result of District action to cut back staff. That made necessary, from the Association's standpoint, the creation of contract language which would afford protection to the teachers against increased class size. The Association

points out, however, that in the current dispute it has met the objections expressed by Arbitrator Michelstetter and has demonstrated that there is need for the class size language and there is a direct relationship between larger class size and teacher workload.

The Association argues that during the bargaining process for the 1984-86 Agreement, now being arbitrated, the District made no proposals to modify the class size language or to address its problems or concerns. Rather the District chose only to propose elimination of the provision. In the Association's view the District has the burden to show that elmination of the language is justified, and in the Association's view the District has not met that burden. The District has not shown that the class size provision has interfered with its management or caused a financial problem. To the contrary, the Association asserts, the class size provision has addressed an existing problem and provided a workable and equitable solution for it. The Association argues that while proposing to eliminate the class size provision, the District has made no offer of a quid pro quo as incentive for the Association to accept such a proposal.

Discussion

The arbitrator believes that the District has met its burden of proof on this issue. The evidence does not persuade him that the teachers of this District have a workload which is greater than that of teachers generally, and it is not even clear that the teachers who testified in this proceeding have workloads which exceed those of their fellow teachers who have slightly fewer students in their classes. Given that Arbitrator Michelstetter would not have implemented the class size provision initially had he been free to make his award on that issue, given that the enrollments situation has improved and that there is no current evidence of a serious problem justifying compensation for exceeding class size limitations in the manner established in the current language, and given that no other comparable district has adopted similar class size language, the arbitrator favors the District's position on this issue.

Limited Term Disability

The District currently pays the full cost of the existing LTD plan which provides 60% of a teacher's salary. Changes in federal tax law have markedly decreased the real coverage to about 35-40%. The Association has offered to have the Wisconsin Education Association Insurance Trust be the carrier, with coverage established at 90% with a 60-day waiting period and a maximum benefit of $3600. It offers a guaranteed premium for the first two years of coverage, and that rate is lower than the existing rate and provides greater coverage than the existing plan.

The District wishes to maintain the status quo. It argues that the existing plan is comparable to what is in effect in other districts. Moreover, it argues that during bargaining and as of the date of the arbitration hearing the WEAIT had not received authority from the State of Wisconsin as an insurance company. The District is concerned also that no other carrier offers the 90% plan and there is thus no competition for rates.

The District presented data for the comparable districts showing that four have coverage at the 90% rate, four have a 67% rate and one has no coverage. The District has a 60% plan. All of the comparable districts have a 90-day waiting period, whereas either final offer would continue the current 60 day waiting period. The Association's proposed maximum coverage is $3600, which is higher than any of the comparable districts except one at $4,000. All of the others have $3,000 or less.

Discussion

It appears to be the case that an increase in the percent of covered salary is warranted to continue to provide teachers with the same LTD dollars that they would have received prior to changes in federal tax law. The 90% coverage offered by the Association is not a unique benefit, since approximately half of the comparable districts have that level of coverage. The cost of the Plan is lower than the existing coverage, and the rate is guaranteed for two years. Under these circumstances the Association's offer would appear to be a reasonable one. Any uncertainty about the WEAIT's status was resolved during the pendency of this arbitration proceeding. The arbitrator is not persuaded that that uncertainty of necessity affected the District's ability to agree to the Association's offer either outright or conditionally upon determination of the Trust's status. The District may be correct that there is no competing insurance company offering a 90% LTD plan. If the plan or its costs or administration prove to be unsatisfactory, changes can be made through future collective bargaining.

The arbitrator facors the Association's offer on the LTD issue.

Pay to Timers and Scorers

The Association proposes to increase the rate of pay for timers and scorers from $10 for a two game session to $15, and from $5 for a one game session to $7.50. The District wants to maintain the current rate. The District argues that there is no evidence presented by the Association justifying such an increase. Association Exhibit #81 demonstrates that Lomira pays timers and scorers $10 per game; Mayville $6; North Fond du Lac $13; Plymouth $8; Random Lake $9.47. Rosendale and Slinger may also pay for these activities, but the rates are not clear from the Association exhibits.

Discussion

This is a minor item and both offers are reasonable. Comparable districts pay varying amounts for timing and scoring, but it would appear that most are at or below the current $10 paid by the District. The Association has not shown any particular justification for increasing these rates above current levels. On this issue the arbitrator would favor the District's position.

Number of extra duty assignments

The Agreement provides for payment of $176 (the newly stipulated figure) "for the performance of extra duties." The Association offer alters the language to state, "for the performance of up to eight (8) extra duties." Superintendent Bertone testified that the District believes that it has, and wants to continue to have, the right to assign more than eight extra duties if teachers don't volunteer for them. Former Union chief negotiator Pankratz testified that he knew of no instances since 1971-72 in which any teachers were assigned more than eight extra duties. The District cited one instance in which a teacher had nine such assignments. This proved to be an instance in which the teacher had done seven assignments in the preceding year, when he should have done eight.

In addition to the number of assignments, the District objects to the Association's proposed elimination of contract language concerning extra duties which states, "These duties are an integral part of every high school teacher's contract." The Association argues that the language is unnecessary, and the proposed change does not alter the District's right to make extra duty assignments.

Discussion

The parties have agreed upon a sum to be paid for extra duty assignments. They do not agree on the number of such assignments. The District does not see the need to place a limit of eight assignments, arguing that more or less might be appropriate. While the evidence suggests that such assignments have rarely if ever exceeded eight, there does not appear to the arbitrator to be a need to fix that number and thereby limit the District's flexibility. The arbitrator believes also that there is some merit to the District's position that the expectation of teachers' responsibilities might be altered if the disputed sentence were eliminated.

In the arbitrator's opinion the Association has not provided justification for making the changes discussed in this subsection and the District's position on them is preferred by the arbitrator.

Pay for Chaperoning and Extra Duties

There is now no pay for elementary and junior high school teachers who chaperone or supervise school sponsored activities or perform extra duties outside the regular work day, except as specified elsewhere in the Agreement. The Association proposes that such teachers be paid $15 per such event or activity. It is also undisputed that prior to 1983-84 teachers volunteered for such activities, and the District did not require them to undertake such activities. In 1983-84 the District require all teachers at the elementary school to attend and supervise the choral concert.

The District-provided data on how other districts compensate chaperones: Kewaskum $17.20 for home events, $6.90 away; Horicon $11 per hour; Lomira $7 per hour beyond six voluntary duties; Markesan, no payment; Plymouth

$8 per hour; Random Lake $9.76 per hour; Slinger $12.60 - $23.63. Several other districts are mentioned, but their payment practices are not clear.

Discussion

It is reasonable, in the arbitrator's opinion, that if teachers are to be required to chaperone and supervise extra events not connected with their normal academic duties, that they should be compensated. There has been no problem of pay in the past because the activities have been handled on a voluntary basis. The $15 per event figure offered by the Association would appear to be within the general boundaries of the payments of comparable districts which are mostly expressed in per hour figures, rather than per event. The arbitrator prefers the Association's offer on this issue over the District's offer to provide no payment even where the activity is required of the teachers.

Release from Extra Assignments

The Association's offer would establish a procedure for the release of teachers from extra curricular assignments. None exists under the present Assignment. Several teachers testified concerning their experiences in seeking release from such assignments.

Meyers testified that his initial contract was for teaching and coaching football. He volunteered for wrestling for one year, and after that the assignment was made a part of his contract without his being given an option. During 1983 he resigned as football coach but his resignation was refused. He filed a grievance. During the first day of football practice in the Fall, he was released from the assignment, he testified. In February, 1984 he resigned as wrestling coach for the 1984-85 season. The resignation was refused. He eventually grieved. He also tried to get his own replacement, both from inside and outside of the District. He testified that the Superintendent told him he wanted the replacement to be from the staff. Meyers does not know what efforts the District made to find a replacement. He sought to resign from wrestling after the District switched the hours of practice and it interfered with his developing real estate business, and stood to work a financial hardship on him. He was released from wrestling just prior to the end of the 1984-85 school year. He was replaced by a new teacher who had wrestling experience.

Pankratz testified that he was replaced in a coaching assignment by someone who was not on the teaching staff.

Vollmer testified that in 1980 he gave the District three years notice that he wanted to be replaced as track coach. He gave the District reminders in 1981 and 1982. In early 1983 he was told by Bertone that there was not yet a replacement for him. Despite there being no replacement the District released him after Spring, 1983.

Schmitt testified that in 1971-72 she agreed to be pom pon adivsor for a year. Thereafter that assignment was put in her contract and she had no option about continuing it. In 1975 she sought release because she was pregnant. She testified that the District told her that if she wanted to teach, she had to do the pom pon activity. In 1981 and

thereafter she sought to be released. In 1982-83 there was a former pom pon squad member who volunteered to replace her. The District did not agree to that arrangement because the would-be replacement was not a member of the teaching staff. In August, 1983 Schmitt was released when a part-time teacher said that she would do the pom pon activity if Schmitt helped out. She agreed. Schmitt testified also that there was a football coach working who was not a member of the teaching staff.

Vollendorf testified that she was released as track coach in Spring 1975 when she and the principal found a replacement. In April, 1981 she resigned as volleyball coach, but the resignation was not accepted until July, 1981 when a replacement was found. In July, 1983 she resigned as basketball coach. That resignation was accepted in September, 1983 when someone else on the staff agreed to replace her. Vollendorf believes that she found her replacement.

Szablewski resigned as volleyball coach in 1982-83 for 1983-84. A replacement was found. She resigned from basketball in 1983-84 and found a replacement who was a regular substitute teacher and who had a degree in physical education. The District did not agree to the arrangement because the replacement was not a member of the regular teaching staff. Szablewski filed a grievance. She was released at the end of 1983-84 when the District found a replacement just prior to the arbitration hearing.

Balsom is a physical education teacher. She was released from cheerleading when a replacement was found. She also resigned from basketball coaching in 1975-76. In Fall, 1981 she asked to be released from track coaching at the end of the year because she was newly married, had a new family and her husband was a farmer. She formally resigned from track coaching in Spring, 1982 and was not released until March, 1983 when a replacement was found. She resigned from volleyball coaching in 1982, but was told by the District to continue in 1983-84 because she is a physical education teacher. She resigned again in 1984-85 and as of the end of the school year was still not released because no suitable replacement had yet been found. In March, 1985 she was asked to sign her teaching contract, which also still specified head volleyball coach. She crossed out that designation but she was told by Bertone that she had to sign the contract as is or resign from her teaching position. Balsom testified that one of the four physical education teachers does no coaching at all.

Bertone testified that when a teacher wants to be released from a coaching assignment the District tries to find a suitable replacement from the teaching staff, both the existing staff and incoming teachers. The District lists the available teaching and coaching positions at universities, and asks at teacher meetings in the District if teachers are interested in the assignments. He testified that the District does not hold teachers in coaching positions after suitable replacements have been found. Bertone testified that the District has only hired coaches from outside the teaching staff when no one else was available, e.g., in the instance of a coach who retired from teaching in the middle of the school year.

On cross-examination Bertone testified that the principals are briefed about coaching openings and resignations, and they ask the teachers about their preferences once a year in the Spring. They post the openings in April. Bertone testified that the staff is reluctant to take coaching openings and therefore the openings are not posted more frequently. He wants to avoid more paperwork. He testified that word gets around to teachers about openings without the need for more postings.

The Association argues in its brief that prior to 1983 the District had no policy about releases from coaching. It adopted a policy stating, "All the coaches not be released from their coaching duties until a suitable replacement has been found." The Association argues that the current bargaining is the first opportunity for bargaining over the impact of the new policy. The Association argues that in view of the frustrations of teachers, threats to their job security, and the inconsistency of the District's application of its policies and procedures, a "clear and understandable procedure" is needed.

The Association further states its position as follows: (brief pp. 65-66)

> The Association offer does not contain the automatic release provision found as a result of separate extracurricular contracts in North Fond du Lac and Slinger, nor does it contain the provision for automatic release after one year found in Mayville and New Holstein. The Association offer, however, does require that a one year notice be given by teachers wishing to be released from an extracurricular position, that the District post the position, and that the District make every effort to secure a replacement. It also provides for the posting of qualifications, notice to the Association, an option to employ outside the bargaining unit at the District's discretion and the right to reappoint the teacher in the position in the event a replacement is not found. ...While the Association ...procedure does require the District to follow a standard procedure, it does not set forward a process that significantly departs from that outlined by Bertone, nor does it alter the assignment decision which remains with the District.

Contrary to District assertions, the Association argues, there is no evidence that the District immediately and actively seeks suitable replacements for coaches wishing to resign. This proposed procedure will take steps toward accomplishing that, in the Association's view.

The District argues that extracurricular assignments are and have been an integral part of the educational process. It argues that its present practices of listing openings with universities, asking interviewees about coaching preferences, making announcements at teacher meetings, and asking administrative staff to look for replacements are adequate. It points to data showing that in the past six years there has been turnover in 26 of 42 coaching positions and replacements have been found for all but one. Eleven other coaching positions were vacated by teachers leaving the District, and those positions also were filled. The District argues (at page 37 of its brief.) :

> While the replacement may not have been instantaneous, changes were made as soon as suitable replacements were found and in an efficient, fair manner with an eye toward the important educational policies involved.

The District argues that the practices in comparable districts are varied and they do not lend support to the Association's proposal. The District cites four districts which have no language, four which require posting, two which require automatic release after a year, and three which provide for replacement from outside the unit.

The District also cites the ambiguity of the Association's proposed language and cites the virtual certainty that disputes about its meaning will have to be litigated. The District also views the Association proposal as procedurally burdensome.

Discussion

It is clear that there is a need for the parties to devote more effort and attention than they have in the past to the problem of the quick and orderly replacement of coaches when they wish to resign from coaching positions. Clearly many coaches have been replaced, and possibly with no undue delay or difficulty. On the other hand the testimony of Association witnesses makes it clear that for a certain number of teachers there has been long delay and frustration in their attempts to be released from coaching duties. There is no way of knowing whether this experience is different from what occurs in other districts.

The Association's proposal provides certain protection for the District. It requires that the teacher's resignation be in writing and that it be "at least one (1) year prior to the beginning of the next extracurricular season." It also imposes certain obligations on the District: to post the position in each of the administrative offices, with a copy of the posting sent to the Association; to make every effort to find a replacement for the teacher; to "periodically update the teacher" on its progress in finding a replacement" if such update is requested by the teacher; to keep the request for resignation for the subsequent season if the resignation letter is not withdrawn. The proposal recognizes the District's right to fill its positions from within or from outside the unit, and to reappoint the teacher to the position if a replacement is not found.

It is the arbitrator's opinion that the Association's porposal is a reasonable one. The District is correct that there is room for controversy over the meaning to be attached to some of its phrases, e.g., "every effort", "suitable replacement" "periodically update", but these terms are not so controversial as to detract from their resonableness as a step towards easing the burden felt by teachers seeking release from extracurricular responsibilities. The added burden to the District of posting openings and keeping teachers informed periodically as to the status of its efforts are not so arduous as to outweigh the possible benefits from such procedures, in the arbitrator's opinion.

Conclusion

Under the statute the arbitrator is required to make a decision favoring the entire offer of one party. He has no discretion to award on an issue by issue basis. The choice is difficult in a case such as this in which each party's offer is preferable on some issues. The decision must be made based on the statutory factors. These have not been specifically mentioned above except for comparability because most have not been particularly germane to the issues. That is,there has been no issue with respect to the lawful authority of the District, the stipulations of the parties, the financial ability of the District to meet the costs of settlement and the cost-of-living. The issues have been resolved largely without resort to comparability either with respect to wages or total compensation. The arbitrator has made his decision, however, being mindful of the statutory factors and has considered them in making his decision.

The arbitrator has favored the Association's offer in the areas of salary, duration, LTD, pay for chaperones, and release from extra-curricular activities. He has favored the District's offer in the areas of class size, pay for scorers and timers, and limits on the number of extra duty assignments.

Based on the facts and discussions above, the arbitrator has determined that the Association's offer is preferable and he therefore makes the following AWARD

The Association's final offer is selected.

Dated this 28th day of October, 1985 at Madison, Wisconsin.

Edward B. Krinsky
Mediator-Arbitrator

Name of Case: Campbell [illegible] School District

The following, or the attachment hereto, constitutes our final offer for the purposes of mediation-arbitration pursuant to Section 111.70(4)(cm)6. 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.

1/29/85
(Date)

(Representative)

On Behalf of: School Dist. of Campbell

1. Article VI - Other Provisions - Delete existing language under section T, Liquidation of Damages, and Replace with the following:

Teachers resigning from their teaching position after June 1 for the following academic year, shall, at the Board's discretion, reimburse the District for the costs of all insurance paid after the teacher's last day of classroom teaching. Such reimbursement may be deducted from that employee's last paycheck.

Teachers resigning from their teaching position prior to June 1 for the following Academic year, shall have their insurances paid in accordance with this Agreement up through June 30.

2. Article VI - Other Provisions - Delete subsection 5, Class Size Workload, from section B, Teaching Load, in its entirety.

Arbitrator's note: This section should read as typed. It was inadvertently crossed out - CBK

3. Article VI - Other Provisions - Modify section M, Retirement Pay by adding the following sentence:

Effective January 1, 1986, the school district shall pay up to 6% of a teacher's gross salary toward each teacher's retirement.

4. Article VIII - Duration - Modify to read as follows:

This Agreement shall be in effect on July 1, 1984, and shall remain in effect through June 30, 1986.

5. Salary Schedule:

1984-85	attached as Appendix A
1985-86	attached as Appendix B

respectfully submitted by:

MULCAHY & WHERRY, S.C.

James R. Macy

attorneys for the
School District of Campbellsport

1984-85

APPENDIX A - 1

SALARY SCHEDULE

LANE / STEP	B	6	12	18	24	M	6	12
1	~~14618~~	~~14918~~	~~15218~~	~~15518~~	~~15868~~	~~16218~~	~~16568~~	~~16968~~
1.5	~~14878~~	~~15178~~	~~15478~~	~~15778~~	~~16128~~	~~16548~~	~~16898~~	~~17298~~
1.75	~~15608~~	~~15908~~	~~16208~~	~~16508~~	~~16858~~	~~17278~~	~~17628~~	~~18028~~
2	15138	15438	15738	16038	16388	16878	17228	17628
2.25	15268	15568	15868	16168	16518	17043	17393	17793
2.5	15398	15698	15998	16298	16648	17208	17558	17958
3	15658	15958	16258	16558	16908	17538	17888	18288
3.25	15788	16088	16388	16688	17038	17703	18053	18453
3.5	15918	16218	16518	16818	17168	17868	18218	18618
4	16178	16478	16778	17078	17428	18198	18548	18948
5	16698	16998	17298	17598	17948	18858	19208	19608
6	17218	17518	17818	18118	18468	19518	19868	20268
7	17738	18038	18338	18638	18988	20178	20528	20928
8	18258	18558	18858	19158	19508	20838	21188	21588
8.75	18723	19023	19323	19623	19973	21408	21758	22158
9	18878	19178	19478	19778	20128	21598	21948	22348
10	19498	19798	20098	20398	20748	22358	22708	23108
10.5	19808	20108	20408	20708	21058	22738	23088	23488
10.75	19963	20263	20563	20863	21213	22928	23278	23678
11	20118	20418	20718	21018	21368	23118	23468	23868
12	20738	21038	21338	21638	21988	23878	24228	24628
13	21358	21658	21958	22258	22608	24638	24988	25388
14	21978	22278	22578	22878	23228	25398	25748	26148
15	22598	22898	23198	23498	23848	26158	26508	26908

EMPLOYEES ON EACH STEP

LANE STEP	B	6	12	18	24	M	6	12
1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1.5	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1.75	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2	10.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
2.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
2.5	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
3	4.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3.25	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3.5	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4	2.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
6	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	1.00	0.00	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
8	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
8.75	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
9	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
10	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
10.5	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
10.75	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
11	2.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	1.00
12	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
14	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
15	6.00	7.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	10.00	0.00	0.00

SALARY SCHEDULE

LANE STEP	B	6	12	18	24	M	6	12
1	~~15686~~	~~15986~~	~~16286~~	~~16586~~	~~16936~~	~~17336~~	~~17736~~	~~18136~~
2	~~16226~~	~~16526~~	~~16826~~	~~17126~~	~~17476~~	~~18016~~	~~18416~~	~~18816~~
2.5	~~16496~~	~~16796~~	~~17096~~	~~17396~~	~~17746~~	~~18356~~	~~18756~~	~~19156~~
3	16766	17066	17366	17666	18016	18696	19096	19496
3.25	16901	17201	17501	17801	18151	18866	19266	19666
3.5	17036	17336	17636	17936	18286	19036	19436	19836
3.75	17171	17471	17771	18071	18421	19206	19606	20006
4	17306	17606	17906	18206	18556	19376	19776	20176
4.5	17576	17876	18176	18476	18826	19716	20116	20516
5	17846	18146	18446	18746	19096	20056	20456	20856
6	18386	18686	18986	19286	19636	20736	21136	21536
7	18926	19226	19526	19826	20176	21416	21816	22216
7.5	19196	19496	19796	20096	20446	21756	22156	22556
8	19466	19766	20066	20366	20716	22096	22496	22896
9	20106	20406	20706	21006	21356	22876	23276	23676
9.75	20586	20886	21186	21486	21836	23461	23861	24261
10	20746	21046	21346	21646	21996	23656	24056	24456
11	21386	21686	21986	22286	22636	24436	24836	25236
11.5	21706	22006	22306	22606	22956	24826	25226	25626
11.75	21866	22166	22466	22766	23116	25021	25421	25821
12	22026	22326	22626	22926	23276	25216	25616	26016
13	22666	22966	23266	23566	23916	25996	26396	26796
14	23306	23606	23906	24206	24556	26776	27176	27576
15	23946	24246	24546	24846	25196	27556	27956	28356

1985-86

APPENDIX B - 2

EMPLOYEES ON EACH STEP

LANE STEP	B	6	12	18	24	M	6	12
1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2.5	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3	10.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
3.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
3.5	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
3.75	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4	4.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4.5	1.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
6	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
7.5	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
8	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
9	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
9.75	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
10	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
11	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
11.5	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
11.75	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
12	2.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	1.00
13	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
14	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
15	6.00	8.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	11.00	0.00	0.00

Name of Case: Campbell [illegible] School District

The following, or the attachment hereto, constitutes our final offer for the purposes of mediation-arbitration pursuant to Section 111.70(4)(cm)6. 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.

1/29/85
(Date)

(Representative)

On Behalf of: Campbellsport Education Association

Article VI, G. Extra Duty and Extracurricular Assignments

Revise to read:

1. Each high school teacher will be assigned one advisorship in addition to sharing administrative details on a rotation basis. The advisorship shall be expressed on the teacher's individual teaching contract. For purposes of this Article, thirty (30) hours shall be considered the standard for paying for an advisorship.

2. Extracurricular assignments shall be noted on the teacher's initial individual teaching contract. Any further change in duties will be added only with the full knowledge and consent of both parties.

3. If a feasible arrangement can be determined, teachers may switch assignments with concurrence from the building administrator or the District Administrator.

4. Elementary and junior high teachers required to chaperone or supervise a school sponsored activity or perform an extra duty outside the regular workday that is not expressly covered elsewhere in Article VI, G, will be paid $15.00 per event or activity.

5. Junior high school teachers shall be compensated at the rate of $15.00 per two game session ($7.50 per single game) for timing and scoring athletic events.

6. The sum of $176 will be paid to each high school teacher (and to grade school teachers who volunteer) for the performance of up to eight (8) extra duties. The high school principal shall make a fair distribution of these duties. If a high school teacher cannot be scheduled in these assignments because of conflicts with other high school schedules, the high school principal can remove a teacher from all or part of this requirement.

7. Teachers wishing to be released from their extracurricular position shall submit a written letter of resignation from the position to the District Administrator at least one (1) year prior to the beginning of the next extracurricular season. The District will post the position along with the qualifications for the position in each of the administrative offices in the District. A copy of the posting along with the qualifications for the position will be sent to the Association President. The District will make every effort to find a replacement for the teacher. In the event a suitable replacement is not available from within the bargaining unit, the District may contract with anyone outside the unit. At the teacher's request the District will periodically update the teacher on its progress in finding a replacement. In the event the District is unable to replace the teacher the District may reappoint the teacher to the position. Unless the teacher requests that the letter of resignation be withdrawn, the District shall consider the teacher to have submitted a timely resignation request for the subsequent season.

   The one (1) year notice requirement will be waived if the teacher's resignation from the extracurricular position is due to health reasons.

8. Coaches' Salaries: Coaches' salaries shall be equalized for men's and women's sports, utilizing the number of total hours scheduled for practice and meets/games. Extra duty for cheerleaders and pom pom girls will be scheduled the same as athletic squads. Extra curricular assignments not scheduled shall not be paid.

Article VI, I. Insurance

4. The Board will pay 100% of the premium cost for long-term disability coverage for full-time staff with a monthly benefit of 90% of monthly salary up to $3,600 per month following 60 days of disability. Benefit levels shall be equal to or better than those contained in WEA Insurance Trust's long-term disability plan (attached to this proposal for reference purposes). In the event the WEA Insurance Trust is unable to provide the above referenced plan and the plan is unavailable from any other insurance carrier, the District may revert to the plan currently in effect (January 29, 1985) at a monthly benefit of 67% of monthly salary.

TERMINATION OF COVERAGE

An employee's coverage terminates on the earliest of the following dates, the end of the period for which the last required premium contribution was made, the end of the month coincident with or next following the date an employee ceases to be eligible, the end of the month coincident with or following the employee's 70th birthday, the date of termination of the policy

LIMITATIONS AND REDUCTIONS

Benefits are not payable during disability when (1) a covered employee is not under the regular care of a legally-qualified physician or surgeon, or (2) a covered employee is engaged in any work for compensation, wages, or profit This limitation will be waived while an employee otherwise eligible for the monthly disability benefit participates in a program of rehabilitation or retraining approved in writing by the Trust Not more than 50% of any income from compensation or wages which may be earned each month by this employee during his approved rehabilitation or retraining period will be included as other income under the "Integration With Other Benefits" provision with the monthly benefit adjusted accordingly

Benefits are not payable for disability (1) caused or contributed to by war, declared or undeclared or any act or hazard of war, (2) caused or contributed to by intentionally self-inflicted injuries or attempted suicide while sane or insane (3) arising from participation in committing a felony

After an aggregate of 2 years of benefit payments under this plan for total disability due to neurosis, psychoneurosis, psychopathy, psychosis, alcoholism and drug addiction, or mental or emotional disease or disorder of any kind, the Trust will pay the monthly disability benefit only when the employee is confined in a hospital or other institution qualified to provide care and treatment for such disability

When an employee is so confined for at least 14 consecutive days, the monthly disability benefit will be paid during the continuance of total disability up to 90 days immediately following such hospital or institutional confinement

SPECIAL BENEFITS AND PROVISIONS

The special benefits and provisions outlined on this page supplement, modify, or replace the standard Long Term Disability benefits and provisions described in subsequent proposal pages

These special benefits and provisions have been included for the purpose of creating a program custom designed to the specific needs and requirements of your group.

WEAIT Cost of Living Adjustment

EMPLOYEE ELIGIBLITY

Regular full-time employees, under age 70, who are working at least 20 hours per week, are eligible to enroll

QUALIFYING PERIOD

60 days of continuous total disability are required before benefit payments may begin

MONTHLY BENEFIT

90 % of monthly salary, exclusive of bonuses and overtime, will be payable up to a maximum benefit of $ 1,600 per month.

MAXIMUM BENEFIT PERIOD

Benefits are payable during continuous total disability to age 65 if disability occurs before age 62. After that age, the following durations apply:

Age at Disability	Benefit Duration
62	42 months
63	36 months
64	30 months
65	24 months
66	21 months
67	18 months
68	15 months
69 and over	12 months

MONTHLY PREMIUM

The premium for this coverage is developed by applying a "premium factor" to the covered monthly payroll This monthly payroll is the total monthly salary for all covered employees after excluding that portion of any employee's salary that exceeds $ 4,000 per month

The initial "premium factor" for this benefit will be determined by the age, sex and salary of employees included on the original effective date of the policy Based on the data provided

81 Employees are eligible
$126,733.46 covered monthly payroll
.36 % is the "premium factor"
$ 456.24 is the estimated monthly premium

Because the premium for this plan is very small in relation to the amount of benefits provided, the rate has been set on a non-participating level and claim experience will be totally pooled The initial rate for this plan will be guaranteed during the first two policy years

SPECIAL NOTE:

If any federal or state statute or the governmental administration thereof materially changes the Trust LTD exposure, the Trust reserves the right to adjust the rates or benefits under this contract

WAIVER OF PREMIUM

The Trust will waive payment of premium falling due for an employee eligible to receive benefits for total disability, during the continuation of such period of disability for which benefits are payable.

BASIS OF PROPOSAL

This proposal is issued for a period of thirty-one days; however, the quotation may be extended for additional thirty-one day periods by written approval of the Trust.

The above rate presumes all employees are covered by a state teacher retirement system or similar programs in addition to social security

Duration Clause

This agreement shall be in effect on July 1, 1984 and shall remain in effect through June 30, 1986. The agreement shall be reopened for 1985-86 for the purpose of negotiating all economic issues and up to two language items proposed by each party.

Approved for the Board:

_____
President

_____
Clerk

Approved for the CEA:

_____
President

_____
Clerk

CAMPBELLSPORT 1984-85 SALARY SCHEDULE

CAMPBELLSPORT $15,000 BASE SCHEDULE 2/13/85

STEP	BA	BA+6	BA+12	BA+18	BA+24	MA	MA+6	MA+12
1.0	15000	15300	15600	15900	16250	16740	17090	17490
1.5	15287	15587	15887	16187	16537	17097	17447	17847
2.0	15574	15874	16174	16474	16824	17454	17804	18204
2.5	15861	16161	16461	16761	17111	17811	18161	18561
3.0	16148	16448	16748	17048	17398	18168	18518	18918
3.5	16435	16735	17035	17335	17685	18525	18875	19275
4.0	16722	17022	17322	17622	17972	18882	19232	19632
4.5	17009	17309	17609	17909	18259	19239	19589	19989
5.0	17296	17596	17896	18196	18546	19596	19946	20346
5.5	17583	17883	18183	18483	18833	19953	20303	20703
6.0	17870	18170	18470	18770	19120	20310	20660	21060
6.5	18157	18457	18757	19057	19407	20667	21017	21417
7.0	18444	18744	19044	19344	19694	21024	21374	21774
7.5	18731	19031	19331	19631	19981	21381	21731	22131
8.0	19018	19318	19618	19918	20268	21738	22088	22488
8.5	19305	19605	19905	20205	20555	22095	22445	22845
9.0	19592	19892	20192	20492	20842	22452	22802	23202
9.5	19879	20179	20479	20779	21129	22809	23159	23559
10.0	20166	20466	20766	21066	21416	23166	23516	23916
10.5	20453	20753	21053	21353	21703	23523	23873	24273
11.0	20740	21040	21340	21640	21990	23880	24230	24630
11.5	21027	21327	21627	21927	22277	24237	24587	24987
12.0	21314	21614	21914	22214	22564	24594	24944	25344
12.5	21601	21901	22201	22501	22851	24951	25301	25701
13.0	21888	22188	22488	22788	23138	25308	25658	26058
13.5	22175	22475	22775	23075	23425	25665	26015	26415
14.0	22462	22762	23062	23362	23712	26022	26372	26772

ACTUAL 1984-85 STAFF PLACED ON ASSOCIATION 1984-85 PROPOSED SALARY SCHEDULE

STEP	BA	BA+6	BA+12	BA+18	BA+24	MA	MA+6	MA+12	TOTAL
1.0	10.500	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	11.500
1.5	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	0.000	1.000	2.000
2.0	4.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	6.000
2.5	1.500	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.500
3.0	2.500	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.500
3.5	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
4.0	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.000
4.5	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
5.0	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.000
5.5	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
6.0	1.000	0.000	0.500	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.500
6.5	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
7.0	2.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.000
7.5	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.000
8.0	2.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.000
8.5	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
9.0	4.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	4.000
9.5	2.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.000
10.0	2.000	2.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.000	0.000	1.000	7.000
10.5	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
11.0	0.000	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.000
11.5	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
12.0	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.000	1.000	5.000
12.5	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
13.0	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	3.000
13.5	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
14.0	6.000	7.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	10.000	0.000	0.000	24.000
TOTAL	40.500	12.000	2.500	1.000	5.000	16.000	0.000	3.000	80.000