

1536

Howlett Jd Pm FF  
11/8/68 84LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL  
RELATIONS LIBRARYRECEIVED  
NOV 13 1968LABOR MEDIATION BOARD  
DETROIT OFFICE

In the Matter of a Dispute )  
 between )  
 The Orchard View Schools )  
 and )  
 The Orchard View Education Association, MEA )  
 Robert Bowers )

### FACT FINDING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The undersigned was appointed Fact Finder pursuant to Section 25 of Act 176 of Public Acts of 1939, as amended, in a dispute between the Orchard View Schools Board of Education of the Orchard View Education Association. The appointment was made by Robert G. Howlette, Chairman, Labor Mediation Board in a letter dated September 4, 1968.

Hearings with the parties were held on Tuesday, October 8, 1968 at the Orchard View School, Muskegon, Michigan.

### ISSUES

The following issues were submitted for fact finding: financial responsibility clause, arbitration, pay for extra services, salary and insurance benefits, extra duty pay.

### POSITION OF THE ASSOCIATION

#### Financial Responsibility Clause

The Association recommends that a financial responsibility clause be incorporated into the Agreement. Such a clause is referred to as an agency shop in private employment. This is the type of security provision which

Orchard View Schools

does not insist that an employee become a member of the group which represents him. It does, however, require such an employee to pay his negotiating agent an amount equal to the dues of the organization because he receives benefits obtained by the agent.

The Association maintains that such a provision is legal under the Michigan Public Relations Act and that there are no means of enforcement other than dismissal which are acceptable to the courts and to administrative agencies which have jurisdiction. Also, there is no conflict within Michigan Teacher Tenure Act, and a large number of school districts have entered into such agreements with their teachers. This type of provision is recommended by experts in employee-employer relations.

The Association referred to several circuit court cases in which the decisions stated that such clauses were legal under the Public Relations Act and the Michigan Teacher Tenure Act. The Association further referred to a report of the Governor's Advisory Committee on public employee relations which recommended that public employers and employees should be expressly authorized to include in their collective bargaining agreements union security provisions of any type authorized in the case of private employers by the National Labor Relations Act.

#### Arbitration

The Association desires to reinstate binding arbitration of grievances as a contractual provision. The Association points out that in the Agreement which existed between the parties in 1966-67 such a provision existed.

The Agreement for the 1967-68 omitted such a provision and the Association now seeks to reinstate this type of dispute settlement procedure.

The Association contends that the omission of such a provision in the 1967-68 Agreement between the parties was due to a question of its legality. The Association maintains that such a provision is legal having been disposed of favorably by both courts and administrative agencies having jurisdiction. The Association refers to a number of school districts that have entered into such agreements with their teachers and further points out that the Orchard View Board of Education has entered into such agreements with other parties. Furthermore, the Association states that experts in employee-employer relations recommend such a provision.

#### Pay for Extra Services

In addition to their teaching duties, teachers are sometimes asked to perform a number of duties which are essentially nonprofessional in nature. These duties would include officiating or supervising an athletic event or chaperoning school sponsored activities. They may also be asked to substitute for absent teachers. For these activities the Association is requesting payment in the amount of \$6.00 per hour.

The Association contends that such duties interfere with a teacher's regular professional duties--requiring the teacher to commit time to preparing and carrying out his regular responsibilities which he would not otherwise have had to provide. Teachers regularly employed by the Board,

due to their knowledge of and familiarity with the school and students, can be more effective than a substitute teacher and are seeking reimbursement only slightly higher than substitutes are being paid. Furthermore, the Association maintains that teachers, when asked to assume such duties, should be reimbursed at the level commensurate with their professional training, experience and skill, and such reimbursement should also reflect the inconvenience caused the teacher in pursuit of his professional duties and personal life.

#### Salary and Insurance Benefits

The latest proposal of the Association with regard to salary and insurance benefits is found in Table 1. The Association contends that present economic benefits for teachers have been inadequate and this inadequacy has been further emphasized by a spiraling economy. The Association presented data showing that the salary of the Orchard View teacher was substantially below the amount necessary to maintain a moderate standard of living as established by the United States Department of Labor. The Association maintains that teachers in other school districts, with which the Orchard View Board must compete for professional personnel, command higher benefits than do teachers in Orchard View. There are thus serious doubts about the ability of the Board to avoid the excessive turnover which is so detrimental to the educational program.

The Association presented data showing the relative low level of Orchard View salaries as compared with the salaries of similar sized schools in western Michigan and also with the salary schedules for the state of Michigan. The Association contends that other occupational groups which require less training and experience receive greater economic benefits, placing a great hinderance on society's ability to convince talented young citizens to enter the teaching profession--as well as placing the teacher in an economic strata inconsistent with the value of his services. Moreover, occupational groups requiring similar training and experience receive greater economic benefits than do teachers.

The Association is convinced that the Board has the ability to provide the salaries and other economic benefits which are requested. The Association believes that the Board is quite conservative in estimating its revenue, pointing out a significant difference between the budgeted and actual revenue of the past two years in which actual revenue exceeded substantially the budgeted revenue.

In support of its requests for higher insurance expenditures by the Board, the Association states that the per capita expenditures for health services have increased more than 50% since 1950 in terms of 1966 prices. Furthermore, according to a study by the MEA, the average insurance subsidy per teacher was \$193.52 in 1967-68 compared with the \$144 which the Association is seeking.

### Extra Duty Pay

The Association proposes that all salaries for such duties as coaching and class sponsorship should maintain a consistent percentage relationship to the regular salary schedule. The Association points out that the Board has agreed in part to this plan. Such a system, the Association believes, focuses attention on good structure rather than dollar amounts, insures proportionate adjustments at all steps and training levels, and reveals interrelationships at a glance. Also such a system is simple, avoids favoritism, and should be much easier for the Board to administer. Furthermore, the executive officers of the Board are favorable toward such a system. At the Hearing, the Association suggested that the Board supply an index system for extra duty pay and that this would be acceptable to the Association.

## POSITION OF THE BOARD

### Financial Responsibility Clause

The position of the Board is that the financial responsibility clause is of doubtful legality. The Board maintains that only circuit courts have made decisions on this matter to date and no Supreme Court decision has been rendered. Furthermore, the report of the Governor's Advisory Committee recognizes that present legislation does not legalize the agency shop or any similar type of union security provision.

### Arbitration

The Board contends that binding arbitration of grievances is of doubtful legality. There has been no Supreme Court decision on this matter and the Governor's Report does not recommend that present law be amended to approve this step in the grievance process.

### Pay for Extra Services

The Board proposes a rate of \$5.50 an hour for such services as officiating at or supervising an athletic event or chaperoning school sponsored activities.

### Salary and Insurance Benefits

The Board has proposed two plans for salary increases; Proposal No. 1 (See Table 8) and Proposal No. 2 (See Table 9). In Proposal No. 1 the insurance is to be increased from \$100 to \$144 with dental added as optional. In Proposal No. 2 the insurance is to remain at \$100 with dental added as optional. Under Proposal No. 2 the Board points out that the average salary will be over \$8,500 which represents about a 13% increase on the average over the salary for 1967-68. The Board contends that the Orchard View B.A. minimum and maximum and M.A. minimum and maximum salaries proposed compare very favorably with salary schedules in this area which have already been established for 1968-69. (See Table 10).

The Board further maintains that minimum and maximum ranges do not mean very much because of the large number of teachers in the higher brackets in the Orchard View system. A total of  $56\frac{1}{2}$  teachers out of a 146 are at the top of the Orchard View salary schedule. Also the average class

size at Orchard View is among the lowest in the area and in some of the school districts where the average teacher's salary is above that of Orchard View so is the average class size. The Orchard View teachers also enjoy a longevity pay plan which is not common in school contracts. This amounts to \$10,000 for the 1968-69 year. Also the workday schedule for the Orchard View teacher is substantially lower than that of some of the surrounding school districts.

With 28.65 mills for operation debt service Orchard View is well up on the millage level as compared with surrounding districts. The Board also emphasizes that of the total voted extra millage of 13.4 mills, 9.9 mills will be levied for the last time this tax year and it must be revoted for the next school year. In order to continue the proposed salary increases for 1969-70 it will be necessary to vote approximately 3 mills in addition to the 9.9 mills. After two failures in the attempt to raise millage for the 1967-68, the Board decided it would be impossible to add millage for the 1968-69 year. The Board maintains that the Orchard View system is a class D system paying class B salaries. For the proposed salary increases, expenditures will exceed income by more than \$113,000. This cannot be done each year. The Board cannot go any further; it cannot spend money it does not have.

#### Extra Duty Pay

The Board proposes the following "index" system of determining such pay. The Board explains that teachers who have been asked to take certain



positions for 1968-69 have been quoted the flat sum amounts. Since this means a considerable cut from the amount expected to persons who are taking these positions for the first year, the Board is suggesting only three steps in the index as comparable to the five steps in the other positions.

	<u>0 yr.</u>	<u>1 yr.</u>	<u>2 yr.</u>	<u>3 yr.</u>	<u>4 yr.</u>
Aquaettes	6.5%	7.0%	7.5%	8.0%	8.5%
Competitive swimming (girls)	3.0%	3.5%	4.0%	4.5%	5.0%
Girls GAA	5.0%	5.5%	6.0%	6.5%	7.0%
Class Play		2.5%	3.0%	3.5%	
Junior Class Advisor		1.5%	2.0%	2.5%	
Audio-Visual Director		2.5%	3.0%	3.5%	
Cheerleaders		3.5%	4.0%	4.5%	
Debate		2.5%	3.0%	3.5%	

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### Financial Responsibility Clause

The Fact Finder recommends that a financial responsibility or agency shop clause be included in the Agreement for 1968-69. The only objection which the Board raises to such a clause is that it is of doubtful legality. The Board raises no issue of principle or philosophy. The Fact Finder is aware, as the Board states, that neither the Supreme Court nor the Legislature have expressly approved union security clauses in agreements in public employment. But to date, no case on this issue has yet reached the Supreme Court and until the Supreme Court specifically prohibits the parties from mutually agreeing to this type of clause it would appear that the parties would be free to include such a clause in their agreement. Also, no precise expression of the Legislature intending to invalidate union security agreements appears. Furthermore, over a hundred agreements between school districts and teachers' organizations include a union security clause. While this certainly does not mean that such a clause is legal it does indicate that some school districts and organizations have felt free to bargain about this issue and agree that it should become a part of their contract until they are expressly prevented either by court decision or legislation from so doing. It should further be noted that in those instances in which this issue has come before several Michigan circuit courts that these courts have not ruled that the parties are prevented from bargaining

about such an issue. Of course, if such a clause is found to be contrary to law, then this section of the Agreement would be invalid. . Section F of Article 20 of the Agreement of 1967-68 pertains to this possibility. Thus it is the belief of the Fact Finder that there is no legal reason why such a provision should not be included in the Agreement.

#### Arbitration

The Fact Finder recommends the reinstatement in the Agreement of binding arbitration as the final step in the grievance procedure. Such a step was provided for in Sections D and F of Article 8 of the Agreement for 1966-67. The Board's only objection to the inclusion of such a step in the grievance procedure is solely one of legality. The Board does not raise the question as to the desirability or undesirability of arbitration as a final step in grievance procedure. The fact that the Board agreed to arbitration in the Agreement of 1966-67 would seem to indicate no strong objection on principle to this issue.

It is true, as the Board states, that the Supreme Court has not as yet decided on this issue. It is also true that there is no statute of Michigan expressly providing that school districts or other public employers may agree to binding arbitration, and there is no law expressly prohibiting it. If the Legislature had intended that binding arbitration was improper in public employment agreements it could easily have so stated. Unless the Michigan law prohibits school districts from agreeing to binding arbitration of grievances of their employees, school districts and teachers' associations are free to have a voluntary agreement which includes binding

arbitration. There are now over 200 agreements between school districts and teachers which include arbitration. Again, if any provision of the Agreement is found to be contrary to law, then such provision would be invalid.

#### Pay for Extra Services

The Fact Finder recommends the adoption of \$5.50 per hour for such services as proposed by the Board of Education. This represents an increase of 10% over the amount for 1967-68 and would appear to be an equitable increase.

#### Salary and Insurance Benefits

The recommendation for the salary adjustments uses Board Proposal No. 2 as a basic schedule. In presenting its case for salary increases the Association by using B.A. and M.A. maximum salaries appeared to be particularly concerned with the uncompetitive position of the more experienced teachers in the Orchard View system. Consequently, the Fact Finder recommends that the schedule for the first 6 steps remains as contained in Proposal No. 2. Starting with step No. 7 and continuing through to step No. 11 the recommendation is that each step is to be increased by \$100. This would mean that step 7 would be \$8,101 and step 11 or the maximum for the B.A., would be \$9,802. The M.A. schedule would be increased accordingly. This increase would not apply to non-degree teachers.

In regard to insurance benefits the Fact Finder further recommends that \$144 per year be paid to each teacher to be used toward hospitalization

insurance, dental insurance, or other options available through the Michigan Education Special Services Association. As nearly as can be determined, this salary and insurance increase would be approximately \$14,000 to \$15,000 above the cost of Board Proposal No. 2. The Fact Finder is confident that the Board can adjust its budget to meet this increase without experiencing too severe a strain. The Board suggested at the Hearings that an increase of two in the average class size could absorb the total expected increase of \$113,000 in the personnel budget. Since Orchard View presently enjoys one of the lowest class size averages in the area, such an adjustment should not be too difficult or unreasonable. Furthermore, the Board might be too pessimistic, as it has been in the past two years, in predicting its actual revenues as compared to its budgeted revenues. The Fact Finder is aware of the millage problem faced by the Board in the future and hopes that the citizens of the community will squarely face their financial responsibilities in this district. Orchard View salaries have been deteriorating relative to other school districts these past few years. The proposed salary schedule will help to restore Orchard View to its former position. Orchard View will now be in the upper third of similar sized school districts as to B.A. and M.A. maxima. The recommended salary increase represents an increase of between 9% and 10% for most of the affected steps. It should be noted here that the Board's Proposal No. 2 represents an actual average increase of between 8% and 9% over the steps in the 1967-68 schedule and not 13% as suggested by the Board.

Extra Duty Pay

The Fact Finder recommends the adoption of the "index" salary schedule for extra duty pay as proposed by the Board of Education.

Nov 8, 1968  
Date

Robert S. Bowers  
Fact Finder, Robert S. Bowers

Table 1

## ASSOCIATION "SALARY AND INSURANCE" PROPOSAL

1) Salary

<u>Years Experience</u>	<u>BA</u>	<u>BA + 20</u>	<u>MA</u>	<u>MA + 15</u>	<u>MA + 30</u>
0	\$6,300	\$ 6,552	\$ 6,804	\$ 6,930	\$ 7,056
1	6,552	6,867	7,119	7,308	7,434
2	6,804	7,182	7,434	7,686	7,812
3	7,119	7,497	7,812	8,064	8,253
4	7,434	7,812	8,190	8,442	8,694
5	7,749	8,127	8,568	8,820	9,135
6	8,064	8,505	8,946	9,198	9,576
7	8,379	8,883	9,324	9,576	10,017
8	8,757	9,261	9,702	10,017	10,458
9	9,135	9,639	10,080	10,458	10,899
10	9,513	10,017	10,458	10,899	11,340
11	9,891	10,395	10,836	11,340	11,781

2) Insurance

\$144.00 per year toward insurance for each teacher. This subsidy to be paid toward hospitalization insurance, dental insurance, or such other options as may be available through the Michigan Education Special Services Association.

Table 2

## ASSOCIATION SALARY PORPOSAL

<u>Step</u>	<u>Salary BA</u>	<u># Staff</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Step</u>	<u>Salary MA</u>	<u># Staff</u>	<u>Total</u>
0	\$ 6,300	9	\$56,700	0	\$ 6,804		
1	6,552	9	58,968	1	7,119		
2	6,804	9	61,236	2	7,434		
3	7,119	11	78,309	3	7,812		
4	7,434	10	74,340	4	8,190	2	\$16,380
5	7,749	2	15,498	5	8,568		
6	8,064	7	56,448	6	8,946	2	17,892
7	8,379	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	37,706	7	9,324	1	9,324
8	8,757	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	30,560	8	9,702	1	9,702
9	9,135	2	18,270	9	10,080	2	20,160
10	9,513	6	57,078	10	10,458	6	62,748
11	9,891	14	138,474	11	10,836	9	97,524
15	10,091	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	136,229	15	11,036	4	44,144
20	10,291	1	10,291	20	11,236	2	22,472
25	10,491	5	52,455	25	11,436		
30	10,691			30	11,636		
35	10,891	1	10,891	35	11,836	1	11,836
40	11,091	1	11,091	40	12,036		

Total of above. . . . . \$1,216,816  
 Non degree teachers . . . . . 18,000  
 MA + 30 cost. . . . . 23,562  
 Estimated five substitutes . . . . . 22,500  
 GRAND TOTAL . . . . . \$1,280,878



Table 3

**BACHELORS MAXIMUM SALARIES FOR SIMILAR SIZED SCHOOL DISTRICTS  
IN WESTERN MICHIGAN 1968-69**

**Source:** Michigan Public School District Data 1967-68, and  
Teachers Contract Settlement Report, published by  
the Michigan Education Association

**Description:** Data represents salaries for teachers holding  
Bachelors Degrees and at the maximum level of the  
salary schedule (excluding longevity or super-  
maximum levels.)

<u>District*</u>	<u>Salary</u>
Comstock	\$ 10,758
East Grand Rapids	10,131
South Haven	10,042
Lakeshore	9,856 --Assoc. Proposal \$9,891
Ionia	9,750
Northview	9,664 --Board Proposal #2 \$9,702
Rockford	9,660
Ludington	9,600
Fruitport	9,600
West Ottawa	9,550
Dowagiac	9,472 --Board Proposal #1 \$9,513
Greenville	9,450
Three Rivers	9,425
Forest Hills	9,344
Allegan	9,317
Sturgis	8,640

\*Information not available for Reeths Puffer, Godwin Heights and Kenowa Hills

Table 4

**MASTERS MAXIMUM SALARIES FOR SIMILAR SIZED SCHOOL DISTRICTS  
IN WESTERN MICHIGAN 1968-69**

**Source:** Same

**Description:** Same, except substitute Masters for Bachelors

<u>District*</u>	<u>Salary</u>
Comstock	\$ 12,144
East Grand Rapids	11,121
Ludington	11,040
South Haven	10,815 --Assoc. Proposal \$10,836
Northview	10,626 --Board Proposal #2 \$10,64
Allegan	10,577
Sturgis	10,560
Ionia	10,500
Forest Hills	10,496
Lakeshore	10,472
Rockford	10,410 --Board Proposal #1 \$10,45
Fruitport	10,400
Dowagiac	10,336
Greenville	10,200
West Ottawa	10,000
Three Rivers	9,925

\*Information not available for Reeths Puffer, Godwin Heights and Kenowa Hills

Table 5

RANKING OF B. A. MAXIMUM SALARIES  
IN  
MUSKEGON COUNTY SCHOOLS

	<u>1963-64</u>	<u>1964-65</u>	<u>1965-66</u>	<u>1966-67</u>	<u>1967-68**</u>	<u>1968-69***</u>
1	\$ 7,191	\$ 7,500	\$ 7,800	\$ 8,415	\$ 9,509	\$10,360
2	7,100	7,330	7,650	8,360	9,185	10,010
3	6,940	7,200	7,550	8,294	9,040	9,969
4	6,900	7,191	7,389	8,217	8,910	9,835
5	<u>6,850*</u>	7,041	<u>7,300*</u>	8,046	8,880	9,600
6	6,800	<u>7,000*</u>	7,300	8,007	8,880	9,525
7	6,700	7,000	7,200	7,992	8,791	9,525
8	6,600	7,000	7,060	<u>7,938*</u>	8,775	9,176
9	6,500	6,815	7,000	7,790	8,700	9,176
10	6,200	6,650	6,956	7,700	<u>8,526*</u>	
11	6,200	6,500	6,850	7,700	8,200	
12	5,750	6,400	6,800	7,696		

\* Orchard View

\*\* No data for Muskegon Heights

\*\*\* Does not include Orchard View, Muskegon, or Reeths Puffer

Table 6

RELATIONSHIP OF SALARY SCHEDULES AT ORCHARD VIEW TO STATE MEDIAN

Source: Teacher Salary Schedule Study of 1964-65, 1965-66, 1966-67 and 1967-68, published by the Michigan Education Association.

	<u>1964-65</u>	<u>1965-66</u>	<u>1966-67</u>	<u>1967-68</u>	<u>1968-69</u>		
					<u>Bd. Proposal #2</u>	<u>Bd. Proposal #1</u>	<u>Assn. Proposal</u>
<u>A MINIMUM</u>							
State Median	5,032	5,165	5,609	6,148	6,696*	6,696*	6,696*
Orchard View	4,800	5,000	5,400	5,800	6,300	6,300	6,300
Difference	- 232	- 165	- 209	- 348	- 396	- 396	- 396
<u>A MAXIMUM</u>							
State Median	7,708	8,042	8,652	9,589	10,624*	10,624*	10,624*
Orchard View	7,000	7,300	7,938	8,526	9,702	9,513	9,891
Difference	- 708	- 742	- 714	-1,063	- 922	-1,111	- 733
<u>A MINIMUM</u>							
State Median	5,341	5,545	5,981	6,593	7,194*	7,194*	7,194*
Orchard View	5,100	5,300	5,724	6,148	6,678	6,678	6,804
Difference	- 241	- 245	- 257	- 445	- 516	- 516	- 390
<u>A MAXIMUM</u>							
State Median	8,200	8,666	9,590	10,580	11,729*	11,729*	11,729*
Orchard View	7,600	8,000	8,748	9,396	10,647	10,458	10,836
Difference	- 600	- 666	- 842	-1,184	-1,082	-1,271	- 893

\*Projected on basis of mean percent increase achieved by Region 13 School Districts applied to 1967-68 Medians.

Table 7

INSURANCE BENEFITS PAID BY SCHOOL DISTRICT AND  
OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO EMPLOYEES

Insurance Paid by School District

<u>Schools</u>	<u>Options*</u>	<u>Amount of subsidy</u>
Lakeshore	2 " 1	\$120 year (Single Subscriber)
Dowagiac	4 options	\$128 per year
Comstock	4 "	\$250 per year (Full Family)
Sturgis	4 "	\$144 per year
Three Rivers	3 " No GTL	\$145 (50% of Super Medical)
South Haven	4 "	\$117 to \$189 (Optional Usage)
Ionia	3 " " "	\$120 year (Single Subscriber with Optional Usage)
East Grand Rapids	3 " " "	\$20 per month
Godwin Heights	3 " " "	\$112 per year
Northview	3 " " "	BA-.2% of salary, BA+2- 1/2% and MA or above 3
Rockford	4 "	\$180 per year
Greenville	4 "	No insurance
Ludington	4 "	\$225 per year
Reeths-Puffer	4 "	\$144 per year
Fruitport	4 "	\$84- 1967-68 (1968-69 report not in)
Orchard View	4 "	No insurance 1967-68 (1968-69 not in)
Allegan	4 "	\$10 month 1967-68 (1968-69 not in)
Forest Hills	4 "	\$12.40 per month 1967-68 (1968-69 not in)
West Ottawa	4 "	\$50 year (1967-68) (1968-69 report not in)

\*Options: 1. Health Insurance

2. Salary Protection

3. Group Term Life

4. Major Medical \$500.00 deductible

Table 8

BOARD "SALARY AND INSURANCE"  
PROPOSAL #1

1) Salary

<u>Years Experience</u>	<u>Non Degree</u>	<u>BA</u>	<u>MA</u>	<u>*MA + 30</u>
0	\$4,700	\$6,300	\$ 6,678	
1	4,900	6,489	6,867	
2	5,100	6,741	7,119	
3	5,300	6,993	7,371	
4	5,500	7,245	7,623	
5	5,700	7,497	7,938	
6	5,900	7,749	8,313	\$ 8,568
7	6,100	8,001	8,694	8,946
8	6,300	8,379	9,135	9,387
9		8,757	9,576	9,828
10		9,135	10,017	10,332
11		9,513	10,458	10,710

\*The 30 hours beyond the degree may be either graduate or undergraduate credit earned after the date of the MA degree.

2) Insurance

Insurance increased from \$100 per year to \$144 per year with dental added as optional.

Table 9

BOARD "SALARY AND INSURANCE"  
PROPOSAL #2

1) Salary

<u>Years Experience</u>	<u>Non Degree</u>	<u>BA</u>	<u>MA</u>	<u>*MA + 30</u>
0	\$4,700	\$6,300	\$ 6,678	
1	4,900	6,489	6,867	
2	5,100	6,741	7,119	
3	5,300	6,993	7,371	
4	5,500	7,245	7,623	
5	5,700	7,497	7,938	
6	5,900	7,749	8,316	\$ 8,568
7	6,100	8,001	8,694	8,946
8	6,300	8,379	9,135	9,387
9		8,820	9,639	9,891
10		9,261	10,143	10,458
11		9,702	10,647	10,899

\*The 30 hours beyond the degree may be either graduate or undergraduate credit earned after the date of the MA degree.

2) Insurance

Insurance to remain at \$100 per year with dental added as optional.

Table 10

1968-69 AREA SALARY SCHEDULES

District	B. A.			M. A.		
	Minimum	Maximum	Steps	Minimum	Maximum	Steps
Grand Haven	6,500	10,400	10	7,150	11,635	10
Zeeland	6,500	9,555	10	6,890	10,128	10
Fruitport	6,400	9,600	12	6,910	10,400	12
Hart	6,200	9,300	12	6,700	10,050	12
Holton	6,000	8,800	12	6,480	9,360	12
North Muskegon	6,500	9,835	13	7,007	10,725	14
Holland	6,500	9,700	11	6,900	10,400	12
Mona Shores	6,350	9,970		6,617	11,455	
Fremont	6,400	9,500	12	6,825	10,200	12
Kentwood	6,400	9,728	11	7,040	10,496	11
Grand Rapids	6,400	10,016	11	6,912	10,880	11
Hesperia	6,300	9,150	13	6,800	9,650	13
Ludington	6,400	9,600	11	6,900	11,040	13
Oakridge	6,500	10,010	11	6,900	10,626	11
East Grand Rapids	6,600	10,131	12	7,260	11,121	12
Spring Lake	6,500	10,010	12	6,900	11,010	12
Shelby	6,300	8,800	12	6,900	9,400	12
Montague	6,350	9,525	11	6,928	10,392	11



Table 11

## BOARD PROPOSAL #2

<u>Step</u>	<u>Salary BA</u>	<u># Staff</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Step</u>	<u>Salary MA</u>	<u># Staff</u>	<u>Total</u>
0	\$ 6,300	9	\$56,700	0	\$ 6,678		
1	6,489	9	58,401	1	6,867		
2	6,741	9	60,669	2	7,119		
3	6,993	11	76,923	3	7,371		
4	7,245	10	72,450	4	7,623	2	\$15,246
5	7,497	2	14,994	5	7,938		
6	7,749	7	54,243	6	8,316	2	16,632
7	8,001	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	36,005	7	8,694	1	8,694
8	8,379	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	29,327	8	9,135	1	9,135
9	8,820	2	17,640	9	9,639	2	19,278
10	9,261	6	55,566	10	10,143	6	60,858
11	9,702	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	130,977	11	10,647	9	95,823
15	9,902	14	138,628	15	10,847	4	43,388
20	10,102	1	10,102	20	11,047	2	22,094
25	10,302	5	51,510	25	11,247		
30	10,502			30	11,447		
35	10,702	1	10,702	35	11,647	1	11,647
40	10,902	1	10,902	40	11,847		

Total of above. . . . . \$1,188,534  
 Non degree teachers . . . . . 18,900  
 MA + 30 cost . . . . . 21,798  
 Estimated five substitutes . . . . . 22,500  
 GRAND TOTAL. . \$1,251,732

Table 12

## CLASS SIZE AND AVERAGE TEACHER'S SALARY

	<u>Class Size</u>	<u>Average Teacher's Salary</u>
*Muskegon	26.5	
Muskegon Heights	28.	
Mona Shores	26.2	\$ 8,587
Oakridge	25.9	7,767
Reeths Puffer	25.5	
Ravenna	26.0	8,270
North Muskegon	26.7	8,581
Whitehall	29.2	8,393
Montague	26.3	8,679
Holton	24.5	7,000
Orchard View	25.5	8,527(proposed)

\*Muskegon has many small classes for deprived children under federal programs.