

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board

**In the Matter of the Employees of  
Warrior run School District  
Case No. ACT 88-13-23-E**

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Diana S. Mulligan, Fact Finder

Hearing: May 2, 2013

For the School District: Benjamin L. Pratt, Esq.

For the Association: Robert Nicoletti

BACKGROUND

Pursuant to ACT 88 of 1992 and the Pennsylvania Labor Relations Act, Act 195 of 1970, notice was received by the Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board (PLRB) from the Bureau of Mediation that no agreement had been reached by the Warrior Run School District (SD or WRSD) and the Warrior run Education Association (Association or WREA). By letter dated April 10, 2013, the PLRB appointed the undersigned to act as Fact Finder with the authority set forth above. Subsequent to such notice, the parties were duly notified and a hearing was held on May 2, 2012 in Turbotville, PA at which time all parties in interest were afforded a full opportunity to present testimony and introduce documentary evidence.

Although the SD listed "Term of Agreement" as one of its issues in dispute, the Association, in its Fact Finding Evidence Book agreed to the 4 year term proposed by the SD. Therefore, this issue is no longer in dispute. The term of the agreement will begin on July 1, 2011 and end on June 30, 2015. The following remain as issues in dispute for consideration by the Fact Finder:

MUTUAL ISSUES

1. Article VII, Section 7.08. Payment in Lieu of Hospitalization Coverage
2. Article VII, Section 7.10. Cost Control Provision
3. Article X, Section 10.01, Severance
4. Article XII, Section 12.17. Summer Professional Development MOU
5. Appendix A. Salary Schedules

SD ONLY ISSUES

1. Article V, Section 5.03. Longevity Payment
2. Article V, Section 5.05. Increments for Additional Training
3. Article V, Section 5.08. In-Service Payments
4. Article VI, Section 6.01. Tuition Payments
5. Article VII, Section 7.01. Hospitalization/Medical Coverage
6. Article X, Section 10.02. Early Retirement
7. Article XII, Section 12.09. Contracted School Days
8. Appendix B & C. Interscholastic and Extra-Curricular Salaries

This Report contains Recommendations for the unresolved issues which constitute the settlement proposal upon which the parties are now required to act, as directed by statute and PLRB regulations. Without any comment, the issues already agreed upon by the parties and the undisputed portions of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA or Agreement) shall be incorporated without change into this Report.

A vote to accept the Report does not necessarily constitute endorsement of the Recommendations but, rather, represents only an agreement to resolve the disputed issues. Pursuant to statutory authority, the Report will be released to the public after the consideration period if rejected by either party.

The parties are hereby directed to review the Report and, within 10 calendar days of its issuance, notify the PLRB and each other if they accept or reject the Report. Confidentiality must be maintained during the consideration period.

**Issue #1: Article V, Section 5.03. Longevity Payments**

**Position of the Parties**

The SD wants to discontinue the current \$100 longevity payments for those teachers with 20, 25 and 30 years of service. The Association wants to maintain the status quo. These payments roll into base pay and, since the salary schedule has 18 steps, they are made only to those teachers who have reached their career rate and no longer get step increases. [Note: All bargaining unit members shall hereinafter be referred to as “teachers.”]

### **Discussion**

The negotiators for both parties entered into a Tentative Agreement (TA) for a successor CBA on November 17, 2011. The teachers voted to reject this TA and both sides subsequently continued negotiations without success. In its Hearing Evidence Book (HEB), the Association (in purple ink) states that “TENTATIVE AGREEMENTS ON THE CURRENT CONTRACT LANGUAGE SET FORTH IN THIS SECTION WAS PREVIOUSLY AGREED TO BY THE PARTIES.” These “purple ink” (PI) TAs were the ones reached in November, 2011 but that CBA was rejected by Association members. Therefore, any PI TAs will be considered as a *de novo* issue. For some other SD proposals submitted as issues for Fact Finding, the Association, in its HEB, refers to a May 1, 2012 TA which was updated on October 25, 2012 (in red ink) and further states that these are not open issues for review by the Fact Finder. There was no evidence presented at the Fact Finding hearing that the parties signed off on these “red ink” (RI) issues, thus making it possible for the SD to reconsider its prior position for Fact Finding.

The issue on longevity payments was a PI TA. The SD originally agreed to continue the longevity payments but now takes the position that they are “archaic” and that wage increases and automatic step increases over the years have been enough so that it is no longer necessary to use longevity payments to “entice” teachers to stay at WRSD (SD HEB, Tab 2, p.1). These payments cost the SD a total of \$57,001 in the past 5 years with \$13,206 of that amount attributable to 2012-13 alone. The Association argues (HEB, tab 8) that these payments provide economic equity to teachers at the top of the scale, enhance retirement income and mitigate the negative impact of inflation. By 2014-15, according to the SD's salary scale matrix, there will be approximately 30 teachers with 20+ years of service who get only the percentage salary increase on scale. This is about a .66% increase in each year of the CBA.

### **Recommendation**

Maintain the status quo.

### **Issue #2: Article V, Section 5.05. Increments for Additional Training**

#### **Position of the Parties**

In its issues presented for Fact Finding, the SD proposed to restrict movement on the salary scale for those teachers who obtain a Master's Equivalent (ME) degree and to also restrict columnar movement to once over a 2 year period. The Association rejects this proposal.

### **Discussion**

The SD expanded on its issue presented for Fact Finding by proposing that those teachers currently possessing an ME or Master's (M) degree by June 30, 2012 can continue to move across the salary scale for each additional 6 credits of graduate work. (They can currently obtain 9 graduate credits.) The SD proposed that, beginning July 1, 2013, a teacher with an ME will no longer be able to move across the scale. This was a logical proposal since 2012 has come and gone and the parties are operating under the terms and conditions of the expired Agreement. Likewise, if a teacher took 9 credits in the 2012-13 school year, (s)he cannot give them back.

The second modification made to its Fact Finding issues is the SD's proposal in its HEB that the 2 year columnar movement applies only when the teacher uses 6 online or video credits. However, in its rationale for its proposal (HEB, Tab 4, p.1), the SD states it wants to restrict columnar movement to once every 2 years without mentioning online/video courses as the only ones subject to the bi-annual restrictions. The Association alleges that this is a RI TA and not open for review by the Fact Finder, but it has not provided the specific language of the TA in its HEB, only stating that there was a TA on May 1, 2012 and a SD proposal and Association's counter proposal on October 25, 2012. The SD's current proposal, except for the change from July 1, 2012 to July 1, 2013, was identical to the November 17, 2011 TA.

### **Recommendation**

Adopt the language of the most recent TA on this issue, adjusting the effective date of the TA, as necessary.

### **Issue #3: Article V, Section 5.08. In-Service Payments**

#### **Position of the Parties**

The SD, both in its submission of issues for Fact Finding and in its HEB, proposed to maintain the current \$22 rate for the term of the

CBA. The Association maintains that there was a May 1, 2012 TA and a more recent SD proposal and Association counter proposal, both on October 25, 2012.

### **Recommendation**

\$22 for the term of the Agreement in accordance with the parties' most recent proposals.

### **Issue #4: Article VI, Section 6.01. Tuition Payments**

#### **Position of the Parties**

The SD proposes to limit reimbursement to a fixed pool of money for teachers with a Level II Certification, limit those who do not yet have permanent certification to 6 credits per year and limit on-line or video credits to 6 per year.

#### **Discussion**

In the expired CBA, teachers would be reimbursed for 9 graduate credits at the Bloomsburg rate. In the PI TA, language was also added to this section which limited teachers to 6 online/video credits per year but allowed them to take extra reimburseable credits if such credits are required for the M or Doctorate (D) degree and are only offered electronically. The SD's current proposal caps reimbursement for all teachers with a Level II Certification to a \$15,000 pool of money, limits Level I teachers to 6 credits per year at the Pennsylvania System of Higher Education (PASHE) rate and does not allow carryover of credits. The SD argues that it needs these cost saving measures in the Agreement, especially with the influx of younger teachers who, according to the SD, will still be able to obtain their mandated credits while, at the same time, slowing down the financial responsibility to the SD.

The Association argues that the cap slows professional development among experienced staff and imposes an economic hardship on those coping with high student loan debt. The Association pointed out, at the Fact Finding hearing, that some professional employees who took graduate courses were administrators and their cost could not legitimately be charged to the teachers. The SD e-mailed a corrected list. The original list, in 3 of the 5 years in evidence, contained the statement "Charged to PAG." This PAG charge was subtracted from the total payments to get an amount which was titled, in one of the years, "Net to General Fund." There was no PAG amount in the corrected documents. In any event, even with the PAG payment, it does not appear that \$15,000 is an adequate sum to cover the tuition reimbursement for the teachers, unless most of those teachers are fairly new and have not yet attained the Level II Certification. Such data were not in evidence. I also did not find the PASHE rate which is, presumably, less than the Bloomsburg rate (\$1,248 for 3 credits).

### **Recommendation**

1. Limit reimbursement to 6 credits per year at the Bloomsburg rate.
2. Adopt the online/video language of the November 17, 2011 TA.
3. Adopt the "no carryover" language.

### **Issue #5: Article VII, Section 7.01. Hospitalization/Medical Coverage**

#### **Position of the Parties**

The SD is proposing to move to a \$500/\$1,500 deductible plan under the trust and to maintain the current 10% premium share. The Association alleges that a TA had already been reached on this issue on May 1, 2012 but was replaced by the SD's October 25, 2012 current proposal to which the Association objects.

The PI TA is identical to the SD's latest proposal with the exception that the SD has added language offering a \$500/\$1,500 deductible plan as provided by the CS Trust. The SD will establish a Health Reimbursement Account (HRA) which will pay this deductible in full resulting in no cost to the employee. Even after paying into the HRA, the SD will realize a \$150,000 savings in insurance premiums in the first year. According to the Association, the May 1, 2012 TA substitutes "PPO or HMO" for the current language and adds that benefits will be equivalent to those already provided. The expired CBA says nothing about equivalent benefits nor does the November 17, 2011 TA. Since the HMO/PPO plans are less expensive than the current plan, employee premium share will also be less, according to the SD.

The Association argues that the proposed new plans are actually inferior to the current plans (some of which will not even be offered by the Trust in the future) in that the co-pay for office visits increases, there will be a tiered premium which will negatively impact those with family (F) coverage and there is a higher prescription drug (RX) deduction. (Fact Finder's note: The current composite rate negatively impacts those with less than F coverage.) If the Trust will charge a tiered rate for everyone, there is little the SD can do except withdraw from the Trust (which it does not intend to do). To withdraw will likely result in a higher premium since the risk pool will be smaller.

The equivalency language in the May 1, 2012 TA is unnecessary because of the “essentially equal” statement which appears in the “Cost Control” article. Since the parties are operating under the expired CBA, a July 1, 2013 effective date (by which time a new CBA will, hopefully, be ratified) is appropriate. Health insurance plans cannot be changed *ex post facto*.

### **Recommendation**

Adopt the SD's proposal.

### **Issue #6: Article VII, Section 7.08. Payment in Lieu of Hospitalization Coverage**

#### **Position of the Parties**

Both parties agree that the current amount should increase to \$2,500. The Association wants this amount to be retroactive to the effective date of the CBA. The SD wants the increase to take effect on January 1, 2013.

#### **Discussion**

In the absence of a successor Agreement, the SD has twice amended its proposal to pay the \$2,500 beginning on July 1, 2013. The Association objects to the SD's “no retroactivity” stance. This opt out provision provides a savings of \$11,000 for each of the approximately 37 employees who are currently opting out of the SD's medical plans. By making this payment retroactive to July 1, 2011, the SD's \$150,000 savings from its new HMO and PPO plans will be reduced to \$124,800.

#### **Recommendation**

Increase the payment in lieu of hospitalization coverage to \$2,500, effective July 1, 2011.

### **Issue #7: Article VII, Section 7.10. Cost Control Provision**

#### **Position of the Parties**

The SD proposes to add language to the CBA which would allow it to contract for essentially equal coverage through a different insurance carrier if the premium increases by more than 8% in any year. The Association proposes that any change of carrier or program benefits be subject to approval by the Association.

#### **Discussion**

In its presentation of issues for Fact Finding, the SD proposed if premiums increase by more than 8% in any year of the Agreement, it should be able to contract for “essentially equal” coverage with a new carrier. The SD's HEB (Tab 5, p. 3) states only that the “...District shall be free to select an alternate CS trust plan...” In the SD's rebuttal to the Association's counter proposal (HEB, Tab 14, p.2), except for the last sentence (The SD cannot make a plan change without the Association's approval.), the language is essentially the same as in the November 17, 2011 TA. This TA contains the “essentially equal” language. Since there is no such thing as identical health coverage, “essentially equal” is a stronger statement than “equivalent”.

A health insurance contract is between an employer and the carrier, with the employee being the third party beneficiary. Most employers may solicit the opinion of their employees on plan choice, but it is rare for an employer to allow the employees to ratify the plan. WRSD has already had a presentation for its employees on the new plans, has agreed to limit plan change to only once during the term of the CBA and to contract for essentially equal coverage. The contractual limits on the SD to select alternate plans in an effort to control costs offers protection to the employees in that the SD, for example, is barred from contracting for a plan with a \$10,000 deductible since this is not even remotely equivalent to the current plan.

#### **Recommendation**

Adopt the SD' proposal in its “Rebuttal” document, EXCEPT for the last sentence (Change of plan is subject to the Association's approval.), which should be deleted.

### **Issue #8: Article X, Section 10.01. Severance**

#### **Position of the Parties**

The SD proposes to remove the severance language entirely. The Association proposes to increase this payment by a fixed amount throughout the term of the CBA.

## **Discussion**

The \$3,000 currently payable to a retiring teacher is the same as found in the expired CBA and the November 17, 2011 TA. Since the teachers voted against that TA, the SD elected to change its position on this issue for budgetary reasons. The SD now proposes (“Rebuttal to Association Proposals”) to offer a severance payment extra-contractually on a case by case basis by giving the Association the opportunity to request severance payments for individual retirees at which time the SD would determine the terms of the incentive based on its financial needs at the time. This SD proposal is, at least arguably, a term and condition of employment, subject to bargaining. Between 2010 and 2013, 30 teachers retired, 18 of whom were eligible to receive the severance benefit for a total cost of \$54,000 (SD HEB, Tab 6, pp. 4 & 5).

The Association suggests that this payment is mutually beneficial to both the SD and the teachers. The SD reduces payroll costs by encouraging the higher paid senior employees to leave and the employee receives money which can be used to offset the cost of medical premiums until Medicare age. The Association also asserts that, with the years of service requirements to be eligible for the benefit, few teachers will qualify.

## **Recommendation**

Retain the current language BUT see the Recommendation for Section 10.02 for alternatives.

## **Issue #9: Article X, Section 10.02. Early Retirement**

### **Position of the Parties**

The SD proposes to eliminate the years of service payments for the early retirement incentive (ERI) currently in the CBA. The Association wants to maintain the status quo.

## **Discussion**

It is natural for a person to expect that things can only get better or, in the alternative, at least remain the same without the necessity of giving up something (s)he already has. The WRSD is proposing a retraction, deletion or freeze in certain benefits/monetary items. The Association wants to not only keep what it already has but also to increase certain benefits and wages. The days are long gone when automatic pay raises were the norm, one's house could only increase in value, employers paid 100% of the medical premium for the best plan available, etc. There is an ebb and flow to the economy and, at the current time (unless one is heavily invested in the stock market), school districts are struggling to balance budgets, retain non-mandatory programs such as art and music and avoid demoting certain employees (such as librarians) to part-time status. WRSD is no different.

The expired CBA provides the retiree with a payment of \$60 for each unused sick day and \$110 per year of service with the SD. The SD wants to eliminate the less costly \$110 per year of service at retirement. This payment, unlike severance pay, is payable to all retiring teachers. From 2010-13, that \$110 payment cost the SD \$93,115 (v. the \$54,000 for severance paid only to eligible retirees). The costliest retirement benefit is the payment for unused sick days. Most school districts have a cap on sick leave (SL) payout at retirement – WRSD does not. The SL payout for 2010-13 was \$325,200, with 11 teachers getting \$20,000+ from all 3 benefits in addition to receiving a guaranteed lifetime pension benefit.

## **Recommendation**

Either the \$3,000 severance payment or the \$110 per year of service should be deleted from the CBA beginning on July 1, 2013 or when the Agreement is executed, if later. The choice is up to the Association.

## **Issue #10: Article XII, Section 12.09. Contracted School Days**

### **Position of the Parties**

The SD wants to define the workday as 7.5 hours with a specific start and end time, and to allow for one professional meeting per month. The Association objects to this time added to the workday without benefit of prorated compensation and to the logistics involved in the monthly meeting.

## **Discussion**

Except for Selinsgrove and Lycoming, all school districts in IU #16 have a 7.5 hour workday (SD HEB, Tab 7, pp. 4 & 5), but only 25% have a defined start/stop time. Total teacher days range from 182 in Loyalsock to 190 in Muncy with the norm being 185-187, the

parameters within which WRSD falls. The Association calculates that the additional half hour adds 7% to the workday without additional compensation to cover that extra time. As of the 2010-11 school year, WRSD ranked 10<sup>th</sup> in career rate with the 7 lower ranked school districts in career rate having 7.5 hour days.

The SD states that its proposal is a response to safety concerns expressed by students and parents, since the buildings open for drop off at 7:30 A.M., but teachers are not required to arrive until 7:50-8:03, depending on location. According to the Association, the students are not roaming the halls unattended if they arrive before the teachers, but go to the auditorium where they are monitored. Although there is no start/stop time in the majority of the schools in the IU, it can be logically concluded that teachers are not free to wander in at their leisure. The WRSD has a definitive arrival time (HEB, tab 7, p.2) although such time is not stated in the CBA. The SD has not shown that this has been a problem.

When labor relations are harmonious, there are few teachers who will sit in their cars until the last second before they must enter their classrooms. This is as it should be if one is a professional employee and not someone who has to punch a time clock.

The Association is equally concerned about the proposed monthly in-service meetings. According to the SD, the current practice is to have 2 required meetings per month. The SD provided agendas for these meetings in its HEB. All of them deal with appropriate educational/professional issues. Depending on building policy and who conducts the meetings, some of them may last longer than the proposed 45 minutes. In its proposal, the SD is attempting to eliminate any long-winded presenters. The Association also complains that the proposed 5 day notice is insufficient for a teacher to adjust his/her calendar and that the SD is providing no means for a teacher to obtain or adhere to/apply information discussed at the meeting. I assume the SD has photocopiers and scanners, and can provide a container in a defined location for the teachers excused from attending the meeting to gain access to the information presented at the meeting.

### **Recommendation**

1. Adopt paragraph 1 of the SD's proposal.
2. Adopt a 7 hour, 15 minute day.
3. Adopt the SD's meeting language but give a 10 day notice and provide a defined location where the teachers can obtain the meeting information.

### **Issue #11: Article XII, Section 12.17. Summer Professional Development**

#### **Position of the Parties**

The SD wants to incorporate this current Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) into the Agreement. The Association proposes to delete the MOU entirely.

#### **Discussion**

The Summer Professional Development MOU, which became effective for the 2011-12 school year, was a joint venture of the SD and Association. This MOU allowed for the scheduling of 2 days during the summer for professional development. The programs were to be offered for "specific classifications or grade levels" and the opportunity to attend these voluntary sessions was at the sole discretion of the Administration and not subject to the grievance procedure. The SD was to give 20 days' notice of these meetings and would provide materials used in these sessions for those teachers electing not to attend. If a teacher did not attend (s)he would be able to "swap out" these summer days for a professional development program during the school year.

The Association stated that, in the first year, the program worked as expected. Teachers who participated in the summer sessions were allowed to swap them for the regularly scheduled November, 2011 and January, 2012 in-service days. According to the Association, several problems arose during the 2012-13 school year: (1) Some teachers were allowed 4 swap days while others had none (Fact Finder's note: The MOU clearly states that "not all professional employees shall be scheduled to attend each day or either day over the summer."); (2) The SD allowed some teachers to earn swap time during the school year while others were denied; (3) Swap time was not necessarily offered to replace the traditional in-service days – for example, the SD added June 10<sup>th</sup> to the calendar then offered it as a swap day; (4) The SD identified November 19, 2012 as a swap day. Although not listed on the school calendar, the SD decided to use that evening for parent-teacher conferences, mandating teachers who thought they had the day off, to appear for these conferences; (5) For 2013-14 the SD has scheduled swap days for days the teachers traditionally have off and (6) SmartBoard training was scheduled with less than 20 days' notice and some teachers who signed up were never notified and missed the class.

According to the SD, the original swap form allowed for up to 4 days with approval, June 10<sup>th</sup> is a legitimate swap day which was to be "activated" once school began and the majority of teachers who participated gave favorable reviews of the program.

This is a big issue for both parties, exacerbated by the fact that they have been without a contract for almost 2 years. It seems to be a valuable program and should not be scrapped. However, at this time, it needs some work in its execution and there are too many unresolved issues to have it incorporated into the CBA. According to the Association, the parties have attempted to resolve these

issues but to no avail. A program such as this must be consistently applied, a goal which has yet to be fully met.

## **Recommendation**

Do not incorporate the MOU into the Agreement at this time.

## **Issue #12: Appendix A. Salary Schedules**

### **Position of the Parties**

The SD proposes a complete wage freeze in 2011-12 and to add \$400 to each step in every year of the CBA thereafter. The Association proposes an annual step movement and the addition of the following amounts to the salary scale: \$1,000 in 2011-12; \$1,075 in 2012-13; \$1,175 in 2013-14 and \$1,175 in 2014-15.

### **Discussion**

It was the negotiators for the teachers who originally proposed a freeze for 2011-12 and both parties agreed to a 1% increase on scale in each of the next 2 years. When that TA fell through, just as the SD did on several proposals, the Association altered its demand. In comparing Warrior Run to other school districts in the IU, the Association found that it is in the middle for property and income resources backing each student and dependence on revenue from the state; it is near the bottom in tax effort. With the SD's offer, the WRSD teachers will fall even further behind in starting and career pay. Although the SD overestimated actual revenue from 2008-11, actual revenue did exceed budgeted revenue in 2012. From 2009-12, actual expenditures have been lower than budgeted. The SD maintains a fund balance in the 10% range and is in a good financial position.

The SD, in its rationale for its proposals, stated that it has been negatively impacted by state budget cuts, was unable to obtain any savings in health care for 2011-12 and other school districts are entering into wage freeze contracts. Overall, the WRSD's proposal will allow for average wage increases of 3-4.78%, well above the cost of living index. In addition, with the SD's health care proposal, the employee will pay a lower amount in premium share.

This Fact Finder was hearing cases when salary scales were as long as the teacher with the highest number of years of service. The effect of this was that a teacher's career rate was reached the year (s)he retired. This resulted in salary schedules with as many as 43 steps. Several years ago, teacher organizations campaigned to compact these scales. This resulted in increasing a teacher's lifetime earnings because (s)he attained the top rate in fewer years. (WRSD teachers currently have an 18 step salary scale.) Those teachers starting out earn not only the contractual "on scale" raise but also move up one step every year. This adds an incremental cost to the stated percentage increase, which is why the SD is able to state that its proposed average increases are from 3-4.78%/year even though \$400 added to each step is less than that amount for those at the top of the scale. Since those at the top have already reached their career rate, they receive only the "on scale" percentage raise which, with compaction was the intended result. If the on scale raise is 2-3% and a school district has a relatively young staff still moving on step, the average annual increase for the entire staff could reach 5-7%.

When presenting their salary scales for the Fact Finder's consideration, each party will not only cost out its own proposals, but will do the same for the other side. The customary way of doing this is to show how many employees are on each step (the matrix) and their collective earnings (the total payroll cost). When developing a matrix, the parties select a date certain then calculate future costs based on that date (the base year). The costs will not be accurate unless no one retires/resigns during the term of the

Agreement and there are no new hires. Since higher paid employees will likely leave and be replaced (if at all) by teachers at the lower steps on the scale, actual salary costs will be lower than stated in the parties' exhibits. I mention this only because the SD and Association are not using the same matrix. Should the School Board study the salary scales and their total cost as presented by the Association, they may be appalled to see that costs on the Association's salary schedules exceed those on the SD's scales by 6 figures. When I studied the SD's salary exhibits, I realized that the SD was using 2011-12 as the base year and the Association was using 2010-11. Sixteen teachers retired in 2010-11 resulting in a decrease in salary costs ("attritional" savings) for 2011-12. Therefore, the actual salary costs will more resemble the SD's lower numbers.

## **Recommendation**

1. Complete freeze in 2011-12;
2. \$600 plus step in 2012-13;
3. \$600 plus step in 2013-14;
4. \$600 plus step in 2014-15.

Salary scales are attached.

**Issue #13: Appendix B & C. Extra-Curricular and Interscholastic Salaries**

The SD proposes to freeze these salaries at the 2010-11 rates. The Association wants to increase the salaries anywhere from \$50 per week to a flat rate ranging from \$100 to \$150, depending on position.

**Recommendation**

1. Increase interscholastic salaries by \$25 in 2013-14 and \$25 in 2014-15;
2. Increase payment for chaperones by \$15-\$15;
3. Increase post season salaries for varsity coaches by \$40-\$40/week and extra-curricular salaries by \$60-\$60 over the prior year's salary;
4. Increase extra-curricular salaries by \$25-\$25.

SIGNED \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_  
Diana S. Mulligan, Fact Finder

SIGNED \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_  
Robert Nicoletti, for the Association

ACCEPT      REJECT

SIGNED \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_  
Benjamin L. Pratt, Esq., for the School District