

DEC 0 2 1986

WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT
STATE OF WISCONSIN RELATIONS COMMISSION
BEFORE THE ARBITRATOR

In the Matter of the Petition of

BEECHER-DUNBAR-PEMBINE
SCHOOL DISTRICT

To Initiate Mediation-Arbitration
Between Said Petitioner and

Case 20
No. 35996
MED/ARB-3636
Decision No. 23679-A

PEMBINE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

APPEARANCES:

Steven nolzhausen, Wisconsin Association of School Boards, on behalf of the District

R. A. Arends, WEAC UniServ Council #21, on behalf of the Association

On May 28, 1986 the Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission appointed the undersigned Mediator-Arbitrator pursuant to Section 111.70(4)(cm) 6b of the Municipal Employment Relations Act in the dispute existing between the above named parties. Pursuant to statutory responsibilities the undersigned conducted a mediation session on August 21, 1986 which did not result in resolution of the dispute. The matter was thereafter presented to the undersigned in an arbitration hearing conducted on the same date for final and binding determination. Post hearing exhibits and briefs were filed by the parties which were exchanged by November 17, 1986. Based upon a review of the foregoing record, and utilizing the criteria set forth in Section 111.70(4)(cm) Wis Stats the undersigned renders the following arbitration award.

ISSUES.

The parties salary proposals for the 1985-86 and 1986-87 school years are attached hereto as appendices.

The Board costing of the parties salary proposals follows

Average Salary Increase

	1985-86		1986-87	
	\$	%	\$	%
Board	1626	7.4	1690	7.2
Association	1926	8.9	1893	7.9

The Board estimates the difference between the parties' salary proposals to be about \$7500 for 1985-86 and \$2500 for 1986-87.

Average total compensation increase

	1985-86		1986-87	
	\$	%	\$	%
Board	2332	7.9	2065	6.5
Association	2737	9.3	2565	8.0

The Association's costing of the average increase the parties' salary proposals follows

	1985-86		1986-87	
	\$	%	\$	%
Board	1623	5.6	1685	5.4
Association	1961	7.2	1835	6.2

The Board is proposing that secondary teachers in 1986-87 will be required to work a schedule consisting of five class periods, one supervisory period, and one preparation period. This is a change from a workload of five class periods, and two preparation periods.

The Board also proposes reducing the compensation received by a teacher for teaching a 6th class, in lieu of the supervisory period, by 50%.

The parties also disagree as to which school districts should be utilized as comparables for purposes of this proceeding.

ASSOCIATION POSITION

The arbitrator should take note of settlements across the State of Wisconsin, and in Marinette, Florence, and Forest counties, as well as the White Lake School District settlement in Langlade County. The State of Wisconsin should be used because a larger statistical sampling results in more valid comparisons, because the State's funding formulas are designed to equalize the financial ability of all schools in the State to provide equal educational opportunity for children, and lastly, if statewide averages are ignored, the disparity between wage levels across the State would increase dramatically.

It is also noteworthy that the District is the easternmost district in an athletic conference which is totally outside the County in which the District resides. Relatedly, Marinette County is the main economic and labor market for citizens in the Beecher-Dunbar-Pembiné area. The District is closer to Niagra than any other town around, and shares a major source of income from the large and prosperous paper mill there. In addition, in past negotiations, comparisons with Niagra's wage and fringe levels were influential. Relatedly, Wausaukee and Crivitz benefits were also historically very much a topic of discussion in District negotiations. The record also demonstrates that the other Marinette County districts are based on manufacturing economies, while three Conference districts, Elcho, Three Lakes, and Phelps, are dissimilar in this respect. These three Districts are also in a different CESA; they are all high evaluation-low state aid districts; all are quite removed from Marinette County where the District is situated; and all are part of the property-rich resort area which has little in common with the District.

On the salary issue it is important to note that the Board's proposal will have a disparate effect on a number of the career teachers in the District. In this regard there is no good reason why the teachers at the Bachelor's top area of the schedule should receive so much less than similarly situated teachers in comparable districts.

It is also significant that under both parties proposals the District will remain substantially behind state average teacher salaries. However, the Board's proposal will further erode the gap that already exists in this regard, and in addition, it does not even match the increases which have been granted in comparable districts in the region. On the other hand, the Association has proposed increases which will just match regional increases and the gap between the District and State average salaries will continue to increase.

Regarding comparable settlements the District's evidence pertaining to the value of such settlements is simply not reliable enough to utilize in this proceeding.

With respect to the impact on the public, it is noteworthy that the difference between the parties' salary proposals will only increase each average taxpaying unit's assessment by 93 cents for 1985-86 and \$1.34 for 1986-87. Relatedly, the record indicates that the District's economic environment is no worse than other comparable districts in the region which granted much bigger raises than that contained in the Board's final offer. Although the Board has indicated that a weak farm economy supports the Board's position, this could not be an issue since only .8% of the District's population is engaged in farming.

Regarding the assignment issue, it is important to note that when the Association obtained the current language regarding same, there was a quid pro quo given for it. Furthermore, the Board recognized that in a small district most teachers had to prepare more different lessons because they teach more different classes than they would in a larger district.

On this issue the Board has the burden of justifying its requested change. It has however introduced no evidence of problems that have arisen under the current contract in this regard. In addition, the concept of reducing the amount of preparation time for teachers is unsound educationally and not in the public interest. Also, Wausaukee and Niagara have provisions in their contracts which are similar to the current language.

Furthermore if the Board's proposal prevails on this issue the contract will contain inconsistencies in that one provision will allow for the involuntary assignment of supervisory periods without extra compensation, while another provides for the voluntary acceptance of extra curricular assignments.

The Board's proposal also eliminates the guarantee that no high school teacher will have to teach 7 classes in one day since it would allow for the assignment of seven classes in unusual or emergency situations.

Lastly, the Board's proposal provides no guarantees for the fair rotation of supervisory assignments, thus allowing no contractual remedy for unequal workload distribution.

DISTRICT POSITION:

On the comparability issue, the Northern Lakes Athletic Conference school districts should be deemed comparable for purposes of this proceeding. In this regard, arbitrators have traditionally and consistently relied upon the athletic conference to determine comparability.¹ In the instant case both parties have advanced seven of the Athletic Conference school districts as comparables, five of which have settled contracts for the 1985-86 and 1986-87 school years (Crandon, Florence, Goodman, Laona, and White Lake). Out of the three remaining Conference school districts excluded by the Association, two are settled: Phelps and Three Lakes. With seven out of ten Conference districts settled, there is no basis whatsoever for expanding the comparable pool. This is particularly so since the record demonstrates that with respect to levy rates, equalized valuation, cost per member, and FTEs, on the average the District is very similar to the Conference districts.

Although the Association has deleted three Conference districts from its list of proposed comparables on the basis that they are 'atypical', the question is, atypical to what? If these three districts are to be deleted due to the fact that they receive no state aids and have high equalized valuations, then why does it propose Goodman and Laona when they have relatively low equalized valuations and high state aids?

The fact of the matter is that the Association has presented no compelling evidence supporting non use of the Conference districts. In this regard, although the Association asserts that in past negotiations comparisons with Niagra were influential, there is no record evidence to support this assertion. The same may be said of the Association's assertion that Wausaukee and Crivitz benefits were historically very much a topic of discussion at Pembine.

It is also noteworthy in this regard that in four recent med/arb decisions involving the Marinette-Oconto Conference districts, not one expanded the comparable pool to districts outside the athletic conference much less to Pembine.²

With respect to costing of the parties' proposals, the Board has submitted data showing the salary and total cost increases associated with both parties' final offers. The Association on the other hand has submitted no background information regarding how it costed the proposals.

The Board has also presented comparable costing data from standard WASH forms which contain specific instructions as to their completion. The consistent and systematic collection of costing data by the WASH makes the information submitted by the Board in this matter much more accurate and reliable than the evidence submitted by the Association, which is not based upon uniform reporting to the DPI.

Regarding the interest and welfare of the public in this dispute, the record demonstrates that although the District is generally very comparable with the districts in the Conference, in terms of compensation it ranks in the top three. Under such circumstances the Association's proposed increases are unreasonable, particularly since they run contrary to salary trends in both the public and private sectors. In this regard, the Board's offer more reasonably balances the public interest with the employee interest.

¹ Citations omitted.

² Citations omitted.

Providing teachers with a salary increase of 8.5% over the relevant rate of inflation gives them real and substantial increases over the cost of living. This is particularly significant in a stagnant economic period, at best, where trends in wage increases indicate moderation rather than acceleration.

In analyzing the parties' final salary offers, a benchmark analysis is becoming increasingly unreliable. This is so because of the occurrence in recent years of agreements which have severed the strict relationship between teachers' education and experience and their placement on the salary schedule.

If salary benchmarks are considered, the Board offer retains the District's enviable position in this regard. Sixty percent of the staff will retain salary rankings with their peers in comparable school districts, except for 2 FTEs on the BA maximum, which will drop from a rank of 1 to 2; which is hardly a drop at all.

In addition, the Board's offer, while concededly moderate, still leaves the District's teachers well above average in terms of average salary. The teachers in the District have the lowest number of work days and the lowest number of hours worked per day, yet the Board's offer for 1985-86 gives the average teacher in the District a salary which is \$857 greater than the average salary paid to teachers in settled districts in the Conference. In this regard arbitral precedent has established that a proposal which is lower than the settled average can be justified when the employer is a wage leader and where the employer's proposal leaves it in a relatively favorable position.³ Lower paying districts can justify larger salary increases due to their very real need to bring compensation in line with other comparable districts. However, in this case there is no need for such an increase.

On the teaching assignment issue, the Board's proposal in no way increases the workload of secondary teachers and brings equality to the system due to the fact that elementary teachers in the District are assigned one preparation period per day. Furthermore, the District is the only one in the Conference which allows for two preparation periods in a day. Also, only two other comparable districts require secondary teachers to teach five classes. All other districts in the Conference have a teaching load of at least six class periods. Although the District has the lowest number of teaching assignments in the Conference, it is the third highest paying district in the Conference. Under such circumstances, the Board's proposal should be deemed fair and reasonable.

As Arbitrator Vernon has stated elsewhere, "Just as arbitrators favor wage proposals which tend toward uniformity in salaries among comparable employers, final offers, all other things considered equal, which tend toward uniformity in hours and basic working conditions should be equally preferred"⁴

³ Citations omitted

⁴ Citation omitted

DISCUSSION:

On the comparability issue, the record does not provide a sufficient evidentiary basis, based upon either size, geography, or ability to pay, to support the exclusion of any of the settled Athletic Conference districts from the comparables which should be utilized in this proceeding. However, application of the same comparability criteria also supports utilization of Niagara as an appropriate comparable, and, if it had been settled, Wausaukee might have been utilized as well.

Since eight comparable districts in the area are settled for 1985-86 and 1986-87, a number which the undersigned deems to be sufficient for a relatively reliable comparability analysis, for reasons which the undersigned has repeatedly expressed in other awards, there is no need to analyze comparability data from across the state

On the salary issue, two techniques will be utilized to compare the parties final offers to comparable settlements. While both are somewhat imperfect instruments, it is hoped that by utilizing both approaches, the undersigned will be able to draw some conclusions based upon a relatively reliable comparability analysis.

Although the undersigned concedes that evidence pertaining to the value of average salary increases in comparable districts is not reliable, based upon the available record evidence it would appear that the District's 1985-86 salary proposal is about \$160 below the comparable average while the Association's proposal is about \$180 above the comparable average. When 1986-87 offers are compared, the District's proposal appears to be about \$135 below the comparable average, while the Association's proposal appears to be \$60, or perhaps somewhat less, above the comparable average

A benchmark analysis of salary schedule minimums and maximums where the correlation between years of experience and placement on the schedule remains relatively intact, indicates the following.

<u>BA Base</u>		Increase		Increase	
84-85	85-86	\$	%	86-87	\$ %
Comparable average					
13748	14846	1098	8.1	16009	1050 7.9
District					
13683	B14800	1020	7.4	15900	1100 7.4
	A15000	1220	8.9	16003	1003 6.7
+/- Average					
-65	B-46	-78	-7	-109	+50 -5
	A+154	+122	+8	-6	-47 -1.2
Rank among 9					
6	B 6			6	
	A 5			6	

BA Maximum

	84-85	85-86	Increase		86-87	Increase	
			\$	%		\$	%
Comparable Average	21487	22913	1426	5.7	24419	1506	6.5
District							
	22750	B23500	1020	4.5	24900	1100	4.8
		A24241	1461	6.4	25765	1524	6.3
---Average							
	1293	B-887	-406	-2.2	-481	-406	-2
		A-1328	+35	-.3	+1346	+18	-.3
Rank among 9							
	1	B 2			3		
		A 1			1		

MA Base

	84-85	85-86	Increase		86-87	Increase	
			\$	%		\$	%
Comparable Average	15279	16482	1203	7.9	17754	1271	7.8
District							
	15955	B17325	1370	8.6	18800	1475	8.5
		A17454	1499	9.4	18528	1074	6.2
---Average							
	+676	B+843	+157	+.7	+1046	+204	+.7
		A+972	+296	+1.5	+774	-197	-1.6
Rank among 9							
	3	B 2			1		
		A 1			1		

MA Maximum

	84-85	85-86	Increase		86-87	Increase	
			\$	%		\$	%
Comparable average							
	24254	25791	1538	6.4	27521	1730	6.7
District							
	24955	B26325	1370	5.5	27800	1475	5.6
		A26719	1764	7.1	28402	1683	6.5
--- Average							
	-701	B+534	-168	-9	+279	255	-1.1
		A+928	-226	+7	+881	-47	-4
Rank among 9							
	4	B 3			3		
		A 3			3		

Schedule Maximum

	84-85	85-86	Increase		86-87	Increase	
			\$	%		\$	%
Comparable Average							
	25672	27669	1997	7.9	29531	1902	6.9
District							
	27555	B29355	1700	6.5	31280	1925	6.5
		A29553	1988	7.2	31309	1756	5.9
--- Average							
	+1855	B+1686	-207	-1.4	+1749	+23	-3
		A+1884	-9	-7	+1778	-146	-7
Rank among 9							
	4	B 4			4		
		A 3			3		

What the above data indicates is that in overall terms, both parties' salary proposals for 1985-86 are at the high and low ends of the comparable settlement spectrum (in terms of the value of the increases which have been granted), and that for that year the District's proposal is slightly closer to the comparable average than is the Association's. For 1986-87 it would appear that the Association's proposal is substantially more in line with the average settlement than is the District's proposal.

When benchmarks are analyzed, it would appear that at the BA base, the District's proposal is more in line with comparable settlements for 1985-86, while the Association's proposal is more comparable than the District's in 1986-87. At the BA Maximum, for both 1985-86 and 1986-87, although there appears to be justification for a moderate increase in the context of comparable settlements based upon the District's relative ranking at this benchmark, there does not appear to be justification for the District's proposed increase, which is substantially out of line with the settlement

pattern. Thus, at this benchmark, the Association's proposal clearly appears to be the more comparable of the two. At the MA Base, for 1985-86 the District's proposal is more comparable than the Association's, while for 1986-87, the Association's more moderate proposal appears to be more comparable and justifiable than the District's, particularly in view of the District's ranking among comparables at this benchmark. At the MA Maximum, for 1985-86 the District's proposal is again more comparable than the Association's, while for 1986-87 the Association's proposed increase is again more comparable than the District's. Lastly, at the Schedule Maximum, for 1985-86 the Association's proposed increase is more comparable than the District's, while in 1986-87, the District's proposal is more in line with the comparables than the Association's.

In sum, all of the foregoing indicates that neither party's salary proposal is substantially more comparable than the other's. In fact, if comparability were the prime determinant of the outcome of the salary dispute, in the undersigned's opinion the dispute would be very difficult to decide. If salary were the only issue in dispute, in view of the outcome of the foregoing analysis, the undersigned probably would find the District's salary proposal to be slightly more acceptable than the Association's since neither proposal is significantly more comparable than the other, and since the District's proposal is more in line with other non teaching public and private sector settlements and also, since it would provide the teachers with meaningful gains in real income in the context of current relevant inflationary data

However, salary is not the only issue in dispute, and in view of the nature of the second disputed issue, namely the assignment of a supervisory period in lieu of a prep period, in the undersigned's opinion both issues must be analyzed together in order to achieve a relatively equitable result herein.

On the assignment issue the record indicates that comparability clearly supports the reasonableness of the District's proposal in that only one other comparable district, Niagra, affords its teachers two prep periods, while the rest of the District's comparables provide their teachers with only one prep period. The problem that the undersigned sees with the removal of the prep period at this time is that the second prep period does constitute a substantial and meaningful benefit which the teachers have achieved through negotiations, and accordingly, its loss, though perhaps justifiable based upon comparability, should entitle the teachers to a meaningful quid pro quo, and based upon the District's final offer, no such quid pro quo has been offered. In fact, the District's salary proposal, though perhaps justified based upon the considerations discussed above, is substantially below the comparable average in several critical areas, and under such circumstances, it cannot be persuasively argued that a fair exchange has been offered for the loss of the second prep period which the District proposes. If the District were to prevail on this issue, it seems to the undersigned that the District should be offering at least an above average, but nonetheless comparable salary proposal, and that clearly is not the case herein.

Therefore, based upon all of the foregoing considerations, although individually considered, the District's proposals on salary and assignments appear to be meritorious, when they are considered together, the merit of the District's proposal falters, since its below average salary proposal doesn't constitute a fair quid pro quo for the loss of the prep time benefit which it proposes. Accordingly, since the Association's salary proposal is not significantly less comparable than the District's--in fact, in some regards it

appears to be somewhat more comparable-- the undersigned deems it to be the more reasonable of the two final offers at issue herein.

Accordingly, the undersigned hereby renders the following.

ARBITRATION AWARD

The Association's final offer shall be incorporated into the parties' 1985-1987 collective bargaining agreement.

Dated this 25th day of November, 1986 at Madison, Wisconsin.

Byron Yaffe
Arbitrator

April 21, 1986

RECEIVED

FINAL OFFER OF THE PEMBINE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION APR 23 1986
for the
1985-87 COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT
RELATIONS COMMISSION

All language shall remain the same as in the previous agreement, except the stipulations of the parties and as follows:

Article XXXII - Change dates in Paragraph #1 as follows:

1984 to 1985 and 1985 to 1987.

Appendix A - Wage Rate Schedule - See attached.

10'2
R 4/21/86

APPENDIX - A
WAGE RATE SCHEDULE

STEP 86-87	STEP 85-86	B	B6	B12	B18	B24	M B30	M6 B36	M12 B42	M18 B48	M24 B54	M30 B60	M36 B66
	13	24241	24737	25232	25728	26223	26719	27191	27664	28136	28608	29081	29553
13		25765	26261	26756	27252	27747	28402	28874	29347	29819	30291	30764	31309
	12	23471	23966	24461	24957	25452	25947	26420	26892	27365	27838	28311	28783
12		24952	25447	25942	26437	26932	27579	28052	28525	28997	29470	29943	30497
	11	22701	23196	23690	24185	24680	25175	25648	26121	26594	27067	27540	28014
11		24138	24633	25128	25622	26117	26756	27229	27703	28176	28649	29122	29685
	10	21931	22425	22920	23414	23908	24403	24876	25350	25823	26297	26770	27244
10		23325	23819	24313	24808	25302	25934	26407	26881	27354	27828	28301	28873
	9	21161	21655	22149	22643	23137	23631	24105	24578	25052	25526	26000	26474
9		22511	23005	23499	23993	24487	25111	25585	26058	26532	27006	27480	28062
	8	20391	20884	21378	21871	22365	22859	23333	23807	24282	24756	25230	25704
8		21698	22191	22685	23178	23672	24288	24762	25236	25711	26185	26659	27250
	7	19621	20114	20607	21100	21593	22087	22561	23036	23511	23985	24460	24935
7		20884	21377	21870	22364	22857	23465	23940	24414	24889	25364	25839	26438
	6	18850	19343	19836	20329	20822	21314	21790	22265	22740	23215	23690	24165
6		20071	20563	21056	21549	22042	22642	23117	23592	24067	24543	25018	25626
	5	18080	18573	19065	19558	20050	20542	21018	21493	21969	22444	22920	23395
5		19257	19749	20242	20734	21227	21819	22295	22770	23246	23721	24197	24814
	4	17310	17802	18294	18786	19278	19770	20246	20722	21198	21674	22150	22626
4		18444	18935	19428	19919	20412	20997	21472	21948	22424	22900	23376	24002
	3	16540	17032	17523	18015	18507	18998	19474	19951	20427	20903	21380	21856
3		17630	18122	18613	19105	19596	20174	20650	21126	21603	22079	22555	23190
	2	15770	16261	16752	17244	17735	18226	18703	19179	19656	20133	20609	21086
2		16817	17308	17799	18290	18781	19351	19828	20304	20781	21258	21734	22378
	1	15000	15491	15982	16472	16963	17454	17931	18408	18885	19362	19839	20316
1		16003	16494	16985	17475	17966	18528	19005	19482	19959	20436	20913	21567

A. In order to qualify for interim step rate increases, a teacher must successfully complete two (2) inservice days or their equivalent during the preceding school year.

20'2
4/21/86

RECEIVED

FEB 27 1986

APPENDIX B

WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT
RELATIONS COMMISSION

FINAL OFFER
OF THE
SCHOOL DISTRICT OF BEECHER-DUNBAR-PEMBINE

February 25, 1986

This offer of the School District of Beecher-Dunbar-Pembine shall include the previous agreement with the Pembine Education Association, the tentative agreements between the parties and any attached modifications.

This offer shall be effective as of the first day of the fall term, 1985, and shall continue and remain in full force and effect as binding on the parties until the first day of the fall term, 1987.



For the School District of Beecher-Dunbar-Pembine

BDP SCHOOL DISTRICT

RUN DATE: 02/21/86

SALARY SCHEDULE

PAGE 1

SAL. SCH. #: 030 85-86 FINAL OFFER

FORMAT: DOLLARS

SCHEDULE BASE SALARY: \$14,800

PERCENT CHANGE: 0.0000%

REPORT BASE SALARY: \$14,800

AMOUNT CHANGE: \$ 0

STEP	B	B6	B12	B18	B24	M-B30	M6-B36	M12-B42
1	14,800	15,305	15,810	16,315	16,820	17,325	17,830	18,335
2	15,550	16,055	16,560	17,065	17,570	18,075	18,580	19,085
3	16,300	16,805	17,310	17,815	18,320	18,825	19,330	19,835
4	17,050	17,555	18,060	18,565	19,070	19,575	20,080	20,585
5	17,800	18,305	18,810	19,315	19,820	20,325	20,830	21,335
6	18,550	19,055	19,560	20,065	20,570	21,075	21,580	22,085
7	19,300	19,805	20,310	20,815	21,320	21,825	22,330	22,835
8	20,050	20,555	21,060	21,565	22,070	22,575	23,080	23,585
9	20,800	21,305	21,810	22,315	22,820	23,325	23,830	24,335
10	21,550	22,055	22,560	23,065	23,570	24,075	24,580	25,085
11	22,300	22,805	23,310	23,815	24,320	24,825	25,330	25,835
12	23,050	23,555	24,060	24,565	25,070	25,575	26,080	26,585
13	23,800	24,305	24,810	25,315	25,820	26,325	26,830	27,335

BDP SCHOOL DISTRICT

RUN DATE: 02/21/86

SALARY SCHEDULE

PAGE 1

SAL. SCH. #: 032 86-87 FINAL OFFER

FORMAT: DOLLARS

SCHEDULE BASE SALARY: \$15,900

PERCENT CHANGE: 0.0000%

REPORT BASE SALARY: \$15,900

AMOUNT CHANGE: \$ 0

STEP	B	B6	B12	B18	B24	M-830	M6-836	M12-842
1	15,900	16,480	17,060	17,640	18,220	18,800	19,380	19,960
2	16,650	17,230	17,810	18,390	18,970	19,550	20,130	20,710
3	17,400	17,980	18,560	19,140	19,720	20,300	20,880	21,460
4	18,150	18,730	19,310	19,890	20,470	21,050	21,630	22,210
5	18,900	19,480	20,060	20,640	21,220	21,800	22,380	22,960
6	19,650	20,230	20,810	21,390	21,970	22,550	23,130	23,710
7	20,400	20,980	21,560	22,140	22,720	23,300	23,880	24,460
8	21,150	21,730	22,310	22,890	23,470	24,050	24,630	25,210
9	21,900	22,480	23,060	23,640	24,220	24,800	25,380	25,960
10	22,650	23,230	23,810	24,390	24,970	25,550	26,130	26,710
11	23,400	23,980	24,560	25,140	25,720	26,300	26,880	27,460
12	24,150	24,730	25,310	25,890	26,470	27,050	27,630	28,210
13	24,900	25,480	26,060	26,640	27,220	27,800	28,380	28,960

BOP SCHOOL DISTRICT

RUN DATE: 02/21/86

SALARY SCHEDULE

PAGE 2

SAL. SCH. #: 032 86-87 FINAL OFFER
SCHEDULE BASE SALARY: \$15,900
REPORT BASE SALARY: \$15,900

FORMAT: DOLLARS
PERCENT CHANGE: 0.0000%
AMOUNT CHANGE: \$ 0

STEP	M18-B48	M24-B54	M30-B60	M36-B66
1	20,540	21,120	21,700	22,280
2	21,290	21,870	22,450	23,030
3	22,040	22,620	23,200	23,780
4	22,790	23,370	23,950	24,530
5	23,540	24,120	24,700	25,280
6	24,290	24,870	25,450	26,030
7	25,040	25,620	26,200	26,780
8	25,790	26,370	26,950	27,530
9	26,540	27,120	27,700	28,280
10	27,290	27,870	28,450	29,030
11	28,040	28,620	29,200	29,780
12	28,790	29,370	29,950	30,530
13	29,540	30,120	30,700	31,280

