

Michigan Employment Relations Commission
Hyman Parker, Director

Michigan State University
LABOR TRIAL
RELATIONS LIBRARY

Re: Carrollton Board of Education
Carrollton Education Association

In the employment relations dispute between the Carrollton Board of Education and the Carrollton Education Association, Fr. J. R. Dempsey, S.J. was appointed "fact finder" by the Michigan Employment Relations Commission on September 25, 1960. Hearings were held on two separate days. Issues between the parties had been settled except two-provided that there would be a one year contract. These two issues were salary and insurance.

Some of the important facts in this dispute which influence the hearings officer recommendation are the following. First the School Board and the Association bargaining teams did reach a tentative agreement before the opening of school. This agreement was subsequently ratified by the School Board but was turned down by the members of the Educational Association. Second the members of the Association started the school year without a contract in the hope that the differences between them and the Board could be worked out without the disruption and the consequent harm to all concerned especially the pupils of the school district.

In the hearing the Association took the position that the salary scale for the teachers should include the following: B.A. \$7500-\$11,790; B.A.+10 \$8000-\$12,576; M.A. \$8500-\$13,362 with 10 increments on each scale.

The reasoning supporting this demand included first - area practice. The association showed that schools in the 25 mile radius of Carrollton paid higher salaries than Carrollton. Second, the association claimed that there was money available in the budget for teachers salaries at a level commensurate with neighboring school districts and the demands of the Association. The total cost of teacher salaries at the level demanded was \$760,598 plus \$23000 for extra pay and substitute making the cost of total salary package \$783,598.

On the other hand, the position of the school Board was that the offer agreed to by bargainers prior to school opening was in accord with area practice. The scale agreed to included: B.A. \$7100-\$10,508 and M.A. \$7,600-\$11,248 with twelve increments. The area selected by the Board was the county where the average B.A. starting salary was \$7075 and the average M.A. starting salary was \$7557.

In addition the Board claimed that at the B.A. \$7,100 and M.A. \$7600 level the total cost of teachers salaries was \$722,407 at the \$7,500-\$8000-\$8500 level the cost would be \$818,493. And such an increase at this time would seriously impair the financial integrity of the Carrollton School District. At the projected income and expenditure level for 1969-70 with teachers salaries at the \$7,100 and \$7600 level there would be a deficit of \$49,000. This would be the difference between the projected

Carrollton Board of Education

1095

income of \$1,161,526 and the expected outgo for all expenses of \$1,210,525.

After due consideration of the arguments of both parties to this dispute the hearings officer does see some merit to the Association's contention that the number of steps in the B.A. scale and the M.A. scale is excessively high therefore he recommends that these be cut from 12 to 11. This would amount to an increase in the cost of teacher salaries of about \$20,000. The scale itself should remain the same since it meets the area practice of 4th class school districts and in fact is slightly higher than average. To raise the scale or reduce the steps further in the face of an already projected deficit would risk the charge of deficit financing or seriously reduce needed services to students of the School District.

Thus the hearings officer recommends that the B.A. scale be \$7100-\$10,508 with 11 equal steps and the M.A. scale be \$7600-\$11,248 with 11 equal steps.

With regard to the demand for changes in the Insurance provisions of the contract, the hearings officer recommends that they remain the same as was agreed on in the contract tentatively agreed on.

Since demands for an agency shop and experience allowance were associated with a two year contract, these were not considered by the hearings officer since he could not see any factual basis for recommending a two year contract at this time.

The thoroughness with which the facts were gathered and presented to the hearings officer was remarkable and hopefully will aid in the acceptance of this recommendation, in spite of conditions that may affect the bargaining climate of the parties.

J.R. Bampton