

**Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board**

In the Matter of the Impasse Between	)	
Bangor Area Education Association	)	
And	)	ACT-88-19-15-E
Bangor Area School District	)	

**FACT FINDING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**PREPARED BY LARRY CHESKAWICH**

**APPEARANCES:**

**For the Association:**

**-Jolene Vitalos  
UniServe Representative  
Pennsylvania State Education Association,  
4950 Medical Center Circle  
Allentown, PA 18106**

**For the District:**

**-Braden Hendershot  
Assistant to the Superintendent  
Bangor Area School District  
123 Five Points Richmond Road  
Bangor, PA 18013**

## **BACKGROUND**

On August 20, 2019, the Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board (PLRB) appointed the undersigned as fact finder pursuant to ACT 88 and the Public Employee Relations Act (PERA) in the impasse between the Bangor Area Education Association (Association) and the Bangor Area School District (District), for the District's professional employees.

The parties to this dispute have a long collective bargaining relationship. The most recent Agreement between the parties was a two (2) year agreement that expired June 30, 2019. The parties have been bargaining since October 2018, but have been unable to amicably reach a successor agreement. The Association declared an impasse and requested fact finding on August 14, 2019, and subsequently, the PLRB granted the request and ordered fact finding. Pursuant to this order, the above listed fact finder was appointed on August 20, 2019 to serve all involved parties.

The fact finding hearing was held on September 9, 2019 at 10:00 AM at the Bangor Area School District Administrative Building in Bangor, PA. At that time, the parties were afforded a full opportunity to present extensive testimony, cross examine witnesses and introduce documentary evidence in support of their respective positions. The Association was admirably and professionally represented by Ms. Jolene Vitalos and Ms. Ruthann Waldie of the Pennsylvania State Education Association (PSEA). The District was represented in a likewise effective and commendable manner by Mr. Braden Hendershot, Superintendent Dr. William Haws, and Mr. Mark Schiavone of the Bangor Area School District. Indicative of the parties' diligent efforts in negotiations prior to fact finding, tentative agreements were reached on a substantial number of issues. Among remaining open items, there was dispute regarding two matters (Insurance Benefits and Extracurricular Schedule) as to whether or not tentative agreements were reached. At the conclusion of the hearing, the record closed and the matter is now ready for the within report of Recommendations.

## **OVERVIEW**

The Bangor Area School District is rural in nature, comprised of seven (7) small municipalities encompassing eighty-six (86) square miles. What once was open farmland has evolved over the years to housing developments and bedroom communities for people commuting to larger cities such as New York, for work. Within the town of Bangor there has been some recent growth in previously vacant buildings turned into small business locations, some successfully, some otherwise. Some of the land near the Delaware River and Interstate 80 has seen growth of warehousing and industry due to the ease of highway and city access; however, there are few, if any retail stores or malls located within the District. The majority of the small municipalities in the District host most of the households who rent and/or have lower incomes.

As of a July, 2019 real estate information site, the District's population is slightly over 24,000 residents. Of that population, the median age is forty-four (44); the number of households is 9,136, of which 2,595 have school age children. About seventy-five percent (75%) of the households are owner-occupied; the remaining twenty-five percent (25%) are rentals.

Of significance to this matter, while the overall County unemployment rate hovers around six percent (6%), the school District experiences a range of five (5) to fourteen (14) percent unemployment, with the town of Bangor suffering at the eleven percent (11%) level. Additionally, from seven (7) to twenty (20) percent of the District's citizenry have no insurance, above the County-wide average of nine percent (9%). The County poverty level stands around six and a half percent (6.5%); however, in three (3) of the District's municipalities, the level rises higher than the County average. In a 2018 published article listing the thirty (30) poorest towns in the Lehigh Valley and northwest New Jersey, four (4) of the towns were contained within the District.<sup>1</sup> The County median income is approximately \$65,000 annually, while the range of about \$41,000 to \$78,000 annually exists in the District. Finally, according to 2017-2018 records, the average salary of a bargaining unit member is slightly over \$72,000.

---

<sup>1</sup>Miller, Rudy; 2018; [https://www.lehighvalleylive.com/news/2018/01/the\\_30\\_poorest\\_towns\\_in\\_lehigh.htm/](https://www.lehighvalleylive.com/news/2018/01/the_30_poorest_towns_in_lehigh.htm/)

Based on information provided by the parties this bargaining unit is comprised of 227 members. This report relies upon that benchmark number in the submission of my Salary recommendations to follow.

### **OPEN ISSUES**

The Association and the District identified the following issues remaining in dispute and open at the time of the fact finding hearing:

- 1. ARTICLE II - DURATION OF AGREEMENT**
- 2. ARTICLE III - NEGOTIATION OF A SUCCESSOR AGREEMENT**
- 3. ARTICLE XIII - TEACHER WORK YEAR/DAY**
  - A. TEACHER WORK YEAR**
    - 1. TENURED TEACHERS**
    - 2. NON-TENURED TEACHERS**
    - 3. PART-TIME TEACHERS**
  - B. TEACHER WORK DAY**
    - 1. PREPARATION TIME**
- 4. ARTICLE XVI - PERSONAL/EMERGENCY LEAVE**
- 5. ARTICLE XXI - MILEAGE**
- 6. ARTICLE XXII - COMPENSATION; APPENDIX B - SALARY SCHEDULES**
- 7. ARTICLE XXIV - RETIREMENT BENEFITS**
- 8. ARTICLE XXVII - LONG-TERM SUBSTITUTES**

The parties disputed at the hearing as to whether a previous tentative agreement had been achieved during negotiations on the following, and whether or not the issues were properly before the fact finder to resolve. Specifically, the Association contended these issues were not yet resolved. The District protested that early in negotiations these matters were agreed upon.

1. **ARTICLE XVIII - INSURANCE BENEFITS**
  - A. **MEDICAL INSURANCE PREMIUM SHARE CONTRIBUTIONS**
  - B. **PRESCRIPTION DRUG DEDUCTIBLE**
2. **APPENDIX A - EXTRA - CURRICULAR SCHEDULE**
3. **APPENDIX E - HEALTH AND WELLNESS PROGRAM**

Based on a thorough review of the testimony elicited at the hearing; a review of pertinent documents submitted at the hearing (including documents labeled as “tentative agreements”); email exchanges with attachments; and most importantly an email to all involved parties sent from the District at 3:24 PM on August 26, 2019 with attachment entitled “BASD-BAEA OPEN”, I conclude the above items are also considered open and will be subject to my Recommendations in this report.

### **DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

To arrive at the following recommendations, this fact finder relied upon, among other things, the following criteria:

1. The reliable and credible testimony provided, the evidence presented at the Fact Finding hearing and further clarifications given to questions of this fact finder.
2. The expired collective bargaining agreement.
3. Comparisons of unresolved issues relative to the employees in this bargaining unit and how those issues related to other districts and employees doing similar work, giving consideration to factors peculiar to the Bangor Area School District.
4. The interest and welfare of taxpayers and the ability of Bangor Area School District to finance and administer the Recommendations proposed.
5. The understanding that each individual issue has been reviewed for its relative individual merit; at the same time, each individual issue has also been reviewed with consideration given to whether or not it appropriately fits into the collective bargaining agreement created through this process.

**The Recommendations that follow constitute the settlement proposals upon which the parties are now required to act as directed by PLRB regulation and statute. A vote to accept the report does not constitute agreement with, nor endorsement of the rationale contained therein. Rather, it represents only an agreement to resolve the issues by adopting the Recommendations. The parties are directed to review the report and within ten (10) days of its issuance, notify the PLRB of their decision to “accept” or “reject” the recommendations. The report will be released to the public if not accepted by one or both parties.**

## **ARTICLE II—DURATION OF AGREEMENT**

### **Association Position:**

The Association proposes a five (5) year Agreement (July 1, 2019-June 30, 2024). The Association believes a five (5) year term would contribute to stability and assurances that the work efforts of this bargaining unit are valued and appreciated. While this term is proposed, it is contingent upon the final agreed-upon Salary provisions.

### **District Position:**

The District proposes a five (5) year Agreement. All proposals submitted at the hearing reflected the desire of the District for an Agreement of this term length.

### **Recommendation and Rationale:**

Both parties seek the stability and security of a five (5) year Agreement, especially in light of the fact the previous Agreement spanned only two (2) years. I recommend adoption of a five (5) year Agreement. Subsequent Recommendations in this report reflect provisions extending five (5) years.

## ARTICLE III–NEGOTIATION OF A SUCCESSOR AGREEMENT

### Association Position:

Deadline Date - “The parties agree to enter into collective bargaining over a successor agreement no later than October 15, 2023.” (Relevant portion) The Association pointed out this change reflects updated contractual changes and allows for both sides to have sufficient time for meaningful discussions months prior to the mandatory January start date as provided for in ACT 88/195.

### District Position:

Deadline Date - “The parties agree to enter into collective bargaining over a successor agreement no later than October 15, 2023”. (Relevant portion)

### Recommendation and Rationale:

As both parties are in agreement to exercise foresight in beginning successor negotiations prior to mandatory deadlines, I recommend adoption of this provision, reflective also of a Recommendation of a five (5) year term of Agreement.

## ARTICLE XIII–TEACHER WORK YEAR/DAY

### A. Teacher Work Year-Tenured Teachers/Non-tenured Teachers

#### Association Position:

The Association rejects any proposed change to language pertaining to length of work year for Tenured or Non-Tenured Teachers. Current amount of work days, including in-service days prior to and during school year is sufficient. The Association stressed that the compensation package offered by the District does not adequately offset the increase in number of days requested. Further, the Association contended that the Bangor educators work day currently exceeds that of neighboring districts by ten (10) minutes.

**District Position:**

The District proposes to increase the total work days for Tenured teachers to 186 in 2020-2021; to 187 in 2021-2022; to 188 in 2022-2023; and 189 work days in 2023-2024. Furthermore, the District wants to increase in-service days for this group to 6 in 2020-2021; 6 in 2021-2022; 7 in 2022-2023; and 7 in 2023-2024, grouping the days as “in service” without current contractual distinction of which days are prior to the school year, and which days are during the school year.

The District proposes to increase the total work days for Non-Tenured teachers to 188 in 2020-2021; to 189 in 2021-2022; to 190 in 2022-2023; and 191 work days in 2023-2024. Furthermore, the District wants to increase in-service days for this group to 8 in 2020-2021; 8 in 2021-2022; 9 in 2022-2023; and 9 in 2023-2024, grouping the days as “in service” without current contractual distinction of which days are prior to the school year, and which days are during the school year.

The District presented a passionate plea to increase teacher work days for several reasons. In comparison to surrounding districts, most notably Nazareth, Easton and neighboring Wilson, Bangor teachers work less days and have a resultant higher per diem when factoring in average salaries. The District asserted that the time administration can spend with teachers on factors that result in higher student achievement is the top priority. The District also pointed out that a correlation exists between increased work days and higher rank among Pennsylvania high schools. Specifically, it cited Nazareth with 189 days and a ranking of 74 out of 500 schools. Neighboring Wilson ranked 107 while it employs teachers for 186 days. On the other end of the spectrum, both Bangor and Pen Argyl with a 185 work day year, ranked 377th and 396th, respectively. The District highlighted its commitment to improving student academic achievement by citing its already comprehensive and sustained literacy professional development for teachers of early readers; its new mathematics and reading materials; wireless learning solutions; personal student devices; and Apple TV's, among other accomplishments. The District protested that with only 185 teacher work days, and 180 student days, it only has five (5) days to in-service, train and develop skills with staff per school year, and it has had to apply to the Pennsylvania Department of Education for additional



ACT 80 days to provide sufficient professional development to staff. Finally, the District is seeking flexibility vis-à-vis scheduling in-service days either prior to start of school or during the year.

**Recommendation and Rationale:**

I am persuaded that the District proposal, to phase in gradually an increased number of teacher work days in the school year should be accepted. The District has presented evidence that suggests additional days can provide important skills training to an already highly professional unit, resulting in higher academic achievement for students. Therefore, I recommend adoption of the District proposal regarding Teacher Work Year in totality:

Tenured            2019-2020-185 days/5 in-service days  
                         2020-2021-186 days/6 in-service days  
                         2021-2022-187 days/6 in-service days  
                         2022-2023-188 days/7 in-service days  
                         2023-2024-189 days/7 in-service days

Non-Tenured    2019-2020-187 days/7 in-service days  
                         2020-2021-188 days/8 in-service days  
                         2021-2022-189 days/8 in-service days  
                         2022-2023-190 days/9 in-service days  
                         2023-2024-191 days/9 in-service days

**B. Teacher Work Day, II. Preparation Time**

**Association Position:**

The Association has proposed language that uniformly applies provisions concerning uninterrupted preparation time during the instructional day across all grade levels and support service departments. Their proposal specifically focuses on provision of preparation time for secondary instructors, to be treated similarly to elementary instructors. The Association objects to the District proposal to re-define student hours via a contractual provision, and additionally, it

objects to the District proposal to remove limits upon pre-instructional day administratively directed meetings. Finally, the Association is seeking no changes to language pertaining to clarification of two (2) reserved days per month for planned, professional activities as referenced in the current contract.

**District Position:**

The District proposes to more precisely define student hours as “the officially announced time of student arrival and dismissal.” The District is not interested in extending the possibility of pre-instructional time to secondary educators in the unit. The District seeks to eliminate the limitation of the current four (4) pre-instructional days per month as well as two (2) per week. Finally, the District seeks to clarify language pertaining to two (2) reserved monthly days for planned professional activities.

**Recommendation and Rationale:**

A recurrent theme presented by *both parties* to this process concerned a desire for uniformity and consistency. That is, all members of the bargaining unit should be treated equally as to pay increase, working conditions, etc. Further, policies, procedures and contractual provisions should apply uniformly to all unit members. The Association is seeking to insert language to provide equal opportunity for thirty (30) minute preparation time for secondary instructors, as currently enjoyed by elementary members. As no strong evidence has been presented to indicate this would create operational problems, I recommend adoption of this proposal, effective with the 2020-2021 school year.

Regarding the remaining proposals pertaining to Preparation Time as proffered by the District, I see no evidence of persistent, systemic problems with current language. Therefore, with the exception of the recommendation cited above, I propose no change to the remainder of Article XIII, Teacher Work Year/Day.

**2019-2020** - No change to language under B. Teacher Work Day, II. Preparation Time.

**2020 and subsequent contract years:**

**B. II. Preparation Time:**

- a. Definition of types of prep time: Instructional day preparation time occurs during student hours. Pre/post instructional preparation time occurs 30 minutes before or after student hours.
- b. Definition of student hours: Secondary 7:00 AM - 2:05 PM, Elementary 8:10 AM- 3:20 PM. (Changes to student hours upon request of district with approval of BAEA.)
- c. Each member will be provided with 40-80 continuous minutes of uninterrupted preparation time during the instructional day (instructional day preparation time) and 30 minute pre/post-instructional day preparation time. Members may be asked to attend up to four (4) pre/post-instructional day administrative directed meetings per month, not to exceed two (2) per week.
- d. Bangor Area Education Association shall furnish a Letter of Intent to the Bangor Area School District stating that individual teachers will give up these periods in situations of an unusual or emergency nature, as determined by Administration. It is understood that teachers will continue to contribute time toward professional responsibilities and curriculum development efforts as in the past. However, two (2) days each month will be reserved for planned, district-wide or school-wide professional activities. These professional activities may include faculty meetings, curriculum meetings, and department and/or grade level meetings. These activities will begin at the conclusion of the workday and last no longer than forty-five (45) minutes in length.

## **ARTICLE XVI—PERSONAL/EMERGENCY LEAVE**

### **Association Position:**

The Association argues that the current language significantly limits the use of personal days at the beginning and end of the school year (10 days). The Association proposes limiting the restriction to only the first and last days of the student year. The Association cites the restrictive language effect on returning family members to college, as example. As advance notice is not often provided for these necessary trips, it affects pre-planning and quality of life for the family unit. As for the end of school year, parent/grandparent employees are limited as to attendance of younger family members' functions and events due to restriction currently in place. The Association does not object to the District's position on limiting leave for emergencies to 1/2 day increments nor, when applicable, to requesting emergency leave with a minimum of three (3) working days in advance.

### **District Position:**

The District proposes maintaining current language which provides that Personal days will not be granted during the first ten (10) or last ten (10) days of the student school year. The District argued that obtaining substitute teachers to fill-in early in the school year has become increasingly difficult. Furthermore, continuity and familiarity is extremely important for students at the beginning of the school year. The District also proposes that the use of Personal and Emergency leave must be taken in 1/2 day increments, in order to minimize operational inefficiencies. Finally, the District seeks modification of current language regarding prior notification for Personal leave requests to be at least three (3) working days advance notice.

### **Recommendation and Rationale:**

The Association is seeking quality of life enhancement and more flexibility in enjoying a Personal day for a variety of reasons, including familial obligations for transporting children to required events, as well as optional but equally important life events. The District, in its responsibilities to maintain efficient operations by ensuring sufficient staffing is available, contends the first-ten/last-ten day restrictions in current language is vital to maintaining these efficiencies, as well as continuity and familiarity for students. Furthermore, the parties seem very much on "the

same page” as far use of leave in 1/2 day increments requiring three (3) working days notice for use of appropriate leave. After due consideration and appreciation of both parties’ positions, I find the District obligations to maintain efficient operations and continuity and familiarity overrides the Association position. I recommend no change to current language regarding Personal days not being granted during the first ten (10) or last ten (10) days of the student school year. I am not unsympathetic to the position of the Association, and I do note the current language provides for the possibility, at the discretion of the Superintendent, the use of an emergency day exclusive of a Personal day for certain situations. Therefore, I recommend:

**2019-2020** -No change to current Article XVI language.

**2020-2021 and subsequent contract years:**

**Article XVI - Personal/Emergency Leave**

Use of Personal or Emergency leave must be taken in 1/2 day increments.

Requests for Personal or Emergency leave require three (3) working days advance notice.

## **ARTICLE XXI—MILEAGE**

### **Association Position:**

The Association initially argues that the current language supports members of the bargaining unit where they travel daily between the Five Points Complex and Washington Elementary (approximately five (5) miles). Because there is an increase in members of this bargaining unit having to travel daily between the Complex and Washington Elementary, some with preparation time at a separate location, mileage at the IRS rate should be compensated. Wear and tear on vehicles as well as gasoline costs should be reimbursed for the employee in the course of said employee completing required services for the District.

### **District Position:**

While the District avers employees in the past have not been compensated for this travel between the Complex and Washington Elementary, it seeks to clarify the practice of not paying

mileage by deleting the “Five Points Complex” reference in paragraph one of the Article. It argues that only a small number of employees will be required to travel during their work day to Washington Elementary, and furthermore, this may in fact shorten the distance they have to travel to their homes at the end of the day. Furthermore, the District asserts time is set aside during the employee’s work day to account for this travel, in some instances while being “on the clock”, and finally, other districts experience this same situation, with no mileage reimbursement for travel between locations being offered.

**Recommendation and Rationale:**

A peculiar scenario exists regarding this Article, in that both parties believe current language and/or practice supports their respective position. Because of this situation, and because a potential increase in the amount of teachers travelling between Five Points Complex and Washington Elementary in and of itself does not change the current language or its meaning, I recommend no change to current language in Article XXI.

**ARTICLE XXIV—RETIREMENT BENEFITS**

**Association Position:**

The Association contends that the amount reimbursed for retirees for health insurance has remained at \$4,000 for a decade. Because of the increase in health insurance costs during this period, this amount is insufficient. The Association proposes a graduated scale of payments to encourage longevity of service to the District, with the assurance of affordability for employees who have dedicated their careers to the District/community. The Association also seeks adjustment to the retirement notification deadline because decisions to retire vary from planned to unexpected, based on individual circumstances. As this life-changing decision is extremely critical, consideration needs to be given to members who have reached this point in their careers.

**District Position:**

The District seeks a language change clarifying service with PSERS, given a certain minimum number of years of service with the District is required. The District also seeks clarification of language stating these payments are contributions towards payments, and also seeks adjustment to retirement notification deadline date. The District seeks to maintain the \$4,000 annual payment ceiling, as it stated that retiree health care costs the District approximately \$96,000 per year.

**Recommendation and Rationale:**

As the Association points out, and as it comes as no surprise to anyone, the \$4,000 reimbursement figure for retiree health insurance may have been adequate a decade ago, but it does not cover premium cost now. This is also reflected in the District proposal to change the wording from “pay premiums” to “contribute towards premiums”. While not in agreement to recommend the proposed Association graduated structure and increase of maximum payment, I do recommend an increase in maximum annual contribution at some future point. I concur with the District that this amount represents a contribution rather than a payment of premium. While I am sympathetic to the Association’s argument that retirement is a critical life-changing decision, and circumstances change, I can appreciate the District’s decision-making processes that need to be put into action when a member retires, and the amount of time that is necessary to secure adequate replacement(s). Therefore I recommend the following:

**2019-2020 -No change to current language.**

**2020-2021 and subsequent contract years:**

**Article XXVI- Retirement Benefits**

- An employee who has a combined total retirement score of 75 or higher (score is based on employee’s age plus number of years of service with the District) shall be eligible for the below District retirement benefits. Ten years of service shall have been with the Bangor Area School District. The Employer agrees to contribute towards premiums for Medical/Major Medical, Prescription and Dental Insurance coverage for the employee, single coverage, for five (5) years or until a federally funded insurance program takes over. The total premium contribution shall not

exceed a maximum of \$4,500 per year. The Employer agrees to pay a Sick Leave Accumulation/Severance Payment at retirement, calculated at Fifty Dollars (\$50.00) per day times the number of days of accumulated sick leave as an employee of the Bangor Area School District, but not to exceed two hundred ten (210) days. The employee must notify the School District of the employee's retirement plans, in writing, with not less than 90 calendar days' notice of the effective date of retirement, or later than March 31 in the year preceding the retirement, whichever is lesser.

## **APPENDIX A—EXTRA-CURRICULAR SCHEDULE**

### **Association Position:**

The Association stated that while there were tentative agreements reached concerning many of the positions on the current Extra-Curricular schedule, there remained open twenty-three (23) assignments, mainly Advisor and Coach positions. The Association stated many bargaining unit members support academic focus through their roles as class advisor, academic and department team leaders, and mentor teachers. The Association feels that the total dollars offered by the District needs to be reallocated for the remaining open assignments in a more equitable manner. Rationale for this requested reallocation was not provided at the hearing.

### **District Position:**

The primary argument of the District is that all assignments on the Extra-Curricular schedule have been tentatively resolved. Furthermore, they state compensation provided to these positions is competitive with surrounding districts. Finally, they contend that the Association is seeking higher salaries earmarked for certain individuals without providing supporting rationale.

### **Recommendation and Rationale:**

As stated earlier in this report, my review of the evidence submitted leads to the conclusion this is an open item. In reviewing these open items, the Association is seeking approximately



\$7,000 in additional compensation to be allocated as they feel appropriate over the remaining twenty-three (23) assignments. Based on the lack of supporting rationale for the suggested reallocation of compensation for these remaining assignments, I recommend adoption of the District Proposed Stipend with the exception of one position. As equality in salary for similarly situated members has been an underlying theme echoed by both parties to these negotiations and hearing, I recommend one deviation from the District Proposed Stipend, that being **COACH: GOLF HEAD VARSITY**. In reviewing Head Coach assignments in both open items and where it is undisputed that tentative agreements have been reached, I believe it is an appropriate recommendation for a Proposed Stipend of \$4,000 to be allocated to this assignment. Otherwise, the District's Proposed Stipend should be adopted for the other twenty-two (22) Extra-Curricular assignments.

## **ARTICLE XXII—COMPENSATION/APPENDIX B—SALARY SCHEDULES**

### **Association Position:**

Citing financial reports from the Pennsylvania Department of Education as well as the District, the Association presented information indicating the District ended the 2017-2018 school year with a surplus of over \$6,000,000, and based on budget figures received, an expected surplus of approximately \$5,500,000 existed in 2019-2020. Furthermore, based on these reports, an anticipated \$57.39 million in total revenue for the 2019-2020 fiscal year was projected for the District. The Association stated that over the past five (5) years, the District has been conservative in raising taxes, a levy less than the average County or State rate. The Association reported that the actual District fund balance was \$6,214,128 on June 30, 2018; that the market value of taxable property in the District has increased slowly but steadily since 2013-2014; that the District has \$100,000 of unallocated funds in a budgetary reserve account for 2018-2019; and that the priority of bargaining unit salary accounts has declined over the past six (6) years, as the budgeted increase for 2019-2020 is \$282,990 or 1.5%. The Association also asserted that based on reports for the previous five (5) years, the District has exhibited a pattern of spending more than what they budgeted for, but also receiving more than what is expected, to offset the spending pattern. The

conclusion to be reached is there are no “red flags” to report budget-wise, as reflected by Standard and Poor’s satisfactory rating, revealing a fiscally healthy District. The Association reported that the District recently approved a tax hike of 1.9% in balancing its budget for 2019-2020, but noted this was lower than neighboring County districts, and lower than the maximum rate it could have levied.

Focusing on its specific salary proposal, the Association argued that salaries and benefits in the 2017-2019 contract were significantly less than what the District budgeted. Specifically, the 2018-2019 salary increase without step increment was lower than the neighboring district average, while the salary plus step movement increase in both 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 was lower than neighboring district average. Over the terms of the last two (2) collective bargaining agreements, bargaining unit members have experienced freezes and salary schedule expansion and compaction, resulting in unequal step increment values, and hence unequal pay increases for the members, a problem for which a solution is top priority in this contract. In comparing its salary proposal with the District’s proposal for the period 2019 through 2024, the Association proposal is only approximately \$800,000 richer in total dollar increase over the five (5) year period. A major difference between the two proposals is that the Association seeks to maintain a traditional fair and equitable salary–scale structure with equal step increments. The District opposes a traditional salary-scale structure.

The Association strongly believes that fairness and career equity, as well as predictability for both parties are critical in maintaining the traditional salary schedule. All employees should be compensated equitably based on education and experience because they indeed perform the same work for the District. The Association’s proposal is a series of salary schedules over five (5) years that work to adjust incremental differentials to be equal by the third year. This includes a series of deleting the previous year’s lowest step on the schedule, while utilizing a “jump step” to achieve incremental equity. This proposal corrects a relatively low entry-level step and also corrects the low maximum Masters column step relative to other County districts. Specifically, the Association is seeking:

2019-2020- 3.00% increase

2020-2021- 2.91% increase

2021-2022- 2.83% increase

2022-2023 and 2023-2024 - open, unable to make proposal because of philosophical difference.

Step movement for those not at maximum beginning in 2022-2023 and 2023-2024.

Column movement in all years of term of contract.

Wages to be retroactive to July 1, 2019.

**District Position:**

While strongly disagreeing with the Association's report of the fiscal health of the District, specifically the amount of reported surplus, the District stated that its financial position is strong, rated "A+ stable". It was recently upgraded to "good" based on its fiscal practices. The District did however caution that there is a "downward" trend and that caution in spending must be exercised. As budgets normally need to be established before prior year audit report results are disclosed, many times districts can be slow to react if there isn't a surplus from a previous year. Furthermore, the District stated that had it used up all of the previous year's surpluses, there would not be a current positive balance to be enjoyed. The District's position of avoiding significant tax increases or layoffs is one it hopes to maintain for the future.

The District agreed that the current salary schedule is rife with inequities due to compacting steps and questionable and disproportionate distribution of monies by the Association in years prior, and resultant feelings of resentment by some veteran members must be remedied. The District agrees that equal pay and pay increases should be available to employees doing the same type of work. To that end, the District proposal provides the same base salary increase to all members every year. Additionally, it provides more substantial raises to novice and "career rate" bargaining unit members than previous contracts. It abolishes the traditional salary schedule, and provides for significant payments for teachers who move from Bachelor's Degrees to Master's Degrees, with increases in between upon attainment of certain credit levels. Furthermore, it provides for base rate increases upon attainment of Pennsylvania Department of Education teaching certificates and a Doctoral Degree. The District is seeking equity within its three (3) employee groups (administrative, professional and support staff) and contends its salary proposal achieves that equity within this unit and amongst all District employees.

The District presented a comparative analysis of neighboring districts, which revealed starting salaries and maximum Masters steps are competitive, especially with comparable districts such as Wilson and Pen Argyl. Furthermore, the District explained that the average member of this bargaining unit moving across the salary schedule earns significantly more than neighboring districts that are comparable. The District's proposal allows all presently employed certificated District teachers to earn more than \$62,000, with a minimum increase of \$5,000 over five (5) years for every employee. Currently, the District pointed out that 12% of the bargaining unit earns salaries exceeding \$90,000. Specifically, the District is seeking:

2019-2020 - \$900 base compensation increase.

2020-2021 - \$900 base compensation increase.

2021-2022 - \$1,000 base compensation increase.

2022-2023 - \$1,100 base compensation increase.

2023-2024 - \$1,100 base compensation increase.

No step or column increases, as traditional salary schedule is abolished.

All years 2019-2024:

Movement from Bachelors to Masters - \$12,000 base compensation increase.

Movement from Bachelors +15 to Masters - \$3,000 base increase.

Movement from Bachelors+24 to Masters - \$3,000 base increase.

Movement from Bachelors +30 to Masters - \$500 base increase.

Movement to Doctoral Degree - \$5,000 base compensation increase.

Earning one (1) new active and valid teaching certificate - \$1,500 base increase.

Earn second active and valid teaching certificate - \$2,500 base increase.

No wage retroactivity.

The District made argument that it strongly opposes retroactivity, and it has communicated this at the negotiation table and at the hearing on September 9th. The District feels the Association has been a passive participant during these negotiations, specifically, they did not present any

salary-focused proposals, nor enter into any serious salary negotiations until July 10, 2019, subsequent to the June 30, 2019 expiration date of the prior contract.

**Recommendation and Rationale:**

Both the Association and the District are of one accord in that they seek equality in pay raises and opportunities for increases. Both agree that the inequalities created in past contracts regarding compensation are in dire need of repair. The parties could not be any farther apart in their positions on how to accomplish these repairs, one side adamant about maintaining a traditional schedule, one side arguing for abolition of such a schedule. Additionally, the Association argues for retroactive salary adjustments; the District argues retroactivity should not be granted to this unit. After review of both side's arguments, evidence and rationale for their respective proposals, I am convinced that while the compensation structure is in need of corrective adjustment, equity and fairness can best be achieved by maintaining the traditional salary schedule, and my recommendation to follow reflects that conviction. I am convinced that the basic template of deleting lower steps while adding steps at the top of the scale, as proposed by the Association, along with collapsing steps and "jump-stepping" certain individuals accomplishes equity in a satisfactory manner in a short time. While the District proposal provides ample opportunity for generous base compensation increases for individuals not holding a Master's Degree, employees currently holding a Masters inherently have less opportunity of increase, especially if they are at a point in their career where they have no interest in obtaining a Doctoral Degree. Furthermore, the District proposal offers no guidance as to where newly hired employees would be placed. This lack of specificity and unequal opportunity for compensation increase between Masters Degree and Bachelor's Degree can only exacerbate present-day salary inequalities. I am not convinced percentage increases as proposed by the Association are in order for this unit, at least in the early years of this Agreement, and I am convinced increases similar to neighboring Districts, comparable to Wilson and Pen Argyl, are appropriate. These recommended increases are also consistent and comparable with average salary increases with and without an increment in neighboring Districts over the five (5) year span of the recommended Agreement. Most importantly to the parties, a \$1,650 salary difference between steps will be achieved by the third contract year (2021-2022) and no employees will suffer a decrease in compensation due to "manual adjustment" of steps, which includes deleting and adding of steps. Therefore, I recommend:

2019-2020 - \$921 increase to most cells. Further explanation will follow in attachment to salary schedules. 2019-2020 is the year individual adjustments to steps on schedule will be implemented. Normal column movement. No step movement. Delete/add one step.

2020-2021 - \$1,000 increase to cells on schedule. Normal column movement. No step movement. Delete/add one step.

2021-2022 - \$1,000 increase to cells on schedule. Normal column movement. No step movement. Delete/add one step.

2022-2023 - \$1,100 increase to cells on schedule. Normal column and step movement.

2023-2024 - \$1,100 increase to cells on schedule. Normal column and step movement.

In order to facilitate migration to this schedule, I have attached to each year's respective scales in Appendix B a more detailed explanation page.

With the recommendation of maintaining a traditional salary schedule, this encompasses rejection of the District salary proposal (except for the base compensation increases) including proposed changes to Article XXII-Compensation, Professional Compensation: grammatical and paragraph structure changes.

In regards to retroactivity to July 1, 2019, I have thoroughly considered the positions of both parties and I am sympathetic to the frustration expressed by the District. However, based on all the factors presented and in light of my salary recommendation including no step movement for bargaining unit members for the first three (3) years of the Agreement, as well as recommendation of yearly increases closely associated with what the District is proposing, I recommend the salary proposal to become effective retroactive to July 1, 2019.

## **ARTICLE XXVII—LONG-TERM SUBSTITUTES**

### **Association Position:**

The Association argues this proposal goes hand-in-hand with its salary proposal to maintain a salary schedule, as it reflects their desire to retain such schedule. While there has been tentative agreement regarding elimination of the phrase “not to exceed Step 5”, the Association opposes the District proposal to hire Long-Term Substitutes “according to practices established by the District”, and proposes Long –Term Substitutes **will** be placed up to Step 5.

### **District Position:**

The District proposes to hire Long-Term Substitutes in accordance with established past practices. The District primary salary proposal eliminates a salary schedule as currently exists in the collective bargaining agreement. Furthermore, the District is proposing annual compensation increases rather than percentage increases or movement “on scale.” Finally, the District seeks to utilize its prerogative in placement of a Long-Term Substitute on a salary schedule, so long that it is done in a just and equitable manner.

### **Recommendation and Rationale:**

In accordance with the Compensation recommendation above, the salary schedule is to be retained. While the District advocates for placement in accordance with established practices, no evidence of these practices was submitted. Therefore, I recommend adoption of the Association position of placement on the applicable salary schedule up to Step 5. This replaces the word “may” with the word “will.” This is in addition to the previous Article XXVII tentative agreement reached prior to fact finding.

## **ARTICLE XVIII—INSURANCE BENEFITS**

### **B.MEDICAL INSURANCE PREMIUM SHARE CONTRIBUTIONS**

#### **Association Position:**

While the Association acknowledges annual costs of the medical plan has increased over the last several years, it is strongly opposed to the District's two (2) tiered proposal to eliminate participation in Wellness activities and the opportunity to receive an annual premium share reduction. The Association proposes to maintain the current five (5) tiered option which differentiates family structures and provides a lower and more reasonable and realistic option for the multiple types of family arrangements that exist. Because family structures can change quickly and often, the current structure provides a fair option for members. Furthermore, the District proposal places an undue net compensation burden on current subgroups who are not associated with the highest costs of the plan. Finally, the Association contends a significant and increasing number of bargaining unit members participate in Wellness activities and should be able to realize a reward for participation in a program that can have long-term positive impact upon benefit utilization and costs.

#### **District Position:**

In addition to contending this matter had been resolved previously in negotiations, the District proposes reducing the current five (5) tiered program to a two (2) tier premium share contribution structure, namely "Single Monthly" and "Non-Single Monthly". In addition to increasing the premium share for both groups in order to account for rising annual costs of the self-insured medical plan, the plan proposed by the District is competitive if not less than the plans offered by neighboring districts. The District proposal provides low-cost benefits to employees, is the basic platform that is in existence for other staff in the District, and is extremely affordable when combined with the compensation package offered by the District.

#### **Recommendation and Rationale:**

The Association proposal of maintaining the current five-tier structure while affording opportunity to engage in voluntary Wellness programming proposes reasonable 5% per year



increases to premium share contributions. The proposal rewards employees willing to engage in health-enhancing activities and can reasonably lead to lower future medical costs. The proposal also provides for premium contributions higher than what the District seeks in employee shares for subgroups not willing to participate in health-related Wellness activities. The Association makes a meritorious point that multiple variations of family make-up exist today, and to not recognize these various sub-groups places unequal financial strain on those perhaps least able to afford the “Non-Single Monthly” premium. Finally, no evidence was presented to indicate Wellness activities place an undue administrative or otherwise hardship upon the District. Therefore, I recommend adopting the Association’s proposal which maintains the current five (5) tier structure, with annual contributions as proposed by the Association, reflecting a 5% increase annually. Consequently, this also results in a recommendation to maintain current Appendix E-Wellness Activities.

July 1-November 30, 2019: Maintain current 18-19 contributions and tiers (w/Wellness).

**December 1, 2019 and subsequent contract years:**

with Wellness Activities:

	<b>12/1/19-6/30/20</b>	<b>20-21</b>	<b>20-22</b>	<b>22-23</b>	<b>23-24</b>
Single	\$22	\$23	\$24	\$25	\$26
EE and Spouse	\$40	\$42	\$44	\$46	\$48
Parent and Child	\$26	\$27	\$28	\$29	\$31
Parent and Children	\$33	\$35	\$37	\$39	\$41
Family	\$49	\$51	\$54	\$57	\$60

without Wellness Activities:

	<b>12/1/19-6/30/20</b>	<b>20-21</b>	<b>20-22</b>	<b>22-23</b>	<b>23-24</b>
Single	\$32	\$34	\$36	\$38	\$40
EE and Spouse	\$59	\$62	\$65	\$68	\$71
Parent and Child	\$39	\$41	\$43	\$45	\$47
Parent and Children	\$48	\$50	\$52	\$55	\$58
Family	\$73	\$77	\$81	\$85	\$89

## ARTICLE XVIII- INSURANCE BENEFITS

### F. PRESCRIPTION DRUG DEDUCTIBLE

#### **Association Position:**

The Association acknowledges an increased cost for brand name formulary and non-formulary drugs, although not to the extent as to what the District is proposing in co-pays. The Association proposes a decrease in generic prescription co-pays, as over 75% of all members' prescriptions filled are with generic and not name-brand products.

#### **District Position:**

In addition to contending this matter was resolved previously during negotiations, the District proposes increase in co-pays for generic, brand name formulary and non-formulary prescriptions.

#### **Recommendation and Rationale:**

While it is contested as to what percentage prescriptions have risen in recent years, there is no dispute they have increased dramatically. In light of the parties' presentations and in comparison with neighboring districts, most notably Wilson and Pen Argyl, I recommend the following:

#### **July 1, 2019-November 30, 2019:**

Maintain current co-pays for generic, brand name formulary and non-formulary prescriptions. Mail Order/3-month supply - 2x monthly.

#### **December 1, 2019-June 30, 2024:**

Generic:	\$12.00
Brand Name Formulary:	\$40.00
Brand Name Non-Formulary:	\$70.00
Mail Order/3-Month Supply:	2x Monthly

**ALL OTHER MATTERS**

Any other matters not specifically addressed are recommended to be **withdrawn**. Additionally, as noted above, any tentative 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.

September 23, 2019  
Allentown, PA

Respectfully submitted,  
Larry Cheskawich, Arbitrator/Fact Finder

---

## APPENDIX B AND IMPLEMENTATION INSTRUCTIONS

### INSTRUCTIONS FOR MIGRATION TO 2019-2020 SALARY SCHEDULE

The following is based on scattergram of bargaining unit member placement-227 members:

1. Initial emphasis placed on moving employees on Steps 1, 2 and 3 to Step 4 in their respective columns.
  - a. Three (3) employees move from Bachelors column, Step 1, to Step 4.
  - b. Five (5) employees move from Bachelors column, Step 2, to Step 4.
  - c. One (1) employee moves from Bachelors column, Step 3, to Step 4.
  - d. Three (3) employees move from Masters/ME column, Step 2, to Step 4.
  - e. Two (2) employees move from Masters/ME column, Step 3, to Step 4.
  - f. One (1) employee moves from Masters +15 column, Step 2, to Step 4.
  - g. Two (2) employees move from Masters +45 column, Step 3, to Step 4.
2. Step 1 from 2018-2019 schedule is deleted.
3. Step 2 and 3 from 18-19 schedule becomes **new** Step 1 and 2, respectively. No dollar value added to cell, no employees on these Steps, no employees harmed.
4. Step 4 through Step 13 from 18-19 schedule are re-numbered to **new** Step 3 through 12. Employees remain at dollar value, only the **number** of the Steps decreases.
5. Add \$921 dollar value to **new** Steps 3 through 12
6. **Second emphasis** focuses on properly adjusting Bachelors and Bachelors +24 columns. Bachelors +15 column can be eliminated from schedule, as no employees currently occupy that column, nor is movement there permitted.
7. Four (4) current employee placements from the 18-19 schedule in Bachelors column at 18-19 Steps 4 through 6, and two (2) from Bachelors +24 column at 18-19 Steps 4 and 12 will have a “manual adjustment” to their step placement. This is followed by “manual adjustments” to cells in Bachelors and Bachelors +24 columns where no employee occupies the cell. No employee will experience a negative financial impact.
8. Two (2) employees on Bachelors Step 4, 18-19 schedule move to **new** Bachelors Step 4, 19-20 schedule.
9. One (1) employee on Bachelors Step 5, 18-19 schedule moves to **new** Bachelors Step 5, 19-20 schedule.

10. One (1) employee on Bachelors Step 6, 18-19 schedule moves to **new** Bachelors Step 6, 19-20 schedule.
11. Bachelors column Steps 7 through 12 on 19-20 schedule are “manually adjusted” to reflect \$1,650 difference between Step increments. No employee currently occupies these cells; therefore, no employee is financially impacted.
12. **New** Step 13 is added to Bachelors column (no employee occupies), with a \$1,650 dollar value more than Bachelors column **new adjusted** Step 12.
13. One (1) employee on Bachelors +24 Step 4, 18-19 schedule moves to **new** Bachelors +24 Step 4, 19-20 schedule.
14. Bachelor +24 column Steps 5 through 12 on 19-20 schedule are “manually adjusted” to reflect \$1,650 difference between Step increments. No employee financially impacted.
15. **New** Step 13 is added to Bachelors +24 column, with a \$1,650 value more than **new adjusted** Step 12.
16. One (1) employee on Bachelors +24 Step 12, 18-19 schedule moves to **new** Bachelors +24 Step 13, 19-20 schedule.
17. **New** Step 12, 19-20 schedule in Bachelors +30, Masters/ME, Masters +15, Masters +30, and Masters +45 columns has cell dollar amount **reduced** (subsequent to above steps taken) by \$350.
18. Sixty-four (64) employees who occupied **old** Step 13 on 2018-2019 schedule each receive a one-time lump sum payment of \$350.
19. **New** Step 13 is added to Bachelors +30, Masters/ME, Masters +15, Masters +30, and Masters +45 columns, with a \$1,650 value more than the **new adjusted** (as described in step 17 above Step 12).

### **INSTRUCTIONS FOR IMPLEMENTING 2020-2021 SALARY SCHEDULE**

1. Delete 2019-2020 Step 1, all columns from schedule.
2. Renumber Steps to next lowest number. Ex. 19-20 Step 2 becomes 20-21 Step 1; 19-20 Step 3 becomes 20-21 Step 2, etc.
3. No employee Step movement. Ex. any employee on Step 1, 19-20 schedule, remains on Step 1, 20-21 schedule.
4. Increase each cell value on schedule by \$1,000.
5. Add **new** Step 13 to all columns on schedule; **new** (20-21) Step 13 value is \$1,650 over **new** Step 12 value. (ex. Bachelors at \$67,232).

### **INSTRUCTIONS FOR IMPLEMENTING 2021-2022 SALARY SCHEDULE**

1. Delete 2020-2021 Step 1, all columns from schedule.
2. Renumber Steps to next lower number. Ex. 2020-21 Step 2 becomes 2021-22 Step 1; 2020-21 Step 3 becomes Step 2, etc.
3. No employee Step movement. Ex. Any employee on Step 1, 20-21 schedule, remains on Step 1, 21-22 schedule.
4. Increase each cell value on schedule by \$1,000.
5. Add **new** Step 13 to all columns on schedule; **new** Step 13 value (2021-22) is \$1,650 over **new** Step 12 value. (Ex. Bachelors at \$69,882)

### **INSTRUCTIONS FOR IMPLEMENTING 2022-2023 SCHEDULE**

1. Eligible employees advance **one** Step.
2. Increase each cell value on schedule by \$1,100.
3. Deletion of lowest Step and addition of new Step ceases.
4. Example:
  - a. Bachelors Step 1 2021-2022 schedule (\$50,082), eligible for Step, moves to Bachelors Step 2 2022-2023 schedule (\$52,832) or \$2,750 increase.
  - b. Masters +45 Step 6 2021-2022 schedule (\$81,784), eligible for Step, moves to Masters + 45 Step 7 2022-2023 schedule (\$84,534) or \$2,750 increase.

### **INSTRUCTIONS FOR IMPLEMENTING 2023-2024 SCHEDULE**

1. Eligible employees advance **one** Step.
2. Increase each cell value on schedule by \$1,100.
3. No deletion of lowest Step/addition of new Step.

**APPENDIX B**

**SALARY SCHEDULES**

<b>2019-20 Salary Schedule</b>							
<b>*Normal column movement; no step movement.</b>							
<b>*No further movement into B+30 column.</b>							
<b>Step</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>B+24</b>	<b>B+30</b>	<b>M/MEQ</b>	<b>M+15</b>	<b>M+30</b>	<b>M+45</b>
1	46,547	54,011	63,322	63,905	65,490	67,463	69,999
2	46,854	54,318	63,629	64,212	65,797	67,770	70,306
3	48,082	55,546	64,857	65,440	67,025	68,998	71,534
4	49,732	57,196	66,507	67,090	68,675	70,648	73,184
5	51,382	58,846	68,157	68,740	70,325	72,298	74,834
6	53,032	60,496	69,807	70,390	71,975	73,948	76,484
7	54,682	62,146	71,457	72,040	73,625	75,598	78,134
8	56,332	63,796	73,107	73,690	75,275	77,248	79,784
9	57,982	65,446	74,757	75,340	76,925	78,898	81,434
10	59,632	67,096	76,407	76,990	78,575	80,548	83,084
11	61,282	68,746	78,057	78,640	80,225	82,198	84,734
12	62,932	70,396	79,707	80,290	81,875	83,848	86,384
13	64,582	72,046	81,357	81,940	83,525	85,498	88,034



**2020-21 Salary Schedule**

**\*Normal column movement; no step movement.**

**\*No further movement into B+30 column.**

<u>Step</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>B+24</u>	<u>B+30</u>	<u>M/MEQ</u>	<u>M+15</u>	<u>M+30</u>	<u>M+45</u>
1	47,854	55,318	64,629	65,212	66,797	68,770	71,306
2	49,082	56,546	65,857	66,440	68,025	69,998	72,534
3	50,732	58,196	67,507	68,090	69,675	71,648	74,184
4	52,382	59,846	69,157	69,740	71,325	73,298	75,834
5	54,032	61,496	70,807	71,390	72,975	74,948	77,484
6	55,682	63,146	72,457	73,040	74,625	76,598	79,134
7	57,332	64,796	74,107	74,690	76,275	78,248	80,784
8	58,982	66,446	75,757	76,340	77,925	79,898	82,434
9	60,632	68,096	77,407	77,990	79,575	81,548	84,084
10	62,282	69,746	79,057	79,640	81,225	83,198	85,734
11	63,932	71,396	80,707	81,290	82,875	84,848	87,384
12	65,582	73,046	82,357	82,940	84,525	86,498	89,034
13	67,232	74,696	84,007	84,590	86,175	88,148	90,684

**2021-2022 Salary Schedule**

**\*Normal Column Movement; No Step Movement.**

**\*No further movement into B+30 column.**

<u>Step</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>B+24</u>	<u>B+30</u>	<u>M/MEQ</u>	<u>M+15</u>	<u>M+30</u>	<u>M+45</u>
1	50,082	57,546	66,857	67,440	69,025	70,998	73,534
2	51,732	59,196	68,507	69,090	70,675	72,648	75,184
3	53,382	60,846	70,157	70,740	72,325	74,298	76,834
4	55,032	62,496	71,807	72,390	73,975	75,948	78,484
5	56,682	64,146	73,457	74,040	75,625	77,598	80,134
6	58,332	65,796	75,107	75,690	77,275	79,248	81,784
7	59,982	67,446	76,757	77,340	78,925	80,898	83,434
8	61,632	69,096	78,407	78,990	80,575	82,548	85,084
9	63,282	70,746	80,057	80,640	82,225	84,198	86,734
10	64,932	72,396	81,707	82,290	83,875	85,848	88,384
11	66,582	74,046	83,357	83,940	85,525	87,498	90,034
12	68,232	75,696	85,007	85,590	87,175	89,148	91,684
13	69,882	77,346	86,657	87,240	88,825	90,798	93,334

**2022-23 Salary Schedule**

**\*Normal step and column movement.**

**\*No further movement into B+30 column.**

<u>Step</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>B+24</u>	<u>B+30</u>	<u>M/MEQ</u>	<u>M+15</u>	<u>M+30</u>	<u>M+45</u>
1	51,182	58,646	67,957	68,540	70,125	72,098	74,634
2	52,832	60,296	69,607	70,190	71,775	73,748	76,284
3	54,482	61,946	71,257	71,840	73,425	75,398	77,934
4	56,132	63,596	72,907	73,490	75,075	77,048	79,584
5	57,782	65,246	74,557	75,140	76,725	78,698	81,234
6	59,432	66,896	76,207	76,790	78,375	80,348	82,884
7	61,082	68,546	77,857	78,440	80,025	81,998	84,534
8	62,732	70,196	79,507	80,090	81,675	83,648	86,184
9	64,382	71,846	81,157	81,740	83,325	85,298	87,834
10	66,032	73,496	82,807	83,390	84,975	86,948	89,484
11	67,682	75,146	84,457	85,040	86,625	88,598	91,134
12	69,332	76,796	86,107	86,690	88,275	90,248	92,784
13	70,982	78,446	87,757	88,340	89,925	91,898	94,434

**2023-24 Salary Schedule**

**\*Normal step and column movement.**

**\*No further movement into B+30 column.**

<u>Step</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>B+24</u>	<u>B+30</u>	<u>M/MEQ</u>	<u>M+15</u>	<u>M+30</u>	<u>M+45</u>
1	52,282	59,746	69,057	69,640	71,225	73,198	75,734
2	53,932	61,396	70,707	71,290	72,875	74,848	77,384
3	55,582	63,046	72,357	72,940	74,525	76,498	79,034
4	57,232	64,696	74,007	74,590	76,175	78,148	80,684
5	58,882	66,346	75,657	76,240	77,825	79,798	82,334
6	60,532	67,996	77,307	77,890	79,475	81,448	83,984
7	62,182	69,646	78,957	79,540	81,125	83,098	85,634
8	63,832	71,296	80,607	81,190	82,775	84,748	87,284
9	65,482	72,946	82,257	82,840	84,425	86,398	88,934
10	67,132	74,596	83,907	84,490	86,075	88,048	90,584
11	68,782	76,246	85,557	86,140	87,725	89,698	92,234
12	70,432	77,896	87,207	87,790	89,375	91,348	93,884
13	72,082	79,546	88,857	89,440	91,025	92,998	95,534