| In the Matter of the Petition of | $\cdots$ ，「「号 |
| :---: | :---: |
| CLINTON EDUCATION ASSOCIATION to | Case 14，No． 35882 |
| initiate Mediation－Arbitration | Med／Arb－3587 |
| between said Petitioner and | Decision No．23147－A |
| CLINTON COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT | Mediator－Arbitrator <br> Stanley H．Michelstetter II |

Appearances：
Lysabeth N．Wilson，UniServe Director，appearing on behalf of the Association．

Shannon E．Bradbury，1／Staff Counsel，appearing on behalf of the Employer．

## MEDIATION－ARBITRATION AWARD

Clinton Education Association，herein referred to as the ＂Association，＂having petitioned the Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission to initiate Mediation－Arbritation pursuant to Section 111.70 （4）（cm），Wis．Stats．2／between it and the Clinton Communty School District，herein referred to as the ＂Employer，＂and the Commission having appointed the Undersigned as Mediator－Arbitrator on January 16，1986；and the Undersigned having conducted Mediation on March 19，1986，which was unsec－ cessful；and the parties having waived hearing in the matter and having submitted stipulated exhibits，and briefs，the last of which was received June $18,1986$.

## ISSUES

The sole issue in this case is the appropriate salary sche－ dule for the period July 1,1985 to June 30 ，1986．This case arises under a reopener provision in the parties July 1,1984 to June 30 ，1986，collective bargaining agreement．The 1984－85 salary schedule of the parties is attached hereto and marked appendix A．The Employer proposes to adjust the base to $\$ 15,580$ and each cell by $6.5 \%$ ．The parties agreed that the Employer＇s salary increase represents $8.01 \%$ ．The Employer alleges that its total package increase is $8.28 \%$ ．The Association increases the BA Base to $\$ 15,701$ and increase each cell of the new schedule by 7． $3 \%$ ．The parties agree that the Association＇s offer is a salary Increase of $8.86 \%$ ．The Employer costs the total package of the Association at $9.06 \%$ ．The Association costs the total package of the parties at $8.07 \%$ of the Employer and $8.86 \%$ of the Association．The final offer of the Employer is attached hereto and marked Appendix $B$ and the final offer of the Association is attached hereto and Marked Appendix $C$ ．

## POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES

The Association takes the position that its proposed general increase should be adopted namely on the basis that it 1 s more comparable to other similar units among comparable Employers．In its view，prior arbitration awards between the parties properly established the appropriate comparison group for Clinton as the Rock Valley Conference，excluding Walworth Unton High School． These school districts are Brodhead，Edgerton，Evansville， Orfordville（Parkview），and Beloit－Turner．However，only one school district in that comparability group，Evansville，has been settled（in arbitration）．In its view the Arbitrator should use an enhanced comparability group of those schools in old CESA 17 which have settled．These school districts are Beloit， Evansville，Janesville，Jefferson，Lake Mills and Milton．It then uses comparisons to the schedule adjustments made in these

[^0]2／Section 111.70 （4）（cm），has since been amended；however those dmendments are not effective for this dispute．
school districts to show that "at all benchmarks except one, the Clinton Teachers are below the median and average salaries of other selected schools and that the Employer's offer would drop the benchmark further below the median and average salary established for 1984-85 in this group. It denies that Clinton can legitimately claim difficulty in paying. It relies upon the rationale of Arbitrator Yaffe in Fall Creek (decision No. 21997-A) in which he required a showing of 1 . Harmful reduction of services 2. That the Employer would be required to engage in detrimental long term deficit financing or 3 . The settlement would require levels of taxation beyond that which have proved politically unacceptable by experience in comparable districts. It argues that the tax level of Clinton has been the lowest of the fourteen comparable districts for the last three years. Clinton has the second highest equalized value per member. Finally, it notes Clinton has the fourth highest median family income and is nine out of fourteen of the number of families below poverty level. Finally, it denies farmers in Clinton are worse off than farmers in districts which have settled much as the Association has proposed. It takes the view, that the cost of living criterion should be weighted by the settlements.

The Employer takes the position that its offer satisfies all the applicable criteria. It primarily argues that local economic conditions require that its offer be adopted. It argues that this Rock County communty is heavily dependent on agriculture and manufacturing in Janesville and Beloit. It argues that tax deliquencies in Rock County have risen $99.3 \%$ since 1981 to $5,585,860$ (the fourth highest in the state). It also argues that $9.6 \%$ of Rock County's population was unemployed in February, 1986, compared to state wide 8.8\%, Jefferson (9.8\%), Green ( $7.8 \%$ ), and Walworth ( $7.3 \%$ ). In this respect Rock County's umemployment rose $2.2 \%$ of full from February, 1985. It also relies on comparison to the nonmetropolitan consumer price index which rose $1.1 \%$ in the year of February, 1986. It also emphasizes its position that the crisis in farming does not justify tax increase. It notes that land values are declining, deliquencies are up, and virtually all farmers are suffering loss of income. The Employer relies on the Rock Valley Athletic Conference for comparison, excluding Walworth Union High School on the basis that this comparability group is a comparison group well established and accepted by the parties. It argues that since one district in the conference is settled (by arbitration), Evansville, that the arbitrator should rely on the result in Evansville and the noncomparison factors. It concludes that the other communities lack complete comparablility and should therefore be disregarded. It notes that its offer compares as to the benchmarks and total package more favorably with the Evansville settlement than the Association's.

## DISCUSSION

It is the responsibility of the Mediator-Arbitrator to apply the statutory criteria to select, without modification of any kind, the final offer which most nearly meets the statutory criteria. The statutory criteria in effect for this dispute are the following: (Section 111.70) (4)(cm):
"7. Factors considered. In making any decision under the arbitration procedures authorized by this subsection, the mediator-arbitrator shall give weight to the following factors:
a. The lawfull authority of the municipal employer.
b. Stipulations of the parties.
c. The interests and welfare of the public and the financial ability of the unit of government to meet the costs of any proposed settlement.
d. Comparison of wages, hours and conditions of employment of the municipal employes involved in the arbitration proceedings with the wages, hours and conditions of employment of other
employes performing similar services and with other employes generally in public employment in the same communtty and in comparable communities and in private employment in the same community and $1 n$ comparable communities.
e. The average consumer prices for goods and services, commonly known as the cost-of-living.
f. The overall compensation presently received by the municipal employes, including direct wage compensation, vacation, holidays and excused time, insurance and pensions, medical and hospitalization benefits, the continuity and stability of employment, and all other benefits received.
g. Changes in any of the foregoing circumstances during the pendency of the arbitration proceedings.
h. Such other factors, not confined to the foregoing, which are normally or traditionally taken into consideration in the determination of wages, hours and conditions of employment through voluntary collective bargaining, mediation, fact-finding, arbitration or otherwise between the parties, in the public service or in private employment."

While the statutes specifies the factors to be applied it does not specify the weight to be attached to any particular factor in a specific dispute. That matter is left to the mediatorarbitrator.

## Consumer Price Index

The nonmetropolitan urban area wage earner and clerical workers consumer price index changed $2.7 \%$ from June, 1984 , to June 1985. The Association has the lower costing per total package of the two offers. The Association cost the Employer's total package at $8.07 \%$ and the Association's at $8.86 \%$. This factor favors the Employer's position.

## Interests of the Public

The evidence offered by the Employer indicates that Rock County like other places nationally is suffering from the national farm crisis. It further alleges that Rock County is facing a substantial problem with unemployment. The following is the data presented by the employer:

Location 1985 Dec., 1985 Jan. Feb., 1986

| Janesville-Beloit | $6.9 \%$ | $7.7 \%$ | $9.5 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Green County | $4.8 \%$ | $5.1 \%$ | $7.9 \%$ |
| Jefferson | $8.0 \%$ | $8.8 \%$ | $9.6 \%$ |
| Walworth | $5.5 \%$ | $6.1 \%$ | $7.9 \%$ |
| Wisconsin Average | $7.0 \%$ | $7.5 \%$ | $8.7 \%$ |

It is clear that the Janesville-Beloit area shares a problem similar to that of Jefferson County with respect to unemployment. It is unclear whether the relevant parts of Green and Walworth have less of a problem with unemployment or merely have a larger percentage of their populus engaged in farming. However, it is clear that the area does have a problem with unemployment. It does not appear that Clinton is affected any worse than any of the other areas in Rock County and the reasoning of the Employer would suggest that Beloit-Janesville is much more affected by unemployment. Similarly, it is apparent that Green County is experiencing a more severe problem proportionately than Rock County with respect to tax delinquencies and Jefferson appears to have recently reached the same level. It is apparent that Walworth County is not experiencing anywhere near the problem that the other three are experiencing with respect to tax delinquencies.

It is important to note that among the Rock Valley Athletic Conference Group which the parties have agreed is comparable, Clinton has the lowest cost per member and the highest property Yalue permember. in ith has the second highest per capita income.
would cause the detrimental elimination of vital programs, result in a tax level which is politically unacceptable as measured by levels in comparable communities or result in detrimental long term borrowing. I would also note that Clinton has the lowest tax rates of any district in the conference. Ordinarily, this factor would be given weight in accordance with the comparability factor. However, there is only one settlement in the admitted comparability group. In order to give weight to this factor, I have looked at settlements of the other school districts in Rock County because, although they are dissimilar, they are evidence of settlements other people would reach under the same economic circumstances.

## Wage Comparisons

Both parties agree that the correct comparability groups for wage comparison to similar employees among similar employers is the Rock Valley Athletic Conference excluding Walworth Union High School. The schools included in the Rock Valley Athletic Conference are: Brodhead, Clinton, Edgerton, Evansville, Orford-ville-Park View, and Beloit-Turner. Only one contract of the comparable units has been resolved for $1985-86$ (Evansville in arbitration). The Association has proposed expanding the comparability list to include schools in the old CESA 17 which have settled while the Employer asserts that the other factors other than comparability should be given determinative weight and alternatively, the Evansville settlement should be the only comparable used.

Both parties seek to establish the appropriate general increase and neither is taking the position that there ought to be a fundamental adjustment in the relative relationship between Clinton and the other schools in the accepted comparability group. This comparison is as follows:

1984-85

| Sch Dist | BA | $B A+7$ | BA Max | MA | $M A+10$ | MA Max | Max |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brodhead | \$14,275 | 17,701 | 19,985 | 16,075 | 21,535 | 25,175 | 25,475 |
| Edgerton3/ | 14,328 | 18,197 | 19,916 | 16,947 | 22,305 | 24,873 | 26,472 |
| EvansvilTe | 14,350 | 18,226 | 19,660 | 15,310 | 22,086 | 26,296 | 27,665 |
| Orfordville <br> (Parkview) | 13,850 | 17,313 | 18,559 | 15,038 | 21,504 | 24,813 | 26,327 |
| Beloit- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Turner | 14,600 | 17,777 | 29,087 | 16,177 | 22,303 | 25,661 | 27,559 |
| Average w/o |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

As stated before, only one school district in the comparable group has been resolved, Evansville. The arbitrated award there granted a $6.6 \%$ wage increase. The Employer's wage increase compares more favorably to this than the Association's. However, this data is insufficient to be given great weight. Were this the only data of comparisons available, comparability should be given less weight. However, the Association offered comparison to a number of school districts in old CESA 17. While these districts do not share a community of interest with respect to their individual ability to pay, they do share much of the same common economic difficulties occurring in this area. The school districts are City of Beloit, Evansville, Janesville, Jefferson, Lake Mills, and Milton. The average benchmark analysis for this group yields the following:

Benchmark Average Employer Association

| BA | 8.4 | 6.5 | 7.33 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BA +7 | 7.8 | 6.5 | 7.33 |
| BA MAX | 6.6 | 6.5 | 7.33 |
| MA | 8.15 | 6.5 | 7.33 |
| MA +10 | 7.4 | 6.5 | 7.33 |
| MA MAX | 6.5 | 6.5 | 7.33 |
| SCH MAX | 6.4 | 6.5 | 7.33 |

This data favors the Association's position slightly, but when distribution is taken into account, (a majority of the unit is in the area affected by the MA MAX), it favors the Association more heavily. However, when wage increase comparisons are used, this data favors the Employer heavily.

| Community | Increase |
| :--- | :---: |
| Beloit | 8.19 |
| Evansville | 6.6 |
| Janesville | 7.72 |
| Jefferson | 9.0 |
| Lake Mills | 7.66 |
| Average | 7.99 |

(this data is wage increase only, the same result would apply with total package.) This later data was also supplied by the Association. I view the data as substantially conflicting. It appears that the reason the conflict occurs is with the jefferson settlement. The Jefferson settlement has the following increases at the benchmarks:

| BA | 14.1 |
| :--- | ---: |
| BA + | 14.2 |
| BA MAX | 6.5 |
| MA MIN | 12.9 |
| MA +10 | 13.6 |
| MA MAX | 7.5 |
| SCH MAX | 7.7 |

average at the benchmarks 10.93\%. The data offered by the Association shows that the wage increase at Jefferson is $9 \%$. It appears that this could only occur with a very unusual distribution of employees at Jefferson or some variance in the implementation of the schedule. Accordingly, I have chosen to rely upon the wage increase data supplied by the Association in percentage terms and this data favors the Employer.

## SUMMARY

All the factors in this case favor the position of the Employer. Accordingly, the offer of the Employer is adopted as being most in line with the above criteria.

## AWARD

That the final offer of the Employer be, and the same, hereby is adopted.



## Clinton Commenity School Distatort irponix A

| $Y_{R S}$. | $B . A$. | $B A+6$ | $B A+12$ | $B A+18$ | $B A+24$ | $B A+36$ <br> $O R$ $\operatorname{HAA}$ | $M A+10$ | $M A+20$ | $M A+30$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| 0 | 14629 | 14921 | 15213 | 15506 | 15798 | 16090 | 16382 | 16674 | 16967 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 15068 | 15369 | 15670 | 15971 | 16272 | 16572 | 16874 | 17175 | 17476 |
| 2 | 15507 | 15817 | 16126 | 16436 | 16746 | 17056 | 17365 | 17675 | 17984 |
| 3 | 16092 | 16413 | 16735 | 17056 | 17378 | 17699 | 18021 | 18341 | 18663 |
| 4 | 16678 | 17010 | 17344 | 17676 | 18010 | 18343 | 18676 | 19009 | 19342 |
| 5 | 17262 | 17607 | 17952 | 18297 | 18641 | 18986 | 19331 | 19676 | 20020 |
| 6 | 17994 | 18353 | 18712 | 19072 | 19432 | 19791 | 20150 | 20510 | 20869 |
| . 7 | 18725 | 19099 | 19473 | 19847 | 20221 | 20595 | 20969 | 21343 | 21717 |
| 8 | 19457 | 19846 | 20234 | 20623 | 21012 | 21400 | 21788 | 22177 | 22568 |
| 9 | 20043 | 20442 | 20843 | 21243 | 21644 | 22043 | 22444 | 22844 | 23245 |
| $10^{\circ}$ | 20627 | 21039 | 21451 | 21864 | 22275 | 22687 | 23099 | 23512 | 23923. |
| 11 |  | 21636 | 22060 | 22483 | 22907 | 23331 | 23755 | 24178 | 24602 |
| 12 | $X$ |  | 22668 | 23104 | 23539 | 23975 | 24409 | 24845 | 29281 |
| 13 |  |  |  | 23724 | 24171 | 24618 | 25365 | 25512 | 25960 |
| 14 |  |  |  |  | 24645 | $? 5101$ | 35557 | 28013 | 2646.9 |

6.5\% CELL INCREASE

Appendix B
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Salary schedule


1763774
Rush Meterve
12.17 .85

|  |  |  | Appendix C |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CREDITS) | EA | BA+6 | BA +12 | 5A+18 | $8 \mathrm{C}+24$ | 8 $\mathrm{A}^{\text {+ }} 36 / \mathrm{MA}$ | MA+10 | MA+20 | $\mathrm{MA}+3 \mathrm{O}$ |
| 1 | 15701 | 16015 | 16328 | 16643 | 16956 | 17269 | 17583 | 17896 | 18211 |
| 2 | 16172 | 16496 | 16819 | 17142 | 17465 | 17787 | 18111 | 18434 | 18757 |
| 3 | 16644 | 16976 | 17308 | 17641 | 17973 | 18306 | 18638 | 18971 | 19302 |
| 4 | 17272 | 17618 | 17962 | 18306 | 18652 | 18996 | 19342 | 19685 | 20031 |
| Y 5 | 17900 | 18257 | 18615 | 18972 | 19330 | 19688 | 20045 | 20402 | 20760 |
| $E 6$ | - 18527 | 18898 | 19268 | 19638 | 20007 | 20378 | 20748 | 21118 | 21487 |
| A 7 | 19313 | 19698 | 20084 | 20470 | 20856 | 21242 | 21627 | 22013 | 22399 |
| R 8 | 20098 | 20499 | 20900 | 21302 | 21703 | 22105 | 22506 | 22907 | 23309 |
| 59 | 20883 | 21301 | 21717 | 22135 | 22552 | 22969 | 23385 | 23803 | 24220 |
| 10 | 21512 | 21940 | 22371 | 22800 | 23231 | 23659 | 24089 | 24518 | 24949 |
| 11 | 22139 | 22581 | 23023 | 23467 | 23908 | 24350 | 24792 | 25235 | 25677 |
| 12 |  | 23222 | 23677 | 24131 | 24586 | 25041 | 25496 | 25950 | 26405 |
| 13 |  |  | 24330 | 24798 | 25254 | 25732 | 26198 | 26666 | 27134 |
| 14 |  |  |  | 25463 | 25943 | 26422 | 26902 | 27382 | 27863 |
| 15 |  |  |  |  | 26451 | 26941 | 27430 | 27920 | 28409 |

PERCENT 1.0733

| CREDITS | BA | BA+6 | $8 \mathrm{~A}+12$ | BA+'8 | BA+24 | BA+36/RA | MA+10 | $\mathrm{MA}+2 \mathrm{O}$ | $\cdots \mathrm{n}+30$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 33288 | 8488 | 17309 | 0 | 0 | 27459 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 34544 | 17616 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9498 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Y 5 | 0 | 27386 | 0 | 0 | 17330 | 19688 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $E 6$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30011 | 30159 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| A 7 | 0 | 39396 | 20084 | $\hat{0}$ | 41712 | 6797 | 0 | 22013 | 0 |
| $R 8$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22506 | 0 | 0 |
| 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22135 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 0 | 0 | 22371 | 0 | 0 | 23659 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | 0 | 11291 | 23023 | 0 | 0 | 36525 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | ---- | 34833 | 0 | 15444 | 0 | 12521 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | -- | -- | 72990 | 8927 | 0 | 25732 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | ---* | - | - | 229147 | 0 | 26422 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15 | -- | - | - | --- | 270961 | 215528 | 109720 | 83760 | 85227 |
|  | 67832 | 139010 | 155776 | 273673 | 382014 | 433988 | 132226 | 105773 | 85227 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | total | 1784648 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \% INC | 145180 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 INC | 8.855312 |
|  |  |  |  |  | MMLARS PER RETURNING |  |  | TEACHER | 1954 |




[^0]:    IT During the course of the proceeding the name of the represen－ tative of the Employer，＂Bradbury，＂was misspelled；however the matter has since been appropriately corrected．

