

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
PENNSYLVANIA LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF THE FACT FINDING BETWEEN

Central York School District

and

Central York Education
Association

:
:
:
:
:
:

CASE # ACT 88-13-9-E

FACT FINDING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

APPOINTMENT: April 10, 2013

REPORT DATE: May 20, 2013

FACT FINDER: Timothy J Brown, Esquire

FOR THE DISTRICT: Michael W. King, Esquire
Stock and Leader, LLP
Susquehanna Commerce Center East
Suite 600
221 West Philadelphia Street
York, PA 17401

FOR THE Association: Wendy Leary, UniServ Rep.
PSEA/NEA
4750 Delbrook Road
Suite 100
Mechanicsburg, PA 17050

Introduction

On April 10, 2013, the Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board (PLRB), pursuant to Act 88 of 1992 (Act 88) and the Public Employer Relations Act (PERA), appointed the undersigned as Fact Finder in the impasse between the Central York School District (the District) and Central York Education Association (the Union).

Bargaining and Fact Finding History

The Union represents a unit of full-time professional employees employed by the District. The District and Union are party to a Collective Bargaining Agreement effective by its terms from July 1, 2010 until June 30, 2013. (Referred to herein as the Agreement) The parties met in one form or another for purposes of negotiating a successor agreement on a number of occasions, reached tentative agreements on only a few issues and were unable to reach agreement on the several remaining outstanding issues. The Union thereafter initiated the instant Fact Finding.

Following notice of his appointment the Fact Finder and parties communicated with one another on a number of occasions in efforts to narrow the issues and resolve hearing-related matters, including an April 29, 2013 prehearing telephonic conference held by the Fact Finder with representatives of the parties. On May 8, 2013 a formal fact finding hearing was held before the undersigned in York, Pennsylvania, at which time the parties were given the opportunity to present the Fact Finder testimony, documentary evidence and oral argument relating to their outstanding issues.

This Report contains "recommendations" for resolution of all outstanding issues and constitutes the settlement proposal upon which the parties are now required to act, as directed by statute and PLRB regulations. Pursuant to statutory authority, this Report will be released to the public if not accepted. A vote to accept the Report does not constitute agreement with, or endorsement of, the rationales contained herein, but rather, represent only an agreement to resolve the issues by adopting the recommendations contained herein.

The parties are directed to review the Report and within ten days of its issuance, notify the PLRB of their decision to accept or reject the recommendations.

Introduction and Issues

Based upon representations made by the parties to the Fact Finder, the following issues are unresolved between the parties:

1. Duration of Agreement
2. Fair Share
3. Curriculum Writing
4. Health Benefits
5. Employee Assistance Program
6. Supplemental Disability Insurance
7. Family Sick Leave
8. Personal Days
9. Association Leave
10. Religious Leave
11. Graduate Credit Reimbursement
12. Mileage Reimbursement
13. Retirement Payment
14. Work Year/Work Day (Non Instructional Days)
15. Work Year/Work Day (Elementary School Morning staff meetings)
16. Salary Notes
17. Salary

After full consideration of the arguments and careful study of the extensive submissions on the issues by the parties, the follow recommendations are offered:

1) Duration of Agreement

Both parties support a three-year agreement conditioned upon their agreement on financial-related issues.

Recommendation:

I recommend a three-year agreement.

2) Fair Share

The Association proposes new language to the Agreement providing:

Each member in the bargaining unit represented by the Association shall be required to pay a Fair Share Fee as provided in Act 84, 71 P.S. Sec. 578 of 1988. The employer and the Association agree to comply with all provisions of said law. The Association agrees to extend to all nonmembers the opportunity to join the Association. This Fair Share Fee shall be deducted by the employer in accordance with Article II (2.01).

The Association shall indemnify and save harmless the employer from any and all claims, suits, judgments or order arising out of this Fair Share Fee obligation.

According to the Association the duty of fair representations requires that it fairly represent all employee in the bargaining unit both during negotiations and contract enforcement; both costly endeavors that result in economic rewards and job security protection benefits for nonmembers. Non-members should be charged a cost for the benefits they receive, the Association argues.

According to the District, it takes a neutral position relating to the Union and believes that if bargaining unit members feel they receive benefit from the Association and feel the Association is doing a good job they can join that Association and pay dues.

Discussion and Recommendation

I have no doubt that in classes of the District, even at the kindergarten level, the principles of democracy are taught and exercised; that students of the District decide any number of matters that are important to them by voting. Similarly, we chose our government leaders at the Federal, State and local levels by democratic elections. In the private sector democratic principals govern America's corporations by votes of shareholders and board members. The District itself is run by individuals democratically elected and conducts its decision-making responsibilities through the democratic doctrine of majority rule. Democracy in the workplace has also long been declared the policy of the United States,¹ and the democratic process governs the myriad social and civil organizations that form the fabric of our nation.

I am also confident that in each and every forum where our culture applies principles of democracy there are individuals who are not happy with the decisions made by the process. However, the "fairness" of elections to the individual is incorporated in the underlying fairness of the democratic process itself and not necessarily by the personal satisfaction of individuals with the outcome of any one election. Thus in each forum, those whose views do not carry the day, those who do not "win" - even if they do not like it - live with the outcome of the election. Many do so notwithstanding that they honestly believe the outcome may not be fair to themselves as individuals. Consequently, in America, even if you did not vote for elected national or state politicians and disagree with their policies and decisions, you nevertheless pay your taxes. As a stockholder in corporations, it is understood that you may not declare yourself immune from financial loss the corporation may suffer because corporate directors for whom you did not vote made decisions that led to the loss. In public school districts, although a majority of property owners typically do not have children in public schools, many residents send their children to private schools and many property owners may not agree with how school board members govern, all owners are expected to pay their fair share of taxes. It is understood in a democracy that all of us must live by, and pay the price of, majority rule.

So, considering these fundamental principles of our democratic way of life, when I hear an employer - such as the District here - make an argument that it is merely being "neutral" and wants to be benevolent and permit individual employees to decide on their own whether they feel the Association is doing a good job or not before they decided if they should pay for their Union representation, I find the argument anathema to our principles of majority rule; to the fundamental concept of democracy that plays such an important role in all of our lives. Nor do I see the logic of such an argument. It lack sincerity coming from a governmental entity that relies on all property owners to pay their fair share whether they believe the District "do a good job or not." In such circumstances I find myself concluding the obvious; that the District is not concerned about "fairness" to employees and is not being neutral.

The District's employees are represented by the Union as a result of the legal - majority rule - process of our democratic society. It is in the interest of the District, a governmental body that gains its legitimacy from the very same democratic principles that forms the foundation of the Association's proposal, to accept such a proposal.

So on this one, I'll go with the kindergarteners and the grade school students and the middle school students and the high school students and the voters of America and the corporate stock holders of

¹ In the preamble to the National Labor Relations Act, Congress wrote:

It is declared to be the policy of the United States to eliminate the causes of certain substantial obstructions to the free flow of commerce and to mitigate and eliminate these obstructions when they have occurred by encouraging the practice and procedure of collective bargaining and by protecting the exercise by workers of full freedom of association, self- organization, and designation of representatives of their own choosing, for the purpose of negotiating the terms and conditions of their employment or other mutual aid or protection.

America - and pretty much all other Americans who make decisions by vote in uncountable clubs, churches and civic and social organizations - and recommend that the benefits of democracy be recognized and extended to professional employees of the District.

I recommend that the Association's language be added to the Agreement.

3) Curriculum Writing

Article VII(D) of the Agreement currently provides:

Employees who write curriculum at the request and direction of the Employer shall be compensated at the rate of \$30.00 per hour.

The Association proposes that the following language be added to the existing language of Article VII(D):

...All curriculum writing shall occur outside of the school day and will include, but not be limited to, indicators, unit plans, and subject area scope and sequence.

The Association asserts that in the past curriculum writing has taken place outside of the workday; usually in the summer, and that the District has traditionally paid for 30 hours of such work at the rate of \$30.00 per hour for each course. According to the Association the District has recently limited such off-work writing time to 12 hours per course and has required teachers to perform any additionally such writing during regular school days. The Association seeks language to clarify that curriculum writing shall not occur during the regular school day.

The District proposes language providing that;

Employees who write curriculum on non-contracted workdays at the request and direction of the Employer shall be compensated at the rate of \$30.00 per hour.

According to the District, such language does not limit the scope of curriculum writing.

Discussion and Recommendation

I am not persuaded by either party that the language on curriculum writing needs to be changed, and recommend that the language remain as is.

4) Health Benefits

The current Agreement provides that the District will offer employees a choice of health plans, either a traditional indemnity plan or a PPO, and that employees pay a 9% contribution to their health insurance. The employees may choose between (a) single, (b) employee plus one and (c) employee with more than one dependent. Spouses are covered as dependents.

The District proposes to; (1) eliminate the indemnity plan and offer only a PPO plan, (2) require that the employee contribution be increased to 10% effective July 1, 2013, (3) make changes to the plan design, (4) make changes to the prescription benefit and (5) require that employee pay a greater share of coverage for a spouse.

More specifically, under the Employer's proposal the plan design would change effective July 1, 2015 by adding deductibles, increasing existing copays and adding other copays for medical care. In regard to a prescription plan, the District proposes offering only the PPO plan and to also increase prescription deductible and copayment amounts effective July 1, 2015.

In regard to its sought after changes in spousal coverage, the District proposes that effective July 1, 2014: (a) the Employee Contribution shall be fifty percent (50.0%) with respect to spouse coverage for any spouse who is employed and eligible for coverage through his/her employer, irrespective of scope and cost of such coverage; (b) the Employee Contribution shall be twenty-five percent (25.0%) with respect to

spouse coverage for any spouse who is not employed or who is employed but ineligible for coverage through his/her employer; and (c) the cost of spousal coverage shall be the difference between single and two party coverage each year.

The District asserts that in assessing the fairness of the District's offer relating to salary and benefits it is only reasonable to consider the total compensation offered by the District to employees, and when considering total compensation it is only fair to compare such compensation to other professional employees of other employers in the area; particularly other public employers. The fact is, the District argues, when considering total compensation, the District's employees are among the most highly compensated comparable salaried professionals in York County. Similarly, it is relevant to consider other costs of employment facing the District, costs that are significant parts of employee total compensation such as impending increases in pension (PSERS) contributions and significant anticipated increases in the costs of healthcare.

The various individual elements of the total compensation offered employees by the District should not be considered in isolation. It is a financial reality that if the cost of one element of compensation goes up disproportionately there must necessarily be less to offer in other elements. In an effort to control costs, and consistent with a growing number of other employers, including other school districts in neighboring Lancaster County, the District seeks to reduce the cost of spousal and dependent care coverage. Considering the substantial increases expected in PSERS contributions in coming years, the District argues, there is little reason for the District to ask its taxpayers to continue to effectively subsidize the employers of the spouses of district employees. Similarly, the practice of offering District employees exceptionally rich healthcare plans at virtually no cost to the employee is an antiquated practice that needs to undergo a "resetting" to conform with the expectations and realities of the rest of the world. With such in mind, the District's proposed plan changes are reasonable, would save the District significant costs and would nevertheless provide District employees with substantially better than the "adequate coverage" contemplated by the Affordable Care Act.

The Association proposes eliminating the indemnity plan conditioned upon changes in the PPO prescription plan to provide for a 90 day supply of a generic drug for \$0 and a ninety day supply of a brand name drug for \$10.00. The Association opposes any change in employee contribution, the elimination of full spousal health care coverage and any modification to the health insurance plan.

According to the Association, the reason members have selected the indemnity plan in the past has been because of the prescription benefit under that plan. Because the District will realize significant benefit by eliminating the indemnity plan, the Association maintains that in exchange for such savings the District should be willing to change the PPO prescription plan to the levels of the indemnity prescription plan. The unit already pays a 9% premium co-pay that is at the top end of what is paid by employees in other school districts in the county; no other district in the county has spousal exclusions; only 4 of 16 York County school districts have healthcare deductibles of any type; and the Emergency Room and doctor copays sought by the District are significantly higher than averages of such paid by employees of other districts in the county.

In the Union's view, the District is unfairly attempting to reduce the medical coverage for employees and to shift even more of the cost of such reduced coverage to the employees.

Discussion and Recommendation

If the District's cost of providing a benefit goes up and the District continues to provide the benefit, and the benefit is that same, employees should be mindful that such amounts to a very real increase in their compensation. However, during the last decade-plus, it has been difficult throughout both the public and private sectors to determine from year to year whether health insurance plans are in fact the same. Plan designs, pricing and even their names, have undergone constant modifications and changes rendering an "apples-to-apples" comparison extremely challenging. Be that as it may, all who consider the question honestly agree that health care cost have continued to rise significantly.

In the instant matter I am persuaded that if the District does not change its insurance plan the cost of healthcare to the District will increase between 4% and 14% annually, or between \$280,000 and \$980,000. Such potential increases warrant a very real effort by both parties - a joint effort to address a shared

challenge – to reduce health care costs. If one stands back and looks at the health insurance benefit enjoyed by unit employees (and other employees of the District) it is objectively a very good benefit, even with the plan changes proposed by the District. I also see the logic in the District not wanting to subsidize other employer's by paying for the healthcare of the employees of those employers and proposing that the contribution for spouses who have other insurance available to them should reflect such. However, I am not at all persuaded that it is realistic or fair - where there is no arguable subsidizing of other employers - to expect employees whose dependent spouses either do not work or do not have insurance available through their employers to absorb a steep increase in their contribution rates. Finally, I note that although the District has proposed a "stick" approach of charging increased rates for spouses, the District has not proposed a "carrot" approach of offering incentives to employees who can establish that their spouses are covered by another insurance plan and elect not to cover them under the District's plan.

In view of such considerations, I recommend the following:

- 1) Elimination of the indemnity plan for the first year of the Agreement per the District's proposal.
- 2) For the term of the Agreement the premium share shall remain at the current 9%.
- 3) During the second year of the Agreement if an employee's spouse is covered by another employer sponsored health care plan, in addition to the 9% premium share, the employee must pay a surcharge equal to 25% of the difference in premium between employee-and-one-dependent and employee-only coverage.
- 4) During the third year of the Agreement implementation of the District's proposed benefit level changes to the PPO.

5) Employee Assistance Program

The parties agreed to have the specific premium cost of \$12.00 per employee per year stricken from Article VIII, E of the Agreement.

6) Supplemental Disability Insurance

There is no current language in the Agreement relating to supplemental disability insurance.

The Association proposes language providing that;

Employees may enroll in a mutually agreed upon supplemental disability insurance program. The program is voluntary and the payments will be made by payroll deduction.

The District takes the position that employees already have significant sick leave benefits and that there is no need to add such language to the Agreement.

Recommendation

Having carefully considered the positions of the parties on this issue, I recommend no change to the language of the Agreement.

7) Family Sick Leave

The Agreement currently provides that employees may use up to four of their sick leave days for family illnesses. The Association seeks to increase the number of potential family illness days to ten (10). The Association notes that eight of the 16 other districts in the county provide employees ten such days.

The District is opposed to increasing the number of family sick days but would agree to permit use of the four currently available days in ½ day increments.

Recommendation

I recommend that the maximum family sick leave days be increased to five and that they may be used in ½ day increments.

8) Personal Days

The Agreement currently provides employees with two personal leave days each year and that personal days may accumulate up to a maximum of four.

The Association seeks to increase the number of personal days to 3 per year and the number of such days that may be accumulated to six. To support its positions the Association asserts that nine of the other 16 districts in York County provide for 3 personal days a year.

The District opposes any change in personal days.

Recommendation

I recommend no change to the language of the Agreement.

9) Association Leave

The current Agreement provides an aggregate of 15 days leave for purposes of Association business, with no single employee being absent for more than 3 days on such leave. The limit is increased to 5 days for the Association's president and vice president. The Agreement also provides employees on Association Leave shall not suffer any loss of pay and that the Association will reimburse the District for the prevailing cost of providing substitute employees for those days.

The Association proposes to increase the number of Association days allowed from 15 to 30 and to increase the number of days any one person (non president or vice president) can take to 4. The Association maintains that its business is becoming more time consuming and that meetings in Pittsburgh and Philadelphia require certain of its officers to use more than 3 days for Association business.

The District would agree to increase the total number of Association Leave days from 15 to 25 per year, but is opposed to increasing the per person amount of such leave.

Recommendation

I recommend Association leave be increased to 25 days per year and that the amount an individual other than president and vice president may take be increased to 4.

10) Religious Leave

There is no specific provision of the current Agreement relating to Religious leave.

The Association proposes new language to accommodate the religious beliefs and needs of all employees in the bargaining unit providing that:

Employees will be granted three (3) days of religious leave without loss of pay to observe verifiable religious days of observation. The employee and the administration will come up with a suitable plan for the make-up time.

The District opposes the Association's proposed language but has expressed a willingness to consider a written Association proposal on religious leave that addresses such issues as prior notification and how such employees taking leave will honor the number of contracted workdays.

Recommendation

Both parties appear to acknowledge a need to recognize and address religious practices of employees. I recommend that the parties meet further for purposes of exploring mutually agreeable language on the issue.

11) Graduate Credit Reimbursement

The Agreement currently provides that the Employer will reimburse employees 95% of the amount of tuition and fees actually paid by such employee up to the Penn State University rate per qualifying credit, but no more than 12 such credits per year for credits obtained up to the Masters plus 30 classification, no more than 9 such credits per year for credits obtained between Masters plus 30 and Masters plus 45 classification, and no more than 6 such credits per year for credits obtained between Masters plus 45 and Masters plus 60 classification.

The District proposes reducing the Credit Reimbursements provided in the Agreement, and providing only that:

- 1- The Penn State University rate will be replaced with the Millersville University rate.
- 2- Provide a maximum of 9 credits per year for courses up to and including the Master's degree classification.
- 3- Provide that no more than 6 credits per year will be reimbursed for courses beyond the Master's degree level.

The District argues that there is incentive enough built into the salary scale to reward employees for advancing their education, and considering the economic challenges facing the District, graduate credit reimbursement is a prime area for "resetting" the overall compensation package.

The Association opposes any reduction in graduate credit reimbursements and maintains that; (1) this section of the Agreement was dramatically altered in the last negotiations at the request of the District in order to produce cost savings; (2) the current provisions of the Agreement are in line with other area school districts; and (3) considering that school districts are in the business of promoting education, limiting the ability of employees to advance their education goes against the very principles for which schools stand for.

Discussion and Recommendation

The world is changing at an exponential rate and to avoid falling behind in its mission and educational obligation the school district should be enthusiastically encouraging teachers to not only keep current, but to advance in their areas of expertise. Although I recognize the District's desire to cut costs wherever it can, I also recognize the reality that teachers may not have the cash flow or credit resources to pursue advancing their education, and that drastically cutting graduate credit reimbursement in the manner proposed by the District would likely make graduate courses "out-of-reach" for many teachers. Consequently, I recommend that any change to the current benefit be limited to the first of the District's proposed changes; that the Penn State University rate provided in the program be replaced with the Millersville University rate.

12) Mileage Reimbursement

The Agreement currently provides for reimbursement of expenses resulting from required travel by private automobile at the IRS rate by check issued three times a year.

The District proposes that the language be changed to provide for mileage reimbursement on a monthly basis and that yearly co-curricular employee mileage reimbursement shall not exceed \$250.00.

The Association agrees with the change to monthly reimbursement but believes if the District reaches its maximum per year reimbursement it should not require employees to travel in their private automobiles for District related purposes.

Recommendation

I recommend that mileage reimbursement language be changed to reflect payments on a monthly basis and that in the event the District determines it does not have the funds to reimburse employees for their

mileage expenses directly related to performing District related functions, that the District provide such employees other means of transportation.

13) Retirement Payment

The Agreement currently provides that if retirement eligible employees submit letters of resignation at least 90 days before their last day of service prior to retirement, they shall receive a retirement benefit computed based upon the number of days of unused sick leave, not to exceed 140 days at a rate of \$45 per day.

The Association proposes to increase the notice period under the provision from 90 to 120 days and to add language to the provision providing that: "if an employee has more than 140 unused sick days at the time of retirement, up to ten (10) days of this excess will be placed in the Sick Leave Bank." The Association argues that adding the Sick Bank language will encourage employees to save sick days in order to help their colleagues who are suffering a medical emergency.

The District agrees with the notice increase to 120 days but opposes the Sick Leave Bank language, arguing that employees already have generous sick leave benefits.

Recommendation

I recommend the notice increase to 120 days but recommend no change to the language relating to Sick Leave Bank.

14) Work Year/Work Days

The Agreement provides for three non-instructional working days; employees are compensated for two evenings and all employees must participate in a parent teacher conference day.

The Association proposes that language be added to the Agreement providing that nurses shall be able to work an additional day prior to the start of school in exchange for exclusion from being required to work on the parent-teacher conference day before the Thanksgiving break; that half day clerical days be provided for all employees at the end of each marking period; and that the work year be reduced by two days without any reduction in salary. In the Association's view the clerical time is needed as teachers have been given more responsibilities relating to progress assessments and report cards.

The District agrees with the Association proposal relating to nurses, proposes to increase the evening commitments to three per year, opposes the addition of clerical half-days and agrees that the school year may be reduced by two days for the final two years of the Agreement but only with a pro rata reduction in salary.

Recommendations

I recommend: (1) the Association's proposed language relating to nurses, (2) that evening commitments be increase to three in exchange for reducing the school year by two days for the second and third year of the agreement with no change in salary, and (3) no added clerical days.

15) Work Day (Elementary)

Currently elementary school employees have grade or subject level meetings 3 of every 6 cycles in the morning. The Association proposes to reduce such meetings to 2 per cycle to permit employees needed additional planning and preparation time.

The District opposes the change.

Recommendation

The parties have not adequately explored the underlying issues presented by this proposal and I recommend that they engage in further discussion on the issue.

16) Salary Notes

The Agreement currently provides that employees who are rated unsatisfactory are frozen at the amount at the time of the rating and that when they are again rated satisfactory they are returned to the step they were on at the time of the freeze.

The Association proposes language that it asserts is consistent with controlling law clarifying that when an employee is rated satisfactory the employee will be placed on the step the employee would have been on had the unsatisfactory rating not been received.

The District disagrees with the Association's interpretation of the law and opposes any change in existing language.

Recommendation

I do not pass upon the parties' legal arguments and recommend no change in the language of the Agreement.

17) Salary

Consistent with its arguments expressed above in the health care section, concerning the value of the overall compensation package of employees and the new economic realities faced by the District compelling the parties to "reset" normal, the District proposes a salary freeze for the first year of the Agreement and that salaries be increase at a rate of 75% of the Act 1 index for the second and third years of the Agreement. In regard to the Act 1 formula, the District explained that in the second and third years of the Agreement (2014-15 and 2015-16 school years) the PA IFO projects that the Act 1 index will be 2.2% and 2.3% respectively. Consequently, if such were the actual Act 1 figures, under the Employer's proposed formula, salaries would be increased for the second year of the Agreement by 1.65% (.75 x 2.2) and 1.725% for the third year of the Agreement (.75 x 2.3).

Considering the District's strong financials, the Association asserts, the District's position on wages should not be characterized as one focusing upon whether or not the District is "able" to pay, but rather, is accurately characterized as what the District "wants" to pay. Instead of such an arbitrary standard, the Association maintains, the standard that should be applied to salary is one of fairness under the circumstances, and comparing its wage levels with those of other area school districts, the District's proposal is not compatible. The District's proposal does not reflect a desire on the District's part to compensate District employees fairly.

The Association proposes yearly increases of 2.99% for each of the three years of the Agreement.

According to the Association, no area school districts have agreed to a wage freeze and considering the District's financial condition, the District can afford to grant the very reasonable wage increases proposed by the Union.

Recommendations

Based upon the exhaustive data presented by both parties on financial issues, and recognizing that the District has been an effective and prudent steward of the District's resources, I believe it is a sensible and good investment for the District to recognize the valuable contribution of it employees to the mission of the District by granting realistic wage increases. Such increases should reflect the value of the overall compensation package offered employees as well as the their increased share of the costs of medical insurance/care and graduate study contained in my other recommendations in this report. With such in mind, I recommend the following salary increase (as reflected in Appendix A hereto):

- Year 1 – Step increases only.
- Year 2 – Step increases and 1% increase on scale.
- Year 3 – Step increases and 2% increase on scale.

As this is one of the more balanced salary schedules I have seen among school districts, I do not recommend any compression of steps.

Other Matters

Besides matters already subject to agreement by the parties, I recommend that as to all other proposed changes to the Agreement not the subject of recommendations for change herein the applicable contract language remain as is.

***Please note
that the cover letter to this Report and Recommendation summarizes the
responsibilities of the parties to notify the PLRB of their acceptance or rejections of this
Recommendation and should be given careful attention.***



Dated: May 20, 2013

Timothy J Brown, Esquire
P.O. Box 332
Narberth, PA 19072

**ACT 88-13-19-E FACT FINDING REPORT APPENDIX A
SALARY SCHEDULES**

2013-2014

STEP	B	M/ME	M+15	M+30	M+45	PHD/M+60
1	41957	43766	46659	49553	52447	55340
2	43042	45791	48685	51593	54486	57380
3	44127	47817	50710	54660	56526	59420
4	45213	49915	52808	55680	58574	61467
5	46298	51940	54834	57720	60614	63507
6	47383	53966	56859	59760	62654	65547
7	48468	55991	58885	61800	64694	67587
8	49553	58089	60983	63840	66734	69627
9		60115	63008	65880	68774	71667
10		62140	65034	67920	70814	73707
11		64166	67059	69960	72854	75747
12		66191	69085	72007	74901	77794
13		68289	71183	74047	77042	79834
14		70314	73208	76087	78981	81874
15		72340	75234	78127	81021	83914

2014-2015 1%

STEP	B	M/ME	M+15	M+30	M+45	PHD/M+60
1	42377	44204	47126	50049	52971	55893
2	43472	46249	49172	52109	55031	57953
3	44568	48295	51217	55207	57091	60014
4	45665	50414	53336	56237	59160	62082
5	46761	52459	55382	58297	61220	64142
6	47857	54506	57428	60358	63281	66202
7	48953	56551	59474	62418	65341	68263
8	50049	58670	61593	64478	67401	70323
9		60716	63638	66539	69462	72384
10		62761	65684	68599	71522	74444
11		64808	67730	70660	73583	76504
12		66853	69776	72727	75650	78572
13		68972	71895	74787	77812	80632
14		71017	73940	76848	79770	82683
15		73063	75986	78908	81831	84753

2015-2016 2%

STEP	B	M/ME	M+15	M+30	M+45	PHD/M+60
1	43225	45088	48069	51050	54030	57011
2	44341	47174	50155	53151	56132	59112
3	45459	49261	52241	56311	58233	61214
4	46579	51422	54403	57362	60343	63324
5	47696	53508	56490	59463	62444	65425
6	48814	55596	58577	61565	64547	67526
7	49932	57682	60663	63666	66648	69628
8	51050	59843	62825	65768	68750	71729
9		61930	64911	67870	70851	73832
10		64016	66998	69971	72952	75933
11		66104	69084	72073	75054	78034
12		68190	71172	74182	77163	80143
13		70351	73333	76283	79368	82245
14		72437	75419	78385	81365	84337
15		74524	77506	80486	83468	86448