

FEB 11 1987

INTEREST ARBITRATION
OPINION AND AWARDWISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT
RELATIONS COMMISSION

In the Mediation/Arbitration
between
BELOIT-TURNER SCHOOL DISTRICT
and
TURNER EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

CASE 21 NO. 35743
MED/ARB - 3519
Decision No. 23577-A

Meetings Held

August 28, 1986
October 1, 1986
Turner High School
1231 Inman Parkway
Beloit, WI

Appearances

For the Association:

Lysabeth N. Wilson
Rock Valley United Teachers
Route 7
Janesville, WI 53545

Mediator/Arbitrator

Steven Briggs
3612 N. Hackett Ave.
Milwaukee, WI 53211

For the Board:

James K. Ruhly, Esq.
Melli, Walker, Pease & Ruhly
P.O. Box 1664
Madison, WI 53701-1664

BACKGROUND

The undersigned was notified by a May 13, 1986, letter from the Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission of his selection as Mediator/Arbitrator in an interest dispute between the Beloit-Turner School District (Board) and the Turner Education Association (Association). The dispute concerns certain items to be included in the parties' 1985-1987 collective bargaining agreement covering all certified staff members of the school district engaged in teaching full or part-time, including classroom teachers, guidance counselors and librarians but excluding administrators, principals, supervisors, noninstructional personnel such as office, clerical, health service, maintenance, cafeteria, operating employees, substitute teachers, interns, and practice teachers.

Pursuant to statutory responsibilities, mediation was conducted on August 28, 1986. A settlement did not result. Final offer arbitration was conducted on October 1, 1986, during which time both parties had full opportunity to present evidence and argument in support of their respective final offers. Both parties filed timely Posthearing Briefs, and the record was declared closed on November 28, 1986. Based upon a detailed consideration of the record, and relying upon the criteria set forth in Section 111.70 (4)(cm), Wisconsin Statutes, the Arbitrator has formulated this Award.

DISCUSSION

Comparable School Districts

Both parties rely primarily on five other districts in the Rock Valley Athletic Conference (Conference) for comparison purposes:

Brodhead
Clinton
Edgerton
Evansville
Parkview

In addition, the Board uses data from Walworth School District for secondary comparison purposes. It is also within the Conference, but is a good deal smaller than the other member Districts. And in a prior interest arbitration with these same parties, Mediator-Arbitrator Jay E. Grenig held that the five districts listed above were appropriate comparables (School District of Beloit-Turner, Dec. No. 228186-B, July, 1985). For all of these reasons the undersigned adopts the above five districts as the primary comparables list. Walworth will be used as a secondary comparable, especially for non-economic issues.

Salary

Neither of the parties' offers revises the structure of the salary schedule. The Board's offer represents a package cost averaging \$2546 per teacher, an 8.3% increase. The Association's offer reflects a package increase averaging \$2,930 per teacher, a 9.5 % increase.

Salary Only Costing. In terms of salary increase only, the parties differ as to costing methodology. The Board's figures include the increase for extracurricular assignments; the Association's does not. The undersigned has adopted the Board's figures for analysis purposes, for several reasons. First, extracurricular salaries are indeed income, and are treated as such by various tax agencies. Second, the uncontroverted testimony of District Administrator Chuck Melvin confirmed that at the local level the parties agreed to include extracurricular increases when they exchanged their final offers. The Association apparently changed its costing method for the purposes of its mediation/arbitration presentation. Finally, it is clear from the record that in the prior interest arbitration mentioned in a foregoing paragraph, the Association did include extracurricular salaries in its calculation of overall salary increases.

There are other costing differences as well. Table 1 illustrates the differences between Association costing (AX-12) and Board costing (Table A, Brief) for the average salary increase per returning teacher:

TABLE 1
 ROCK VALLEY ATHLETIC CONFERENCE
 1985-1986 SALARY ONLY INCREASES
 (EXCLUDING EXTRACURRICULARS)

| <u>District</u> | <u>Outcome Type</u> | <u>Avg. Incr. Per Ret. Tch.</u> | |
|-----------------|---|---------------------------------|------------------|
| | | <u>Assn. Cost.</u> | <u>Bd. Cost.</u> |
| Brodhead | Arbitration | \$1993 | \$1993 |
| Clinton | Arbitration | \$1768 | \$1768 |
| Edgerton | Arbitration | \$1998 | \$1882 |
| Evansville | Arbitration | \$1466 | \$1466 |
| Parkview | Voluntary | \$2001 | \$1774 |
| | Average | \$1845 | \$1777 |
| | Association Offer (\$1940) = \$95 above | | \$163 above |
| | Board Offer (\$1620) = \$225 below | | \$157 below |

Sources: Assn. Exhibit 12; Board Brief, p. 14.

It is readily apparent from Table 1 that the parties' costing differences are significant. With regard to Parkview, its District Administrator testified in the instant case that the Parkview Board voluntarily negotiated the 1985-1986 salary and that they agreed to a higher salary than they would have under normal conditions because they wanted teachers to work an extra two days per year (189 instead of 187). The Beloit-Turner Board and Association agreed during the arbitration hearing that the package cost of an extra two days would be approximately \$22,850, though the Association was of the opinion that the calendar at Parkview was extended by only four hours. The record does not contain sufficient support for that opinion, however. Deducting \$22,850 from the total increase (\$181,744) and dividing by the Parkview F.T.E. (79.2) yields an approximate package increase per teacher of \$2006, with a salary only increase of approximately \$1774. These figures were verified by Parkview Administrator Bobbe. It therefore appears that the Beloit-Turner Board's costing for the Parkview settlement reflected in Table 1 is the more accurate.

The other costing difference in Table 1 is Edgerton. The Board argues that the Association's costing is wrong, and directs the Arbitrator to Edgerton FTE data in Association Exhibit 7 (also Board Exhibit 16). The Edgerton FTE is 114.13 (Assn. Ex. 7). From Board Exhibit 75, which is a set of exhibits entered into the Edgerton arbitration, the total 1985-1986 salary/economic cost was \$2,854,707, and the comparable cost for 1984-1985 was \$2,639,867. Subtracting the latter from the former and dividing by 114.13 FTE yields an increase of \$1,882 per returning teacher, thus verifying the Beloit-Turner Board's costing for Edgerton in Table 1.

Looking then to the right costing column in Table 1, the Board's offer per returning teacher is \$157 below the Conference average, while the Association's is \$163 above. It should also be noted that Table 1 does not include extracurricular salaries, which the undersigned has already concluded should be included as part of the salary cost. Including those figures produces the following Table:

TABLE 2
 ROCK VALLEY ATHLETIC CONFERENCE
 1985-1986 SALARY ONLY INCREASES
 (INCLUDING EXTRACURRICULARS)

| | |
|-------------|---------------------------------|
| Brodhead | \$2,025 per ret. tchr. |
| Clinton | \$1,830 per ret. tchr. |
| Evansville | \$1,517 per ret. tchr. |
| Parkview | \$1,774 per ret. tchr. |
| Average* | \$1786 |
| Association | (\$2,066) = \$280 above average |
| Board | (\$1,745) = \$41 below average |

Sources: Assn. Exhibits 17, 18, 20; Bd. Exhibit 6; Bd. Brief, p. 15.

* = Does not include Edgerton, since extracurricular data are not evident in the record. Inclusion of Edgerton without any extracurricular increase raises the Table average to \$1805.

From Table 2, the Board's final offer is closer to the relevant Conference average increase per returning teacher than is the Association's.

Package Costs. Table 3 has been constructed to reflect 1985-1986 package settlement costs across the Conference.

TABLE 3
 ROCK VALLEY ATHLETIC CONFERENCE
 1985-1986 SETTLEMENT PACKAGE COSTS

| <u>District</u> | <u>Total Increase</u> | <u>Percent</u> | <u>Source</u> |
|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Brodhead* | \$194,593 | 8.98 | BX-50 AX-17 |
| Clinton* | \$181,512 | 8.28 | BX-50 AX-18 |
| Edgerton* | \$323,005 | 9.10 | BX-75 |
| Evansville* | \$180,116 | 7.01 | BX-50 AX-20 |
| Parkview** | \$158,922 | 7.43 | BX-6 |
| Average = 8.16% | | | |
| | Board | = 8.30% | BX-4 |
| | Association | = 9.59% | AX-4 |

* = Decided in arbitration.
 ** = Voluntary settlement.

As reflected in Table 3, the Board's final offer contains a package increase higher than the average Conference settlement. The Association's final offer is about a percent and one-half higher than the Conference average. In fact, the Association's final offer would give Beloit-Turner teachers the highest package settlement in percentage terms in the entire Conference. Similar results are found when package costs per FTE are calculated from division of cost figures in Table 3 by

the FTE for each district. The Association's offer results in a package cost per FTE of \$2,930; the Board's costs \$2,546 per FTE. Comparing those figures against the conference average of \$2,380 (again excluding the Parkview additional days cost) suggests that the Board's final offer in Beloit-Turner is the more appropriate. The Association's offer would result in a higher package increase per FTE in Beloit-Turner than in any other Conference district.

The Association urges the Arbitrator to give little weight to a comparison of the offers on a package cost basis, arguing that funds expended directly for teaching are the only real reflection of salary costs. The Arbitrator disagrees. Salary is but one part of the entire compensation package, and excluding the rest of it (benefits, extracurricular payments) distorts the economic contribution made by employers on behalf of employees. All costing comparison methods have their weaknesses, to be sure. That is why it is critical in final offer arbitration to employ more than one method when juxtaposing the parties' offers against settlements and Awards among comparable school districts.

Moreover, the Arbitrator notes from the record that in interest arbitration for the previous school year (1984-1985), the Association emphasized package figures before Arbitrator Grenig. One of the reasons used by that Arbitrator for adopting the Association's final offer was that it was "...closer to the 1984-1985 pattern of settlement established by the percentage rate of increase in the comparable school districts..." Thus, in the interest of consistency if nothing else, it is appropriate for the undersigned to give weight to such arguments here.

Benchmark Analysis. Another method of evaluating the parties' respective offers here is by a comparison of benchmark salaries. At the BA Minimum, Beloit-Turner teachers have since 1980-1981 enjoyed either the highest or second highest salary in the Conference. The Association's offer would put them in first place for 1985-1986 (from second in 1984-1985 and 1983-1984). The Board's would put them in fourth place, \$15 below third place Brodhead. Both parties' offers are above the Conference average of \$15,388, with the Association being \$237 above and the Board \$37 above.

Similar results emerge in comparison of the parties' offers at the MA-10th level with Conference settlements. The Conference average is \$23,535. The Board offers \$23,563 (\$28 above); the Association proposes \$23,869 (\$334 above). It is clear from historical records since 1980-1981 that the Association's offer more closely approximates the dollar position of Beloit-Turner teachers at this level as compared to the Conference average than does the Board's. With regard to historical ranking, The Association offer would maintain Beloit-Turner teachers at second place among Conference districts at this benchmark, but it should be noted that Parkview jumped from last place in 1984-1985 to first for 1985-1986. Such a quantum leap is no doubt related to the "buy-out" the Parkview Board agreed to in exchange for adding two days to its school calendar. For 1983-1984 and 1984-1985, Edgerton was the Conference leader, and the Association's MA-10th offer in the instant case would put it above Edgerton in the 1985-1986 rankings. Excluding Parkview as an aberration due to the two-day "buy-out," the Board's offer on this benchmark would retain Beloit-Turner teachers at their second place ranking.

At the MA-Maximum benchmark, both parties' offers would maintain the second place ranking enjoyed by Beloit-Turner teachers since at least 1980-1981. And both parties' offers are above the Conference average of \$26,940 (Board's = \$171 above; Association's = \$523 above). Since 1980-1981, Beloit-Turner

teachers have never enjoyed a salary at this benchmark that was more than \$398 above the Conference average, nor have they received one as low as \$171 above it either. The average amount above the Conference average Beloit-Turner teachers at the MA-Max. level received from 1980-1981 through 1984-1985 was \$324. Thus, the Association's offer for 1985-1986 is farther from that average ($\$523 - \$324 = \$199$) than is the Board's ($\$324 - \$171 = \153).

Finally, both offers at the Schedule Maximum would upgrade Beloit-Turner's historical second place ranking among Conference districts to first for 1985-1986. The 1985-1986 Conference average at this benchmark is \$28,292, with the Association's offer being \$1202 above, and the Board's \$824 above. Thus, the Board's offer is much closer to the amount above the Conference average that Beloit-Turner teachers at the Schedule Maximum have received in any year from 1980-1981 through 1984-1985 (Association Exhibit 11).

On balance, benchmark analysis does not strongly favor adoption of either party's salary offer. When all of the foregoing methods of analysis are considered together, however, the Board's offer emerges as the more reasonable when compared against Conference settlements for 1985-1986.

Other Statutory Criteria. Clearly, both parties' offers exceed the cost-of-living for the relevant period (as measured by the Consumer Price Index, Board Exhibit 43) and average percentage settlements in private industry (Board Exhibit 48). And, given the relatively high tax levy rate for Beloit-Turner (Assn. Exhibit 25) and its relatively low equalized valuation (Board Exhibit 8), it would not seem to be in the public interest for the undersigned to adopt a final salary offer of the magnitude requested by the Association.

The Additive (Extracurricular) Schedule

The parties' offers on this issue are identical in terms of cost to the District. The Association proposes a sixteen percent across-the-board increase; the Board's offer raises the pay in different amounts across the various extracurricular positions, with the total representing a 16% increase from 1984-1985 extracurricular payments. In addition, both parties propose a bi-lateral study committee to make possible recommendations and report to the negotiation teams by either March 15, 1987 (Association offer) or April 1, 1987 (Board offer).

Moreover, both parties recognize that the current additive schedule is inequitable to some teachers. The Association feels that it is best for the present to increase all additive payments across-the-board, and let the study committee make appropriate recommendations later, in preparation for subsequent negotiations. The Board argues that its offer increases compensation for those extracurricular slots for which there have been past difficulties in securing volunteers or for which it is likely that recruiting difficulties will occur in the future.

In coaching positions generally Beloit-Turner seems to be at or near the bottom of the Conference (Board Exhibits 32-37), and the Board proposes large increases for those positions. Its offer would boost coaching salaries more than 16%, but even those increases are not much more than those proposed by the Association (16%) for the same positions. However, the Board's offer includes additional compensation contingent upon a team's making it to the playoffs, so that in the case of football, for example, the coach could enjoy a 28.5% increase over what he

received in 1984-1985. The Association's offer does not include extra compensation for the additional weeks' coaching associated with taking a team to the playoffs.

For non-coaching positions (Yearbook Advisor, Student Council Advisor, Forensics Advisor, Band/Jazz Director, Supervision), Beloit-Turner pays at or near the top of the Conference. The undersigned finds little support for the Association's offer (a 16% increase) under those conditions, especially since the Board's offer generally maintains the District's Conference ranking for those positions in 1985-1986 (Board Exhibits 38-42).

The Association argues that its offer maintains the status quo among the additive positions and that the Board's offer distributes the money in "an uneven, crazy-quilt manner." However, it appears to the undersigned that the Board utilized legitimate rationale in constructing its final offer on extracurriculars. It put more money into positions for which it was not competitive within the Conference, and relatively less into positions for which it was. Its offer did indeed change the status quo, but the comparability data justify such a change.

Overall, the Board's offer on extracurricular payments appears to be the more reasonable.

Administration Initiated Transfers

The 1984-1985 Agreement contains the following provision under Article IV, D, 4:

Any teacher initially employed for a program which is later discontinued shall be assigned to the next available position for which he/she is or can be certified.

The Board seeks to delete the above provision, noting that no other District in the Conference contains one similar. It also argues that the Association made no showing in this proceeding that hardship would result from its deletion. The Board feels that the clause is a nightmare of ambiguity and uncertainty, hypothesizing that under its terms someone who was hired initially as a reading specialist could demand placement as, say, a math teacher if the reading program were discontinued. It presented several additional hypothetical examples of possible inappropriate outcomes under this provision.

The Association maintains that the clause is a long-standing tradition in Beloit-Turner contracts and that its removal was not discussed between the parties at the bargaining table (though it was in the Board's initial proposals). Moreover, it opines that while the clause was improperly placed in the Transfer section of the Agreement (instead of the Layoff section), its removal, movement or modification can be bargained under a previously agreed upon reopener for 1986-1987.

It appears from the parties' arguments that both of them are troubled somewhat by Article IV, D, 4, either by the language itself or its placement in the Agreement. However, there is no evidence in the record revealing even a single problem that has arisen as a result of the paragraph's inclusion in the collective bargaining agreement. Both parties speculate as to related problems that might arise in the future. The undersigned is not willing to conclude on such sketchy "evidence" that Article IV, D, 4, should be removed from the Agreement. It seems more appropriate, since the parties

themselves negotiated the clause in the first place, to give them further opportunity to move it, amend it, or delete it voluntarily.

Moreover, the undersigned is not influenced by the fact that such a clause does not appear in any other Conference collective bargaining agreement. For some reason specific to Beloit-Turner, the parties there found it appropriate to negotiate Article IV, D, 4. Absent any concrete evidence that the clause was ill-constructed and has been a burden to the parties, it would be an abuse of the interest arbitration process to remove it by third-party fiat.

Accordingly, the Arbitrator favors the status quo on this issue, and finds the position of the Association to be the more reasonable.

Health Insurance

The Board proposes a revision to Article IV, Q, 2, b of the 1984-1985 collective bargaining agreement as follows:

The Board will pay 100% health/accident insurance with carrier, policy and plan reached by mutual agreement with the TEA. As soon as practical after settlement or issuance of a mediator-arbitrator's decision, said plan will include the features of a \$100/\$200 front-end deductible, pre-admission hospital review, and second opinion program for elective surgery. Other aspects of the plan/policy will be equivalent to the previous plan/policy. Teachers may request insurance coverage at any time during the school year.

The Association's final offer on this issue is nearly identical, except that it does not include the \$100/\$200 front end deductible provision. A smaller difference is that the Association proposes implementation "As soon as practical within 30 days following settlement or issuance of a mediator-arbitrator's decision..." The former difference is significant; the latter is not.

The Board argues that insurance premiums have skyrocketed since 1980, and that the Beloit-Turner rates are higher than the Conference average. Since premiums are based upon the group's experience, as modified by the local unit's area, benefit, age and sex factors, the Board feels it needs some way to contain health care costs. Both parties' offers provide for pre-admission hospital review and second opinion for elective surgery, so it is not necessary to discuss the merits of those provisions here.

Turning to the front-end deductible, the Board notes that there would be no drop in scope or amount of coverage, and that the new plan would actually increase coverage from 80% to 100% in a number of areas, including certain office calls, kidney treatments, chiropractic and dental services. And the Board believes that the \$100/\$200 front-end deductible will lower insurance premiums by about \$19 per month.

The Board also argues that the comparables support its position. While three of them had no deductible during the 1985-1986 school year (Brodhead, Clinton, Evansville), Brodhead paid the highest family premium and Clinton paid less than the full premium (with the teacher paying the difference) and changed to a deductible plan for 1986-1987. Evansville was insured through the WPS and its status on this issue for 1986-1987 remains to be seen. The remaining Conference districts had deductible provisions for 1985-1986. And

Beloit-Turner had a \$100/\$300 major medical deductible throughout 1985-1986, so the change proposed by the Board is not a radical departure from the status quo, at least so it claims.

The Association feels there is no justification to force single employees to assume the first \$100 of their medical expenses and employees with families to pay the first \$200 of theirs. It notes that the premiums for Beloit-Turner are only slightly above the Conference average for single teachers and below it for teachers under the family plan. Furthermore, the Association feels it has met the Board halfway by including preadmission hospital review and second opinion for elective surgery provisions in its final offer.

On balance, the undersigned finds support in the record for both parties' positions on this issue. Both offers reflect concern for cost-containment, and both contain nearly identical language except for the front-end deductible language. Moreover, there is some support among the comparables for adoption of either offer.


Summary

Of the four issues before the Arbitrator, salary is by far the most significant. Next in terms of importance is extracurricular payments, followed by health insurance and then by the administrative transfer clause. As discussed in the foregoing analyses, the Board's offer is the more appropriate on the salary and extracurricular issues. The Association's offer is the more acceptable on administrative transfers. Neither offer emerges as being clearly favorable on health insurance. Overall, given the greater weight attached by the undersigned to the salary and extracurricular issues, the Board's offer in toto is adopted.

AWARD

After detailed study of the record, including all of the evidence and argument presented by both parties, and in consideration of all relevant statutory criteria, the Arbitrator has determined that the Board's final offer (Attachment A) shall be incorporated into the parties 1985-1987 collective bargaining agreement, along with all of the provisions of the previous agreement which remain unchanged and along with the stipulated changes agreed to by the parties.

Signed by me at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 8th day of February, 1987.



Steven Briggs

ATTACHMENT A-1

March 19, 1986

BOARD OF EDUCATION FINAL OFFER

1. Delete paragraph 4 of Article IV, D (lines 27-29 at page 5)
2. Revise Article IV, Q, 2, b (lines 9-13 at page 15) as follows:
 - b. The Board will pay 100% health/accident insurance with carrier, policy and plan reached by mutual agreement with the TEA. As soon as practical after settlement or issuance of a mediator-arbitrator's decision, said plan will include the features of a \$100/\$200 front-end deductible, pre-admission hospital review, and second opinion program for elective surgery. Other aspects of the plan/policy will be equivalent to the previous plan/policy. Teachers may request insurance coverage at any time during the school year.
3. Modify Article VIII, C and D (See attached Additive Schedule); Add new language: A committee to study Additive Schedules C & D will be formed, consisting of an equal number of Board-designated and TEA-designated representatives. The Committee will determine whether to make recommendations and will report to the negotiation teams by April 1, 1987.
4. SALARY: 1984-85 Salary Schedule format; new BASE SALARY of \$15,425. Ave. PRT \$1,745 salary, approximately \$2,534 package.

NOTE: Board accepts statement of STIPULATIONS attached to TEA final offer of March 10, 1986.

ATTACHMENT A-2

BOARD OF EDUCATION
ADDITIVE SCHEDULE: PROPOSAL

Current schedule is given below with proposed changes appearing in parenthesis, under the existing figures.

| POSITION | STEP 0-1 | STEP 2-3 | STEP 4+ |
|------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| ***** | | | |
| Athletic Director | 1,307 (1,350) | 1,471 (1,500) | 1,634 (1,700) |
| Football | | | |
| Head | 1,307 (1,500) | 1,471 (1,700) | 1,634 (1,900) |
| Assistant | 1,045 (1,200) | 1,176 (1,350) | 1,307 (1,500) |
| Freshman | 882 (1,100) | 980 (1,200) | 1,079 (1,300) |
| Basketball | | | |
| Head | 1,307 (1,500) | 1,471 (1,700) | 1,634 (1,900) |
| Assistant | 1,045 (1,200) | 1,176 (1,350) | 1,307 (1,500) |
| Freshman | 882 (1,100) | 980 (1,200) | 1,079 (1,300) |
| 8th grade | 523 (600) | 589 (700) | 653 (800) |
| 7th grade | 523 (600) | 589 (700) | 653 (800) |
| Wrestling | | | |
| Head | 1,242 (1,450) | 1,406 (1,650) | 1,569 (1,850) |
| Assistant | 980 (1,150) | 1,111 (1,300) | 1,242 (1,450) |
| Middle School | 523 (600) | 589 (700) | 653 (800) |
| Track | | | |
| Head | 1,144 (1,350) | 1,307 (1,500) | 1,471 (1,700) |
| Assistant | 882 (1,050) | 1,013 (1,200) | 1,144 (1,350) |
| Middle School Head | 523 (600) | 589 (700) | 653 (800) |
| Middle School Assis.t. | 458 (550) | 523 (600) | 589 (700) |

ATTACHMENT A-3

| | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|----------|---------|
| Baseball | | | |
| Head | 980 | 1,144 | 1,307 |
| | (1,150) | (1,350) | (1,500) |
| Assistant | 752 | 882 | 1,013 |
| | (900) | (1,025) | (1,175) |
| Softball | | | |
| | 980 | 1,144 | 1,307 |
| | (1,150) | (1,350) | (1,500) |
| Volleyball | | | |
| Head | 980 | 1,144 | 1,307 |
| | (1,150) | (1,350) | (1,500) |
| Assistant | 752 | 882 | 1,013 |
| | (900) | (1,025) | (1,175) |
| Freshman | 620 | 718 | 817 |
| | (725) | (800) | (950) |
| Middle School | 520 | 582 | 673 |
| | (600) | (700) | (800) |
| Cross Country | | | |
| | 980 | 1,144 | 1,307 |
| | (1,150) | (1,350) | (1,500) |
| Elementary Intramurals | 15.00 per session | | |
| | (17.00 per session) | | |
| Weight Training Super. | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | (500) | (600) | (750) |

Extended playoff provision: Head coaches and varsity assistant coaches will be paid compensation for Sectional and State playoff competition. Said compensation shall be \$100.00 for Sectional competition and \$100.00 for State competition.

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--------|--------|---------|
| High School Forensics | 674 | 795 | 917 |
| | (700) | (850) | (1,000) |
| High School Dramatics | | | |
| (Per 3 Act - Per Cast) | 494 | 612 | 740 |
| | (500) | (650) | (800) |

ATTACHMENT A-4

| | | | |
|---|----------|----------|---------|
| Middle School dramatics | 494 | 612 | 740 |
| (500) | (500) | (650) | (800) |
| High School Dramatics (Per 1 Act - Per cast) | 306 | 427 | 551 |
| (325) | (450) | (600) | (600) |
| High School Annual | 919 | 1,042 | 1,163 |
| (925) | (1,050) | (1,175) | (1,175) |
| High School Band Director | 919 | 1,042 | 1,163 |
| (925) | (1,050) | (1,175) | (1,175) |
| High School Jazz Ens.Dir. | 353 | 470 | 578 |
| (375) | (475) | (600) | (600) |
| High School Cheerleading | 674 | 795 | 917 |
| (675) | (850) | (1,050) | (1,050) |
| High School PomPon | 575 | 685 | 791 |
| (600) | (750) | (900) | (900) |
| Jr. and Sr. Class Advisor | 196 | 295 | 392 |
| (200) | (300) | (400) | (400) |
| Middle School Yearbook Adv | 494 | 612 | 740 |
| (500) | (625) | (750) | (750) |
| Middle School Stu.Coun.Adv | 367 | 494 | 612 |
| (375) | (500) | (625) | (625) |
| Head Teacher/Chairman | 612 | 737 | 857 |
| (625) | (750) | (875) | (875) |
| Team Leader | 674 | 795 | 917 |
| (675) | (800) | (925) | (925) |
| High School Choir Dir. | 494 | 612 | 740 |
| (500) | (625) | (750) | (750) |
| High School Stu.Coun.Adv | 367 | 494 | 612 |
| (375) | (500) | (625) | (625) |
| A.F.S. Advisor | 367 | 494 | 612 |
| (375) | (500) | (625) | (625) |
| Supervision/School Events | 9.26 | 15.29 | 20.25 |
| (10.00) | (16.00) | (21.00) | (21.00) |
| Detention Hall Super. | 10.00 | | |
| (10.00) | | | |
| Bus Chaperones | 7.13 | per hour | |