

1701

FF 8/20/70

George T. Roumell Jr. 1970

236

STATE OF MICHIGAN

EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION

In re Fact Finding:

TRENTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

-and-

TRENTON EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

FACT FINDER'S REPORT
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Appearance for the
Trenton Public Schools:
Ian MacDonald, Esq.

Appearance for the
Trenton Education Association:
Mr. Edwin Shimabukuro

Handwritten: Trenton Public Schools

If nothing else, the Trenton Public School District (hereinafter sometimes either called "School District" or "Board") and the Trenton Education Association (hereinafter sometimes called either "Association" or "Teachers") agree that the Trenton Public Schools are among the best in the State of Michigan offering outstanding instruction to the children of the Trenton School District with new outstanding educational concepts.

In keeping with the spirit of excellence, the School District and the Association pioneered two new concepts when negotiating their professional agreement beginning with the school year, 1968. One was an attempt to enter into a long-term agreement, namely, for three years. The idea behind this was

to establish a sound collective bargaining and labor relations atmosphere and eliminate the necessity of returning to the bargaining table each year. The school district and the Association were following the pattern frequently followed in private industry wherein long-term contracts are favored. The second new concept was the establishment of what was then thought to be a substantial improvement in teacher salaries by providing top pay for the M.A. Degree of \$14,000.

Obviously, the idea behind these new concepts was that a top notch school district should pay adequate compensation to its teachers and should have stable labor relations.

However, there was a stumbling block to a three year contract. It was difficult to predict what adequate compensation would be for teachers in the third year of the contract because of the difficulty in predicting the state of the economy and what other school districts might do in subsequent negotiations. To solve this problem and yet accomplish the concept of a three year contract for the purposes of stable labor relations, the parties in Article XVII of the professional agreement dated September 23, 1968 agreed as follows:

"1. Salary Schedule

- A. The salary schedule herein presented shall be effective for a two year period of this agreement. The third year, teachers' salary schedule only (Paragraph IV hereof) shall be negotiated by the parties. Negotiations shall commence in accordance with provisions

of Article IV hereof. If negotiations have not resulted in agreement by June 1, 1970, the parties will invoke mediation and fact finding. If, after a fact finding report is rendered, one or the other party is unreasonable in their acceptance, then the contract shall be null and void. The term "unreasonable" as used herein shall mean: refusal to accept a fact finding report and recommendation that is consistent with the settlements at the time in the Downriver Wayne County area. (emphasis added)

In other words, a three year professional agreement which provided professional compensation for two years is what is known as a reopener as to wages only for the third year. The agreement did set some guide as indicated in the above-quoted language as to what the wages should be in the third year.

Following the spirit of Article XVII, the parties did begin to bargain in the Spring of 1970 but reached an impasse after the failure of mediation; this necessitated the invoking of Fact Finding procedures. The parties did meet in three separate hearings with the Fact Finder and have presented their version of the applicable facts as well as presenting arguments supporting their respective views as to what the professional compensation should be in the third year of the agreement.

Following the 1968 agreement several events occurred. The District needed funds. It went to the voters three times before the voters saw fit on February 10, 1970 to pass seven additional mills. Because of the failure of the first 2 mill increases

April 22, 1969 and June 9, 1969, cuts in the program were necessary. In fact if the millage had not been passed on February 10, 1970, there would have been additional cuts. These cuts, of course, would have jeopardized the fine educational program in Trenton.

But much to the credit of the public of the Trenton School District, the millage did pass and steps are now being taken to restore the cuts and to continue the fine educational program in Trenton. Furthermore, the additional mills did provide the necessary funds in order to adequately compensate the teachers.

Although there are funds available and ability to pay is admitted by both sides to not really be an issue, there is still a duty to the public to be fair in providing adequate teacher compensation. The additional millage voted was not all to be for teacher salaries. Likewise, the administration must recognize that reasonable salaries must be paid.

It is not new to the public of the Trenton School District that there are teacher strikes. In 1968, the Trenton School District witnessed what was up to that time one of the longest teacher strikes in the history of collective bargaining in the public sector in Michigan. In most strikes, it usually takes two parties to cause a strike. Neither the teachers nor the Board could be blamed for the strike of 1968. It happened because of the desire of the Trenton School teachers to be paid adequate compensation and because of the financial situation that the Board found itself in. However, there is no need for a strike

over a reopener in a professional agreement. Neither the Board nor the teachers want to strike. Obviously, the public does not want a strike because the public has provided the funds. Thus, both parties must step up and try to arrive at an agreement that will show good faith to the public as the public by its millage passage in February, 1970 showed good faith to both the Board and the Teachers.

It was quite obvious to the Fact Finder in assessing the respective positions as to salaries put forward by the School District and the Association that both parties were indeed unrealistic.

The Association came to Fact Finding with the request of a salary range of \$8,475 for a brand new teacher with a BA Degree to \$14,831.25 for a teacher with a BA Degree with eleven years of experience, and a range of \$9,068.25 for a beginning teacher with an MA Degree to \$16,102.50 for a teacher with an MA Degree with eleven years of experience. But the Association could not show where any school district in the State of Michigan that has a settled contract had paid such maximums of \$14,831.25 for eleven years experience on a BA Degree and \$16,102.50 on the MA Degree after eleven years of experience. Quite obviously the market place in Michigan has not reached this type of salary range for teachers at the present time.

The Board came to the bargaining table with a salary range at the BA Degree level of \$7,800 with no experience to \$13,050 with eleven years experience and a range at the MA Degree level of \$8,300 with no experience to \$14,560 with eleven years experience. This compares with the average settled district in the downriver area of a range of \$8,122 at the beginning BA to \$13,050 at the BA maximum and \$9,029 MA minimum to somewhere in excess of \$15,000 for the MA maximum. This average included the Gibraltar School District where the MA maximum is paying \$13,700 which is even less than the pay in Trenton was in 1969-70 and it is not even the average paid in 1969-70 in the majority of the school district in Wayne County. Therefore, it should not be included in the average. Thus, these averages which were submitted by the Board itself illustrate the unrealism of the Board's offer because the Board's offer was below the average for the downriver area. And it is this Board that after long bargaining agreed in 1968 that instead of being among the lower third of the school districts in Wayne County in pay, that Trenton would become among the top third. This did in fact happen and Trenton has been for the last two years among the top third of the school districts in Wayne County in salary compensation.

The unrealism of the offer of the Board and the demand of the teachers means that they both expect the Fact Finder to be a modern day Houdini. Fortunately for the Fact Finder, he does not have to be a modern day Houdini in this situation.

There is no need for magic. The facts speak for themselves and clearly dictate a result that is fair to the public who have after defeating two millages of four additional mills and then stepped up to the necessities of education and passed seven additional mills. The facts clearly dictate a formula that will give a fair rate of compensation to the teachers and permit the Board of Education to properly run the School District with good adequate financing.

There are several criteria used universally by Fact Finders in arriving at the recommendation made. Among these criteria are comparison with nearby school districts, the present and past bargaining history of the parties and what the results may be if in fact the parties chose a strike.

In addition to the above-mentioned criteria, there is somewhat of a unique criteria in Trenton. This is the meaning and intent of Article XXVII (1), Salary Schedule, which was quoted above and particularly the last sentence which was emphasized above, namely, "the term "unreasonable" as used herein shall mean: Refusal to accept a Fact Finding Report and Recommendations that is consistent with the settlements at the time in the downriver Wayne County area." Technically, the Fact Finder is not bound by this language. In fact the teachers point out he should not be bound by the language. Nevertheless, it does give a guide

because the parties intended to have a three year agreement. They were puzzled about the third year of the agreement. Therefore, they set up a criteria that should be used as a guide in trying to arrive at this agreement.

The key, of course, in the above-quoted language is the word "consistent". "Consistent" doesn't mean average. It does not mean "striking a median". Webster's Third International Dictionary in defining "consistent" uses such terms as "Marked by harmony, regularity or steady continuity throughout."

At this point it should be noted that the quoted sentence also refers to "downriver Wayne County area". The School District points out that this downriver area includes Ecorse, Lincoln Park, Allen Park, Wyandotte, Grosse Ile, Southgate, Gibraltar and the Melvindale School Districts. It is also noted that the Dearborn School District is adjacent to this downriver area. The clause also refers to "with the settlements at the time".

Thus, if the Fact Finder were to be true to the thinking of the parties, he would try to arrive at a report consistent with the settlements in the downriver Wayne County area.

The the term "consistent" as used here would include comparison not only in the actual salary range but to be in harmony, it would include how the School District would rank at least in the downriver area if not as a matter of fact in the Wayne County area. It also would include the past rankings

and how the parties arrived at a salary compensation in past years through bargaining.

To illustrate the true meaning of "consistent", note what happened in the Trenton School District in the past. In 1967-68, the range of salaries in Trenton were as follows:

BA - \$6,100 to \$9,882

MA - \$6,527 to \$10,797

This meant that Trenton ranked 28th at the BA minimum, 17th at the BA maximum, 32nd at the MA minimum and 28th at the MA maximum out of 41 reported school districts in Wayne County, Michigan. Taking such downriver school districts as Ecorse, Riverview, River Rouge, Melvindale, Wyandotte and Southgate, these ratings would show that Trenton was indeed substantially below the above-mentioned downriver school districts. For example during this period, Ecorse had the highest BA starting salary in the County and River Rouge was the forth highest MA maximum in the County.

Obviously, in 1967-68 Trenton was among the lowest third in the salary ranges in Wayne County.

Then came the long negotiations of 1968 and the resulting strike. As a result, in 1968-69, Trenton was 11th at the BA minimum, 4th at the BA maximum, 19th at the MA minimum and 9th at the MA maximum. In 1969-70 Trenton was third at both the BA minimum and maximum, 12th at the MA minimum and 6th

at the MA maximum. Thus, through past bargaining, Trenton went from the lower third to the upper third. Furthermore, in 1968-69 and 1969-70, Trenton became one of the leaders of the downriver school districts. It might be pointed out that downriver school districts tended to show up in the upper third of the rankings in 1968-69, 1969-70. Generally speaking, downriver school districts established a policy of being among the better paying school districts.

Obviously, the term "consistent" invites comparison, and relative position is one facet of comparison. It is true that the ranking of a school district in terms of compensation should not be treated like major league baseball standings. But quite naturally, if a school district through free collective bargaining and in the case of Trenton, a strike, saw fit to put their teachers in a top relative position, absent other factors, weight should be given to this relative position.

Of course, salary ranges should be considered in the comparison criteria which in turn is part of the definition of "consistent". The downriver districts that are settled have the following ranges:

<u>District</u>	<u>BA Degree</u>	<u>MA Degree</u>
Allen Park	8,250 - 13,100	9,400 - 15,150
Ecorse	8,000 - 13,000	8,950 - 15,300
Gibraltar	8,000 - 12,500	8,696 - 13,700
Grosse Ile	8,125 - 13,000	8,937 - 15,194
Lincoln Park	8,050 - 13,005	8,925 - Wayne County Median

In addition note the following other west Wayne County school districts settlements:

<u>District</u>	<u>BA Degree</u>	<u>MA Degree</u>
Dearborn	8,250 - 13,375	9,000 - 15,200
Garden City	8,050 - 12,880	9,258 - 15,134
Livonia	8,000 - 13,280	8,800 - 15,200

It should be noted that at least two leading downriver school districts, Wyandotte and River Rouge, which generally speaking are among the leading paid districts, have not yet settled their contracts.

It should also be noted that the Allen Park, Ecorse and Grosse Ile contracts were negotiated this spring and summer which indicates the value that those school districts place on their teachers at the present time. Dearborn and Livonia are also newly negotiated contracts. Garden City and Lincoln Park ranges are the result of two year contracts which were negotiated a year ago.

The school district advances two basic arguments in support of the offer made by it. Both the School District and the Association agreed that the cost of living had gone up approximately six percent in the last year. The School District then maintains that the offer which should be made is six percent or the cost of living. Thus, under the School Districts proposal no teacher would get an actual increase in pay because the buying power of their dollar would be about the same it was the previous year, even

though there had been some slight raises. Furthermore, the School District in computing the raise given a teacher would include not only the schedule increase but also the increment increase. To explain, last year the beginning BA teacher at the first step would have received \$7,735. The proposal of the Trenton Board of Education for the 1970-71 school year is \$7,800. Thus, the schedule increase, that is, what a first year teacher last year would have received as compared to a first year teacher this year is a \$65.00 increase or .8%. However, the Board would say that a first year teacher last year at the BA will now be on the second step and therefore that teacher would in effect be getting \$8,199 or a \$464 increase making the schedule plus increment increase a total of about 6%. Interesting enough, at the maximum levels at both the BA and MA, the total percentage increase in the Board's offer including schedule and increment is 4.1% or less than the 6% cost of living. Thus, as there are many teachers who were on the maximum step last year, they in effect, on the Board's offer, would be getting a reduction in salary because even though getting numerically more dollars, the buying power would be less than a year ago.

With the exception of the maximum step, the schedule increases proposed by the Board at the BA range from .8% up to 2.1% and on the 4th step is actually a reduction percentage-wise. The same ratios can be found on the MA offer as they range from .03% up to 1.4%.

Now compare what the Board is offering with the language of Article XXVII, Section 1 and the term "consistent". Ecorse, a downriver school district, has agreed to schedule percentage increases ranging in the BA from 6.7% to 8.8% and in the MA from 8.5 % to 11.3%. Including schedule and increment increases, the Ecorse range percentage-wise at the BA is 12.0 to 14.5 with the maximum since there is no increment increase being 8.8%. At the MA the range is 11.3% to 17.4%. In Allen Park the percentage schedule increases at the BA range from 9.2% to 10.1% and at the MA 9.0% to 11.9%. Including schedule and increment percentage increases, the Allen Park BA runs from 9.2% to 15.4% and the MA from 9.0% to 18.5%. Even Gibraltar, (a district which the Fact Finder will not consider because its numerical figures are substantially below other settled downriver area school districts) run schedule and increment percentage increases at the BA from 10.3% to 20.6% and at the MA from 10.9% to 22.9%. So that the public will understand this and as samples, attached hereto as exhibits are Exhibit 1, the Ecorse Schedule, and Exhibit 2, the Allen Park Schedule. These exhibits verify that in fact other school districts are paying the percentage increases just discussed.

Similar comparisons can be made with Lincoln Park and Grosse Ile, two other downriver settled school districts as well as with Dearborn, Livonia and Garden City, other west Wayne County school district.

In effect the Board is saying that in giving a teacher an increase, the increment increase should be also considered. But the Board by its own contract uses the term "consistent". Every school district, both downriver and elsewhere that has a settled contract, as of this date has followed the principle that has been followed for the last four or five years; namely, that there should be both a schedule increase as well as increments. It is a fact of life. The Board was not able and did not show one school district in the State of Michigan that did not in the current settlements give less than a 6% schedule increase. The Board was not able to show any district that has a current settlement giving anything resembling 6% including both the schedule and increment increase. There were no facts or any reason given why the outstanding Trenton School District should be any different than surrounding school districts in the approach to the method used in compensating Teachers.

The argument that a teacher should not be given a raise for just being around is really an argument for more efficient management. If a probationary teacher does not meet the standards of a district such as Trenton then particularly since there are available teachers, (a point discussed later,) it is up to management to make changes when changes can be made. But it apparently has been recognized throughout Michigan and certainly in the downriver area as well as in Wayne County that experience

in teaching has a money value. Furthermore other school districts have recognized that in our current economy there is still room for improvement in the relative compensation position of the teacher.

It may be that some districts have to make more improvements than other districts. It may be that some districts may have to catch up with the leaders. But when the Board signed the September 23, 1968 contract, they recognized that in the third year of the contract they would have to make an offer that was consistent with at least the settled contracts in the downriver area. Trenton has been a leader by its own contract. In agreeing to the salary schedule for the first two years of the contract, the Board was announcing to the world that it intended to have a top flight school district with a pay schedule that was among the leading in the downriver area and in Wayne County.

The Board argues that there is now a teacher surplus and this is a reason for its offer. There is no question that at least in some areas there is a teacher surplus. It is noted that on page 3, Section A of the Detroit Free Press, dated Thursday, August 13, 1970, columns 2 through 5, there is an article discussing the teacher surplus. But it is interesting to note that in that article the following paragraph appears

"Despite the abundance of teachers in business education, English, social studies and foreign languages, shortages still do exist in areas of industrial arts, vocal music, elementary science, elementary and junior high school mathematics and libraries."

The Board argues that in fact it has received 1,519 applicants for 77 positions. It is interesting to note that 10 of the positions are not yet filled.

But the argument of teacher surplus only emphasizes the point previously made. It gives the Board an opportunity to be more selective. Since both the School District and the Association believe they have a top flight district, this selectivity can only aid the development of the district. Also, there is still a shortage in some areas.

It is noted that Grosse Ile, Lincoln Park and Ecorse as well as Dearborn have had a high ratio of applicants to positions available. The ratio in these districts are as follows:

<u>School</u>	<u>Positions Available</u>	<u>Applications Received</u>
Dearborn	47	3000
Grosse Ile	17	200
Lincoln Park	4	800
Ecorse	20	250

Thus, other downriver and west Wayne County districts which likewise have received a disproportionate number of applications for the positions available still have seen fit to agree to the increases discussed in this Report on the obvious theory that fair compensation must be made in order to insure selectivity in a buyer's market. It is only a competitive wage that is going to permit Trenton the selectivity that it needs.

Finally, in resisting the Association's demands, the Board argues that it should not be bound by an index system. Here the past bargaining history comes into play to some extent. The Board initiated the concept of the index system. It occurred in the first collective bargaining contract between the parties. It became part of the 1968 agreement. It must be emphasized that what is before this Fact Finder is a reopener. Apparently, the parties believed that the index was good. It created a steady progression based upon experience. Even in the Board's offer, though inadequate, there is a recognition of the steady progression concept. By having some sort of index, it avoids what sometimes happens, a desire to get a large starting and ending salaries at the expense of the teachers in the middle. Thus, as will be recommended the index for the most part will be kept in tact with some modifications based upon the concept of a steady progression and fairness to the teachers in the so-called "middle".

For the reason stated based upon the comparison criteria, what the parties have bargained for in the past and the language of the contract, it is quite clear that the Board's offer is indeed unrealistic and does not stand any tests.

As already mentioned, there is very little that can be said about the teachers demand except to point out that such a demand would not be consistent with the settlement in the downriver Wayne County area or for that matter consistent with settlement anywhere else.

Considering the facts mentioned above, this Fact Finder is recommending for the BA schedule Exhibit 3 and for the MA schedule Exhibit 4. This represents a BA range of \$8,225 to \$13,324 in an MA range from \$8,800 to \$15,216. This range is consistent with the settled downriver settlements. There is at least one district which begins at \$8,250. There is at least one district that is paying at the MA maximum \$15,300. At the BA maximum, there is one district, River Rouge, that was paying \$13,000 in 1969-70. No doubt this district will pay at least what is recommended here and even among the settled districts in the downriver area the BA maximum recommended herein is consistent. Allen Park is \$13,100 which is an increase over Allen Park's BA maximum of 1969-1970 of \$1,100. The recommended figure here would be an increase of about \$800. Thus, the recommendation is consistent with the downriver settlements. It is also pointed out that there is no downriver settlement to date with a beginning step that is not at least about \$500 over the same beginning step last year. The recommended \$8,225 certainly falls within this range.

The recommendations herein if compared, as only examples, Exhibit 1, the Allen Park schedule, and Exhibit 2, the Ecorse schedule, will show that the recommendations are consistent and that the percentage increases are no more than those school districts which are downriver school districts.

The teachers rightfully can argue that the Fact Finder is not bound by Article XXVII. For that matter the Board may say that they are not bound by Article XXVII. But the point of the matter is Article XXVII does set up a criteria. This Fact Finder has followed that criteria. As a check, he notes the recommendations here compare favorably with Dearborn, Livonia and Garden City, other west Wayne County School Districts.

To the Board, the Fact Finder points out that they set the standard when they signed the contract. The recommendation is consistent and it is in keeping with what other downriver school districts and, for that matter, other west Wayne County schools are doing.

To the teachers, it is pointed out that salary schedules must be fair. They must not be treated like baseball standings and the recommendation within reason is consistent. The term "consistent" is defined by this Fact Finding as to be within the same relative position that they have been in in the past two years both downriver and Wayne County wise. Furthermore, the percentage increases are consistent. They may not be as dramatic as in some school districts, but it is remembered that other school districts had a longer way to go.

To both parties it is pointed out that the strike criteria has been applied in arriving at the recommendation. Allen Park has a history of two Fact Findings and a strike. Yet, this year, without even going to Fact Finding, the Allen Park Board of Education reached the range previously pointed out. Ecorse has had three strikes and yet the Board without going to Fact Finding

reached the range previously pointed out. Thus, in the opinion of the Fact Finder, this is probably the range the parties would reach if forced to a strike which indeed would be a tragic situation.

To the public, the Fact Finder points out that the recommendations here are consistent. After all the public did vote millage and in voting so they expected to pay their teachers a fair compensation consistent with other school districts. Furthermore, the public should know that in the hearings, the Fact Finder raised the question of figures such as set forth herein. Yet, at no point did the Board discuss that if figures such as here recommended were in fact recommended, it could not pay same or if paid, it would be necessary not to restore the cuts. With the lack of any evidence to the contrary, the Fact Finder must find that in fact these salaries can be paid and that the restoration of the cuts as announced can be made.

In the final analysis, both parties and the public should recognize that this is a contract reopener which unlike other reopeners has in fact set in Article XXVII, a criteria; namely, "consistent with the settlements at the time in downriver Wayne County area."

The parties knew what they were doing when they signed the September 23, 1968 contract. They wanted labor peace. The teachers did not want to sign a three year contract and find that in the third year contract they had dropped in relative position.

The Board on the otherhand, did not want to find that in the third year they were paying beyond what other school districts were paying. This Fact Finding Report and Recommendations do not create either of these two situations.

Finally, it would be a breach of trust to the public on the part of either the Board and the Association to permit a strike in the fall of 1970 in the Trenton Public Schools. There is no need for it and it should be recognized by both parties that it takes two in most cases to cause a strike situation. There is no question, that a strike in Trenton would contribute to the collapse of a fine school district financed by the hard working population of the Trenton School District who by this report are not being asked to pay any more than their neighbors in the downriver area and for that matter in west Wayne County.

Again, the parties should be reminded that the situation here is a reopener of a contract that the parties signed on September 28, 1968. The parties did not intend with a mere reopener in the fall of 1970 to engage in major policy changes through negotiating a new contract. This Report and the Recommendations herein are based upon this premise and on the premise that no one desires what could be a very tragic strike.


George T. Roumell, Jr.

Dated: August 20, 1970

ALLEN PARK

B.A.

STEP	1969-70	1970-71	SCHEDULE DOLLAR INCREASE	SCHEDULE PERCENTAGE INCREASE	SCHEDULE AND	
					INCREMENT DOLLAR INCREASE	INCREMENT PERCENTAGE INCREASE
1	\$ 7500	\$ 8250	\$ 750	10.0	\$ 1125	15.0
2	7875	8625	750	9.5	1150	14.6
3	8250	9025	775	9.4	1200	14.5
4	8625	9450	825	9.5	1300	15.1
5	9025	9925	900	10.0	1375	15.2
6	9450	10400	950	10.1	1450	15.3
7	9925	10900	975	9.8	1525	15.4
8	10400	11450	1050	10.1	1600	15.4
9	10900	12000	1100	10.1	1650	15.1
10	11450	12550	1100	9.6	1650	14.4
11	12000	13100	1100	9.2	1100	9.2

ALLEN PARK

M.A.

STEP	1969-70	1970-71	SCHEDULE DOLLAR INCREASE	SCHEDULE PERCENTAGE INCREASE	SCHEDULE AND INCREMENT DOLLAR INCREASE	SCHEDULE AND INCREMENT PERCENTAGE INCREASE
1	\$ 8400	\$ 9400	\$ 1000	11.9	\$ 1550	18.5
2	8900	9950	1050	11.8	1600	18.0
3	9400	10500	1100	11.7	1650	17.6
4	9925	11050	1125	11.3	1675	16.9
5	10450	11600	1150	11.0	1700	16.3
6	10975	12150	1175	10.7	1725	15.7
7	11525	12700	1175	10.2	1775	15.4
8	12075	13300	1225	10.1	1825	15.1
9	12650	13900	1250	9.9	1850	14.6
10	13250	14500	1250	9.4	1900	14.3
11	13900	15150	1250	9.0	1250	9.0

ECORSE

B.A.

STEP	1969-70	1970-71	SCHEDULE		SCHEDULE AND		SCHEDULE AND	
			DOLLAR	PERCENTAGE	INCREMENT	DOLLAR	INCREMENT	PERCENTAGE
			INCREASE	INCREASE	INCREASE	INCREASE	INCREASE	INCREASE
1	\$ 7500	\$ 8000	\$ 500	6.7	\$ 900	12.0		
2	7850	8400	550	7.0	1000	12.7		
3	8250	8850	600	7.3	1050	12.7		
4	8650	9300	650	7.5	1200	13.9		
5	9150	9850	700	7.7	1250	13.7		
6	9650	10400	750	7.8	1300	13.5		
7	10150	10950	800	7.9	1450	14.3		
8	10750	11600	850	7.9	1550	14.4		
9	11350	12300	950	8.4	1650	14.5		
10	11950	13000	1050	8.8	1050	8.8		

ECORSE

M.A.

STEP	<u>1969-70</u>		<u>1970-71</u>		<u>SCHEDULE</u> <u>DOLLAR</u> <u>INCREASE</u>	<u>SCHEDULE</u> <u>PERCENTAGE</u> <u>INCREASE</u>	<u>SCHEDULE AND</u> <u>INCREMENT</u> <u>DOLLAR</u> <u>INCREASE</u>	<u>SCHEDULE AND</u> <u>INCREMENT</u> <u>PERCENTAGE</u> <u>INCREASE</u>
	\$		\$				\$	
1	8250		8950		700	8.5	1100	13.3
2	8600		9350		750	8.7	1150	13.4
3	8950		9750		800	8.9	1350	15.1
4	9450		10300		850	9.0	1450	15.3
5	9950		10900		950	9.5	1650	16.6
6	10550		11600		1050	10.0	1750	16.6
7	11150		12300		1150	10.3	1850	16.6
8	11750		13000		1250	10.6	1950	16.6
9	12350		13700		1350	10.9	2150	17.4
10	13050		14500		1450	11.1	2250	17.2
11	13750		15300		1550	11.3	1550	11.3

COMPENSATION SCHEDULE

BA

Sex	Step	Salary 1970-1971	Schedule Increase		Schedule + Incremen Increase	
		\$	\$	%	\$	%
10	1	8,225.00	490.00	6.3	901.25	11.0
15	2	8,636.25	437.25	5.3	930.75	11.0
20	3	9,129.75	466.75	5.3	1,042.50	12.0
25	4	9,705.50	500.50	5.4	1,076.25	11.0
30	5	10,281.25	612.25	6.3	1,105.75	11.0
35	6	10,774.75	641.75	6.3	1,135.25	11.0
40	7	11,268.25	671.25	6.3	1,082.50	10.0
45	8	11,679.50	618.50	5.5	1,112.00	10.0
50	9	12,173.00	648.00	5.6	1,306.00	11.0
55	10	12,831.00	764.00	6.3	1,257.50	10.0
62	11	13,324.50	793.50	6.3	793.50	6.3

COMPENSATION SCHEDULE

MA

Index	Step	Salary 1970-1971	Schedule Increase		Schedule + Incremen Increase	
		\$	\$	%	\$	%
1.07	1	8,800.75	524.75	6.0	1,018.25	12.0
1.13	2	9,294.25	553.25	6.3	1,129.00	12.0
1.20	3	9,870.00	558.00	6.0	1,163.75	12.0
1.27	4	10,445.75	622.75	6.3	1,198.50	12.0
1.34	5	11,021.50	656.50	6.3	1,396.75	13.0
1.43	6	11,761.75	855.75	7.8	1,431.50	13.0
1.50	7	12,337.50	889.50	7.7	1,629.75	14.0
1.59	8	13,077.75	1,088.75	9.0	1,582.25	13.0
1.65	9	13,571.25	1,040.25	8.3	1,780.50	14.0
1.74	10	14,311.50	1,161.50	8.8	2,066.25	15.0
1.85	11	15,216.25	1,216.25	8.6	1,216.25	8.6

COMPENSATION SCHEDULE

2nd MA

Index	Step	Salary 1970-1971	Schedule Increase		Schedule + Incremen Increase	
		\$	\$	%	\$	%
1.14	1	9,376.50	1,358.50	16.0	2,016.50	25.0
1.22	2	10,034.50	597.50	6.0	1,255.50	13.0
1.30	3	10,692.50	636.50	6.0	1,212.25	12.0
1.37	4	11,268.25	671.25	6.0	1,247.00	11.0
1.44	5	11,844.00	706.00	6.0	1,364.00	12.0
1.52	6	12,502.00	899.00	7.0	1,557.00	13.0
1.60	7	13,160.00	936.00	7.0	1,679.25	13.0
1.69	8	13,900.25	1,137.25	8.0	1,630.75	12.0
1.75	9	14,393.75	1,090.75	8.0	1,831.00	13.0
1.84	10	15,134.00	1,211.00	8.0	2,115.75	15.0
1.95	11	16,038.75	1,264.75	8.0	1,264.75	8.0