

1494

Michigan State University  
LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL  
RELATIONS LIBRARY

4/23/84 FF

FACT-FINDING AND RECOMMENDATION

Pursuant to Section 25 of the  
Michigan Labor Mediation Act, Act  
No. 176, P.A. 1939, as amended,  
and Part 3 of the General Rules  
and Regulations of the Michigan  
Employment Relations Commission.

In the matter of:

NORTH CENTRAL AREA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

-and-

NORTH CENTRAL AREA EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,  
MEA, NEA

REPORT OF FINDINGS,  
CONCLUSIONS, AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS

MERC Case No. G83 H-1385

Fact-Finder:

Dr. William E. Barstow, Jr.  
312 Center Street  
Hancock, Michigan 49930

April 23, 1984

*North Central Area Public Schools*

I.

PROCEEDINGS

Spring, 1983	Negotiations initiated by parties pursuant to impending termination June 30, 1983, of collective bargaining agreement.
August 26, 1983	Mediated negotiations convened.
August 29, 1983	North Central Education Association (hereinafter referred to as "Association") began a strike lasting approximately ten days.
September 1, 1983	Mediated negotiations.
September 9, 1983	Mediated negotiations.
September 11, 1983	Mediated negotiations.
September 13, 1983	Petition for fact-finding filed with the Michigan Employment Relations Commission by the Association.
December 9, 1983	Fact-Finder appointed and hearing ordered by MERC.
January 21, 1984	Hearing scheduled by Fact-Finder for February 28, 1984 at Powers, Michigan.
February 28, 1984	Hearing convened at 4:00 P.M. CST, in meeting facilities in the high school building of the North Central Area Public Schools (hereinafter referred to as "Board"), in Powers, Michigan, at which were present:

For the Association:

Lyle Painter, MEA 15A Uniserv Director  
Robert R. Slade, MEA 17A Uniserv Director  
John Meeder, MEA Staff Representative  
Robert St. John, President, NCEA  
Mary Busick, Member, NCEA  
Patrick Moher, Member, NCEA  
Tom LeQuia, Member, NCEA  
Brian Forgette, Member, NCEA

For the Board:

Allen S. Bush, Attorney at Law  
Clifford Luft, Superintendent of Schools  
Carol Pipkorn, Member, Board of Education  
Robert Meintz, Member, Board of Education  
Carl Sorensen, Auditor  
Carlyn Lynch, Bookkeeper

February 28, 1983

Oral presentations entered, documentation filed, and hearing adjourned.

March 23, 1983

Post-hearing briefs received by Fact-Finder and hearing was closed.

April 23, 1983

Report of findings, conclusions, and recommendation was issued.

## II.

### ISSUES IN DISPUTE

Prior to hearing, the parties reached agreement on certain issues of contract language and on fringe benefits in the medical-dental insurance area. The parties also are agreed that the new agreement shall be for three years retroactive to the beginning of the 1983-84 contract year to the extent possible.

Issues remaining to be resolved are as follows:

#### Salary Increases

1. The Association demands annual salary increases approximating 5.73% for 1983-84, 8.35% for 1984-85, and 13.83% for 1985-86.
2. The Board offers annual salary increases approximating 2.65% for 1983-84, 5.10% for 1984-85, and 7.50% for 1985-86.

#### Salary Schedule Structure

1. The Association demands an additional higher salary schedule paralleling the present provisional BA, permanent BA, and MA qualification schedules, for teachers qualified by MA plus 15 or more graduate study credits beyond the MA.

The Association also demands longevity pay of \$500 at step 20 of the salary schedules for all of the three contract years, and longevity pay of \$300 at step 14 for the 1985-86 contract year.

The Association demands further that the vertical increments in the salary schedules be made uniform by pegging each increment at 3.5% of its preceeding step for 1983-84, at 4.0% for 1984-85, and at 4.5% for 1985-86.

2. The Board offers salary schedules which increase the present structure of 15 steps to 16 steps for 1983-84, to 17 steps for 1984-85, and to 18 steps for 1985-86.

### III.

#### STIPULATIONS

At some time during or shortly after the time frame of this hearing, the parties hereto appear to have agreed that this fact-finding will utilize the arbitration standards enumerated in Michigan's police and firefighters compulsory arbitration statute, Act 312, P.A. 1969, to form its recommendations, and that they will accept the Fact-Finder's recommendations as a final and binding resolution of the issues.

The Fact-Finder in this proceeding, as an agent of the Michigan Employment Relations Commission, is not subject to procedural direction by the parties. However, the decisional standards of Act 312 must be regarded as the State of Michigan's definitive policy in public employment dispute determinations involving interests, and this Fact-Finder would comply with such standards in any event. And one of the decisional parameters prescribed by Act 312 is the stipulations of the parties.

The subject written agreement between the parties, duly executed but undated, is included below in this report.

R. 11/13/84  
WEB

BINDING FACT-FINDING AGREEMENT

It is agreed by the undersigned that the parties hereto will acknowledge and abide by the holding or holdings of the Fact-Finder, William E. Barstow, Jr.

It is understood and agreed that the Fact-Finder will utilize the terms and provisions of the compulsory arbitration of labor disputes and Police & Fire Departments Act, P. A. 1969 No. 312 and will specifically utilize as the basis of his findings the parameters contained in MCLA 423.239 which provide in pertinent part as follows:

- "(a) The lawful authority of the employer.
- (b) The stipulations of the parties.
- (c) The interest and welfare of the public and the financial ability of the unit of government to meet those costs.
- (d) Comparison of the wages, hours and conditions of employment of the employees involved in the arbitration proceeding with the wages, hours and conditions of employment of other employees performing similar services and with other employees generally:
  - (1) In public employment in comparable communities.
  - (2) In private employment 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 employees, including direct wage compensation, vacations, holidays and other 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 proceeding."

It is further agreed that a determination of the Fact-Finder will be final and binding upon the parties and will provide the basis for concluding the collective bargaining agreement and contract of employment between the North Central Area Public Schools and the North Central Area Education Association. The undersigned, on behalf of their respective parties, hereby warrant that they have the authority and the approval of their principal to enter into this agreement.

NORTH CENTRAL AREA SCHOOLS

By: Carol J. Rypkorn

NORTH CENTRAL EDUCATION  
ASSOCIATION

By: Ly Paine

#### IV.

#### FINDINGS

##### Negotiating Position of the Association

The Association's presentation at hearing was largely concerned with three matters: first, the low relative level of North Central salaries in comparison with other school districts in the central Upper Peninsula, in the entire Upper Peninsula, and throughout the state; second, the inequity of lacking uniformity in size of the vertical increments of the salary structure, the desirability of added longevity pay for senior teachers, and need for an added salary schedule for teachers substantially qualified beyond the MA degree; and third, the Association's belief that the North Central district has the ability to pay salary increases of the size demanded by the Association but has misrepresented its financial condition by specious accounting practices, has wasted its funds by unwise capital outlays, and has failed to campaign aggressively enough for additional millage. The Association proposes a new salary structure designed to eliminate most salary problems (see Appendices G, H, and I).

##### Negotiating Position of the Board

The Board's presentation at hearing has stressed its inability to pay salary increases of the size demanded by the Association although it agrees that salary increases are justified, has contended that the non-uniformity of vertical increments in the salary structure are merely minor variations created in previous negotiations with agreement of the Association to reward senior teachers, has urged that selection of other school districts must be limited to those with similar revenue sources, community economic bases, and similar millage and enrollment levels, and has described as misconceptions and misunderstandings the Association's analyses purporting to find major additional funds concealed in the Board's budget projections. The Board offers a salary structure that would stretch out the steps over which salary increases would be paid to permit as large an increase as possible (see Appendices K, L, and M).

##### Consideration of Act 312 Decisional Standards

##### 1. The lawful authority of the employer.

Under Michigan law, school districts may not budget at an unreconcilable deficit. This requirement mandates a highly pragmatic and budget-oriented approach to collective bargaining and to awards by neutrals in arbitration or fact-finding that would impose new fixed costs.

##### 2. The stipulations of the parties.

The parties hereto have requested observance of the decisional standards prescribed by Michigan's Act 312, P.A. 1969, in the present fact-finding. The Fact-Finder has complied.



3. The interest and welfare of the public and the financial ability of the unit of government to meet costs of operation.

In the present situation, ten attempts in the last seven years to obtain a higher voted millage have failed, suggesting public reluctance to fund its schools at a more substantial level. The North Central Area school district, operating in the recent past without a budgeted contingency fund, and with a projected June 30, 1984, liquid fund equity of about \$21,000 as against a businessman's ideal level of about \$130,000, certainly is in straightened financial circumstances.

4. Comparison of contract terms for public employees should include comparisons with both public employment in comparable communities and with private employment in comparable communities.

There is no question in the observation of this Fact-Finder, based on over thirty years of involvement with labor-management relations in both the private and public sectors, but that public school teaching salary levels consistently have been far below compensation for similarly qualified personnel in the private sector, and even in many other areas of public employment. This situation, in the views of most authorities who have studied the matter, is directly related to the mode of funding the public schools. However, to note this reality is not to provide means of changing it. Collective bargaining year by year and efforts to make the community more aware of the problem can help, but there is near-unanimous agreement that any ultimate solution must be achieved at the state level.

5. The general cost of living.

The double-digit inflation of the past decade or so has diminished sharply, but still has fluctuated during the past year in a zero to five or six percent range. Certainly, annual salary increases of some nature are appropriate.

6. The overall compensation of the employees concerned including fringes, stability of employment, and excused time.

Generally, fringe benefit levels in public school teaching are above the average levels found in private employment, employment over the long term tends to be stable, and Michigan's teachers are only mandated to work 183 days per year, with no restrictions on supplemental employment. However, they are encouraged to spend a part of excused time in continuing education.

7. Changes in the foregoing circumstances during dispute proceedings.

No such changes have been observed.

CONCLUSIONSFinancial Situation of the School District

The Association raised numerous questions concerning the Board's 1983-84 budget, ranging from alleging self-serving bias (overestimating liabilities and underestimating revenues) to negligence (failing to include revenue items on state reports) to misleading interpretation (concerning the liquidity of fund equity). While the Fact-Finder might quibble with certain aspects of the Board's budgetary efforts, he can find nothing sufficiently substantial in such allegations to change the district's financial status from a very austere outlook to the image of a district capable of salary concessions of more than merely competitive size.

The Association also accused the Board of unwisely devoting nearly \$200,000 during the past seven years to capital outlays such as building a bus garage, building a new industrial education building (while selling the old one for about half of the cost of the new), propane conversion for school buses, and furnace conversion to wood chip fuel. On review, these expenditures seem to be thrifty investments, since they either resulted in substantial savings or improved educational facilities at slight cost. The seven year average for capital outlays averaged 2.16% of total expenditures per year, while the state guideline maximum is 3%.

The obvious primary problem in this district is a ten year drop in enrollment from 893 students to 669, which is the cause of greatly reduced state aid. A second major problem is reluctance by voters to approve a millage increase after ten tries in the past seven years. These problems are underscored by the low socio-economic makeup of the community, which largely consists of marginal small businesses and woods-related industry, and which has exhibited unemployment exceeding 15% for many years. In the eyes of too many residents of the district, teachers are among the more affluent of their neighbors.

Not only is the present financial situation of the district grim, the future appears to the Fact-Finder to be at least as bleak, barring some sort of turnaround in method of school funding by the state, or a resurgence of the Upper Peninsula economy. Enrollments probably will continue to drop.

School District Comparability

The Association has presented salary comparisons between North Central Area and other regional districts, all Upper Peninsula districts, and the entire state. North Central tends to fall in the lowest quartile in each of these comparisons. Based on broad considerations such as economic base of the community, size of the various district enrollments, access to outside revenue sources, voted millage levels, the state aid formula, and the like, the Fact-Finder is persuaded that this is about the level that one should expect.

When similarly situated districts are compared, such as Big Bay de Noc, Carney-Nadeau, Mid-Peninsula, and Stephenson, North Central is found to compare either competitively or favorably. (See Appendix A.)

It is noted that in fringe benefits the weaker districts compare surprisingly well with the larger and more affluent districts.

#### The Board's Multiple Salary Offers

During the course of negotiations, the Board accomplished a somewhat unique achievement by making three "final offers" to the Association. The first was based on the budget for 1983-84 and was made in September, 1983. It totaled \$106,682. In December, 1983, the Board reworked its budget and made another salary offer, this one totaling \$108,018. In January, 1984, the budget received a third review, and this time a true "last offer" was extended to the Association, totaling \$106,450. The three proposals varied in detail but slightly. The Association contends that only the first "last offer" is eligible for consideration.

The Fact-Finder suggests that, while such tinkering with a salary offer is anything but sound negotiating technique, the interests of the Association are not prejudiced by using the Board's third offer as it requests because differences among the three offers are minimal and, if anything, the third may be less attractive to employees than the others.

#### Salary Level

Given the fact that both parties agree that a salary increase is justified, the question remains what it has been throughout the long negotiations: how large an increase can be justified? And the answer is dictated by the financial condition of the school district. Basically, the choice is between the Association demand for about \$191,000 and the Board offer of about \$106,000. It must be kept in mind that additional annual insurance costs of about \$27,000 presumably will be faced by the district also.

The Fact-Finder is compelled to conclude that the school district is more apt to be able to meet the costs of the lesser amount without harming other school programs, particularly since the Board's proposal for the retroactive payment for the year 1983-84 is a minimal 2.6%. Nevertheless, the Fact-Finder suspects that the district will face a need for further program cutbacks before the three contract years have run their course, unless added millage can be approved.

Although less than the Association's demand, the increases of 2.6%, 5.1%, and 7.5% for the three contract years will place the district in a more than competitive position among districts of this type (see Appendices C, D, and E).

The attempts by the Association to compare teacher salary levels to the compensation of school administrators are ignored here by the Fact-Finder because administrative compensation is entirely irrelevant to the issues of teacher compensation.

### Salary Structure Changes Proposed by the Association

The Association's demand for an added MA plus 15 salary schedule and for longevity payments, in the view of the Fact-Finder, are essentially methods of increasing the compensation of senior teachers. While the maturity curve salary structure in itself accomplishes this to a degree, many school districts seek to avoid the plateau at the end of the automatic increase schedule by means of such additional structures. They are not appropriate, however, when the employer's ability to pay already is closely contested as in this case.

The question of uniform percentage vertical increments in the salary schedules is a different matter. While the present increments are progressive in size just as a uniform percentage would be, minor inequities obviously exist, and such inequities sometimes can "bug" employees beyond their actual importance. However, an abrupt total adjustment would inevitably impose its own inequities. These could be avoided by "red-lining" personnel adversely affected, but this is hardly appropriate here because of the dollar constraints in this case at this time.

### Salary Structure Changes Proposed by the Board

The Board offers structural changes in the salary schedules in the form of increases in the number of steps in the salary schedules, extending the present 15 steps to 16 in 1983-84, to 17 in 1984-85, and to 18 in 1985-86.

This type of structural change has the effect of turning a percentage increase based on actual gross salary costs into an illusion, because stretching the same amount of money to cover an added step lowers the real dollar increase to most individuals paid within the structure. (See Appendices K, L, and M)

Such manipulation is doubtful salary administration practice because it engenders employee distrust. Also, 18 step maturity curves are seldom used in public school salary administration, for reasons of theory if nothing else. It is unlikely that teaching experience beyond 14 years can add measurably to teaching skills, although added years may well add to subtleties such as understanding, emotional maturity, or compassion.

### Recommended Salary Level and Structure

The Fact-Finder concludes that, in the immediate circumstances of this particular case, the interests of all parties will be best served by retaining the salary structure of the 1982-83 contract, by increasing each step in each category of the 1982-83 salary schedules 2.6% for 1983-84, by increasing each step in each category of the resultant 1983-84 schedules 5.1% for 1984-85, and by increasing each step in each category of the resultant 1984-85 schedules 7.5% for 1985-86. (See Appendices C, D, and E.)

## VI.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

The Fact-Finder recommends, on the basis of careful analysis of (a) oral presentations by the parties at hearing, (b) statistical and conceptual information stated in pre-hearing and post-hearing briefs, and (c) the findings and conclusions reported herein, as follows:

1. The salary increase percentages offered by the Board (2.6% for 1983-84, 5.1% for 1984-85, and 7.5% for 1985-86) should be the measurement for salary increases granted by the new contract between the parties.
2. The fifteen step and three category salary structure of the 1982-83 contract should be continued in all years of the new contract between the parties.
3. The salary increase percentages prescribed in Paragraph 1 above should be computed at each step in each category of the salary structure (see Appendices C, D, and E).
4. All changes in the structure of the salary schedules as proposed by either party should be categorically rejected at this time.
5. Provisions negotiated by the parties prior to the present proceeding, involving contract language adjustments, medical-dental insurance benefits, and length of contract, should be included in the new contract between the parties.

Respectfully submitted,

*William E. Barstow Jr.*  
William E. Barstow, Jr.  
Fact-Finder

## BA/MA MINIMUM &amp; MAXIMUM SALARY COMPARISONS

## 15 U.P. School Districts

## 1983-84 Contract Settlements

<u>SCHOOL DISTRICT</u>	<u>BA MIN</u>	<u>BA MAX</u>	<u>MA MIN</u>	<u>MA MAX</u>	<u>Steps To BA Max</u>
Bark River	\$13,301	\$21,282	\$14,631	\$23,410	13
* Big Bay de Noc	12,950	19,018	13,450	19,753	14
* Carney-Nadeau	12,503	18,806		19,404	
Escanaba	15,844	25,984	16,871	27,688	13
Gladstone	13,800	20,700	14,600	21,900	11
Ishpeming	12,760	19,778	14,036	22,330	12
Menominee	12,738	19,999	13,884	21,799	13
* Mid-Peninsula	12,400	19,380	13,000	20,318	12
Munising	12,900	18,400	13,600	19,500	16
Negaunee	14,350	21,525	16,503	25,113	11
* North Central (Association's Demand)	12,700	20,312	13,589	21,201	15
* North Central (Board's Offer)	12,730	20,077	13,191	20,756	16
North Dickinson	12,660	19,490	13,610	22,728	12
Norway-Vulcan	13,300	19,950	14,630	23,940	11
Rapid River	12,916	19,884	13,441	20,612	11
Republic-Michiganme	13,800	20,427	15,732	23,286	10
* Stephenson	12,797	19,451	13,821	20,475	13
AVERAGE	\$13,281	20,374	14,385	22,165	12.7

\* Districts most nearly comparable.

NORTH CENTRAL AREA SCHOOLS  
82-83 Teachers Salary Schedule

Step	B.A.	Perm. or Cont.	M.A.
0	12,750	12,845	13,191
1	13,048	13,163	13,510
2	13,594	13,509	13,856
3	13,752	13,868	14,226
4	14,111	14,226	14,595
5	14,468	14,583	14,965
6	14,826	14,942	15,335
7	15,260	15,375	15,787
8	15,693	15,809	16,239
9	16,127	16,242	16,691
10	16,559	16,675	17,142
11	17,102	17,218	17,707
12	17,644	17,759	18,272
13	18,185	18,301	18,837
14	-	18,452	19,076
20	-	19,559	20,220

NORTH CENTRAL AREA SCHOOLS  
Recommended 1983-84 Salary Schedule

STEP	BA	BA Cont./Perm.	MA
0	13,067	13,185	13,541
1	13,394	13,562	13,868
2	13,749	13,867	14,223
3	14,116	14,236	14,603
4	14,485	14,603	14,982
5	14,851	14,969	15,362
6	15,219	15,338	15,741
7	15,664	15,782	16,205
8	16,109	16,228	16,669
9	16,554	16,672	17,133
10	16,998	17,117	17,596
11	17,555	17,674	18,176
12	18,112	18,230	18,756
13	18,667	18,786	19,336
14		18,941	19,582
20		20,077	20,756

Percent Increase: 2.65 at each step



## NORTH CENTRAL AREA SCHOOLS

## Recommended 1984-85 Salary Schedule

STEP	BA	BA Cont./Perm.	MA
0	13,733	13,857	14,232
1	14,077	14,254	14,575
2	14,450	14,574	14,948
3	14,836	14,962	15,348
4	15,224	15,348	15,746
5	15,608	15,732	16,145
6	15,995	16,120	16,544
7	16,463	16,587	17,031
8	16,931	17,056	17,519
9	17,398	17,522	18,007
10	17,865	17,990	18,493
11	18,450	18,575	19,103
12	19,036	19,160	19,713
13	19,619	19,744	20,322
14		19,907	20,581
		21,101	21,815

Percent Increase: 5.10 at each step

NORTH CENTRAL AREA SCHOOLS  
Recommended 1985-86 Salary Schedule

STEP	BA	BA Cont./Perm.	MA
0	14,763	14,896	15,299
1	15,133	15,323	15,668
2	15,534	15,667	16,069
3	15,949	16,084	16,499
4	16,366	16,499	16,927
5	16,779	16,912	17,356
6	17,195	17,329	17,785
7	17,698	17,831	18,308
8	18,201	18,335	18,833
9	18,703	18,836	19,358
10	19,205	19,339	19,880
11	19,834	19,968	20,536
12	20,464	20,597	21,191
13	21,090	21,225	21,846
14		21,400	22,125
20		22,684	23,451

Percent Increase: 7.50 at each step.

## COST OF ASSOCIATION'S SALARY DEMAND

82-83 Base \$598,688

83-84:

Total amount of salaries from schedule	\$629,491
Longevity pay	<u>3,500</u>
Salary Costs	\$632,991
Amount of Increase	34,303
Percent Increase	5.73
Additional Fringe Costs - 5.37%	<u>1,842</u>
Total Increased Cost	\$ 36,145

84-85:

Total amount of salaries from schedule	\$682,327
Longevity pay	<u>3,500</u>
Salary Costs	\$685,827
Amount of Increase	52,836
Percent Increase	8.35
Additional Fringe Costs - 5.37%	<u>2,857</u>
Total Increased Cost	\$ 55,673

85-86:

Total amount of salaries from schedule	\$772,869
Longevity pay	<u>7,800</u>
Salary Costs	\$780,669
Amount of Increase	94,842
Percent Increase	13.85
Additional Fringe Costs - 5.37%	<u>5,095</u>
Total Increased Cost	\$ 99,955

-----  
 Total increased cost to the district over the three-year period:

Salaries	-	\$181,981
Fringes	-	<u>9,772</u>
		\$191,753

## NORTH CENTRAL AREA SCHOOLS

## Association's Demand for 1983-84

BASE 12700 PERCENT .035 INCREASE / STEP 444.5				
83-84				
STEP	BA	PERM	MA	MA+15
0	12700	13144.5	13589	14033.5
1	13144.5	13589	14033.5	14478
2	13589	14033.5	14478	14922.5
3	14033.5	14478	14922.5	15367
4	14478	14922.5	15367	15811.5
5	14922.5	15367	15811.5	16256
6	15367	15811.5	16256	16700.5
7	15811.5	16256	16700.5	17145
8	16256	16700.5	17145	17589.5
9	16700.5	17145	17589.5	18034
10	17145	17589.5	18034	18478.5
11	17589.5	18034	18478.5	18923
12	18034	18478.5	18923	19367.5
13	18478.5	18923	19367.5	19812
14	18923	19367.5	19812	20256.5
20	19367.5	19812	20256.5	20701

Add longevity of \$500 at 20th step.

NORTH CENTRAL AREA SCHOOLS  
Association's Demand for 1984-85

BASE 13000 PERCENT .04 INCREASE/STEP 520 84-85				
STEP	BA	PERM	MA	MA+15
0	13000	13520	14040	14560
1	13520	14040	14560	15080
2	14040	14560	15080	15600
3	14560	15080	15600	16120
4	15080	15600	16120	16640
5	15600	16120	16640	17160
6	16120	16640	17160	17680
7	16640	17160	17680	18200
8	17160	17680	18200	18720
9	17680	18200	18720	19240
10	18200	18720	19240	19760
11	18720	19240	19760	20280
12	19240	19760	20280	20800
13	19760	20280	20800	21320
14	20280	20800	21320	21840
20	20800	21320	21840	22360

Add longevity of \$500 at 20th step.

## NORTH CENTRAL AREA SCHOOLS

## Association's Demand for 1985-86

BASE 13900 PERCENT .045 INCREASE/STEP 625.5 85-86				
STEP	BA	PERM	MA	MA+15
0	13900	14525.5	15151	15776.5
1	14525.5	15151	15776.5	16402
2	15151	15776.5	16402	17027.5
3	15776.5	16402	17027.5	17653
4	16402	17027.5	17653	18278.5
5	17027.5	17653	18278.5	18904
6	17653	18278.5	18904	19529.5
7	18278.5	18904	19529.5	20155
8	18904	19529.5	20155	20780.5
9	19529.5	20155	20780.5	21406
10	20155	20780.5	21406	22031.5
11	20780.5	21406	22031.5	22657
12	21406	22031.5	22657	23282.5
13	22031.5	22657	23282.5	23908
14	22657	23282.5	23908	24533.5
20	23282.5	23908	24533.5	25159

Add longevity of \$300 at 14th step,

and \$500 at 20th step.

## COST OF BOARD'S SALARY OFFER

(Offer of February, 1984)

<u>1983-84</u>	82-83 Base \$598,688
Total amount of salaries from schedule	\$614,973
Amount of increase	16,285
Percent increase	2.65
Additional fringe costs - 5.37%	<u>875</u>
Total increased cost	\$17,160
<u>1984-85</u>	
Total amount of salaries from schedule	\$646,337
Amount of increase	31,364
Percent increase	5.10
Additional fringe costs - 5.37%	<u>1,684</u>
Total increased cost	\$33,048
<u>1985-86</u>	
Total amount of salaries from schedule	\$694,814
Amount of increase	48,477
Percent increase	7.50
Additional fringe costs - 5.37%	<u>2,603</u>
Total increased cost	\$51,080

----- 2 -----  
 Total increased cost to the district over the three-year period:

Salaries	\$96,126
Fringes	<u>5,162</u>
	\$101,288

APPENDIX K

## NORTH CENTRAL AREA SCHOOLS

Board's Offer for 1983-84

STEP	BA	BA Cont./Perm.	MA
0	12,900	13,015	13,361
1	13,067	13,185	13,541
2	13,394	13,512	13,868
3	13,749	13,867	14,223
4	14,116	14,236	14,603
5	14,485	14,603	14,982
6	14,851	14,969	15,362
7	15,219	15,338	15,741
8	15,664	15,782	16,205
9	16,109	16,228	16,669
10	16,554	16,672	17,133
11	16,998	17,117	17,596
12	17,555	17,674	18,176
13	18,112	18,230	18,756
14	18,669	18,786	19,336
15		18,941	19,582
20		20,077	20,756

Percent Increase: 2.65 of total salaries.



## NORTH CENTRAL AREA SCHOOLS

Board's Offer for 1984-85

STEP	BA	BA Cont./Perm.	MA
0	13,100	13,215	13,561
1	13,558	13,679	14,042
2	13,733	13,857	14,232
3	14,077	14,201	14,575
4	14,450	14,574	14,948
5	14,836	14,962	15,348
6	15,224	15,348	15,746
7	15,608	15,732	16,145
8	15,995	16,120	16,544
9	16,463	16,587	17,031
10	16,931	17,056	17,519
11	17,398	17,522	18,007
12	17,865	17,990	18,493
13	18,450	18,575	19,103
14	19,035	19,160	19,713
15	19,621	19,744	20,322
16		19,907	20,581
20		21,101	21,815

Percent Increase: 5.10 of total salaries.

## NORTH CENTRAL AREA SCHOOLS

Board's Offer for 1985-86

STEP	BA	BA Cont./Perm.	MA
0	13,400	13,515	13,861
1	14,083	14,206	14,578
2	14,575	14,682	15,095
3	14,763	14,896	15,299
4	15,133	15,266	15,668
5	15,534	15,667	16,069
6	15,949	16,084	16,499
7	16,366	16,499	16,927
8	16,779	16,912	17,356
9	17,195	17,329	17,785
10	17,698	17,831	18,308
11	18,201	18,335	18,833
12	18,703	18,836	19,358
13	19,205	19,339	19,880
14	19,834	19,968	20,536
15	20,463	20,597	21,191
16	21,093	21,225	21,841
17		21,400	22,125
20		22,684	23,451

Percent Increase: 7.50 of total salaries.