COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
PENNSYLVANIA LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

In the Matter of the Impasse Between	:	
Greencastle-Antrim Education Association	:	Case No. Act 88-17-34-E
and	:	
Greencastle-Antrim School District	:	

Report and Recommendation

Appearances

For the Association:	For the District:
Marcia A. Bender Pennsylvania State Education Association	Michael W. King, Esquire Stock & Leader

Background

On October 17, 2017, the Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board (PLRB) appointed the undersigned as the fact-finder pursuant to Act 88 of 1992 (Act 88) and the Public Employee Relations Act (PERA) in the impasse between the Greencastle-Antrim Education Association (Association) and the Greencastle-Antrim School District (District) for the District's professional employees.

The parties' last collective bargaining agreement ran from September 1, 2014 to August 31, 2017. The parties began negotiations for a successor agreement on January 9, 2017. Both parties exchanged proposals on two separate dates. On March 1, 2071, the Association presented the District with a written proposal that contained twelve issues. On April 3, 2017, the District presented the Association with a written proposal that contained six issues. The parties continue to work under the terms of the expired agreement.

There have been approximately 11 bargaining sessions, with the state mediator being present at some of them. They have reached tentative agreement on four issues. Any agreements mutually made prior to the commencement of fact-finding that are not specifically addressed in this Report are recommended to be included, as agreed upon, in the new Agreement.

On October 2, 2017, the Association filed a request for fact-finding. The PLRB granted the request and ordered fact-finding. The fact-finding hearing was on November 13, at the District's high school library. At that time, the parties were afforded a full opportunity to present testimony, cross

examine witnesses and introduce documentary evidence in support of their positions. The parties presented extensive documentary evidence and reports as well as testimony.

The District is one of five school districts in Franklin County. The District is part of the Lincoln Intermediate Unit #12, which encompasses 25 districts in Franklin, Adams and York Counties. The District's professional employees have the highest salaries of all the school districts in Franklin County, whether measured by starting salary, average salary or career salary. There are 180.5 bargaining unit members.

The District raises slightly over one-half of its revenue from the real estate property tax. The Association acknowledges that the District's millage rate is highest of the five districts in the county, 15.4 mills on market value tax effort. Between 2009-10 and 2013-14, the District has increased its real estate millage from 14.0 to 15.5 mills measured by equalized mills on market value.

From the evidence presented at the fact-finding hearing, it is clear that the District's Board of School Directors are responsible stewards of tax revenue and other revenue sources. The last available Audited Financial Statement, June 30, 2016, shows that the District is prudently operated. Despite the District increasing its General Obligation Debt from $18,936,037 in 2015 to $26,505,296 in 2016, the District maintains an A1 rating from Moody's Investors Services.

The Financial Statement went on to state, "[The] District has a strong fund balance (12.2% of expenditures) in its general fund at June 30, 2016 on the modified accrual basis of accounting. Based on the 2015-2016 budget of the School District's General Fund operations, 52.9% of the revenue is received from real estate taxes on residential, commercial, and industrial properties. Another 6.7% is received from earned income and real estate transfer taxes, while State subsidies and reimbursements account for 34.1% and Federal revenues provide 2.1%. The remaining 4.2% is from interest earnings, student/community activities, grants, delinquent taxes, intermediate unit pass-thru funds and miscellaneous revenues."

Issues

The parties have identified nine outstanding issues. I have identified the corresponding section of the collective bargaining agreement.

1. Wages and Salaries, Section 2.1

The CBA currently has a 14 step salary schedule that provides column movement across six (6) columns: Bachelor; Master; 45 including Master; 60 including Master; 75 including Master and 90 including Master. The salary schedule has historically deemed the highest cell in the Master column as the "Career Rate" and this rate was deemed 100%. Raises for cells below and above the career rate

were applied via an index. The index goes from a low of 64.5% at the first step of the Bachelor's to a high of 108% at the 14th step of 90 Including Master.

The Association proposes salary increases as follows:

2017-18 - salary increase of $900 on the Career Rate (Masters' 14th Step) shall be applied to the salary schedule matrix Index identified in Appendix A of the CBA.

2018-19 – salary increase of $1,000 on the Career Rate shall be applied to the salary schedule matrix Index identified in Appendix A of the CBA.

2019-20 – salary increase of $1,275 on the Career Rate shall be applied to the salary schedule matrix Index identified in Appendix A of the CBA.

2020-21 – salary increase of $1,397 on the Career Rate shall be applied to the salary schedule matrix Index identified in Appendix A of the CBA.

These salary increases, including step and column movement, would result in increases of 2.87% or $365,109 in 2017-2018; 2.79% or $364,603 in 2018-2019; 2.96% or $397,689 in 2019-2020 and 2.96% or 409,780 in 2020-2021.

The District proposes to freeze salaries and steps for 2017-18 and 2018-2019, with a newer and lower starting salary at "Step Zero" in 2018-19. Column movement would continue. In year 2019-20, the District proposed a continuation of the 2018-19 schedule, but with step and column movement. This would result in an overall increase in payroll of 1.75%. For 2020-21, the District would reinstitute the application of a "Career Rate" by applying $500 to highest Master cell on the salary schedule with raises, of a lower amount, to each cell below that. This, along with step and column movement, would result in an overall salary increase of 2.21%, plus the cost of step and column movement.

The District argues that its proposal is guided by the fiscal responsibility that has been delegated to it by the Pennsylvania School Code of 1949, as amended. The discharge of this duty requires the District to balance the interests in providing fair and reasonable compensation to employees with the fiduciary duty to citizens to spend their tax dollars wisely and consistent with economic conditions in the local market.

The District's rationale for its salary proposal is driven by two objectives: maintaining expenses that are fair to the District's taxpayers and narrowing the gap between the high pay of the District's professional employees, the highest in Franklin County, and other districts in the County.

The District points out that it has increased taxes in four of the last five years. The millage rate has gone from 14.0 mills in 2009-10 to 15.4 mills in 2013-14. In those five years, the market value of taxable property increased at an average annual rate of 1.9%, but the District's millage rate in market value tax effort in 2013-14 nevertheless placed the District first of the five Franklin County school districts.

The District demonstrated that its teachers have had the highest starting salaries in Franklin County for years. They have also had the highest salaries at the top of the career rate and in the course of their careers. The District points out that the high career earnings also drive up pension benefits which are also far higher than other Franklin County districts and which then will become partially the District's obligation.

In response, the Association argues that its members' high pay compared to other Districts should not be held against them by freezing their wages. There has to be one district with the highest paid employees. The Association also argues that an attractive wage structure benefits the District with a larger pool of applicants for future job openings.

Furthermore, if the District's pay freeze proposal was adopted, the employees' pay would not keep up with the increases in the cost of living. One of the facts of this bargaining unit is that almost one-half of the professional employees are at the top of their respective columns. In the 2017-18 school year, 81 of the 180.5 members are at the top of the scale. That number will increase to 105 in the 2020-21 school year. These employees no longer benefit from step movement, so they rely on general pay increases to the salary schedule to keep up with increases in the cost of living. It also means that general pay increases to the salary schedule will not be magnified by the step movement.

Rather than recommend the District's proposal, I am recommending salary increases in each of the four years of the CBA, but at a level lower than the Association's proposal. The recommendation for increasing salaries that is set forth below is justified by several factors. The salary increases as a percentage of the budget are a small percentage of the District's expenditures and are affordable to the District. The increases in wages in the salary schedules, according to the calculations provided by the Association, will be: 2017-18 $348,693 or 2.75% increase; 2018-19 $347,689 or 2.66% increase; 2019-20 $350,785 or 2.62% and 2020-21 $358,001 or 2.6% increase.

A look at the history of the District's budgeting reveals a prudently run fiscal organization. The District consistently brings in more actual revenue (local, state and federal) than it has budgeted for. For the five years between 2012 and 2016, actual revenues exceeded budgeted revenues by an average annual amount of $857,910. In 2016, the amount was $1,452,652. Additionally, the District's tax is modestly growing. The 2016 Audited Financial Statement noted, "Assessed property valuation average has been increasing at approximately 1.50% per year."

As for recent years' expenditures, the District has been careful and its budgets have stayed in roughly the same range. The District's budgeted expenditures totaled $37,649,226 for 2015-16. The actual expenditures were $40,899,001. For 2016-2017, the District budgeted $39,485,175 in expenditures, a decrease of $1,413,826. The District's 2017-2018 budget projects expenditures of $39,761,553, an increase of $276,378 or 0.6% from the 2016-2017 budgeted amount and an increase of $1,137,448 or 2.7% from the actual amount spent in 2015-2016.

The control of expenses could be related to the fact that the priority of bargaining unit salary accounts has declined over the past six years from 45.7 percent of total instruction expenses in 2012-2013 to 40.4 percent in 2017-18.

The District's prudent budgeting practices has led to a pattern of maintaining healthy fund balances for the last five years. This is the same, whether measured by "budgeted ending balance", "estimated ending balance" or "appropriable balance." The District's actual fund balance (appropriable fund balance) on June 30, 2016 was $4,652,742. From these fund balances, the District can pay the increases that I am recommending. Recommendation

The parties should adopt the salary schedules that are attached as Exhibit A to this Report.

The salary Increases that I am recommending will allow newer teachers to continue their career progression on increasing steps and allow long time employees to keep up with increases in the cost of living. About one-half of the employees are at the top of their pay columns and no longer receive step increases. Therefore, a general pay increase is the only raise they will get. The recommended salary increases in this Report recognize the percentage increases in the US Department of Labor's Consumer Price Index for Northeastern US Urban Consumers. In 2016, this index increased at an annual rate of 1.1%. In the first half of 2017, this index increased by 2.1%.

The proposed salary schedules apply the increases in the Career Rate cell to the rest of cells in the salary schedule using the same index that is in place in the current CBA.

2. Medical Benefits, Section 2.5

The Association has proposed no changes.

The District has proposed several changes for the same reason as it proposed changes to salaries and wages: to address concerns about the sustainability of the benefit plans; to fulfill its duty to responsibly manage tax revenue and to make these benefits comparable to those of the private citizens whose taxes fund the benefits.

First, it proposes increasing the spousal surcharge from $100 a month to $150 per month on January 1, 2018, then to $200 in 2019, to $300 in 2020 and to $400 on January 1, 2021. The District contends that there is no rationale to continue to subsidize the cost of health benefits for the working spouses of its employees who are eligible for health coverage from their own employers. Under the Affordable Care Act (ACA), the provision of health benefits is the mutual responsibility of each employee and his or her employer. Under the ACA, employers are not even required to offer coverage to spouses, much less pay any portion of the premium. The current system imposes very significant and unnecessary costs on taxpayers and unfairly provides a substantial subsidy, primarily to the (mostly private sector) employers of the spouses of Association employees, much more so than to the employee's household.

The current surcharge of $100 per month is too low to have any significant impact on employee behavior. The spousal surcharge needs to be significantly increased in order to encourage working spouses to seek coverage from their own employers.

Second, the District proposes changing the plan design to avoid exposure to the Cadillac Tax liability under the Affordable Care Act. The current PPO/HRA plan under the collective bargaining agreement is projected to trigger the Cadillac Tax liability by around 2022-23 and to cost an additional

$1.66 Million over 2016-17 costs. The District argues that it would be unfair to taxpayers to place the burden of the Cadillac Tax liability on them for the cost of the excessive benefits. Therefore, the District has proposed language which would guarantee that the District, as the employer, would never have to pay such a tax on the excess benefits. It proposes adding to the agreement language that is in the new West Shore School District agreement. The District is making this proposal now in the event that an impasse goes into 2022-23 during the negotiations for a successor to the agreement now being negotiated

Third, it proposes instituting a Qualified High Deductible Health Plan (QHDHP) linked with a Health Saving Account (HSA) option available to employees with significant funding by the employer to better manage health care costs.

This is what the high deductibles would be: 2017-18 increase the deductible to $1,600 single/$3,200 family for in/out network; increase Out of Pocket Maximum 80%/60% with Total Out of Pocket Maximum to $2,300/$4,600. In 2018-19 increase the deductible to $1,800 single/$3600 family for in/out network; increase Out of Pocket Maximum 70%/50% with Total Out of Pocket Maximum to $2,800/$5,600. In 2019-20, increase the deductible to $1,900 single/$3,800 family for in/out network; increase Out of Pocket Maximum 60%/40% with Total Out of Pocket Maximum to $3,200/$6,400.

The District contends that instituting a QHDDP with the HAS would bring the District in line with the "best practices" of employers across the state. The District contend that health insurance companies themselves that are using this approach for their own employees, pointing to Capital Blue Cross, Highmark, Aetna and other major health insurance companies. The District also contends that this structure for health care benefits is now in the recently negotiated agreement between the West Shore School District and its professional employees.

The District argues that this proposal has two noticeable benefits. First, it will bring more "consumerism" to the employees' health care decisions, meaning that it will make employees shop around for the lowest cost medical care, because they will be spending their money on care and procedures rather than "other people's money." Second, the HSA has a triple tax benefit to employees: the employer money is contributed to the HSA "before taxes" are taken out; the money in the HSA grows tax-free and the money is not taxed at withdrawal as long as the money is spent on qualified purposes. The HSA is also portable with the employee, to take to future employment.

The District also proposes changing the plan year to run from September 1 to August 31. As a result of an arbitration award, the plan year was set to run from October 1 to September 30.

The Association opposes the District's proposals. The parties made significant changes to the health benefits plan in the expired contract, thereby providing the District with significant savings. Due to the contract not getting settled until the second year of the CBA, the parties have only been covered under the current health care plan since October, 2015. To make more changes now would be disruptive to employees and not allow an evaluation of the full measure of the cost savings in the current plan.

The Association is opposed to instituting a QHDHP, even with the option of an HSA because such a high deductible plan, when combined with the District's proposal for no pay increases, would worsen the employees' economic status.

As for increasing the spousal surcharges, the Association is opposed to increases proposed by the District because they are extreme and unlike any others in Franklin County.

Finally, the Association argues that when the District's medical insurance plan is compared to plans in other Districts in Franklin County, the current plan is in line with the others.

Recommendation

Having reviewed and considered the District's proposal, I recommend that the parties keep their eye on stability and predictability in this important fringe benefit. The District's proposal would constitute a serious alteration to a medical benefits plan that was just negotiated two years ago. It is too early to conclude that the plan is not controlling costs. As for the proposal to introduce the option of the HSA with a QHDHP, the District has not presented compelling evidence in this record of similar plans having controlled increases in the cost of health care.

The one District proposal that has merit is to increase the Spousal Surcharge. The District makes a persuasive argument that it should not pay for spousal health care if the spouse's employer is providing for it and the current surcharge is not an adequate incentive. However, the amounts of the increase in the Spousal Surcharge will not be as high as proposed by the District, but rather be doubled to $200 on January 1, 2019, and remain at that amount for the remainder of the term of the CBA. I recommend no other changes to the agreement's medical benefits.

As for the District's Cadillac Tax proposal, this tax will not hit the District until after this new CBA has expired. However, as the District correctly points out, in the event the parties are at impasse at that time, the tax will be a reality. Accordingly, I recommend that the parties form a joint committee in the beginning of the 2019-20 fiscal year to develop a recommendation on this issue no later than June 30, 2020.

3. Dental Insurance, Section 2.6

The Association's position is to add coverage for crowns at 50%, add coverage for orthodontics to $2,000 per person maximum and increase the maximum per year to $1,500 from the current $1,000.

The Association argues that crowns and orthodontics are expensive dental procedures for employees. Increasing the dental insurance to cover crowns and orthodontics would be very helpful to bargaining unit members and not add significant cost to the District. The Association produced an actuarial estimate that the annual cost to the District of changing this dental benefit would be $116,988. Five other Districts in Franklin County provide some coverage for crowns and four districts provide some coverage for orthodontics.

The District's position is that in light of the high salary for teachers, it is unwilling to pay the costs connected to this improved benefit.

The Association's position is not without merit. However, to increase the dental benefit at this time is not recommended.

Recommendation

Maintain the status quo for dental insurance.

4. Section 2.7 Vision Insurance, Section 2.7

The Association proposes adding this language "The vision plan will cover annual eye exams and cover glasses and contacts each year if needed." The current agreement provides for eye exams and contacts every other year. The Association argues that the amount of reading and computer work that is required of a teacher, the annual eye exams are a necessity. The costs to the District, as estimated by its actuary, are $17,750 a year

The District's position is that in light of the high salaries in the CBA, it is unwilling to pay for the costs related to this improved benefit.

The Association has made a persuasive case for improving the vision insurance.

Recommendation

Add the Association's proposed language to the Agreement

5. Preparation Time, Section 3.2

The Association is proposing to guarantee planning time during the student day; limit the meetings after the student day to one per week; define preparation period; add two early dismissals for students for teachers to complete report cards/grading and provide compensation in time for bargaining unit members who lose their preparation time.

The District is opposed to making any changes to preparation time.

The Association argues that this addition to the CBA is required because professionals need time free from other activities during their workday in order that they may be prepared, professionally and attitudinally, to provide sound educational experiences to their students. It also argues that constant pupil contact is physically and mentally exhausting.

The principles behind the Association's proposal are understandable. Some of the proposals should be included in the new CBA. The addition of the words "during the student day" reflects what is currently in place. The Association wants to have the guarantee that the current practice is written so that administrators do not erode the planning time. The Association points to other Franklin County school districts that provide such preparation time. However, only Chambersburg Area School Disrict dismisses students early for grading, planning or IEP writing.

Recommendation

Amend the CBA to provide for the following language:

"A maximum of one meeting per week shall be held after the student day. A preparation period is defined as a period of time when a Bargaining unit member is released from instruction and student contact, and free from other duties, in order that such time may be used in preparation connected with the teacher's responsibilities. In the event of a teacher absence which causes members of the bargaining unit to substitute for that absent teacher, the District shall compensate each teacher who is required to relinquish his/her preparation period(s) ½ personal day for one (1) to four (4) documented classroom coverages and one (1) full personal day for five (5) to eight (8) documented classroom coverages."

6. Personal Leave , Section 4.6

The Association proposes that the new CBA include an additional personal day once an employee reaches 15 years of service. The current CBA provides for three (3) personal days. The Association's rationale for the additional day is that it provides a reward or incentive for people who are loyal to the District. Two other Districts in Franklin County provide for four personal days.

The District opposes this, arguing that the professional staff is already well compensated and there is no evidence that the employees are leaving the District out of dissatisfaction with any issue or this issue in particular.

Recommendation

Make no changes to the CBA for this issue.

7. Passes for School Sponsored Events, Section 8.6

The Association proposes that all members of the bargaining unit be allowed to use their "District issued identification badge to entitle him or her and one (1) guest to attend any school sponsored events." Currently, the CBA provides activity passes to staff only. The District did provide passes to staff and a guest for many years, but in 2010/11 the District eliminated this benefit.

The Association argues that this proposal costs the District very little, with the District only losing the revenue from those guests who would have had to pay. The District, meanwhile, gains supportive audiences and fans, which has the potential to lift the students' morale and school spirit.

The District opposes the proposal.

Recommendation

The Association's proposal should be added to the new agreement.

8. Credit Reimbursement, Appendix A

Both the Association and the District have made proposals on this issue. The Association proposes that the District provide pre-payment of tuition for courses registered to take. The District proposes to reimburse tuitions for a lifetime maximum of 24 credits and to exclude long term substitutes from being eligible for reimbursement.

The Association points to the obvious benefits to the District of having a better educated professional staff, not to mention that any additional changes that diminish this benefit will place the teachers behind the majority of other locals in Franklin County. This benefit, in some form, has been in the CBA for some years. In the current agreement, the Association conceded to the District on several issues regarding reimbursement and for that reason alone, the Association does not want to make further concessions as proposed by the District. In order to continue to teach in the District, all bargaining unit members are required to obtain Act 48 professional development credits every five years. Inserting a lifetime maximum of the total number of credits to be reimbursed to 24 credits does not even cover getting a Master's Degree let alone the Act 48 requirements.

The Association argues that it is unfair for the District to propose to eliminate the ability for long term substitutes to receive credit reimbursement starting their second year with the District as a long term substitute. These individuals must secure 24 credits within six years of employment to get their Instructional II certificates to be able to maintain their teaching certificate. If the District wants to continue to use them as long term substitutes, it is fair that the District continue to make them eligible for the reimbursement.

The Association has indicated a willingness to withdraw its proposal if the District withdraws its proposal.

Having reviewed the parties' proposals, it appears that the current CBA fairly addresses the parties' respective concerns. I am not persuaded that either parties' proposal should be made part of the CBA.

Recommendation

Make no changes in the current CBA.

9. Curricular and Coaches

The Association proposes a salary increase for these positions that is equivalent to the same percentage increase as the Career Rate for the duration of the contract. The District proposes no salary increase for the term of the agreement. The Association argues that it is unfair for the District to propose to freeze the salaries for these positions, when the salaries are already low. While the teachers do the jobs primarily because they enjoy the activity and working with the students, they should also be given modest increases in the compensation for those activities.

The District has also proposed that it have the right to post all supplementary positions annually. The District contends that the positions should not have a feature that is like tenure. The District has not shown why the current method of posting positions is not working.

Recommendation

The District shall provide salary increase for these positions that is equivalent to the percentage increase as the Career Rate for the duration of the contract. There should be no changes with respect to posting positions.

All Other Matters

Any other matters not specifically addressed herein are recommended to be withdrawn. As noted above, any agreements mutually made prior to the commencement of fact-finding that are not specifically addressed in this Report are recommended to be included, as agreed upon, in the new Agreement.

November 27, 2017
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

_____
Thomas P. Leonard, Esquire
Fact-Finder

EXHIBIT A

SALARY SCHEDULES

2017-18

2018-19

2019-20

2020-21

$800

Greencastle Antrim EA
2017/18
Yr. 1

Steps	Years	Bachelor	Master	45 inc. M	60 inc. M	75 inc. M	90 inc. M
1	1	51,267	53,652	55,242	56,831	58,420	60,010
2	2	53,255	55,639	57,228	58,818	60,408	61,997
3	3	55,242	57,625	59,215	60,805	62,395	63,985
4	4-5	57,228	59,613	61,202	62,792	64,382	65,972
5	6	59,215	61,600	63,190	64,779	66,369	67,959
6	7	61,202	63,587	65,177	66,767	68,356	69,946
7	8	63,190	65,574	67,164	68,754	70,344	71,932
8	9	65,177	67,562	69,151	70,741	72,330	73,920
9	10	67,164	69,549	71,139	72,727	74,317	75,907
10	11	69,151	71,536	73,125	74,715	76,304	77,894
11	12	71,139	73,522	75,112	76,702	78,292	79,881
12	13	73,125	75,509	77,099	78,689	80,279	81,869
13	14	75,112	77,497	79,086	80,676	82,266	83,856
14	15+	77,099	79,484	81,074	82,664	84,253	85,843

$900

Greencastle Antrim EA
2018/19
Yr. 2

Steps	Years	Bachelor	Master	45 inc. M	60 inc. M	75 inc. M	90 inc. M
1	1	51,848	54,260	55,867	57,474	59,082	60,690
2	2	53,858	56,269	57,876	59,484	61,092	62,699
3	3	55,867	58,278	59,886	61,494	63,101	64,709
4	4	57,876	60,288	61,895	63,503	65,111	66,719
5	5-6	59,886	62,297	63,905	65,513	67,121	68,729
6	7	61,895	64,307	65,915	67,523	69,131	70,738
7	8	63,905	66,317	67,925	69,532	71,140	72,747
8	9	65,915	68,327	69,934	71,542	73,149	74,757
9	10	67,925	70,336	71,944	73,551	75,159	76,766
10	11	69,934	72,346	73,953	75,561	77,168	78,776
11	12	71,944	74,355	75,963	77,570	79,178	80,786
12	13	73,953	76,364	77,972	79,580	81,188	82,796
13	14	75,963	78,374	79,982	81,590	83,198	84,805
14	15+	77,972	80,384	81,992	83,600	85,207	86,815

			$1,000				
Greencastle Antrim EA 2019-20 Yr. 3							
Steps	Years	Bachelor	Master	45 inc. M	60 inc. M	75 inc. M	90 inc. M
1	1	52,493	54,935	56,562	58,189	59,817	61,445
2	2	54,528	56,969	58,596	60,224	61,852	63,479
3	3	56,562	59,003	60,631	62,259	63,886	65,514
4	4	58,596	61,038	62,665	64,293	65,921	67,549
5	5	60,631	63,072	64,700	66,328	67,956	69,584
6	6-7	62,665	65,107	66,735	68,363	69,991	71,618
7	8	64,700	67,142	68,770	70,397	72,025	73,652
8	9	66,735	69,177	70,804	72,432	74,059	75,687
9	10	68,770	71,211	72,839	74,466	76,094	77,721
10	11	70,804	73,246	74,873	76,501	78,128	79,756
11	12	72,839	75,280	76,908	78,535	80,163	81,791
12	13	74,873	77,314	78,942	80,570	82,198	83,826
13	14	76,908	79,349	80,977	82,605	84,233	85,860
14	15+	78,942	81,384	83,012	84,640	86,267	87,895

			$1,100				
Greencastle Antrim EA 2020/21 Yr. 4							
Steps	Years	Bachelor	Master	45 inc. M	60 inc. M	75 inc. M	90 inc. M
1	1	53,202	55,677	57,327	58,976	60,625	62,275
2	2	55,265	57,739	59,388	61,038	62,688	64,337
3	3	57,327	59,800	61,450	63,100	64,750	66,400
4	4	59,388	61,863	63,512	65,162	66,812	68,462
5	5	61,450	63,925	65,575	67,224	68,874	70,524
6	6	63,512	65,987	67,637	69,287	70,937	72,586
7	7-8	65,575	68,049	69,699	71,349	72,999	74,647
8	9	67,637	70,112	71,761	73,411	75,060	76,710
9	10	69,699	72,174	73,824	75,472	77,122	78,772
10	11	71,761	74,236	75,885	77,535	79,184	80,834
11	12	73,824	76,297	77,947	79,597	81,247	82,896
12	13	75,885	78,359	80,009	81,659	83,309	84,959
13	14	77,947	80,422	82,071	83,721	85,371	87,021
14	15+	80,009	82,484	84,134	85,784	87,433	89,083

Step Conversion For Years Of Service					
Step	**2016/17**	**2017/18**	**2018/19**	**2019/20**	**2020/21**
1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2	2
3	3-4	3	3	3	3
4	5	4-5	4	4	4
5	6	6	5-6	5	5
6	7	7	7	6-7	6
7	8	8	8	8	7-8
8	9	9	9	9	9
9	10	10	10	10	10
10	11	11	11	11	11
11	12	12	12	12	12
12	13	13	13	13	13
13	14	14	14	14	14
14	15+	15+	15+	15+	15+
A salary increase of $800 for 2017/18; $900 for 2018/19;					
$1,000 for 2019/20; $1,100 for 2020/21 on the Career Rate shall be					
applied applicable to the Index identified in Appendix A.					
Step Placement Chart					
2016/17	**2017/18**	**2018/19**	**2019/20**	**2020/21**	
				1	
			1	2	
		1	2	3	
	1	2	3	4	
1	2	3	4	5	
2	3	4	5	6	
3	4	5	6	7	
4	5	6	7	8	
5	6	7	8	9	
6	7	8	9	10	
7	8	9	10	11	
8	9	10	11	12	
9	10	11	12	13	
10	11	12	13	14	
11	12	13	14	14	
12	13	14	14	14	
13	14	14	14	14	
14	14	14	14	14	
This Chart is read horizontally.					