STATE OF WISCONSIN

BEFORE THE ARBITRATOR

In the Matter of the Petition of EAU CLAIRE AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT To Initiate Arbitration Between Said Petitioner and EAU CLAIRE ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATORS	Case 38 No. 39259 INT/ARB-4524 Decision No. 24887-A

Appearances:

Riley, Ward & Kaiser, S. C., Attorneys at Law, by Mr. James M. Ward, appearing on behalf of the Employer.

Mr. Charles S. Garnier, Coordinator, Wisconsin Education Association Council, appearing on behalf of the Association.

ARBITRATION AWARD:

On November 5, 1987, the undersigned was appointed Arbitrator by the Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission, pursuant to 111.70 (4) (cm) 6. and 7. of the Wisconsin Municipal Relations Act, to resolve an impasse existing between Eau Claire Area School District, referred to herein as the Employer, and Eau Claire Association of Educators, referred to herein as the Association, with respect to certain issues as specified below. The proceedings were conducted pursuant to Wisconsin Stats. 111.70 (4) (cm), and hearing was held at Eau Claire, Wisconsin, on January 7, 1988, at which time the parties were present and given full opportunity to present oral and written evidence and to make relevant argument. The proceedings were not transcribed, however, briefs were filed in the matter. Briefs were exchanged on February 10, 1988. Pursuant to understandings arrived at hearing, the parties were afforded an opportunity to file reply briefs by February 18, 1988. No reply briefs were filed, and the record was closed on February 18, 1988.

THE ISSUES:

The dispute is limited to the salary schedules to be contained in the 1987-88, 1988-89 Collective Bargaining Agreement. Neither party proposes a change in the structure of the salary schedule contained in the predecessor Collective Bargaining Agreement. The Employer proposes a salary schedule for 1987-88 that begins at $18,200 at the BS-0 years experience, and tops at $35,462 for the MA + 32 with 14 years of experience. The Association proposes a salary schedule for the 1987-88 school year that begins at $18,440 at the BA-0 step and tops at $35,923 at the MA + 32 lane at Step 14. For 1988-89, the Employer proposes a salary schedule beginning at $18,970 and topping at $36,956; whereas, the Association proposes a salary schedule commencing at $19,340 and topping at $37,677. The salary schedules are attached hereto as Appendix A-1, A-2, A-3 and A-4.

DISCUSSION:

Wisconsin Stats. 111.70 (4) (cm) 7. directs the Arbitrator to give weight to the factors found at subsections a through j in making any decision under the arbitration procedures authorized in this paragraph. The undersigned, therefore, will review the evidence adduced at hearing and consider the arguments of the parties in light of the statutory criteria.

Among the criteria at subsections e and f, the Arbitrator is directed to compare wages, hours and conditions of employment of municipal employees involved in the arbitration proceedings with wages, hours and conditions of employment of

other employees generally in public employment in the same community, and in comparable communities; and that he make the same comparisons of the wages, hours and conditions of employment of the municipal employees involved in the arbitration proceedings with wages, hours and conditions of employment of other employees in private employment in the same community and in comparable communities.

There is no dispute here as to what constitutes the comparable communities which are spoken to in subparagraphs e and f of the statute. The parties, in fact, have entered into a stipulation with respect to the comparables which reads (Board Exhibit No. 6 and Association Exhibit No. 1):

WHEREAS, the parties have recently concluded negotiations over a collective bargaining agreement covering the 1985-86 and the 1986-1987 school years, and

WHEREAS, throughout the course of negotiations over the said collective bargaining agreement and predecessor collective bargaining agreements, a major impediment to settlement has been the ongoing dispute between the parties as to which school districts should be considered as "comparable" for purposes of analyzing the bargaining proposals of the respective parties, and

WHEREAS, there has never been a definitive ruling on the question of which school districts are "comparable" to the Eau Claire Area School District, as that term is utilized under Wisconsin's mediation-arbitration law (Sec. 111.70 (4)(cm), Wis. Stats.), and consequently, the answer to that question remains unresolved and uncertain at this time, and

WHEREAS, in order to eliminate the element of uncertainty over the question of "comparable" school districts as a means of simplifying negotiations and facilitating a voluntary settlement on a successor collective bargaining agreement, the parties desire to implement, on a trial basis, a stipulation governing the school districts to be considered as "comparable".

NOW THEREFORE, for and in consideration of the premises herein, and for other good and valuable consideration, the parties hereto hereby stipulate and agree as follows:

1. With respect to negotiations over a successor collective bargaining agreement to the two year agreement now in force, the parties mutually stipulate and agree that the following school districts, to the exclusion of all others, shall be considered as "comparable" to the Eau Claire Area School District, as that term is utilized under Wisconsin's mediation-arbitration law:

Appleton	LaCrosse
Janesville	Stevens Point
Sheboygan	Beloit
Oshkosh	Fond du Lac
Wausau	Wisconsin Rapids

2. Notwithstanding the foregoing stipulation as to "comparable" school districts, nothing herein shall be construed as implying that the pa ties are in agreement as to the appropriate ranking and placement of the Eau Claire Area School District in relation to the other designated "comparable" school districts. Each party reserves the right, within the group of designated "comparable" school districts, to attempt to differentiate among such school districts in terms of relative size, tax base, strength of local economy, historical trends, etc.

3. The parties further recognize and acknowledge that comparability is but one of the factors to be considered by a mediator-arbitrator in making a decision on the respective final offers submitted by the parties. For that reason, neither party shall be precluded from introducing evidence before the mediator-arbitrator pertaining to any or all of the other factors enumerated in Sec. 111.70 (4)(cm) 7 Wis. Stats., nor from arguing the relative weight that such other factor(s) should be assigned vis a vis the factor of comparability.

4. This Stipulation shall only be binding on the parties in their negotiations over an immediate successor collective bargaining agreement (including any proposed

multi-year agreement) to the collective bargaining agreement now in force. Unless the parties hereafter mutually agree to renew this Stipulation, on the same or similar terms, for use in future rounds of negotiations, the same shall have no force or effect in connection with such future negotiations and may not be recited as precedent by either party in proceedings under Wisconsin's mediation-arbitration law.

In view of the foregoing stipulation, it is unnecessary for this Arbitrator to determine the comparables for the purpose of selecting the final offer in the dispute between these parties. Consequently, wherever it is appropriate under the factors delineated in 111.70 (4)(cm) 7. to consider comparable communities, the comparable school districts are those specified in the Stipulation of the parties.

PATTERNS OF SETTLEMENT AND SALARY COMPARISONS

Turning first to a comparison of wages, hours and conditions of employment of municipal employees involved in these proceedings with wages, hours and conditions of employment of other employees performing similar services, the undersigned notes under subsection d there is no requirement that the Arbitrator consider a comparison of wages, hours and conditions of employment with other employees performing similar services in comparable communities. Subsection d merely requires that the Arbitrator compare wages, hours and conditions of employment with other employees performing similar services without mentioning a requirement that that comparison be made with employees in comparable communities. Consequently, it appears that the legislative intent in severing what had previously been one criteria into three criteria now contemplates that the Arbitrator merely compare wages, hours and conditions of employment of teachers in the disputed district with wages, hours and conditions of employment of teachers, irrespective of whether there is a comparability among the school districts for the comparisons being made. Notwithstanding any of the foregoing, however, the parties have only submitted evidence into this record with respect to the stipulated comparable districts and, consequently, the undersigned, being limited to the record evidence submitted by the parties in arriving at his decision, will make those comparisons based on the comparable districts as stipulated to by the parties.

The Association largely grounds its case on a comparison of wages, teacher to teacher, and the patterns of settlement that have emerged thus far for the 1987-88 and 1988-89 school years in support of its position that the Association offer should be adopted. The Association argues that both comparison at the benchmarks of salary to salary among the comparable districts, as well as the patterns of settlement emerging among the settled comparable districts, supports a conclusion that its offer should be adopted. The undersigned has considered all of the exhibits, as well as all of the charts which the Association derived from its exhibits in its brief in reviewing this record. The undersigned, however, finds it unnecessary to go into a labored or detailed discussion with respect to the exhibits on the patterns of settlement among the comparables, or the argument which the Association advanced with respect thereto in its 59 page brief, because the Employer at page 10 of its brief acknowledges that when comparing patterns of settlement expressed as a percentage "the Board's final offer is on the low side in percentage terms vis a vis the members of the comparability group which have settled for either year in question . . ." Again, at page 11 the Employer argues:

> Since none of those settlements can fairly be discounted, we must again acknowledge that the Board's final offer for that year is on the low side. Still, there is a legitimate question of whether such a small number of settlements can be viewed as representative of the comparability group as a whole. To the contrary, given WEAC's longstanding practice of reaching early settlements only with those districts willing to meet its preordained salary goals (a/k/a the 'whipsaw' technique), it may reasonably be surmised that the unsettled districts are those which have heretofore refused to meet those settlement demands. Based on that premise, we must urge the Arbitrator to give little weight to 1988-89 settlement figures in rendering his award in this proceeding.

In view of the Employer's admission that its offer is on the low side, the Arbitrator finds it unnecessary to engage in any further discussion or analysis with respect to a comparison of the patterns of settlement expressed as a percentage. The Employer, however, would have the Arbitrator give little or no weight to those settlement patterns because of what he has determined the WEAC's long standing practice of reaching early settlements only with districts willing to meet its preordained salary goals. There is no evidence in the record to support this argument and, consequently, the undersigned rejects the Employer argument with respect thereto. The undersigned has reviewed the settlement patterns in light of the Association offer here, and finds that the Association offer conforms generally to the settlement patterns which have emerged thus far among the stipulated districts. Consequently, it follows from all of the foregoing that the settlement patterns support an adoption of the Association offer here.

When considering a comparison of dollar increase per returning teacher generated by the final offers of the Board and the Association, compared to the dollar increase per returning teacher for the settled comparable districts; we find the same result emerges as that set forth in the discussion of patterns of settlement expressed as a percentage in the preceding paragraph. Association Exhibits 111-A and 112-A show that the average dollar increase per returning teacher among the comparables is $1939 for 1987-88, and $1878 for 1988-89. The Employer offer generates $1407 for 1987-88 and $1615 for 1988-89. The Association offer generates $1817 for 1987-88 and $1841 for 1988-89. The foregoing data confirms that the patterns of settlement support the selection of the Association's final offer.

The argument advanced by the Employer with respect to benchmark comparisons is different than the argument the Employer advanced with respect to patterns of settlement. The Employer's argument with respect to the benchmark comparisons is found at pages 5 through 10 of its brief. The Employer argues that the benchmark comparisons are no longer reliable by reason of settlements among the five comparable districts which have frozen increments two recent school years. The districts which have frozen increments are Sheboygan, Stevens Point and Wisconsin Rapids for the 1984-85 school year, and Beloit and LaCrosse for the 1985-86 school year. The Employer then argues that increment freezing creates the illusion that the participating school district has provided a far more sizeable overall salary increase to its teachers in a given year than is the case in fact; and that the increase at certain benchmarks, therefore, is in reality a paper increase only. The Employer then advances the argument that: "It is significant that Eau Claire teachers are predominantly found at the terminal increments of the various lanes of the salary schedule. Benchmark analysis should be so circumscribed."

The undersigned is not in agreement with the Employer argument with respect to the impact of increment freezes. The Arbitrator, however, does agree with the Employer that the points of the salary schedule most crucial for comparison in this dispute are those most densely populated by the teachers in this district. Here, Employer Exhibit No. 25 establishes the teacher placement for all teachers in the district for the school year 1987-88. The exhibit establishes that 359 teachers in the district reside at the top step of their respective lanes. The exhibit further establishes that 232 of the district teachers reside at the top steps of the MA lanes. Employer Exhibit No. 7 establishes that the FTEs in 1986-87 were 554.1 Thus, 41.9% of the teachers in the district reside at the top steps of the five master's lanes, and 64.8% of the teachers in the district reside at the top step of the ten lanes depicted in the salary schedule. From the foregoing, the undersigned concludes that the appropriate spot of the salary schedule at which to make comparisons is the maximum in the lanes. More significantly, in view of the high concentration of employees in this district in the master's lanes, the most significant comparisons are found at the top of the master's lane, and the top of the schedule.

The foregoing conclusions square with the proposition that the value of a salary schedule is best determined by evaluating the top earnings that a teacher can earn in the instant district compared to the top earnings a teacher can earn in other districts, and how long it will take that teacher to arrive at the top.

The undersigned, therefore, will compare the top of the MA lane and the step of the schedule in view of the high density of teachers who are found at those spots with salaries paid at these comparable steps in the comparable settled districts.

Board Exhibit No. 13-C establishes that the final offers of the parties for 1987-88 establish an MA max of $33,741 pursuant to the Board offer, and $34,185 pursuant to the Association offer. The average salary among the settled comparables for that point of the salary schedule is $32,984. Both parties' offer would rank third among the settled districts, irrespective of which party's offer is accepted. Thus, both parties' offer at the MA max for 1986-87 generates a salary consistent with salaries paid at that point of the schedule among the settled comparables.

Turning to the same comparisons at MA max for 1988-89, Board Exhibit 15-C establishes that the Board's offer at the MA max would generate $35,168, whereas the Association offer would generate $35,854, ranking both offers second among the settled comparables for 1988-89. The average salary among the settled comparables for 1988-89 is $34,742 at the MA max. Consequently, the undersigned concludes that at the MA max either party's offer satisfactorily meets the criteria of a comparison of wages paid at that salary schedule step.

Turning to a comparison of salaries at the schedule max, Board Exhibit 13-E shows that the maximum salaries at twenty years are generated by the Board offer for 1986-87 at $36,502, and the Association offer generates $36,992. Both parties' offers rank third among the settled districts. Taking into account longevity, the ranking for thirty years of employment at the schedule max, the offers generate the same amount of dollars at that point of the schedule, and the ranking remains third among the comparable settled districts for 1986-87. However, the final offers of the parties at the maximum salary schedule after twenty years of employment for 1987-88 among the comparable districts is less than the average salary paid at that point of the schedule among the comparable districts, $36,816. The same is true after thirty years, where the average salary is $37,087. Board Exhibit 12-E shows that in 1986-87, after twenty years at the schedule max, Eau Claire ranked third, and after twenty years of employment paid $35,292 compared to an average salary of $35,040, and after thirty years paid $35,292 compared to an average salary of $35,331. Thus, there is an erosion of salaries paid compared to the average salaries at the schedule max pursuant to both parties' final offer. The foregoing establishes that the Association final offer is slightly preferred when comparing maximum salaries in the schedule for 1987-88, because it establishes less erosion compared to the average than that of the Employer.

From Board Exhibit 15-E we find that the Board offer generates a maximum salary of $38,025, whereas, the Association offer generates a salary of $38,757 for 1988-89. The Employer offer ranks third among the settled districts, whereas, the Association offer ranks second at both twenty and thirty years of employment mark. The Association offer after twenty years maintains the approximate relationship of 1986-87, i.e., slightly above, when compared to the average at that benchmark, in that it is slightly above the average of $38,658 after twenty years, whereas, the Employer offer is slightly below that figure. After thirty years, however, both parties' offers fall below the average of the settled districts at the schedule max thirty year employment comparison mark. The average among the settled districts at that point of the schedule (thirty years salary max) is $39,151.

Furthermore, Board Exhibit 14-E establishes that among the comparable districts which are settled for 1988-89, the Employer ranked second among these districts in 1986-87. The second ranking would be maintained by the Association offer and would be eroded to third under the Employer offer. From all of the foregoing, the undersigned concludes that when comparing the schedule max the Association offer is preferred.

COST OF LIVING

We turn now to an evaluation of the cost of living criteria. The record evidence clearly establishes that the Employer offer exceeds the increase in the cost of living, as does that of the Association. Consequently, it is clear that under the cost of living criteria the Employer offer is preferred, because it is closer to the increase in the cost of living.

The undersigned notes with interest the Employer argument at page 3 of its brief the following:

> It is hardly surprising that the Association has introduced no evidence on the cost of living. Yet, in times of rampant inflation, teacher unions invariably defended their salary proposals by reference to the increased cost of living. Now, in a period of low inflation and in the wake of wholesale wage concessions in the private sector, those same unions have found it expedient to ignore this statutory factor altogether. From the Association's vantage point, the cost of living factor seems to have conveniently vanished from the horizon.

The undersigned has arbitrated interest disputes for a number of years, including those years in which double digit inflation was the rule. The undersigned agrees that during those years the Unions and Associations relied on the cost of living criteria. It is equally true from the undersigned's recollection that the employers minimized that cost of living criteria during those years. What is important in the undersigned's opinion is that arbitrators generally did not rely on the cost of living criteria to support the Union's final offer during those high inflation years, holding almost universally that the true indicia of how cost of living should impact a settlement is mirrored by the voluntary settlements that occurred under the same inflationary spiral then being experienced. Because that reasoning was applied during the high inflation years, it would only be consistent that arbitrators take the same approach during low inflation years. Consequently, the weight of the cost of living factor should not be given greater weight in low inflation years, in the opinion of this Arbitrator, than it was accorded during the high inflation years. Those observations will be fully considered when this Arbitrator makes a determination and selection of one party's final offer in its entirety.

COMPARISONS OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTOR SETTLEMENTS

The Employer argues that comparisons of public and private sector employment in the same community favor the adoption of its offer. The Employer relies on Employer Exhibit 22 in support thereof. Board Exhibit 22 shows a ranking of all industry wages paid among the comparable districts for the fourth quarter of 1986, and the average local government wages paid among those same comparables. The exhibit shows that among the average annual salaries paid for all industry, the County of Eau Claire ranked 11th among those comparables, paying an average annual salary of $16,691. The same exhibit shows that public employees in the County of Eau Claire ranked 5th among those same comparables. The Employer argues that the exhibit shows that: "Eau Claire's relatively high teacher salaries are not based on a correlation with either private sector compensation or other economic indicators. Rather, in the context of prevailing wage and economic conditions in Eau Claire, teacher salaries can be seen as something of an anomaly. Consequently, this statutory factor of public and private sector comparability also tends to support the relatively modest final offer of the Board." (Board brief, page 19) The undersigned is unpersuaded by the foregoing argument of the Employer, because Board Exhibit 22 fails to isolate teacher salaries, comparing all public employee salaries rather than only those of teachers.

The undersigned has also reviewed the survey information contained in Board Exhibit 27 which carries responses from other Eau Claire employers, both in the private and public sector, as to the percentages of settlement in their most recent rounds of negotiation. The data indicates that the City of Eau Claire and the County of Eau Claire, for 1987, increased wages by 3%; that the Chippewa Valley Technical College, located in the City of Eau Claire, increased its salary schedules by 5.26%, inclusive of increments for the 1987-88 school year, and that its package increase settlement was 6.41%. Other private sector employers represented in Board Exhibit 27 range from increases at Menards of 0% for 1987 to 6% at Northern State Power for the same year. Phillips Plastic Corporation increased 5% in 1987; Randall's Discount Foods 3% for half of its employees; the postal employees received an increase of 2.9%; and the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire employees received an increase of 2%. Thus, we have a range of increases for 1987 among other public and private sector employees ranging from 0% to 6%. This compares with a 1987-88 percentage salary increase for the Employer offer of 4.7% and 6.1% for the Association offer. (Board Exhibit 19-A) The undersigned would note from all of the foregoing data that the percentage increase by the Employer more nearly typifies the percentage increases among private sector employees; however, Northern States Power settlement certainly is more typical of the percentage increase proposed

by the Association for 1987-88 than is that of the Employer. Consequently, the undersigned finds that the Employer offer is preferred when making the comparisons under these statutory criteria.

THE INTEREST AND WELFARE OF THE PUBLIC

There is no issue raised in this dispute that the Employer is not able to pay the salaries proposed by the Association. The Employer argues that the interest and welfare of the public militates for the selection of its final offer. The Employer relies on Board Exhibits 7, 8 and 24 to support its contention that the interest and welfare of the public favor the adoption of the Employer offer.

Board Exhibit 7 shows that Eau Claire's levy rate is $15.10 compared to a range of levy rates among the comparables of $13.26 at Beloit to $16.48 in LaCrosse. The average levy rate is $14.38 and the median levy rate is $14.05.

Board Exhibit 7 also shows that the equalized value per average daily membership is $147,085 in Eau Claire compared with a range of $91,216 to $221,151 among the comparables. The average equalized value/adm is $160,885, and the median is $159,300. Board Exhibit 7 also shows that last year's cost/adm in Eau Claire is $4157.95 compared to a range of $3725.21 to $4767.84 among the comparables. The average of the comparables is $4062.41 and the median is $3974.24.

Board Exhibit 7 also shows that Eau Claire has the fourth highest levy rate among the comparables, the ninth lowest equalized value/adm among the comparables, and the third highest in cost/adm.

From the foregoing data, the Employer argues that because it is expending a higher effort than the comparable school districts, where Board Exhibit No. 8 shows that its median household income and the percentage of its families in poverty are less favorable than the average of the stipulated comparables, the interest and welfare of the public are best served by the adoption of its offer.

The Arbitrator rejects the foregoing argument of the Employer, finding that the record fails to support its argument, because the data in Board Exhibit No. 8 upon which the Employer relies is outdated. Board Exhibit No. 8 data is excerpted from 1980 School District Census data. In this Arbitrator's opinion, data which is eight years old is too unreliable on which to base a sound conclusion. Having rejected the Employer's data in Board Exhibit No. 8 as being outmoded and unreliable, it follows that the Employer has failed to establish that the interest and welfare of the public supports its final offer.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The undersigned has concluded that patterns of settlement and salary comparisons among teachers favor the Association final offer. The undersigned has further concluded that cost of living criteria favors the adoption of the Employer final offer, and that the Employer offer is slightly preferred when comparing settlements in the private sector and public sector in the same community. The undersigned has also concluded that the evidence fails to support the Employer contention that the interest and welfare of the public militates for the adoption of the Employer final offer. It remains to be determined which party's final offer should be selected when considering all of the criteria.

Because the Employer has failed to establish that the interest and welfare of the public supports its offer; and because the cost of living criteria is given less weight than the patterns of settlement as discussed supra; and because the patterns of settlement and salary comparisons support the Association final offer; and because the comparisons of the other settlements in the same community fail to establish a clear and strong support for the adoption of the Employer final offer; the Arbitrator now concludes that the Association final offer should be adopted.

Therefore, based on the record in its entirety, after considering all of the

arguments of the parties, and the statutory criteria, the Arbitrator makes the following:

AWARD

The final offer of the Association, along with the stipulations of the parties as furnished to the Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission, as well as those terms of the predecessor Collective Bargaining Agreement which remain unchanged throughout the course of bargaining, are to be incorporated into the parties' written Collective Bargaining Agreement for the school years 1987-88 and 1988-89.

Dated at Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, this 12th day of April, 1988.

Jos. B. Kerkman,
Arbitrator-Mediator

JBK:rr

APPENDIX A-1, A-2, A-3, A-4

Name of Case: Eau Claire Area School Dist

The following, or the attachment hereto, constitutes our final offer for the purposes of arbitration pursuant to Section 111.70(4)(cm)6. of the Municipal Employment Relations Act. A copy of such final offer has been submitted to the other party involved in this proceeding, and the undersigned has received a copy of the final offer of the other party. Each page of the attachment hereto has been initialed by me. Further, we **(do)** ~~(do not)~~ authorize inclusion o. nonresidents of Wisconsin on the arbitration panel to be submitted to the Commission.

10-1-87
(Date)

D. T. Kennedy Pres.
(Representative)

On Behalf of: Eau Claire Area School District

ZMARB9.FT

APPENDIX A-1, A-2, A-3, A-4

Approved by	
Prepared by	10/1/87

7:30 P.M.

Eau Claire Area School District
Board of Education
Final Offer

	1	2	3	4	5	6
				1987-88 5% Pkg.		1988-89 5.5% Pkg.
Salary				8,292,759		9,303,707
Activity Assign.				44,207		62,348
Schedule Movement				214,702		122,075
Retirement				1,150,440		1,210,148
Hospitalization				1,248,241	*	1,395,065
Dental				225,016	*	258,518
Disability				83,423		87,735
Life Ins.				60,774		63,915
				21,925,786		23,184,511

* Agreed upon Cap of 10% increase

APPENDIX A-1, A-2, A-3, A-4

NEGOTO
THU, OCT 1, 1987
5:46 PM

EAU CLAIRE AREA SCHOOLS
1987-88 TEACHERS SCHEDULE SCHEDULE=+614
-PROPOSED- TABLE A

-- ROWS --	----BS----	---BS+8---	---BS+16--	---BS+24--	---BS+32-
YR EXP 0	$18200	$18422	$18644	$18866	$19088
YR EXP 1	$19787	$20025	$20266	$20507	$20749
YR EXP 2	$21366	$21628	$21888	$22148	$22410
YR EXP 3	$22158	$22429	$22699	$22969	$23240
YR EXP 4	$22950	$23230	$23510	$23790	$24070
YR EXP 5	$23742	$24031	$24321	$24611	$24900
YR EXP 6	$24534	$24832	$25132	$25432	$25730
YR EXP 7	$25326	$25633	$25943	$26253	$26560
YR EXP 8	$26118	$26434	$26754	$27074	$27390
YR EXP 9	$26910	$27235	$27565	$27895	$28220
YR EXP 10	$27702	$28036	$28376	$28716	$29050
YR EXP 11	$	$28837	$29187	$29537	$29880
YR EXP 12	$	$	$29998	$30358	$30710
YR EXP 13	$	$	$	$31179	$31540
YR EXP 14	$	$	$	$	$32370

NEGOTO
THU, OCT 1, 1987
5:46 PM

EAU CLAIRE AREA SCHOOLS
1987-88 TEACHERS SCHEDULE SCHEDULE=+614
-PROPOSED- TABLE B

-- ROWS --	----MA----	---MA+8---	---MA+16--	---MA+24--	---MA+32--
YR EXP 0	$19436	$19683	$19930	$20177	$20424
YR EXP 1	$21224	$21494	$21764	$22033	$22303
YR EXP 2	$23012	$23305	$23598	$23889	$24182
YR EXP 3	$23906	$24210	$24515	$24817	$25122
YR EXP 4	$24800	$25115	$25432	$25745	$26062
YR EXP 5	$25694	$26020	$26349	$26673	$27002
YR EXP 6	$26588	$26925	$27266	$27601	$27942
YR EXP 7	$27482	$27830	$28183	$28529	$28882
YR EXP 8	$28376	$28735	$29100	$29457	$29822
YR EXP 9	$29270	$29640	$30017	$30385	$30762
YR EXP 10	$30164	$30545	$30934	$31313	$31702
YR EXP 11	$31058	$31450	$31851	$32241	$32642
YR EXP 12	$31952	$32355	$32768	$33169	$33582
YR EXP 13	$32846	$33260	$33685	$34097	$34522
YR EXP 14	$33740	$34165	$34602	$35025	$35462

APPENDIX A-1, A-2, A-3, A-4

NEGOTO
THU, OCT 1, 1987
8:16 PM

EAU CLAIRE AREA SCHOOLS
1988-89 TEACHERS SCHEDULE SCHEDULE=+770
-PROPOSED- TABLE A

-- ROWS --	----BS----	---BS+8---	---BS+16--	---BS+24--	---BS+32--
	COLUMNS				
YR EXP 0	$18970	$19202	$19434	$19666	$19898
YR EXP 1	$20620	$20873	$21125	$21377	$21629
YR EXP 2	$22270	$22544	$22816	$23088	$23360
YR EXP 3	$23095	$23379	$23661	$23943	$24226
YR EXP 4	$23920	$24214	$24506	$24798	$25092
YR EXP 5	$24745	$25049	$25351	$25653	$25958
YR EXP 6	$25570	$25884	$26196	$26508	$26824
YR EXP 7	$26395	$26719	$27041	$27363	$27690
YR EXP 8	$27220	$27554	$27886	$28218	$28556
YR EXP 9	$28045	$28389	$28731	$29073	$29422
YR EXP 10	$28870	$29224	$29576	$29928	$30288
YR EXP 11	$	$30059	$30421	$30783	$31154
YR EXP 12	$	$	$31266	$31638	$32020
YR EXP 13	$	$	$	$32493	$32886
YR EXP 14	$	$	$	$	$33752

NEGOTO
THU, OCT 1, 1987
8:17 PM

EAU CLAIRE AREA SCHOOLS
1988-89 TEACHERS SCHEDULE SCHEDULE=+770
-PROPOSED- TABLE B

-- ROWS --	----MA----	---MA+8---	---MA+16--	---MA+24--	---MA+32--
	COLUMNS				
YR EXP 0	$20258	$20516	$20774	$21032	$21290
YR EXP 1	$22122	$22403	$22685	$22967	$23249
YR EXP 2	$23986	$24290	$24596	$24902	$25208
YR EXP 3	$24918	$25234	$25552	$25869	$26187
YR EXP 4	$25850	$26178	$26508	$26836	$27166
YR EXP 5	$26782	$27122	$27464	$27803	$28145
YR EXP 6	$27714	$28066	$28420	$28770	$29124
YR EXP 7	$28646	$29010	$29376	$29737	$30103
YR EXP 8	$29578	$29954	$30332	$30704	$31082
YR EXP 9	$30510	$30893	$31288	$31671	$32061
YR EXP 10	$31442	$31842	$32244	$32638	$33040
YR EXP 11	$32374	$32786	$33200	$33605	$34019
YR EXP 12	$33306	$33730	$34156	$34572	$34998
YR EXP 13	$34238	$34674	$35112	$35539	$35977
YR EXP 14	$35170	$35618	$36068	$36506	$36956

APPENDIX A-1, A-2, A-3, A-4

Name of Case: Eau Claire Area School Dist.

The following, or the attachment hereto, constitutes our final offer for the purposes of arbitration pursuant to Section 111.70(4)(cm)6. of the Municipal Employment Relations Act. A copy of such final offer has been submitted to the other party involved in this proceeding, and the undersigned has received a copy of the final offer of the other party. Each page of the attachment hereto has been initialed by me. Further, we **(do)** **(do not)** authorize inclusion of nonresidents of Wisconsin on the arbitration panel to be submitted to the Commission.

10-1-87
(Date)

Charles L. Garner
(Representative)

On Behalf of: Eau Claire Association of Educators

ZMARB9.FT

ECAE Final Offer 10:00 p.m. October 1, 1987

APPENDIX A-1, A-2, A-3, A-4

C6

1987-88 FALL PLACEMENT BASE OF 18440 597.8 TEACHERS
BETWEEN CREDIT LANES (1.2220% = $225.34) & (1.3578% = $250.38)
FOR EACH YEARS EXPER (4.3500% = $802.14) & (4.6000% = $848.24)

	BA	BA+8	BA+16	BA+24	BA+32	MA	MA+8	MA+16	MA+24	MA+32
0	18440	18665	18891	19116	19341	19692	19942	20193	20443	20693
1	20044	20289	20534	20779	21024	21504	21777	22051	22324	22597
2	21649	21913	22178	22442	22706	23315	23611	23908	24205	24501
3	22451	22725	23000	23274	23548	24221	24529	24837	25145	25452
4	23253	23537	23821	24105	24389	25127	25446	25766	26085	26404
5	24055	24349	24643	24937	25230	26033	26363	26695	27026	27356
6	24857	25161	25465	25768	26072	26939	27281	27624	27966	28308
7	25659	25972	26287	26600	26913	27844	28199	28553	28906	29260
8	26461	26784	27108	27431	27754	28750	29115	29482	29847	30212
9	27264	27596	27930	28263	28596	29656	30033	30410	30787	31164
10	28066	28408	28752	29095	29437	30562	30950	31339	31728	32116
11	0	29220	29574	29926	30279	31468	31867	32268	32668	33068
12	0	0	30395	30758	31120	32374	32785	33197	33608	34020
13	0	0	0	31589	31961	33279	33702	34126	34549	34971
14	0	0	0	0	32803	34185	34620	35055	35489	35923

APPENDIX A-1, A-2, A-3, A-4

1988-89 FALL PLACEMENT BASE OF 19340 597.8 TEACHERS
BETWEEN CREDIT LANES (1.2220% = $236.33) & (1.3578% = $262.60)
FOR EACH YEARS EXPER (4.3500% = $841.29) & (4.6000% = $889.64)

	BA	BA+8	BA+16	BA+24	BA+32	MA	MA+8	MA+16	MA+24	MA+32
0	19340	19576	19813	20049	20285	20653	20916	21178	21441	21703
1	21023	21279	21537	21793	22050	22553	22840	23126	23414	23700
2	22705	22982	23260	23538	23815	24453	24764	25075	25386	25696
3	23546	23834	24122	24410	24697	25403	25727	26049	26372	26695
4	24388	24685	24984	25282	25579	26353	26689	27023	27359	27693
5	25229	25537	25846	26154	26462	27303	27651	27997	28345	28691
6	26070	26389	26708	27026	27344	28253	28613	28972	29331	29690
7	26912	27240	27570	27898	28227	29203	29575	29946	30317	30688
8	27753	28092	28432	28770	29109	30153	30537	30920	31304	31687
9	28594	28943	29293	29642	29992	31103	31499	31894	32290	32685
10	29435	29795	30155	30515	30874	32053	32461	32868	33276	33683
11	0	30646	31017	31387	31756	33003	33424	33843	34263	34682
12	0	0	31879	32259	32639	33954	34386	34817	35249	35680
13	0	0	0	33131	33521	34904	35348	35791	36235	36678
14	0	0	0	0	34404	35854	36310	36765	37221	37677