

RECEIVED
NOV 15 1989
WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT
RELATIONS COMMISSION

STATE OF WISCONSIN
WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION
Before the Arbitrator

In the Matter of Arbitration

INTEREST ARBITRATION

between

The Brodhead Education Association

WERC Case 9

No. 40679

INT/ARB-4936

Decision No. 25925-A

- and -

The Brodhead School District,
Brodhead, Wisconsin

Before: J. C. Fogelberg,
Neutral Arbitrator

Representation -

For the Association:

Renee C. Scholen, UniServ Director

For the District:

Shannon E. Bradbury, Wisconsin Assn. of School Boards

Statement of Jurisdiction -

On March 27, 1989, the Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission appointed the undersigned to serve as the Neutral Arbitrator and requiring that arbitration be initiated for the purpose of resolving the impasse arising in collective bargaining between the Brodhead School District and the Brodhead Education Association on matters affecting wages, hours and conditions of employment of all regular full-time and regular part-time teachers and guidance personnel employed

by the District. Prior to the appointment, and pursuant to the provisions of the parties' Collective Bargaining Agreement as well as Wisconsin Statute, Section 111.70, the parties met to exchange initial proposals for a new Master Agreement covering the school years 1988-89 and 1989-90. These positions were initially exchanged on March 7, 1988. Following numerous negotiating sessions, the Employer filed a petition for arbitration with the Commission on June 2, 1988. An investigation was thereafter held on July 25th before Commission Investigator Amedeo Greco. A second attempt to mediate a settlement was conducted by the Investigator on November 1st, and after the exchange of several final offers, the matter was closed when the Investigator certified the parties' final offers on February 2, 1989. Subsequently, the certified issue of health insurance was independently resolved by the parties and final offers were amended in May of this year. A hearing was then conducted by the undersigned on July 11, 1989 in Brodhead. Thereafter written summary arguments and reply briefs were received by the Neutral and the matter deemed officially closed on September 14th.

Summary of the Issues -

The Association and the District are a party to a two year 1986-88 Collective Bargaining Agreement. As previously indicated, initially the issues of salary, health insurance and grievance procedure were submitted by the Association and

the District for consideration. As the health insurance issue has been resolved, there remains the selection of one side's certified final offer relative to salaries and definition of a grievance.

Relevant Background Information -

The School District of Brodhead is approximately equally divided between Green and Rock Counties. Prior to negotiating the 1986-88 Agreement, the parties participated in arbitration in 1986 which involved issues of salary schedules, and other matters relating to the school calendar and spring break. Essentially, it has been agreed that the primary comparables to be used in this analysis consist of those schools found in the Rock Valley Athletic Conference which are:

Beloit-Turner

Bigfoot (Wadworth)

Brodhead

Clinton

Edgerton

Evansville

Parkview

(Additionally, the Association has included the districts of Milton and Whitewater in its comparable group, arguing that both are "very similar to the Rock Valley Athletic Conference Schools.")

Position of the Parties -

The DISTRICT has proposed a salary schedule for the 1988-89 school year which essentially follows the format of the existing (1987-88) schedule. They have offered an increase on the BA base of \$1,150, bringing it to \$18,900 in the first year of the new contract. Additionally, the Board has retained the existing incremental steps of \$600 on the BA lanes and \$650 on the MA columns. Similarly the lanes have remained \$300 apart under the Employer's final certified position, with an exception of a "leap" to \$720 between the Bachelors and Masters degree lanes.

For the second year of the Agreement, the Board has again maintained the existing construction of the schedule, this time adding \$1,400 to the BA base figure to bring it up to \$20,300. All other incremental steps and lane adjustments are to remain identical to the first year, under the Employer's proposal.

Additionally, the School Board has sought to retain the existing longevity provision, but increasing the non-cumulative payment made to teachers that have been in the final step of each educational column for at least one year, from \$600 to \$900 in 1988-89, and \$1,200 for 1989-90.

The Board estimates that its 1988-89 salary offer represents an increase of 5.4% or \$1,408 per teacher (Board Exhibit 4) and a total package increase of 6.28% or \$2,118 per bargaining unit member. For the second year of the Agreement,

the Employer's offer is represented as a salary increase of 5.9% (\$1,620 per teacher) and a total package increase of 6.29% (\$2,255 per teacher). Their final position is set forth in greater detail in Appendices A & B attached.

The School District does not seek any amendment to the existing language in the Agreement defining a grievance.

Conversely, the **ASSOCIATION** has proposed a compacted salary schedule for the term of the new contract. Under this proposal, the BA base would be established at \$18,300 (representing a \$550 adjustment in the first year). The new schedule would be increased from the existing 8 to 9 lanes -- 5 for Bachelors and 4 for Masters. The BA lane would have 7 experience steps, the BA +6 lane, 8 steps, the BA +12 lane, 9 steps. All other lanes would contain 10 experience steps. Under the previous contract there were three Masters lanes: MA, MA +9 and MA +15. Under the Association's proposal, the additional lane would result in an alteration of the Masters columns on the schedule as follows: MA, MA +6, MA +12, and MA +18. Under the expired agreement, beyond the BA lane, the number of incremental steps rose in each succeeding column through the existing BA lanes until the MA lane. At that point, all MA lanes were capped at 15 steps. Under the Brodhead Education Association's (BEA) proposal for the new Agreement, the BA lane would have 7 steps, the BA +6 lane, 8 steps, the BA +12 lane, 9 steps, and all remaining lanes on the schedule would be capped at the tenth incremental step.

In addition, the amount of money separating the steps and lanes has been altered under the BEA's proposal. Beginning with the BA base figure, the increments in the BA column would be \$839. This amount raises to \$915 for the BA +6 lane; to \$991 for the BA +12; to \$1,067 for the BA +18; and to \$1,143 at BA +24.

In the Master lanes, increments for the MA column are \$1,219; for the MA +6 column, the increments are \$1,295; for the MA +12 column, they are \$1,371; and for MA +18 -- \$1,447.

Additionally, the longevity provisions that have heretofore been part of the salary schedule would be eliminated and rolled into the new schedule, under the Association's proposal. Were the new schedule adopted, the teachers have indicated that the existing faculty on the newly compacted schedule would be placed by computing each instructor's 1987-88 salary and longevity amount and adding \$1,300. The employee would then be placed on the new schedule at a cell that most nearly matched, but was not higher than this amount.

For 1989-90, the Association seeks to add another \$500 to the BA base for a starting salary of \$18,800. The incremental adjustments in the second year would then range from 2.3 to 2.9% depending upon the lane. The difference between the BA and the BA +6 columns in 1989-90 would amount to \$607, while the distance between BA +6 and BA +12 would be \$747. The rest of the column differentials are \$676, \$677, or \$678.

The Association has costed its proposal to be worth

approximately 5.7% on salary alone, or \$1,504 per teacher in 1988-89 -- with a total package increase of 6.6% or \$1,655 per instructor.

For 1990, the BEA estimates that their offer is 6.38% on salary (\$1,758 per teacher) for a total package increase of 6.73% (\$1,760 per teacher).

The proposed schedules of the Association are set forth in Appendices C & D, attached.

In addition to the salary and schedule changes, the teachers seek an amendment to Article XII (Grievance Procedure) which would include the Association within the definition of "Grievant."

Statutory Criteria -

The criteria to be considered and weighed by the Arbitrator in rendering the Award are those specified in Wisconsin Statute 111.70(4)(cm) as follows:

In making any decision under the arbitration procedures authorized by this subsection, the arbitrator shall give weight to the following factors:

- a. The lawful authority of the municipal employer
- b. Stipulations of the parties
- c. The interests and welfare of the public and the financial ability of the unit of government to meet the costs of any proposed settlement
- d. Comparison of wages, hours and conditions of employment of the municipal employees involved in the arbitration proceedings, but the wages, hours and conditions of employment of other employees performing similar services and with other employees generally in public employment

in the same community and in comparable communities and in private employment in the same community and in comparable communities.

- e. The average consumer prices for goods and services, commonly known as the cost-of-living.
- f. The overall compensation presently received by the municipal employees, including direct wages, compensation, vacation, holidays and excused time, insurance and pensions, medical and hospitalization benefits, the continuity and stability of employment, and all other benefits received.
- g. Changes in any of the foregoing circumstances during the pendency of the arbitration proceedings.
- h. Such other factors, not confined to the foregoing, which are normally or traditionally taken into consideration in the determination of wages, hours and conditions of employment through voluntary collective bargaining, mediation, fact-finding, arbitration or otherwise between the parties, in the public service or in private employment.

Analysis of the Evidence -

In reaching the decision that has been made here, the Arbitrator has given careful consideration to each of the criteria set forth in the above-referenced statute, as they relate to the documents, testimony and written arguments submitted by the parties.

Of those factors listed in W.S. 111.70(4)(cm), it is readily apparent, upon examining the record, that the parties have placed considerable reliance upon external comparisons, the Consumer Price Index, the bargaining history of the parties, and "other factors" as they relate to the change in

the schedule structure and distribution of monies.

The District does not raise any inability to pay argument pursuant to criterion C in the statute. At the same time, however, they contend that the local economic condition for the Brodhead District depends to no small degree, upon the relative health of the farm economy in Green and Rock Counties. Noting that the taxing base for the District is largely dependent upon agriculture, the Employer asserts that the "drought of 1988" has caused long term economic difficulties for the farmers in Wisconsin (Board Exhibits 34-52). This "crisis" is particularly relevant to the Brodhead District, it is asserted, due to its largely rural composition. Documentation was introduced purporting to demonstrate the drought's far-reaching effect with shortages in feed for dairy cattle and other livestock (Board Exhibit 34). It is represented that these projections take into account both federal drought relief programs as well as increases in producer milk prices.

The arguments of the School Board are countered by the Associations' who contend that Brodhead has not been uniquely affected by the recent drought. This District is not, in their estimation, the most heavily agricultural of the schools in the conference. Data gleaned from both their own exhibits (38 and 39) as well as the District's (20-33) they claim, support their position. A review of this documentation favors the BEA's argument. Essentially the evidence shows that this

District ranks somewhere toward the middle of the comparable grouping when measuring the percentage of total property tax base which is agricultural. Further, the Arbitrator is persuaded that the teachers evidence in connection with the increase in state aid through the state's equalization aid formula which alone rose 15% from 1987-88 to 1988-89 should be favored. This represents the largest percentage adjustment among any of the comparable districts in the Conference (Association Exhibit 34).

Additionally, Board exhibit 40 -- the 1989 Status of Wisconsin Farming, paints a healthier picture of the farm economy in Wisconsin than the Employer has represented. Net farm income has risen steadily over the four year period immediately preceding the drought (estimated to be in excess of 21%). When these figures are coupled with the Association's data on the improvement in "farm household income" during the same period (\$17,000 annually to approximately \$37,000) the allegation regarding the "devastating impact" of the 1988 drought must be further discounted. This conclusion is also buttressed through an examination of the financial documentation submitted, which demonstrates conclusively that Brodhead enjoys a relatively healthy fund balance. The evidence shows that they have reduced the tax levies twice in more recent years (Association Exhibits 41 and 43).

Finally, and perhaps most significantly, with regard to the financial evidence relative to the farm economy, the

Arbitrator notes that the Employer has presented little documentation which effectively demonstrates that this District has somehow been uniquely affected by the drought. It is uncontroverted that nearly all schools in the Conference are largely rural. It is not unreasonable, therefore, to measure the impact of the drought in terms of the settlements reached in other conference schools.

When examining the comparison factor, the Reviewer finds that the Employer has utilized the Conference Schools listed previously as the most appropriate grouping with which to evaluate the final positions. Similarly, the Association has relied upon Rock Valley settlements as a basis for comparisons, with the exception of Walworth (aka "Big Foot"). They have, however, added two other schools (Whitewater and Milton) to their collection of external comparables, arguing that additional schools are needed in order to accomplish a fair evaluation of each side's final position. Further, the BEA contends that both Whitewater and Milton share similarities with the other Rock Valley schools in terms of funding, levy rates, and salary schedule structure. The Association adds that it does not object to the inclusion of Walworth as a comparable school per se, but adds that it is more dissimilar than similar to other school districts in the Conference. According to the BEA, the addition of Whitewater to the comparability group, creates a new pool that still shares a community of interest with the other Rock Valley schools.

The Reviewer does not agree with the Association's argument relative to their comparability group. The evidence demonstrates that historically the school's athletic conference has been used as the appropriate measure of comparison. Generally athletic conferences combine reasonably similar schools in terms of socioeconomic composition. Moreover, the District points out that there have been a number of arbitrated settlements in the Conference in the last five years, and that six of the seven decisions rendered utilized the Rock Valley Conference as the primary grouping for external comparison purposes. A collection of five or six districts who have already settled on their new agreements, and who have been used in the past by these parties as a reasonable "sounding board" for comparison purposes, can therefore be considered an appropriate grouping with which to compare each side's final position. Further, no real reason has been made apparent for the extension of comparison to Whitewater and Milton. As the Board points out, neither is adjacent or even geographically approximate to Brodhead, nor have they been discussed or taken under consideration as comparison schools during bargaining. Upon reviewing the Association's data relative to benchmark comparisons, one can readily understand why these two schools have been added to the teachers' pool of comparables. In most instances, their benchmark rates rank at or near the top for the school years examined in the BEA documents (Exhibits 30-32). Clearly this

additional data skews the profile of the Conference grouping. By the Association's own admission, Milton's student population is larger than any other district in the Conference. Further, the Arbitrator notes that in the 1986 interest arbitration proceedings involving these same parties, the Association again attempted to add other districts to their list of comparables. At that time, Milton and Whitewater were not included. Rather the BEA chose Juda as a comparable district due in part to its close geographic proximity (it is immediately to the west of Brodhead) as well as Monroe and Monona Grove. Just as Milton and Whitewater were absent from the previous grouping of the Association, so too, are the additional three districts relied upon by the teachers in 1986, missing from their current collection. This suggests a pattern of convenience; one that is suspect and essentially unfounded. Like the previous neutral, this arbitrator eschews the addition of the non-conference districts -- especially where a relatively lengthy and consistent practice of using conference schools exclusively for comparison, has been established.

In connection with the foregoing however, it is worth noting that in their reply brief, the BEA argued that even with the adoption of the Employer's grouping for comparison purposes, the final offer of the Union is nearly right on the conference average for both years of the new Agreement, while the District's position falls short. A comparison of the data

submitted by the Employer in their summary brief (used to support the contention that their final position is "dead on" the Conference average) with Association Exhibit 31 and 32 reveals that the teachers' argument has merit, as far as the first year is concerned. When the two extrinsic schools are removed from the pool utilized by the Association, the data shows that the average 1988-89 per teacher salary increase in the Conference (using the benchmark rates for computation) is 5.78%. This compares with the Board's offer of 5.4% (including longevity) and the Union's request for 5.77%. For 1989-90, the Employer's salary proposal is .5% above the average in the Conference (including Parkview). If the object is to align the final certified positions with the average in Rock Valley, then in the second year the District's position must be favored as the BEA seeks a wage increase that exceeds this figure by a greater amount -- nearly a full percentage point above (6.38 vs. 5.4%).

In the Arbitrator's view, however, comparability -- while having been considered -- is not nearly as important to the resolution of this dispute as are two other factors: 1) the distribution of the faculty vis-a-vis the final offers, and 2) the two respective (and historic) approaches to altering the schedule structure.

The District has chosen to characterize the placement of the money on the salary schedule as being, "... as much a statement of philosophy as one of economics." This position

however, ignores the evidence and other arguments that have been made. The Board submits that it is important to continue to place greater evidence on the BA column and the entry level salaries in the District in order that they might continue to attract good teachers and remain competitive in this area. Yet the evidence demonstrates (Association Exhibit 16) that of the 33 teachers hired since the 1984-85 school year, only eight of them qualified for the hiring rate at the BA lane (Step 0/1). Indeed, 11 of these new instructors were hired with Masters degrees, and less than half were placed in the BA lane. Board Exhibit 81 -- a memorandum from the National School Boards Association -- indicates that, "there is no teacher shortage, and barring a dramatic turn of events, there will not be one in the foreseeable future."¹ Further, Board Exhibit 1, a memorandum to the teaching staff from Superintendent Hamele dated February 10, 1989, reminds the teaching staff that, "obtaining credits in approved courses is essential to professional growth and ... the movement provided on the schedule for credits earned is to be an incentive to teachers to return to school."

While it is clearly important to attract qualified personnel to a district's instructional staff, it is equally important that there be enough incentive present to retain good teachers. Greater emphasis on the advanced educational

¹ Quoting Emily Feistritz, Director of the National Center of Education Information.

lanes and at the higher steps on a schedule, clearly qualify as a legitimate method for doing just that. Moreover the Board's offer ignores the reality of the distribution of the existing staff on the salary grid. Over 56% of the faculty are at the highest BA lane or in the Master degree section of the schedule (Association Exhibit 29). More than one-half (53%) of the bargaining unit is at the maximum step, and this will increase to 58% in the second year of the contract. An adoption of the Board's position would not benefit the majority of the faculty as much as the Association's would. The BEA's proposal would have a favorable and immediate effect on the majority of the staff. It is, in this regard, more relevant and will make Brodhead more competitive at the benchmark rates when judging the District's salary schedule against the other Conference schools.

Perhaps most troubling to this Arbitrator is the matter of the compacted schedule as proposed by the Association. In the previous arbitration, the parties took positions opposed to those now advanced in the instant matter. Then it was the District that proposed to reduce the steps on the schedule from 16 to 12, and to increase the number of educational lanes. The Association, on the other hand, sought to retain the schedule in existence at that time (with the single exception of an additional lane) and to retain flat, even dollar differentials. On page 9 of his award, Arbitrator Malamud noted the following:

"The Association argues that the departure from the status quo inherent in the compacted schedule offered by the District, should not be imposed through arbitration."

The compacted schedule proposed three years ago by the School Board represented an adoption in theory of the BEA's argument during negotiations that led to the impasse in 1986: that a change in the status quo was warranted and should be implemented.

Between the previous arbitration and the existing one, the District and the Association negotiated a new two year agreement without third party intervention. That contract did not alter (compact) the schedule. Furthermore, it returned to a flat \$600 incremental step increase on all the BA lanes and a \$650 amount on the MA columns -- a feature which the District now seeks to retain for the life of the new contract. In their summary argument, the Association notes that during negotiations over the current contract, the Board was again willing to "discuss a change in the structure of the schedule," and even submitted their initial final offer to the Commission reflecting three additional lanes (Association Exhibit 20). The teachers point out that they wanted "badly" to accept the proposed changes offered by the Board, but could not as "no new money was proposed (by the Board) to fund the additional lane...."

This Arbitrator is now faced with the same problem that confronted Arbitrator Malamud in 1986. This dispute is indeed "quite unusual" -- just as it was three years ago, except that

the matter is further compounded now by the reversal in final positions, with the District now arguing for status quo. The complaint lodged by the Neutral then, is no less applicable now:

"The bargaining history in this case, should have resulted in a mediation/arbitration proceeding in which this Arbitrator would be required to select between the compacted salary schedule of the District or the compacted salary schedule of the Association. That is not the case."

What should have been however, will not resolve this matter. Normally, like most other neutrals called upon to resolve the remaining issues in an interest dispute, this Arbitrator is reluctant to award structural changes for a salary schedule. That is something that is best achieved at the bargaining table. However, in this particular instance, there is ample evidence that neither side theoretically opposes a structural amendment to the compensation format. Had the District's consistent and historical stance been one of a flat refusal to make any alteration in the schedule, the conclusion reached here might have been different. There is however, ample evidence that both parties believe that some change in the structure is warranted. Moreover, the comparability data submitted by the Association in this regard shows that other conference schools have made similar structural adjustments to their schedules in recent years. The existing schedule has a greater number of steps, fewer dollars separating them, smaller lane differentials and fewer lanes, than most of the comparable districts. Finally, the Arbitrator

would note that contrary to the Board's assertion, there has been some consideration offered by the teachers in return for the compaction. This includes a lower starting rate on the schedule than the one the District has offered, as well as the abandonment of the longevity provisions (and attendant increases proposed by the Board).


Finally, with regard to the single language issue remaining at impasse, the Arbitrator notes that both sides clearly considered this matter to be ancillary to the issue of the salary schedule. While the Association has not presented a particularly convincing argument for the need for a change (historically there have been very few grievances filed) the comparability data presented demonstrates that only one other school in the Conference (Walworth) contains language different from that being proposed.

Award -

The foregoing analysis suggests a relatively "close case" in this instance. The strength of the District's arguments lies principally with their comparability grouping and to a certain extent, their position on status quo. Conversely, the Association has presented a convincing proposition for a change in the emphasis with regard to the allotment of monies on the salary grid, the relatively sound economic health of the District, and the need to alter the schedule structure to make it more relevant and more competi-

tive. Accordingly, based upon the reasons set forth above, the Arbitrator selects the final offer of the Brodhead Education Association together with the stipulations of the parties, to be included in their 1988-90 Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Respectfully submitted this 6th day of November, 1989.



J. C. Fogellberg, Neutral Arbitrator

BRODHEAD SCHOOL DISTRICT

1988-1989

horizontal increase 300
 additional inc. to MA 420
 vert. increase in BA 600
 vert. increase in MA 650

exp	BA	BA+6	BA+12	BA+18	BA+24	MA	MA+9	MA+15
0-1	18000	19200	19500	19800	20100	20820	21120	21420
2	19500	19800	20100	20400	20700	21470	21770	22070
3	20100	20400	20700	21000	21300	22120	22420	22720
4	20700	21000	21300	21600	21900	22770	23070	23370
5	21300	21600	21900	22200	22500	23420	23720	24020
6	21900	22200	22500	22800	23100	24070	24370	24670
7	22500	22800	23100	23400	23700	24720	25020	25320
8	23100	23400	23700	24000	24300	25370	25670	25970
9	23700	24000	24300	24600	24900	26020	26320	26620
10	24300	24600	24900	25200	25500	26670	26970	27270
11		25200	25500	25800	26100	27320	27620	27920
12			26100	26400	26700	27970	28270	28570
13				27000	27300	28620	28920	29220
14					27900	29270	29570	29870
15						29920	30220	30520

BRODHEAD SCHOOL DISTRICT

1989-90

horizontal increase 300
 additional inc. to MA 420
 vert. increase in BA 600
 vert. increase in MA 650

Step	BA	BA+6	BA+12	BA+18	BA+24	MA	MA+9	MA+15
-1	20300	20600	20900	21200	21500	22220	22520	22820
	20900	21200	21500	21800	22100	22870	23170	23470
	21500	21800	22100	22400	22700	23520	23820	24120
4	22100	22400	22700	23000	23300	24170	24470	24770
5	22700	23000	23300	23600	23900	24820	25120	25420
6	23300	23600	23900	24200	24500	25470	25770	26070
7	23900	24200	24500	24800	25100	26120	26420	26720
8	24500	24800	25100	25400	25700	26770	27070	27370
9	25100	25400	25700	26000	26300	27420	27720	28020
10	25700	26000	26300	26600	26900	28070	28370	28670
1		26600	26900	27200	27500	28720	29020	29320
2			27500	27800	28100	29370	29670	29970
3				28400	28700	30020	30320	30620
4					29300	30670	30970	31270
5						31320	31620	31920

APPENDIX B (continued)

Longevity Statements

1988-89

\$900 non-cumulative longevity payment made to teachers that have been in the final step at each educational column for at least one year. For purposes of reporting the salaries at the last experience level the \$900 will be included (e.g., the top salary in MA+15 would be \$31,420 or \$30,520 + \$900).

1989-90

\$1,200 non-cumulative longevity payment made to teachers that have been in the final step at each educational column for at least one year. For purposes of reporting the salaries at the last experience level the \$1,200 will be included (e.g., the top salary in MA+15 would be \$33,120 or \$31,920 + \$1,200).

The longevity payment will be made on the first school day in December.

1988-1989 SALARY SCHEDULE

STEP	BA	BA+6	BA+12	BA+18	BA+24	MA	MA+6	MA+12	MA+18
1.0	18300	18960	19620	20280	20940	21600	22260	22920	23580
2.0	19139	19875	20611	21347	22083	22819	23555	24291	25027
3.0	19978	20790	21602	22414	23226	24038	24850	25662	26474
4.0	20817	21705	22593	23481	24369	25257	26145	27033	27921
5.0	21656	22620	23584	24548	25512	26476	27440	28404	29368
6.0	22495	23535	24575	25615	26655	27695	28735	29775	30815
7.0	23334	24450	25566	26682	27798	28914	30030	31146	32262
8.0	—	25365	26557	27749	28941	30133	31325	32517	33709
9.0	—	—	27548	28816	30084	31352	32620	33888	35156
10.0	—	—	—	29883	31227	32571	33915	35259	36603

PLACEMENT OF TEACHERS ON THE 1988-89 COMPACTED SCHEDULE:

The Association has taken the amount of money reflected in the salary schedule cell in which each teacher was placed for the 1987-88 school year as a base figure. If the teacher received longevity in 1987-88, \$600 was added to the amount of money shown in the salary schedule cell. Every teacher was then given an increase of \$1300 dollars for 1988-89 which was added to the cell dollars and the longevity.

We then found the cell on the 1988-89 schedule above, still in the same education lane occupied by the teacher in 1987-88, which was equal to that total amount. If that amount of money fell between cells on the schedule, we placed that person in the next highest cell, unless the amount of difference was less than \$10.00. This is now the teacher's new placement on the compacted schedule. The new placement may not have any relationship to the year of service the person actually has.

In 1989-90, each teacher shall progress a full step on the 1989-90 salary schedule in the usual fashion.

(For seniority purposes, each teacher will receive notification of both their salary schedule placement and their actual years of credited service in the District each year.)

1989-1990 SALARY SCHEDULE

STEP	BA	BA+6	BA+12	BA+18	BA+24	MA	MA+6	MA+12	MA+18
1.0	18800	19407	20154	20831	21508	22184	22862	23539	24216
2.0	19663	20348	21173	21928	22683	23437	24193	24948	25703
3.0	20526	21289	22192	23025	23858	24690	25524	26357	27190
4.0	21389	22230	23211	24122	25033	25943	26855	27766	28677
5.0	22252	23171	24230	25219	26208	27196	28186	29175	30164
6.0	23115	24112	25249	26316	27383	28449	29517	30584	31651
7.0	23978	25053	26268	27413	28558	29702	30848	31993	33138
8.0	—	25994	27287	28510	29733	30955	32179	33402	34625
9.0	—	—	28306	29607	30908	32208	33510	34811	36112
10.0	—	—	—	30704	32083	33461	34841	36220	37599