

Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board

**In the Matter of the Employees of  
Scranton School District  
Case No. ACT 88-11-19-E**

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Diana S. Mulligan, Fact Finder

Hearing: October 12, 2011

For the Association: Marc L. Gelman, Esq.

For the School District: Harry McGrath, Esq.

BACKGROUND

Pursuant to ACT 88 of 1992 and the Pennsylvania Employee 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 Scranton School District (SD or Employer) and the Scranton Federation of Teachers, AFT, AFT-PA, AFL-CIO (Federation). By letter dated September 20, 2011, the PLRB appointed the undersigned to act as Fact Finder, vested with the authority set forth above. Subsequent to such notice, the parties were duly notified and a hearing was held on October 12, 2011 in Scranton, Pennsylvania at which time all parties in interest were afforded a full opportunity to present testimony and introduce documentary evidence. The Advocates and Fact Finder further discussed the issues via e-mail and telephone.

At the hearing, the SD withdrew its proposal for Elementary Prep Periods (Article 48).

The following remain as the issues in dispute for consideration by the Fact Finder:

MUTUAL ISSUES

1. Article 72 - Health Insurance
2. Article 79 – Teacher Salary Schedules
3. Article 85 – Term of Agreement

SCHOOL DISTRICT ONLY ISSUES

1. Article 44 – Class Size
2. Article 60 – Staff Development Programs
3. Article 74 – Retirement Incentive
4. Drug Testing (New)

FEDERATION ONLY ISSUES

1. Article 46 – Special Supportive Services
2. Article 67 – Extracurricular Compensation

3. Article 80 – Coaching Salary Schedules
4. Retroactivity

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 as part of this Report.

Pursuant to statutory authority, this Report will be released to the public if not accepted. A vote to accept the Report does not necessarily constitute agreement with or endorsement of the rationales but, rather, represents only an agreement to resolve the disputed issues by adopting the Recommendations.

The parties are hereby directed to review the Report and, within ten (10) calendar days of its issuance, notify the PLRB and each other if they accept or reject the Recommendations.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### **Issue #1: Article 44 – Class Size**

#### Position of the Parties

The SD proposes to increase the maximum number of pupils in K-grade 3 from 27 to 28 and from 28 to 29 in grades 4 and 5.

#### Discussion

Including language which provides for a maximum number of students in a classroom is always problematic. The first question one has to ask is, “What happens if all of the classes are at their contractual maximum and one new student enrolls in November?” Does the SD now have to select a class and split it into 2 classes, one with 14 students and the other with 15? In the alternative, assuming there are 10 fifth grade classrooms, each with 28 students and the 281<sup>st</sup> student enrolls, must the SD now have 11 classrooms, 5 of them with 25 students and 6 with 26 students?. To further confuse matters, say that one or two students leave in January. Does the SD eliminate that 11<sup>th</sup> class and return to 10? Obviously this can never work, since students would constantly have to be shifted around and would be roaming the halls wondering where they’re supposed to be from one day to the next.

According to the Federation, smaller class sizes are beneficial to both students and teachers and I have found no evidence to refute this statement. However, Scranton is not a private school but a large urban system. The SD stated at the hearing that, while recognizing that larger classes are not ideal, has addressed this issue by providing either an aide or splitting classes if the maximum size has been reached by October 1<sup>st</sup>. In its hearing binder, the SD said it had to revoke boundary exceptions for 3 students due even to the current class size limitations, which resulted in disruption in families by the removal of their children from the school to which they had become accustomed and placing them elsewhere. Had it not done so, according to the SD, it would have had to create 3 new classes at a cost of \$151,038 (salary plus benefits for the new teachers).

This cost, however, would not be in addition to the full complement of teachers employed by the SD in the prior year, since 35.7 teachers were hired to replace the 74 who retired. The SD has increased its enrollment in 2010-11 by 131 students but decreased its staff, following those retirements, by 38 teachers (all by attrition).

The SD states, in its hearing binder (p. 14), that it maintains a 14.6 student to teacher ratio, yet it wants to be able to increase maximum class size to 28 or 29 students, depending on grade level. It would seem, if this was correct, that the SD would not have to revoke boundary exceptions, provide aides or split classes. I can think of one way in which the SD’s stated need for increased maximum class size and the 14.6 student/teacher ratio is not illogical. If a mainstreamed student with somewhat severe mental and/or physical disabilities has his/her own paraprofessional (counted as a teacher) this is a one to one ratio. Averaging these students in with those 27 who are in a classroom with one teacher, brings down the ratio.

#### Recommendation

Do not add one additional student to the maximum currently stated in the CBA.

### **Issue #2: Article 46 – Special Support Services**

#### Position of the Parties

The Federation wants to add language to Section (f) which would require that the SD make reasonable efforts “on a quarterly basis” to assign special needs students to classrooms equitably.

### Discussion

According to the Federation, the SD’s motive for “bundling” its special education students is to save money and, historically, if given “unfettered” discretion, the SD would ignore the mandates of the IDEA and make classroom assignments without regard to the best interests of the students and teachers. The Federation further believes that this quarterly review will provide a timely, equitable distribution of special needs students as the student population changes throughout the academic year. The SD feels that the current language already gives relief to the teachers. (The current language states that, in accordance with the IDEA, and a student’s IEP, the SD will make reasonable efforts to assign these students equitably.) Furthermore, the SD cannot unilaterally assign students since the parents must also be involved. These assignments are made at the beginning of the school year and adjusted as new special needs students enroll. To re-assign (or even consider re-assigning) students 4 times a year, would place an undue burden on the SD because of the huge volume of paperwork, meetings, etc. necessary to complete the transfer. Most experts agree that special needs students benefit from a structured environment. Removing them from an environment to which they have become accustomed is potentially harmful. I fully realize that the Federation continues to want the SD to make a reasonable effort (language currently in the CBA) to assign students but to do so on a quarterly, rather than an annual basis. I think the real problem here is not in the original assignment made at the beginning of the school year, but the disproportionate addition of newly enrolled special needs students to certain teachers as the year progresses. The current language mentions no time frame for the assignment of IDEA students. Therefore, according to the current language, the reasonable efforts to assign students equitably must be ongoing.

### Recommendation

Maintain the status quo.

## **Issue #3: Article 60 – Staff Development Programs**

### Position of the Parties

Since the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) has suspended Act 48 requirements for 2 years, the SD wants to suspend this article as well and negotiate this provision at the end of 2 years.

### Discussion

In lieu of tuition reimbursement, the SD currently funds Educational Research and Dissemination (ER&D) and has done so at least since 1991 according to the CBA (and according to the practice in place before then). This program was developed jointly by the Federation and the SD and is conducted by experienced teachers who have been trained to offer these professional development programs to their colleagues. Unlike most school districts, Scranton has no tuition reimbursement for its teachers to gain additional credits. The ER&D program takes its place. According to the Federation, this continuing education for teachers is one of the reasons why the students receive one of the best educations in the commonwealth, is an “outperforming district” according to Standard and Poor, and has been recognized as such by the SD in public meetings and its own promotional video. According to the SD (hearing binder, pp. 10 & 11), while it recognizes the value of this program and does not wish to discontinue it, a shortage of funds mandates that it be held in abeyance at least until a successor program is negotiated when Act 48 requirements once again become mandatory.

This program is funded through federal Title II grants and the funds must be used, inter alia, for professional development and reduction in class size. According to the SD, the Title II grant for 2011-12 was \$688,153 and

the SD hired 8 teachers at a total cost of \$492,883 to reduce class size leaving \$195,270 for the ER&D program. The cost in 2009-10 for this program was \$204,243.

Although the SD states it hired these 8 teachers primarily to reduce class size, in its proposal for Article 44 (Class Size), it wants to increase the maximum number of students in grades K-5 where lower class size is, at least arguably, more important than in, say, a high school History class. See also paragraph 2 in the “Discussion” section on page 4.

At the hearing, the SD stated that the induction program, also conducted by the Federation, will not be affected by this proposal. Therefore, the \$48,640 (SD hearing binder, p. 11) should not be added to the amount spent on the ER&D program.

#### Recommendation

Maintain the status quo.

#### **Issue #4: Article 67 – Extracurricular Compensation**

##### Position of the Parties

The Federation wants to increase this amount by \$1 in each year of the CBA (to \$30, \$31 and \$32 per hour).

##### Discussion

This compensation is currently paid to teachers who engage in approved extracurricular activities/programs outside of the regular school day (unless the teachers have traditionally attended on a voluntary basis). The current \$29 per hour, especially in the current difficult economic times, seems sufficient.

#### Recommendation

Maintain the status quo.

#### **Issue #5: Article 72 – Health Insurance**

##### Position of the Parties

The Federation wants the SD to provide quarterly detailed financial statements for its health insurance accounts. The SD wants an increase in the employees’ premium share and a change in the plan design, beginning September 1, 2012 (assuming there is a wage freeze in 2011-12).

##### Discussion

The Scranton School District has a self-funded medical insurance program with stop loss coverage administered by Banyan Consulting. In lieu of a premium rate (although the numbers look like a premium), the SD is assessed a monthly “funding rate” and, depending on experience, will either get a rebate at the end of each year or have the funding rate increased. At the request of the Fact Finder, the SD, post-hearing, provided the medical and prescription (RX) premiums for 2011 and 2012. The RX rates were virtually unchanged. According to Banyan, the medical insurance funding rates will increase by an average of 8.38% in 2012. The teachers currently pay \$50 per pay period for single (S) coverage, \$60 for parent and child (P/C), \$65 for husband and wife (H/W), \$65 for parent and child (P/C) and \$80 for family (F).

In addition to freezing pay for 2011-12 and giving a 1.2% raise, with no step movement, for 2012-13, the SD also wants to increase the teachers' premium share in 2012-13 to \$50 (S), \$80 (P/C), \$115 (H/W), \$105 (P/CN) and \$130 (F). In so doing, the SD stated, in its hearing binder (p. 6), that the percentage of premium share will be maintained at about 4.3% of salary. The SD used \$54,952 as the average salary and the September 1, 2012 premium share figures in its calculations. Therefore, one can assume that the \$54,952 is the 2012-13 average salary as proposed by the SD. The 2011-12 average salary should then be \$54,300 ( $\$54,300 \times 1.012 = \$54,952$ ). Using the same calculations as did the SD, based on the \$54,300 salary and the current premium share, the premium share as average percentage of pay is 3.06%. Neither party presented a matrix, which could alter these numbers, so they may not be exact.

The Federation argues that this premium share increase is not the only cost to be considered when calculating the teachers' economic participation in health insurance, since the SD also proposed to change the plan design beginning on September 1, 2012. Without addressing the current plan design benefit by benefit, the SD basically wants to take (with some exceptions) the non-preferred provisions in the current plan (which are more expensive) and place them in the preferred column of the proposed plan. For instance, many of the co-payments in the current plan are zero and would become 20% in the SD's proposal. Deductibles and co-insurance would also increase, in some instances, by over a \$1,000. The logic used to support this increase used by the Scranton School District (and other employers) is that this burden (unlike the premium share) does not fall on the entire bargaining unit but only on those who use the services. While the theory may be logical, the reality, for most families, is likely something else. The SD suggests that, even those who need more medical care than others would have to have a "catastrophic event" to get to the family \$6,000 co-insurance maximum. If one of the teacher's children gets a broken leg and has to be hospitalized for a few days, the deductible, 20% co-payment for in-patient hospital services, the 20% co-payment for lab tests and x-rays, the 20% for ambulance transport, etc., can quickly add up for what is not usually considered a catastrophic event in medical circles.

The Federation showed that teachers in 9 districts in Lackawanna County have no premium share. At the request of the Fact Finder, the Federation provided the expiration date of their contracts, most of which end in 2013. Wilkes-Barre, Wyoming and Wyoming West are not on that \$0 co-pay list, so I suspect they pay something. Lackawanna County is an anomaly in teacher premium share. Teachers in most other school districts in Pennsylvania pay something, with the trend moving from a fixed amount to a percentage of premium.

The RX premiums have remained almost the same for the past 2 years. According to the Federation, at a meeting with the broker, the dental plan had a good experience rating and provided cost savings to the SD. This statement was not challenged by the SD. However, the SD wants a \$50 deductible, and a reduction in the percentage of coverage for the basic and major restorative categories.

Re: the Federation's request for detailed financial statements, when anyone subscribes to a health insurance plan that person does not receive such statements from the carrier on a regular basis (but may be able to obtain them upon application to the appropriate agency). The premium share, once published in the CBA, is fixed and not subject to re-negotiation until a successor Agreement is negotiated at which time the federation will need such information in order to make its proposal. Therefore, there is no logical reason for the Federation to have this information on a quarterly basis.

#### Recommendation

1. Keep the current dental and RX plans.
2. Keep the current plan design.
3. Increase the premium share for 2012-13 and 2013-14 by \$10 in each coverage category except, keep the current single premium share as is for 2012-13.
4. Do not provide the Federation with quarterly financial statements.

## **Issue #6: Article 74 – Retirement Incentive**

### Position of the Parties

The SD, in its presentation of issues for Fact Finding, wanted to delete this article.

### Discussion

Currently, teachers who retire under the provisions of the Pennsylvania School Employees' Retirement System (PSERS), with 20 or more years of service, receive \$70,000 payable over 7 years at \$10,000 per year. (This payment is modified for employees who are age 62 with 10-19 years of service.) Retirees, while they can participate in the SD's health care plans, must pay the full premium. The Federation argues that this retirement incentive payment is actually a savings to the SD since it is no longer obligated to pay the majority of the teachers' medical premiums. In its hearing binder, the SD "re-introduced" (p. 20) this article with modifications. The relevant part of this modification concerns employees with 35 or more years of experience. In the current contract year, section S2 will still provide this benefit provided the teacher retires prior to the 2012-13 school year. (This section may have to be modified if the CBA is not executed by April 1, 2012.) Those with 35 years of service who retire after the 2012-13 school year will still be eligible provided they retire in the following school year. The remainder of this article remains essentially the same.

### Recommendation

Adopt the SD's proposal as stated in pp. 16-20 of its hearing binder.

## **Issue #7: Article 79 – Teacher Salary Schedule**

### Position of the Parties

The SD proposed a pay/step freeze for 2011 and offered a pool of \$487,000 for 2012-13 which, according to its worksheet provided post-hearing at the request of the Fact Finder, equates to a 1.2% flat increase and does not include step movement. The Federation proposed a 3% increase in each year of a 3 year Agreement plus step increment. Although neither side presented a matrix, both agreed that the step increase in the current CBA is about 2%.

### Discussion

The SD, stated, while it recognizes its experienced and well educated group of teachers and would like to provide them the "fair and reasonable raises" (hearing binder, p. 2) as it did in the past, is no longer in a position to continue these past salary increases and needs relief from costly health insurance payments. According to the SD, it has a higher than average number of families living at or below the poverty level, a 9.8% unemployment rate and has paid down its fund balance to a point which leaves little room for emergencies. The City of Scranton itself is having difficulty paying its bills and its bond rating is below average. The SD stated it would need \$1.8 million in new revenue just to cover health insurance costs and pension obligations. An increase of 5.63 mills, in an area where citizens are already having difficulty paying their property taxes, would be needed to get these funds, but the Act 1 Index caps the millage increase to 1.4. According to the SD, it is no secret that government subsidies have been cut and are unlikely to increase or even return to prior levels any time soon. While the SD saved money by eliminating 30 teaching positions, it did so by attrition and did not have to suspend any teachers. Although it now receives almost \$1 million in taxes from the privatization of the formerly non-profit Mercy Hospital, these gains were offset by the cost of retirement payments and a \$5.5 million cut in state revenues.

The Federation paints a somewhat rosier picture of the SD's finances. Traditionally, teacher bargaining units, whether they are represented by the AFT or PSEA, calculate attritional savings by subtracting the salary of new hires, who start at or near the beginning of the salary scale, from the pay of retirees. Other retiree payouts, the likelihood that new hires will need the more expensive family health insurance and additional education to get/keep their certification are not considered. The SD backed out these extra expenses when it calculated attritional savings.

The Federation, which obtained its financial information from the SD and the PDE stated that, for 2008-09, the SD's revenues exceeded its budgeted revenues and its ending fund balance surplus remained at approximately \$1.3 million in 3 out of 4 years. According to the Federation, the SD will receive 10% more in tax revenues this year, almost \$1.8 million in additional tax money, will get increased revenue when KOZ and KOEZ exempt properties are added back into the tax rolls. According to the SD's 2011 budget, it expects an increase of \$930,030 in state funding and \$539,001 in federal funding. (It is to be noted that a budget is not a guarantee that both revenues and expenditures will conform to the budgeted amount.) These additional funds add up to \$4,621,672 and do not include attritional savings which are \$10,994,441 over 3 years. The Federation also stated that the assessed property values have increased \$5,127,635 in the last 2 years.

According to the SD, there are no KOZ and KOEZ revenues this year and actual expenditures exceeded revenues. \$403,405 of the Mercy Hospital tax revenues are due to the transfer of the property and the \$429,191 "found" money in the Single Tax Office are one time payments. (The Tax Office cracked down on delinquent taxpayers who paid several years of back taxes in order to avoid losing their properties.) Furthermore, all properties are assessed, but not all pay taxes. The largest part of these increased assessments is due to the erection of several new buildings by the University of Scranton which is exempt from paying taxes.

According to the SD, the 2009 average teacher salary in Lackawanna County was \$49,876 while the Scranton teachers' salary was \$51,952. According to the Federation, which compares its wages at the 8<sup>th</sup> step with the comparable number of teaching years in other Lackawanna school districts, Scranton's pay for a teacher with a Master's (M) degree is 7<sup>th</sup> out of 10 (Lakeland and Riverside are paid less than \$200 more than Scranton.). The Federation, in its Fact Finding exhibit (p. 66) states that a teacher must have 16 years of experience in order to realize the "elusive" bump step. (For those unfamiliar with the bump step in teacher contracts, until several years ago, the steps on the salary scale were equal to the years of service of the longest employed teacher, so that, if a 62 year old teacher began employment with the district at age 22, there were 40 steps in the contract and this was the point at which the teacher reached his/her career pay. Arguing that a teacher should not have to reach retirement age to get his/her career pay, both the AFT and PSEA began compacting the salary scales so that the career rate could be reached in far less time. Mathematically, this resulted in a very large salary increase (between \$19,131 and \$20,776 in Scranton, depending on degree) between the penultimate and final year on the salary scale. While Scranton does not seem to fare well in the comparison group at step 8, it does quite well once that allegedly elusive final step is reached. Only Abington Heights has fewer steps (15) than Scranton. The others range from 16 to 23 which means that Scranton teachers (M column) reach their career rate of \$75,869 (2010-11 school year) in their 16<sup>th</sup> year of employment. It will take Carbondale teachers 23 years to reach their career rate of \$67,379. Scranton has the highest career rate in the comparison group with others ranging from \$59,904 to \$74,620.

Once the career rate is reached, those teachers at the top step get only the stated percentage rate while those on the lower steps advance on the scale both to the next step (the incremental cost) and the next year. For example, in 2009-10, the 8<sup>th</sup> step M teacher earned \$45,081. In 2010-11, that teacher advanced to Step 9 at a salary of \$47,527 for a total percentage increase of 5.43%. Since the stated percentage increase from 2009-10 to 2010-11 was 3% (the only amount received by those at the top of the scale), the incremental amount was 2.43% for this person.

As can be seen in these comparisons between the SD's statement of its financial condition and that of the Federation, statistics can be used to support any position. Despite its portrayal of a school district practically awash in money, I think the reality is closer to the SD's interpretation of its finances. Scranton is one of the few school districts in the state which had no suspensions. Several teacher contracts of which I have direct knowledge have re-negotiated pay freezes. Few can argue that the economy is booming. Even if Scranton currently has excess funds, just like the prudent householder, something must be held back against unanticipated future expenses.

Since I do not have a matrix (which shows a teacher's actual position on the salary scale), I have had to calculate the recommended salary increase from the post-hearing salary schedule provided by the Federation. These scales take the salary from the prior year and multiply it by 1.03, the Federation's proposed increase (plus step movement). The SD's worksheet freezes the first year's wages and adds 1.2% to the second year without step movement. Those who have reached their 16<sup>th</sup> step career rate, get only the recommended percentage. For example, the 2010 step 16 M pay is \$75,869 X 1.1025 = \$76,817 (the 2011-12 pay; \$76,817 X 1.1025 = \$77,778 (the 2012-13 pay; \$77,778 X 1.015 = \$78,944 (the 2013-14 pay). I have also included a random sample of other columns on the salary scale to show the percentage of employees who are still move up the steps and will receive the incremental rate in addition to the stated percentage.

Colm.	2010 Step/Pay	2011 Step/Pay/Inc	2012 Step/Pay/Inc	2013 Step/Pay/Inc
B+15	3/\$38,806	4/\$43,155/11.21%	5/\$44,812/3.84%	6/\$46,164/3.02%
M	8/\$46,546	9/\$48,121/3.38%	10/\$49,952/3.80%	11/\$52,233/4.57%
M+15	12/\$51,942	13/\$53,805/3.59%	14/\$55,707/4.94%	15/\$58,073/4.25%

Recommendation

Increase salary in 2011-12 by 1.25% plus step.

Increase salary in 2012-13 by 1.25% plus step.

Increase salary in 2013-14 by 1.50% plus step.

**Issue #8: Article 85 – Termination**

Position of the Parties

The SD proposed a 2 year CBA; the Federation wants a 3 year Agreement.

Discussion

Since the prior CBA has already expired and there is no guarantee when its successor will be executed, bargaining will have to begin for the next Agreement when the ink is barely dry on this one. Two years is too short.

Recommendation

The CBA, by its terms, should begin on September 1, 2011 and end on August 31, 2014.

**Issue #9: Article 80 – Coaching Salary Schedule**

Position of the Parties

The Federation wants to increase coaches’ salaries by the same amount as it proposed for the teachers (including step).

Recommendation

Increase salaries for coaches by 1% in each year of the 3 year Agreement with no step increase.

**Issue #10: Retroactivity**

Position of the Parties

The Federation wants the salary increase to be retroactive to September 1, 2011.

Discussion

The SD did allow for an increase in its instructional budget from 1/1/2010 to 12/31/2010. (The SD is on a fiscal, rather than a school year, budget.) The “fault” for not yet executing an Agreement to replace the one which has already expired does not lie solely with the teachers, nor did the SD suggest that it does.

Recommendation

Salary should be retroactive to September 1, 2011.

**Issue #11: Drug Testing (New)**

Position of the Parties

The SD, with the participation of the Federation, wants to develop a drug testing program.

Recommendation

The parties should negotiate a drug testing program which would apply to all SD employees.

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

SIGNED \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_  
Marc L. Gelman, Esq., For the Federation

ACCEPT REJECT

SIGNED \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_  
Harry McGrath, Esq., For the School District

ACCEPT REJECT

Effective Term: September 1, 2010 to August 31, 2011

	<u>Bachelors</u>	<u>Bachelors +15</u>	<u>Bachelors +24</u>	<u>Masters</u>	<u>Master +15</u>	<u>Master +30</u>
1	36,070	36,283	36,707	36,919	37,131	37,343
2	37,237	37,450	37,662	37,874	38,086	38,298
3	38,588	38,806	39,024	39,242	39,460	39,678
4	42,404	42,622	42,840	43,058	43,276	43,494
5	43,494	43,712	43,930	44,148	44,366	44,584
6	44,148	44,366	44,584	44,802	45,020	45,238
7	44,911	45,129	45,347	45,565	45,783	46,001
8	45,892	46,110	46,328	46,546	46,764	46,982
9	46,873	47,091	47,309	47,527	47,745	47,963
10	48,072	48,290	48,508	48,726	48,944	49,162
11	49,544	49,762	49,980	50,198	50,416	50,634
12	51,070	51,288	51,506	51,724	51,942	52,160
13	52,269	52,487	52,705	52,923	53,141	53,359
14	53,468	53,686	53,904	54,122	54,340	54,558
15	54,939	55,157	55,375	55,593	55,811	56,030
16	74,070	74,288	74,506	75,869	76,087	76,305

Special Education Teachers Add \$300

Effective Term: September 1, 2011 to August 31, 2012

	<u>Bachelors</u>	<u>Bachelors +15</u>	<u>Bachelors +24</u>	<u>Masters</u>	<u>Master +15</u>	<u>Master +30</u>
1	36,521	36,737	37,166	37,380	37,595	37,810
2	37,702	37,196	38,133	38,347	38,562	38,777
3	39,070	39,291	39,512	39,733	39,953	40,174
4	42,934	43,155	43,376	43,596	43,817	44,038
5	44,038	44,258	44,479	44,700	44,921	45,141
6	44,700	44,921	45,141	45,362	45,583	45,803
7	45,472	45,693	45,914	46,135	46,355	46,576
8	46,466	46,686	46,907	47,128	47,349	47,569
9	47,459	47,680	47,900	48,121	48,342	48,563
10	48,673	48,894	49,114	49,335	49,556	49,777
11	50,163	50,384	50,605	50,825	51,046	51,267
12	51,708	51,929	52,150	52,371	52,591	52,812
13	52,922	53,143	53,364	53,585	53,805	54,026
14	54,136	54,357	54,578	54,799	55,019	55,240
15	55,626	55,846	56,067	56,288	56,509	56,730
16	74,996	75,217	75,437	76,817	77,038	77,259

Special Education Teachers Add \$300

Effective Term: September 1, 2012 to August 31, 2013

	<u>Bachelors</u>	<u>Bachelors +15</u>	<u>Bachelors +24</u>	<u>Masters</u>	<u>Master +15</u>	<u>Master +30</u>
1	36,977	37,196	37,630	37,848	38,065	\$38,282
2	38,173	38,392	38,609	38,827	39,044	\$39,261
3	39,559	39,782	40,006	40,229	40,453	\$40,676
4	43,471	43,694	43,918	44,141	44,365	\$44,588
5	44,588	44,812	45,035	45,259	45,482	\$45,706
6	45,259	45,482	45,706	45,929	46,153	\$46,376
7	46,041	46,264	46,488	46,711	46,935	\$47,158
8	47,046	47,270	47,493	47,717	47,940	\$48,164
9	48,052	48,276	48,499	48,723	48,946	\$49,170
10	49,281	49,505	49,728	49,952	50,175	\$50,399
11	50,790	51,014	51,237	51,461	51,684	\$51,908
12	52,355	52,578	52,802	53,025	53,259	\$53,472
13	53,584	53,807	54,031	54,254	54,478	\$54,701
14	54,813	55,037	55,260	55,484	55,707	\$55,930
15	56,321	56,545	56,768	56,992	57,215	\$57,440
16	75,933	76,157	76,380	77,778	78,001	\$78,225

Special Education Teachers Add \$300

Effective Term: September 1, 2013 to August 31, 2014

	<u>Bachelors</u>	<u>Bachelors +15</u>	<u>Bachelors +24</u>	<u>Masters</u>	<u>Master +15</u>	<u>Master +30</u>
1	37,532	37,754	38,195	38,415	38,636	38,857
2	38,746	38,968	39,189	39,409	39,630	39,850
3	40,152	40,379	40,606	40,833	41,059	41,286
4	44,123	44,350	44,576	44,803	45,030	45,257
5	45,257	45,484	45,711	45,937	46,164	46,391
6	45,937	46,164	46,391	46,618	46,845	47,072
7	46,731	46,958	47,185	47,412	47,639	47,866
8	47,752	47,979	48,206	48,433	48,660	48,886
9	48,773	49,000	49,227	49,453	49,680	49,907
10	50,021	50,247	50,474	50,701	50,928	51,155
11	51,552	51,779	52,006	52,233	52,460	52,686
12	53,140	53,367	53,594	53,821	54,047	54,274
13	54,388	54,614	54,841	55,068	55,295	55,552
14	55,635	55,863	56,089	56,316	56,543	56,769
15	57,166	57,393	57,620	57,846	58,073	58,301
16	77,072	77,299	77,526	78,944	79,171	79,398

Special Education Teachers Add \$300