

OCT 27 1986

In the Matter of the Petition of
 JOHNSON CREEK EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
 To Initiate Mediation-Arbitration
 Between Said Petitioner and
 JOHNSON CREEK SCHOOL DISTRICT

Case 13 No. 35752
 MED/ARB-3526 WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT
 Decision No. 23158 RELATIONS COMMISSION
 Mediator-Arbitrator
 Stanley H. Michelstetter II

Appearances:

A. Philip Borkenhagen, Executive Director, appearing on behalf of the Association.

Melli, Walker, Pease & Ruhly, S.C., by James K. Ruhly, Attorney at Law, appearing on behalf of the Employer.

MEDIATION-ARBITRATION AWARD

Johnson Creek Education Association, herein referred to as the "Association," having petitioned the Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission to initiate Mediation-Arbitration pursuant to Section 111.70(4)(cm), Wis. Stats.^{1/} between it and the Johnson Creek School District, herein referred to as the "Employer," and the Commission having appointed the Undersigned as Mediator-Arbitrator on January 23, 1986; and the Undersigned having conducted mediation on April 8, 1986, without success and hearing having been conducted on April 29, and again on May 8, 1986 in Johnson Creek, Wisconsin. The parties each filed post-hearing brief and reply briefs the last of which was received July 22, 1986.

ISSUES 2/

The following is a summary of the issues in dispute for the parties' 1985-86 collective bargaining agreement. The parties' final offers are incorporated by reference as if fully set out herein.

1. Wages. The parties 1984-85 salary schedule is attached hereto and marked Appendix A. The Association's proposed 1985-86 wages schedule is attached hereto and marked Appendix B. The Employer's proposed wage schedule is attached hereto and marked Appendix C. Both parties maintain the same educational lanes and reduce the number of steps at each lane by one. Both parties freeze current teachers on step and eliminate the first step of the old schedule. The Employer maintains verticle increments in the low credit BA area, but increases horizontal and verticle increments in the highest BA and all MA areas whereas the Association increases all increments substantially. The parties agree to the costing of their final offers as follows:

	<u>Employer</u>	<u>Association</u>
Increase salary per returning teacher	\$1,475	\$1,929
Salary increase	7.25%	9.48%
Total package	7.56%	9.62%
Total package per returing teacher	2,022	2,576

2. Under the 1984-85 agreement newly hired teachers with prior teaching experience were granted full for prior teaching experience (one step for each year's experience). The Employer proposes to continue this for the first six years, whereas the Association would continue it for the first eight years. Thereafter both parties grant half credit for further experience.

1/ Section 111.70(4)(cm) has since been amended; however, thoses amendments are not effective for this dispute.

2/ During the course of the hearing the parties stipulated to increase Wisconsin Retirement System contribution by 1%.

POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES

The Association relies upon comparisons to other similar districts. It concedes that the Eastern Suburban Conference is an appropriate Comparison group including Lake Mills which is soon due to leave the conference.^{3/} It seeks to expand this group, because there is no "dispositive" settlement pattern in the athletic conference, to include schools of similar size which have any part in a thirty mile radius from Johnson Creek. These schools are Rio, Randolph, Columbus, Mayville, Moricon, Hartland Elementary and Pewaukee. It argues that the Wisconsin Interscholastic Athletic Association is management oriented and there simply is no reason to exclude comparable schools. The Association also relies on neighboring Watertown as an independent comparison district of great weight because it alleges there is a long standing historical relationship. The Association takes the view that its offer is necessary to maintain its relative ranking in the athletic conference, and in the 30 mile radius groups. In its view, analysis of the wage rates at the accepted benchmarks of BA Minimum, BA+7, BA Maximum, MA Minimum, MA+10, Maximum and Scheduled Maximum should be the sole method of wage comparison used herein. Based upon its bench mark comparison, it takes the position that the Employer's proposal allocation is intended to cause turnover. It also seeks to establish a wage level in the same relative ratio as 1982-83 to that of Watertown, because teachers here work and shop in Watertown. Watertown had been used as a comparable by the parties. It points to the Rand report stating that teacher salaries have lost ground to other occupations over the last ten years. It notes that there will be a future high demand for teachers and, therefore, the parties should do everything possible to raise wages in anticipation of this. With respect to the changed schedule, it finds its offer more nearly preserves the existing ratios, whereas the Employer's does not. It believes the Employer has failed to demonstrated a need for change. It believes its offer best serves the public interest because tax rates here are the same as they were in 1980-81; student population decline has minimal impact on state aids which are actually increasing here, and value have grown slightly; the tax increase occurring in 1985-86 by 2 mills was mostly a transfer of the special education levy from the county to the school district. It denies that 90% of the district is rural. Further it believes the district has \$200,000 surplus funds with which to cover increases. It denies that the Employer's data demonstrates any economic problem different from other areas or that the farm "crises" is significant. Although benefits are otherwise fairly uniform among the comparables, Johnson Creek pays \$114 less than average for health insurance and will pay \$114 less than average for the year 1985-86. In its view, the Employer's change in experience recognition for new hires is not justified because, it changes the status quo and is not comparable.

The Employer takes the position that the appropriate primary comparison group is the Eastern Suburban Conference Which consists of Dodgeand, Hustisford, Waterloo, Marshall, Williams Bay, Palmyra, Deerfield, and Cambridge. Lake Mills is currently in the conference and the Employer includes Lake Mills. In its view, the Employer is the least well-to-do district in the conference. The value of real estate in Johnson Creek in 1984 was the lowest in the conference and is likely to continue to be the lowest. The value of the tax base in Johnson Creek declined more than any other district in the conference between 1982 and 1985. The Employer takes the position that 95% of the real estate in the school district is used for agricultural purposes. A large portion of the remainder is used for trailer parks which house elderly retirees on fixed incomes. It argues that enrollment in Johnson Creek is down and that Johnson Creek will lose students in the future meaning a loss in state aids. In this regard it notes that Johnson Creek experienced the largest tax levy rate increase in the conference for the four year and three years periods ending with the 1984-85 school year. The Employer takes the position that its offer exceeds the cost-of-living. Further, the Employer takes the position that its method of allocating the increase encourages teachers to attain additional education cre-

^{3/} These schools are Hustisford, Dodgeand, Waterloo, Marshall, Lake Mills, Deerfield, Cambridge, Palmyra-Eagle and Williams Bay.

ditions whereas the Association's position tends to discourage this. The Employer strongly argues that the public interest is better off having teachers earn additional credits. It notes that its offer is much more in line with consumer price index changes which changed just 3.7% from July 1984 to June 1985. It notes that a large component of this increase related to medical costs which are already picked up by the Employer's offer of increased health insurance payments. It relies on comparisons to the Eastern Suburban Conference. It notes that Johnson Creek has maintained its relative stature in the conference of the last six years and that the total package proposal which it is making is consistent with the total package settlements in conference schools. It notes there have been a large number of settlements in the conference and that many have been voluntary. The Employer sees no reason to go outside the "traditional comparability group" of the Eastern Suburban Conference. It notes that there are a sufficient number of settlements in the conference and the Association has never raised its comparability group proposed herein in bargaining. It also argues that the offer of the Employer is more appropriate in view of the economic conditions of Johnson Creek. It notes that manufacturing in the area is centralized in an industrial park that has a tax deferred basis. It notes that large private employers have had no wage increases in the area. Finally, it notes that Johnson Creek suffers from the farm crisis and that in this context there is no justification for the Association's position. The Employer also relies on the mediation-arbitration award in Fort Atkinson (decision number 23009-A) 6/86. The Employer also takes the position that reliance by the Association in Watertown is not appropriate in that Watertown is a much larger, more urban district which has a heavy commercial/industrial base. It notes that there is no historical relationship between the wage rates in Watertown and those in Johnson Creek. While it apparently concedes that there may have been a relationship of some sort before the adoption of mediation-arbitration in 1978, it notes that voluntary settlements since that time have ignored the relationship of salaries in Johnson Creek to Watertown. It denies that the fact that some employees shop or live in Watertown is a basis for any different result.

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 from Section 111.70(4)(cm), Wis. Stats. are:

"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 lawful 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 employes performing similar services and with other employes generally in public employment in the same community and in comparable communities and in private employment in the same community and in 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 issue or factor in a specific dispute. That matter is left to the mediator-arbitrator. The factors which apply in this dispute are b. stipulations, c. interests and welfare of the public, d. comparison, e. cost of living, f. overall compensation, and h. other factors.

WAGES

Cost of Living

From July, 1984 to June, 1985 the relevant consumer price index changed 3.7%. Both offers vastly exceed this change. Accordingly, this factor favors the Employer.

External Comparisons

There is no dispute that the parties have historically used the Eastern Suburban Conference as a main comparability group. With the exception of Williams Bay located near the Wisconsin Illinois border, these districts are the closest available districts which are the same relative size. Johnson Creek is 41.85 full time equivalent and all of the conference districts are + 15 full time equivalent except neighboring Lake Mills (71.46) and very close by Palmyra-Eagle (83.07). Of all of these districts, Johnson Creek has the lowest equalized value. The economy of Johnson Creek is broadly similar to the others. In this group less weight is assigned to Williams Bay where it is significantly divergent. Of the 9 other conference districts, 6 have settled. There is, therefore, little reason to expand the primary comparable group under the facts of this case. All of the seven supplemental districts are more distant than the conference schools except Williams Bay. Four of the seven are larger than 15 full time equivalent higher. Two are less than 15 full time equivalent smaller. Only Horicon is in this size range + 15. Thus, this group is less comparable than the primary group.

The Association relies upon Watertown as a comparison because of the interrelationship of the local economies and because of a historical relationship between Watertown and Johnson Creek. Watertown is contiguous, but it is a much larger and more urban district. The Association's rationale is based not upon the standards of comparability ordinarily used by mediator-arbitrators, but primarily by virtue of the past voluntary recognition of the parties. It appears undisputed that before the advent of mediation-arbitration in 1978, the parties often referred to the settlements in Watertown. Association Exhibit 33 demonstrates that wage rates in Johnson Creek have not been identical to those in Watertown at any time in the period 1976 to now. While it appears that the size of increase may have been a consideration at the bargaining table in years past, over the years there has been a fairly steady pattern of erosion of the relationship with notable exceptions. While Watertown is comparable to a degree because of its proximity and interrelationship with Johnson Creek, it is far less comparable than the Eastern Suburban Conferences.

The following comparison shows that Johnson Creek was an average to slightly below average paying district in 1984-85. 4/

4/ The average number of BA column steps in the conference was 12. In 1984-85, whereas Johnson Creek had 7. Since both parties have established an abbreviated BA column to encourage teachers to gain additional credits and both propose to continue this policy, I have made comparisons to the BA 5th year instead of 7th year. Accordingly, little weight is placed on the disparity at BA Maximums between Johnson Creek and Elsewhere.

This comparison tends to support the Employer's proposal of providing a greater increase in the MA area of the schedule in that than the BA areas.

1984-5 schedule comparisons to all districts

District	BA	BA+5	BA MAX	MA	MA+10	MA MAX	SD MAX
Camb.	14,725.	16,573.	24,338.	16,735.	21,835.	27,660.	30,445.
Deer.	14,100.	15,920.	20,925.	16,375.	20,470.	23,200.	25,020.
Dodgel.	14,575.	17,199.	21,134.	16,324.	22,227.	24,850.	26,381.
Hustis.	14,450.	16,974.	21,391.	16,040.	22,583.	25,491.	26,685.
Lake M.	14,500.	17,110.	20,154.	16,385.	22,775.	25,396.	27,149.
Marshall	14,000.	16,240.	19,600.	16,240.	21,280.	24,080.	25,760.
Palmyra	13,959.	15,774.	19,612.	16,053.	21,706.	23,730.	26,522.
Waterloo	14,015.	16,257.	19,621.	15,802.	21,491.	25,283.	26,427.
Williams	14,300.	16,731.	22,594.	15,015.	22,165.	25,740.	27,885.
AV.	14,292.	16,531.	21,041.	16,108.	21,837.	25,048.	26,919.
AV.	14,292.	16,531.	21,041.	16,108.	21,837.	25,048.	26,919.
JC	-14,500.	-16,700.	-17,800.	-15,950.	-21,620.	-25,400.	-27,500.
Difference	+208.	+169.	-3,241.	-158.	-217.	+352.	+581.
rank	3	5	10	8	7	4	3

To date, 6 of the 9 other conference schools have settled. Data is incomplete with respect to all types of comparison except total package and actual schedules. There are unexplained conflicts in costing in total package data. Thus, this data demonstrates at most 1. That the offer of the Employer is slightly lower than any settlement; 2. The offer of the Association is slightly higher than any settlement; and 3. It is not possible to tell which is closer to average. The data is as follows:

1985-86 Total Package

Cambridge	8.10		
Deerfield	9.47	or	9.23
Hustisford	9.47	or	9.08
Lake Mills	8.26		
Marshall	8.50	or	8.24 or 8.05
Williams Bay	8.2		
Average	8.48	to	8.66
JC	Er. 7.56	Assn.	9.62

Final Offers	Employer	Association
Waterloo	7.4	8.7
Palmyra	7.51	9.86
Dodgeland	7.5	9.24 (salary only)

The schedules of the settled schools are available. The following districts have settled: Cambridge, Deerfield, Hustisford, Lake Mills, Marshall and Williams Bay. Their settlement at the benchmarks are:

	BA	BA+5	BA MAX	MA	MA+10	MA MAX	SCH MAX
1984-85 - 85-86 increase	894	1,031	1,327	1,004	1,352	1,555	4,793

Because unit employees will not be advanced to the next step under either party's offer, I have compared the proposed settlements at BA 4th Step to the average at BA 5th Step and MA 9th Step to the average at MA 10th Step. By this comparison the Association's increase is clearly more comparable than the Employer's to the average dollar increase at BA 5 and BA maximum, but less comparable in the MA 10 and Maximums. The following is Association compared to average increase

set incr	-894.00	-1,031.00	-1,327.00	-1,004.	-1,352.	-1,555.	-1,793.00
Asso.	1,250.00	1,030.00	1,250.00	1,400.	1,650.	2,310.	2,430.00
	356.00	-1.00	-77.00	396.	298.	755.	637.

Employer compared to average increase at benchmarks

set incr	-894.	-1,031.	-1,327.	-1,004.	-1,352.	-1,555.	-1,793.
Er.	1,475.00	925.00	925.00	1,575.	1,265.	1,505.	1,745.
	<u>581.00</u>	<u>-106.00</u>	<u>-402.00</u>	<u>571.00</u>	<u>-87.00</u>	<u>-50.00</u>	<u>-48.00</u>

By weighing the benchmarks for the number of employees primarily affected by them and the amount of the disparity, the offer of the Employer is more comparable.^{5/} On this basis, I conclude the offer of the Employer is more comparable.

Private Sector

Hearsay testimony about wage rates and better information at the areas two largest employers was excluded at hearing because the employers involved wished not to be identified and were not otherwise know to the Association. The hearsay testimony had no particular guarantees of trustworthiness and, its admission would have denied the Association an effective opportunity to cross examine or otherwise provide evidence. The area's third and fourth largest employers and other employers have for the most part, not been granting wage increase in the relevant periods. This evidence indicates that area residents employed thereat are not receiving increases in their ability to pay. The number and variety of businesses involved and disparity between their increases and my experience in the private sector, suggests depressed wage growth in this area. This factor favors the position of the Employer.

Interests and Welfare of the Public

The public has two somewhat conflicting interests, obtaining quality education including the hiring, retention and encouragement of an adequate number of competent professionals and obtaining education at the lowest possible cost and within the means of the taxpaying public. In the absence of countervailing factors, the balance between the two interests ought ordinarily to be struck at providing wage rates which are comparable to the wages of similar employees in similar areas. In this case, there are factors enhancing the positions of both parties. The main factor favoring the position of the Association is the rationale of the existing salary structure. Consistently for many years both parties have maintained a salary schedule unique among the comparables which virtually mandates that teachers obtain further education. Both parties' proposals enhance this system. Ordinarily, such salary systems need to consistently provide the positive incentive of comparable or higher pay to retain and motivate the more highly qualified teachers. In this case this factor weighs against less than comparable increases due to short term economic fluctuations in the local economy.

The factor favoring the Employer is difficulties in its local economic conditions. First, the ability of local taxpayers to shoulder tax increases has been hurt mainly by the farm crisis and may be impaired more than comparable school districts. Second, the tax base of Johnson Creek is relatively small.

Johnson Creek is located on Jefferson County and is bordered by Watertown, Lake Mills, Cambridge (slightly), Fort Atkinson, and Oconomowoc. The majority of employment appears to be in agriculture. A large number of people are employed in industries in Johnson Creek and surrounding communities. There are a number of retired persons living on fixed incomes in mobile home parks in the district. Approximately 90% of the district's real estate is devoted to agriculture, the remainder being divided between the effects of the national farm crisis. There was testimony that area residents are poor. There has been a sharp decline in farm values^{6/} state wide. The equalized value per student in Johnson Creek has declined from 1982 to 1986 more than all, but one comparable district. The January, 1986 outside study commissioned by the Employer states that future growth will be less than comparables as well. The preponderance of the evidence supports the conclusion that area residents as a whole are less well off than the comparable districts. Johnson Creek has an 1984-85 equalized value per member of \$116,000 which is the lowest of all

5/ BA 5 12.71, BA Max 9.12, MA 10 9.903, MA Max 10, Sch Max 5.037

ten conference schools while its is the lowest, it is very close to four other conference schools. The average of the conference without Williams Bay is \$156,866.

As discussed above the growth in tax base is likely to be less than comparable communities. It should be noted that projected declines in student enrollment and likely increases in state aid will offset this effect to some extent by increasing funds, reducing need for employees and increasing equalized value per student.

The levy rate of Johnson Creek in 1984-85 was 12.58, 4th highest in the conference. Excluding Williams Bay, the conference average was 12.76 and the range was from 15.79 to 11.22. The actual percentage tax levy increases from 1984-85 to 1985-86 in the conference excluding Williams Bay were:

Conference		Contiguous Jefferson County Schools	
Cambridge	10.63%	Watertown	20.65
Deerfield	7.13%	Jefferson	18.15
Dodgeland	14.98%		
Hustisford	14.06%		
Lake Mills	16.46	Oconomowoc	4.08
Marshall	10.94	Fort Atkinson	14.19
Palmyra	36.80		
Waterloo	18.98		
Johnson Creek	18.15		

Combined with the steeper than average decline in area property values, the tax per thousand of equalized value puts Jefferson at the highest in the area. The 1984-85 cost per pupil of Johnson Creek was \$3,294 and the conference average excluding Williams Bay was \$3,292. A review of the Rossmiller, et al. study suggests the district is not in serious danger of sacrificing vital programs and may have program changes which could effect savings. (See pp. 12-23)

Of the nine conference districts other than Williams Bay, Johnson Creek receives the highest state aid per pupil for 1984-85 (\$1,659) closely rivaling three other districts. The average state aid per pupil of the nine was \$1,236. For 1985-86, many districts received proportionately larger increases in state aid; however, it is likely that Johnson Creek's aid per pupil is still relatively high in the conference. From 1984-85 to 1985-86, Johnson Creek's state aid rose 14.4%.

For 1985-86 the Employer established a budget with a planned deficit of \$14 to 15,000 which budget allowed for the Employer's proposal. Because of other unforeseen increases, principally health insurance costs, the budget will be approximately \$30,000 out of balance. At the time of hearing the budget problem was complicated by a question as to whether the district would receive its full budgeted state aid allowance. Based on the foregoing, it appears Johnson Creek taxpayers as a whole are experiencing more economic difficulty than conference districts. While there is no immediate danger of loss of vital programs, the tax rate and property base present continuing problems in Johnson Creek. The offer of the Employer herein is more comparable to conference schools than the Association's. The public interest favors the offer of the Employer over that of the Association.

Hiring Rate

Both parties have substantially increased the starting rate for new teachers and have increased the schedule significantly. Under these circumstances change in the placement of new hires on the schedule is appropriate. The proposals of both parties differ only as to the amount of service granted full credit. The comparative data varies so widely that no inference can be effectively drawn. The position of the Association is closer to past

6/ The January, 1986, study commissioned by the district and done by Rossmiller, et al. @ p.6 suggests that the rate of growth will be less here than statewide.

history and, therefore, is favored on this issue.

WEIGHT

The wage issue is of far more importance than the hiring rate issue. All of the factors in this case favor the position of the Employer. Accordingly, the offer of the Employer is adopted.

AWARD

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

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin this 31 day of October, 1986.

Stanley H. Michelstetter II
Stanley H. Michelstetter II
Mediator-Arbitrator

Appendix A

APPENDIX B

1984-85 SALARY SCHEDULE

STEPS					BA+30				
	BA+0	BA+8	BA+16	BA+24	MA+0	MA+8	MA+16	MA+24	
0	14500	14850	15200	15550	15950	16350	16750	17150	
1	15050	15420	15790	16160	16580	17000	17420	17840	
2	15600	15990	16380	16770	17210	17650	18090	18530	
3	16150	16560	16970	17380	17840	18300	18760	19220	
4	16700	17130	17560	17990	18470	18950	19430	19910	
5	17250	17700	18150	18600	19100	19600	20100	20600	
6	17800	18270	18740	19210	19730	20250	20770	21290	
7		18840	19330	19820	20360	20900	21440	21980	
8		19410	19920	20430	20990	21550	22110	22670	
9			20510	21040	21620	22200	22780	23360	
10			21100	21650	22250	22850	23450	24050	
11				22260	22880	23500	24120	24740	
12				22870	23510	24150	24790	25430	
13					24140	24800	25460	26120	
14					24770	25450	26130	26810	
15					25400	26100	26800	27500	

VERTICAL INCREMENTS

\$550 \$570 \$590 \$610 \$630 \$650 \$670 \$690

HORIZONTAL INCREMENTS BA - BA+24 = \$350 BA+30 - MA+24 = \$400

1985 86 1'

B ₂	550	570	590	610	630	650	670	690
MA	710	730	750	770	790	810	830	850
B ₁ (105)	550	570	590	620	670	690	710	730

APPENDIX B
1985-86 SALARY SCHEDULE

<u>STEPS</u>	<u>BA+0</u>	<u>BA+8</u>	<u>BA+16</u>	<u>BA+24</u>	<u>BA+30 MA+0</u>	<u>MA+8</u>	<u>MA+16</u>	<u>MA+24</u>
0	15750	16130	16510	16890	17350	17810	18270	18730
1	16410	16810	17210	17610	18090	18570	19050	19530
2	17070	17490	17910	18330	18830	19330	19830	20330
3	17730	18170	18610	19050	19570	20090	20610	21130
4	18390	18850	19310	19770	20310	20850	21390	21930
5	19050	19530	20010	20490	21050	21610	22170	22730
6		20210	20710	21210	21790	22370	22950	23530
7		20890	21410	21930	22530	23130	23730	24330
8			22110	22650	23270	23890	24510	25130
9			22810	23370	24010	24650	25290	25930
10				24090	24750	25410	26070	26730
11				24810	25490	26170	26850	27530
12					26230	26930	27630	28330
13					26970	27690	28410	29130
14					27710	28450	29190	29930

VERTICAL INCREMENTS

\$660 \$680 \$700 \$720 \$740 \$760 \$780 \$800

HORIZONTAL INCREMENTS BA - BA+24 = \$380 BA+30 - MA+24 = \$460

Appendix C
APPENDIX B

1935-86 SALARY SCHEDULE

JOHNSON CREEK SCHOOL DISTRICT

STEP	MA + 0							
	BA + 0	BA + 8	BA + 16	BA + 24	BA + 30	MA + 8	MA + 16	MA + 24
0	15975	16325	16675	17025	17525	18025	18525	19025
1	16525	16895	17265	17645	18195	18715	19235	19755
2	17075	17465	17855	18265	18865	19405	19945	20485
3	17625	18035	18445	18885	19535	20095	20655	21215
4	18175	18605	19035	19505	20205	20785	21365	21945
5	18725	19175	19625	20125	20875	21475	22075	22675
6		19745	20215	20745	21545	22165	22785	23405
7		20315	20805	21365	22215	22855	23495	24135
8			21395	21985	22885	23545	24205	24865
9			21985	22605	23555	24235	24915	25595
10				23225	24225	24925	25625	26325
11				23845	24895	25615	26335	27055
12					25565	26305	27045	27785
13					26235	26995	27755	28515
14					26905	27685	28465	29245

VERTICLE INCREMENTS

550 570 590 620 670 690 710 730

HORIZONTAL INCREMENTS

BA-BA+24 = 350 ; BA+30-MA+24 = 500