



12-1973

A Study of Pertinent Contract Information for Van Buren County Teacher-Negotiators

Howard W. Wood
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses



Part of the Educational Administration and Supervision Commons

Recommended Citation

Wood, Howard W., "A Study of Pertinent Contract Information for Van Buren County Teacher-Negotiators" (1973). *Masters Theses*. 2685.

https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses/2685

This Masters Thesis-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



A STUDY OF PERTINENT CONTRACT INFORMATION
FOR VAN BUREN COUNTY TEACHER-NEGOTIATORS

by

Howard W. Wood

A Project Report
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment
of the
Specialist in Education Degree

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
December 1973

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are three people that deserve considerable credit for the successful completion of this project. Bob Nichols is first a friend, but second a project supervisor that takes his responsibilities seriously. He was always ready to counsel, and to help, but also to inspire. This I needed, and appreciated very much. Vera Stafford was the secretary who reduced the oversize tables of this report from their original form to the form presented in this report, and reproduced them so the teacher-negotiators of Van Buren County could use them. She complained a little, but she did a beautiful job, and I appreciate this very much. Dr. Theodore Ploughman knows how to make a student feel good with just the right word at the right moment. He was there when I needed him, but I enjoyed the freedom to do something I think was really worthwhile. Thanks.

Howard William Wood

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again -- beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

MASTERS THESIS

M-4940

WOOD, Howard William

A STUDY OF PERTINENT CONTRACT INFORMATION
FOR VAN BUREN COUNTY TEACHER-NEGOTIATORS.

Western Michigan University, Ed.S., 1973
Education, administration

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER	
I. SCHOOL OPERATIONS INCOME	8
Local Property Taxes	
State Aid Formula	
Comparisons of Van Buren County Schools	
II. 1971-72 EXPENDITURES BY CATEGORIES	12
Teacher Salaries	
Capital Outlays	
General Fund Equity	
Administration	
Comparisons of Van Buren County Schools	
III. RELATIVE SALARY IMPROVEMENT	18
Best Salary Schedule	
Salary Ranking Improvements, 1966 to 1973	
Sample Rankings	
IV. SALARY DETAILS	24
Insurance	
Summary of Salary Details	
V. EXTRA-CURRICULAR ITEMS	27
Variations Between Schools	
Athletic vs Non-Athletic	
Comparisons of Van Buren County Schools	

VI.	COSTING-OUT PROCEDURES	31
	Direct Salary Costs	
	Board-paid Insurance Premiums	
	Extra-Curricular Activities	
	Calculation Procedures	
VII.	CONCLUSIONS	36

INTRODUCTION

Negotiations have become a fact of life in the public schools of Michigan. Since the 1965 revision of the Hutchinson Act requiring public employers to recognize public employee organizations as exclusive bargaining agents, and to bargain collectively with such agents, there has been a continuing growth in the sophistication of the bargaining process. No longer do teachers come to "bargaining" sessions to hear what school boards would choose to hand down to their employees. Forced by law to bargain, school boards no longer "hand down" anything, but now insist that teachers justify their demands. Teachers now find that school boards are willing and ready to justify their positions also. It is primarily the "justification" process that this project was designed to assist.

In justifying a change in working conditions, both teachers and boards of education generally consider conditions in neighboring school districts to be the most telling arguments. Only the larger urban school districts find that comparisons with more distant schools of a similar urban nature have much weight at the bargaining table.

For this reason, area-wide meetings of superintendents are held to keep each board negotiating team informed of activities in other schools. Frequently, teacher organizations claim that these meetings go beyond "information" and get into agreements to limit teacher gains to certain maximums. Teacher groups may at times also be guilty

of this kind of collusion in violation of the "good faith" bargaining requirements of the Hutchinson Act amendment. Naturally, both groups deny any such illegal collusion on their own part, while remaining suspicious of the actions of the other party.

Information about neighboring schools is so vital to the bargaining process that both parties must spend considerable effort to make certain they are fully informed. Such information is widely distributed by the Michigan Education Association, the Michigan School Boards Association, and the State Board of Education. This information is extensively used by both parties, no matter which party has prepared it. State-wide material of this type is usually broken down by individual school districts so that information about neighboring school districts can be extracted. Generally, the averages, medians, and other statistics so carefully worked out on a state-wide basis receive little more than a quick glance. No one can say why, but a school district two miles away, even if it is quite different in size, wealth, and other factors, produces far more convincing arguments at the bargaining table than does a school district fifty miles away that may be very similar in every other way.

It seems, for example, that the negotiations process will do little to improve the salary of a teacher in a school district which has the highest salaries among ten schools in a county, even though that might mean the school was tenth from the bottom among the 10,000 schools in the state. Conversely, teachers in the poorest paid school district in a county of ten schools will probably make considerable salary gains, even though it might be tenth from the highest of the 10,000 schools. Obviously, these are extreme and improbable,

if not impossible, situations. Otherwise they are excellent examples of what actually occurs within each county, intermediate school district, or athletic conference. Among the twelve schools in Van Buren County, for example, the starting salary for a new teacher just out of college varies by just \$ 312.00, the lowest being \$ 7788.00 and the highest \$ 8100.00. State-wide, the variation is more than \$ 2500.00, from \$ 6850.00 to \$ 9405.00.¹

This project report deals entirely with comparisons of schools in Van Buren County intended for use by teacher-negotiators in that county. Each of the comparisons demonstrates particular strengths and/or weaknesses for certain school districts. In some cases, the comparisons point out areas where it should be relatively easy for a particular local association to make gains, and other areas where gains will be more difficult. It should also point out arguments that the local board may be expected to offer, for which rebuttles should be prepared. The charts which are a part of this report are not intended for use, directly, in the negotiating process, but rather as a reference in building detailed arguments and exhibits to justify bargaining positions, and in determining priorities.

The initial use of the information in each case should be as one factor in determining what to request in the initial proposal. For example, if an item is very important to a local association, but the information to justify that proposal does not exist, it may be better to present some highly justifiable proposal, but which is of little

¹Teacher Salary Schedule and Fringe Benefits Study, Michigan Education Association (1972-73), p. xvi.

importance to the local association, and then substitute the unjustifiable proposal at a later point in the bargaining process. When the opposition asks for justification of the new proposal, the association will simply point out that this new proposal is merely a substitute for the former proposal which is fully justifiable. This is often done with salaries and class loads. It is much easier to justify small classes than it is to justify high salaries. Public support is more easily gained when it is learned that class size is holding up a contract settlement. In the end, of course, the teachers will accept the high salaries "only because the board simply refuses to reduce the class size." Boards know that class sizes reduced one year will be difficult to increase in the next round of negotiations, and that teachers would then return to the table with their small class sizes, and with very justifiable demands for salary improvement.

This type of give and take in the bargaining process demands that information be available and well analyzed before the bargaining process commences. In Van Buren County the information provided in this report was available in early March, 1973. In addition to the information provided in this report, each local association in Van Buren County (and throughout Michigan) received directly from the Michigan Education Association, the following: Summary of Selected Contract Provision, Selected Extra Pay Provisions, Teacher Salary Schedules and Fringe Benefits Study for 1972-73, and Negotiations Workbook. The information provided in this report is a supplement to these booklets prepared by the Michigan Education Association, and deals only with Van Buren County.

The eleven tables in this report (excluding tables 3.3 and 3.4 which are extensions of table 3.2) were presented to the teacher-negotiators of Van Buren County in booklet form, numbered pages 1 through 11, preceded by a title page, a table of contents page, and a one page introduction. The information presented in the booklet was determined from three sources: a) Van Buren County Public Schools annual financial reports, form B, which are available in the Intermediate School District office in Lawrence, Michigan. b) Local contracts for the 1972-73 school year in each school district which were made available by the Van Buren County Education Association office in Bangor, Michigan, and c) Financial and membership information for the 1972-73 school year are estimates and/or unofficial figures provided over the telephone on March 2, 1973, by the State Board of Education office in East Lansing, Michigan. Official information regarding a current school year is not available until August. Unofficial estimates vary from day to day during the school year as membership figures, assessed valuations, and other information arrive in the East Lansing office. State aid payments through the school year vary in relationship to this information, from monthly payment to monthly payment, and only when the final payment is made in July is it certain just how much money the state will provide each school district. State Board of Education estimates, however, are generally quite accurate, excluding such tax revenue losses and resultant cutbacks as occur during a prolonged General Motors Corporation strike.

Additional help is provided to local associations in preparing

proposals and exhibits through the Van Buren County Education Association office, and is available upon request. Considerable time was spent in conjunction with this report helping local negotiators to use the information provided, and to apply it to their specific school situations. This was done individually, and through the monthly negotiations training classes organized by the Van Buren County Education Association.

The learning that took place in the course of completing this project provided considerable insight into the complexities of bargaining under the laws of the State of Michigan. The information presented in this report seemed to be quite useful, judging from the discussions it generated at the negotiations training sessions. More obviously, however, this project pointed up its own incompleteness. The areas where additional studies seem to be necessary, and where different types of comparisons and calculations seem desirable are discussed in the concluding section of this report.

ABBREVIATIONS

Because of limited space in the tables of this report, the following abbreviations are used for the twelve school districts in Van Buren County.

Bangor Public Schools	- BANGOR
Bloomington Public Schools	- BLOOM.
Covert Public Schools	- COVERT
Decatur Public Schools	- DECATR
Gobles Public Schools	- GOBLES
Hartford Public Schools	- HARTF.
Lawrence Public Schools	- LAWR.
Lawton Public Schools	- LAWTON
Mattawan Consolidated Schools	- MATTWN
Paw Paw Public Schools	- PAWPAW
South Haven Public Schools	- S.H.
Van Buren County Intermediate School District	- INTERM

Other abbreviations used are:

Assistant	- ASST.
Association	- ASSOC.
Athletic	- Ath.
Baccalaureate Degree	- BA
Baseball	- BB
Basketball	- BB
Cross Country	- CC
Football	- FB
Hour	- Hr.
Junior High	- JH
Junior Varsity	- JV
Master Degree	- MA
Number	- No.
Student	- St.
Wrestling	- Wrest.

SCHOOL OPERATIONS INCOME

Table 1.1 shows the amount of money, and the sources thereof, which were available for each school district in Van Buren County for the 1971-72 school year. There is very little that negotiations can do to change any of these figures, except perhaps income from interest. The two major sources of income are the local property tax and the state aid distribution.

Table 1.2 shows an estimate of the amount of money, and the sources thereof, which were available for the 1972-73 school year. Increases in the State Equalized Valuation were responsible for increases in the local tax revenue, while a slight decrease in this valuation caused a slight decrease in the local tax revenue for Hartford. State aid increases come from increased membership, increased funding by the state legislature, and/or decreased State Equalized Valuation. Decreases are due to increased State Equalized Valuation, and/or decreased membership. There were no changes in operations millage levies. It should be noted that these estimates are for the 1972-73 school year, but that negotiators using this information were working on a contract for the 1973-74 school year. The process of estimating the available funds two years ahead is more a matter of educated guessing than it is of calculation, particularly since most contracts will be settled before the state legislature even determines what it will budget for school operations.

It will be noted that all school districts in Van Buren County except Covert show an increase in income for 1972-73 over 1971-72.

Due to the construction of the Palisades Nuclear Plant in the Covert School District, Covert is undergoing a period of change from a school district heavily dependent on state aid, to one almost totally dependent on local property taxes. During such transitions, the State Aid Formula usually "grandfathers" the local districts so as to guarantee no less revenue than was received the previous year from combined sources. It is quite probable, therefore, that Covert will eventually receive the \$ 10,734.00 which strict application of the formula would deny. The Covert negotiators are aware of this situation, and will take it into consideration should the board demand a staff reduction or salary cut to compensate for their loss of revenue. Since Covert has \$ 1,222.00 available to spend for each student in its district, and no other school has over \$ 758.00, there are other approaches to funds for teacher salaries, as will be discussed in the next section of this report.

From the School Operations Income, and from the General Fund Equity to be discussed in the next section, an estimation of the total funds to operate each school district must be made. Factors in each local school district will determine this estimation, based on the history of each district. Increases or decreases in membership, tax levies, State Equalized Valuation, and the State Aid Formula are the primary factors in estimating how much money a teacher-negotiations team can expect a Board of Education to spend on contract improvements.

1971-72 SCHOOL OPERATIONS INCOME

Form B - Line Numbers

0110	0150	0160	0190		0100	0300	0613		0000
Local	Interest	Revolving	Misc. ²	Other	Total	State	County Other		Total
Taxes	Rebates	Funds ¹			Local	Aid	Special		General
					Revenues		Tax		Fund

BANGOR	413,339	8,709	101,168	1,134	0	524,350	1,111,541	821	0	1,636,712
BLOOM.	302,573	8,062	36,787	2,178	108	349,708	708,483	5,493	5518 ³	1,141,202
COVERT	906,756	4,788	29,118	814	0	941,476	174,563	22,619	2812 ⁴	1,141,470
DECATR	286,886	10,277	1,946	3,564	0	302,673	736,470	0	0	1,039,143
GOBLES	206,368	7,558	48,410	1,122	40	263,498	559,329	1,208	3489 ⁵	827,524
HARTF.	455,739	21,811	97,127	10,566	1640 ⁶	586,883	805,129	6,000	0	1,398,012
LAWR.	196,520	4,642	49,873	1,063	729 ⁶	252,827	424,797	1,033	6309 ⁵	684,966
LAWTON	340,059	3,452	72,482	1,406	142 ⁶	417,541	352,367	0	5929 ⁷	775,837
MATTWN	336,287	6,018	66,853	7,531	12,275 ⁶	428,964	832,699	0	4696 ⁸	1,266,359
PAWPAW	796,771	13,928	121,852	1,944	3,088 ⁶	937,583	1,017,243	4,327	4796	1,963,949
S.H.	1,109,679	0	307,430	2,901	3,134 ⁶	1,423,144	1,363,929	5,723	5025	2,797,821

1 Includes cafeteria, student body fees, etc. (Has little meaning to negotiations.)

2 Sale of property, insurance, rebates, rentals, etc.

3 Office of Educational Opportunity - Head Start and tuition.

4 Education of veterans

5 Emergency Employment Act

6 Local tax, other than property. (mainly)

7 Unspecified intermediate source. (mainly)

8 Out-of-state students: tuition, etc.

Table 1.1

1972-73 SCHOOL OPERATIONS INCOME (Estimated)

	State ¹ Equalized Valuation	M ²	SEV/ Member	Allo- cated Mills	Voted Mills	Total Opera- tions	Local Tax Levy	State Aid	Other ³	Total	Increase over 1971-72	AR ⁴
BANGOR	20,307,682	2023	10,038	8.68	12.0	20.68	419,963	1,169,840	10,664	1,600,467	64,923	693
BLOOM.	14,932,438	1508	9,902	8.68	13.0	21.68	323,735	852,358	21,359	1,197,452	93,037	696
COVERT	42,656,816	822	51,893	8.18	15.0	23.18	988,785	81,800	31,033	1,101,618	-10,734	1222 ⁵
DECATR	15,358,495	1438	10,680	8.68	11.5	20.18	309,935	774,729	13,841	1,098,505	61,308	702
GOBLES	10,755,573	1115	9,646	9.68	11.0	20.68	222,425	635,721	13,417	871,563	92,449	696
HARTF.	20,962,786	1811	11,575	8.68	13.0	21.68	454,473	932,070	40,017	1,426,560	125,675	702
LAWR.	9,217,563	885	10,415	8.68	13.0	21.68	199,837	497,639	13,776	711,252	76,159	683
LAWTON	15,964,514	1040	15,350	8.68	14.0	22.68	362,075	458,940	10,929	831,944	128,489	697
MATTWN	18,801,648	1683	11,171	9.00	12.5	21.50	404,235	874,780	30,520	1,309,535	110,029	685
PAWPAW	32,401,297	2363	13,711	8.68	17.5	26.18	848,266	1,118,266	28,083	1,994,782	152,685	758 ⁶
S.H.	50,340,213	3427	14,689	9.68	12.5	22.18	1,116,546	1,542,190	16,783	2,675,519	185,128	652

1 State Equalized Valuation (SEV) is total amount of taxable property in a school district.

2 Membership (as of Friday, September 29, 1972).

3 Estimated to be same amount as in 1971-72 table, including Interest Rebates, Misc., and County Special

4 Available Revenue per member, estimated, excluding the following: Tax.

a Revolving Fund

b Transportation Expenditures (at 1971-72 levels)

c General Fund Equity

5 Due to high State Equalized Valuation.

6 Due to high millage levy.

Table 1.2

1971-72 EXPENDITURES BY CATEGORIES

Table 2.1 shows the expenditures for each school district during the 1971-72 school year. Teacher-negotiators have the best arguments for salary increases if the Teacher Salaries column shows a low expenditure of funds. However, even if this percentage is low, the search must continue for a category with a correspondingly high percentage of expenditures. Revolving funds do not increase or decrease available funds, so they are not included in calculating the percentages. Transportation is a local situation, dependent upon the urban-rural composition of the district, and not subject to comparisons between districts. It is a separate formula within the State Aid Formula, and little can be done through negotiations to change the costs, so transportation is not included either in calculating the percentages.

The search for funds available to pay for negotiations proposals often begins at the capital outlay column. Under certain circumstances a Board of Education can use its operation money for things that could also be purchased from a building fund. Money may not be available in that fund, or the board may not want to try to pass a bond issue. In such cases, money can be transferred from the general fund. Under no circumstances, however, can money be transferred from the building fund to the general fund, so any transfer is a one-way, permanent transaction. Teachers recognize that one or two percent of the general fund each year must be spent this way to replace furniture, and similar capital investments, but when general funds are used for such technically legal, but highly questionable, purposes as purchases of property and construction

of buildings that voters have turned down at the polls, teachers do not find much joy in then being told that the board has no money to meet their salary demands.

The second place teachers look for money is the General Fund Equity category. This column is made up of all supplies, materials, prepaid bills, and similar expenses that represent funds that would normally have been spent during succeeding school years, as well as bank account balances. Teachers recognize that a school can not use every scrap of paper every year, and that they can not operate with a bank balance of zero. Twenty percent in the General Fund Equity is considered a reasonable amount. When the percent is considerably higher than this, and particularly if high interest income (See table 1.1) indicates a large portion is in the bank, teachers expect the board to come up with some of this money to meet their demands. This is even more important when the General Fund Equity increase has occurred recently, indicated by a high percentage figure in the Excess Revenue category.

Boards usually part with their General Fund Equity very reluctantly, trying to keep their budgets balanced year by year, and they will be very hard to bargain with when this fund is low. Teachers need to check other funds very carefully, as suggested above, to show why a General Fund Equity has been depleted. An extreme example is demonstrated in table 2.1 my Mattawan which spent more money than it received during the 1971-72 school year, reducing its General Fund Equity by \$ 40,479.00. Since only \$ 26,814.00 remains in the fund, some economies will be required for the next school year, assuming that revenue increases are about the same amount as expense increases. The Mattawan Board of

of Education may come to the bargaining table, pointing out that it will not be possible to take another \$ 40,000.00 out of this fund, and that increased expenses can not be allowed this year no matter how well justified. Teachers will then point out that the General Fund Equity would have increased nearly \$ 8500.00 instead of decreasing had the board not chosen to spend \$ 75,638 for the purchase of land and the construction of a building that the voters did not approve. Therefore, the board should be willing to grant demands that do not exceed \$ 8500.00 plus the increase they expect in local and state revenues. They will say it is not fair to hold back teacher salaries to build the General Fund Equity when the board does this kind of thing with operations money.

Any category where the percentage of expenditures varies significantly from other schools is subject to scrutiny, of course, but the Administration category is one of the more sensitive categories. It is not so much that large sums of money are spent in this category, since administration costs seldom exceed 5% except in very small school districts, but it is an area where boards have to negotiate what they spend, even if less formally than with teachers, and where teachers can often show much more rapid administrator salary increases from year to year than have been awarded to teachers.

There is not a separate category in the Annual Financial Report, filed by school districts in Michigan, for teacher salaries. Boards like to refer to Instruction costs, not teacher salaries, but since this includes the principals who are excluded by law from the bargaining unit, this is not really correct. For the purposes of this report, four specific line items from the Instruction category are included

in the Teacher Salaries sub-category: Teachers, Substitutes, Librarians, and Guidance Counselors. This is the pattern followed by the Michigan Education Association in determining teacher salary expenditures.

Table 2.1 shows that the Hartford Public Schools had a very good year financially in 1971-72. The excess revenue amounting to \$ 177,389.00 added to an already well supplied General Fund Equity produced a total fund of \$ 635,612.00, or a General Fund Equity large enough to operate the schools for more than half a year. (51.3%) Only Hartford and Gobles (30.7%) were significantly above the 20% standard. Hartford teacher-negotiators should be able to bargain for a considerable increase in their salary schedules. Hartford, however, has recently passed a bond issue for new buildings, and it may be that the emphasis in negotiations will be on additional teachers, and reduced class sizes. These types of local choices obviously will vary from school to school.

Teachers in Lawton received almost 70% of their school's budget as Teacher Salaries during the 1971-72 school year, the highest percentage in Van Buren County. Lawton experienced a deficit of \$ 11,770.00 with only \$ 7202.00 of this caused by transfers to the building fund. Even though Lawton's rank on the salary charts (See table 3.1 and 3.2) is the lowest in Van Buren County for both the BA and MA maximum salaries, it will be very difficult for them to negotiate salary increases in Lawton. The money is simply not available. Teachers in Lawton will be faced with the unpleasant prospect of pointing out to the board that their millage levy of 14.0 mills is considerably lower than their neighbor Paw Paw which levies 17.5 mills, and that Lawton's high assessed valuation (second only to Covert) forces them to levy millage to meet a large portion of their needs since State Aid is relatively low in districts

with high assessed valuation. The only other way to achieve higher salaries will probably be by increasing class sizes, an unpleasant alternative to both boards and teachers, and subject to unpleasant public relations within the community. Negotiations in school districts with these types of conflicting problems often prove to be very difficult.

South Haven has a different problem. With very low Excess Revenues, and modest General Fund Equity, South Haven has the highest maximum salary levels in Van Buren County, and has had since contracts were first negotiated in this area for the 1966-67 school year. South Haven is the largest school district in Van Buren County, and there is a general tendency for the larger schools across the state to have better salary schedules than do smaller schools. A large district, with fairly high State Equalized Valuation (third highest in the county), South Haven must depend heavily upon its local tax levies. However, they only levy 12.5 mills, third from the lowest in Van Buren County, and extremely low compared to larger school districts that often levy twenty or more mills by vote of the electorate. South Haven teachers can expect a hard time retaining their favored position, and negotiations may prove to be very difficult.

1971-72 EXPENDITURES BY CATEGORIES

(Percentages of income, excluding Transportation and Revolving Funds)

Form B - Line Numbers

	1000	1100- 1600 In- struc- tion	2100 Admin- istra- tion	2200 2300 Atten- dance	2400 Trans- porta- tion	2500- 2700 Costs ²	2799 Sub-Total Current Operation Expense	2800 Capital Outlay	3000 Revol- ving Fund	2900 3300 3400 Misc. ³	3499 Total General Fund	Excess Revenue	Total General Fund Equity
BANGOR	1,053,237 73.1%	875,224 60.8%	49,782 3.5%	1636 .1%	103,054	248,710 17.1%	1,456,419 94.0%	18,541 1.3%	95,268	200 0%	1,570,428 95.4%	66,234 4.6%	282,756 19.6%
BLOOM.	755,101 76.3%	626,967 63.3%	44,438 4.5%	1182 .1%	111,112	171,958 17.4%	1,083,791 98.2%	29,517 3.0% ⁴	36,078	2,389 0.2%	1,151,775 101.5%	-10,573 -1.1%	190,573 19.2%
COVERT	691,782 66.5%	508,657 48.9%	58,752 5.6%	56 0%	56,720	170,586 16.4%	977,896 88.6%	39,805 3.8% ⁵	40,169	47,429 4.6% ⁶	1,105,299 97.0%	36,171 3.5%	203,600 19.6%
DECATR	723,250 76.7%	600,538 63.2%	37,456 3.9%	184 0%	84,972	134,258 14.1%	985,120 94.7%	24,323 2.6% ⁷	3,850	880 0.1%	1,014,173 97.4%	24,970 2.6%	191,019 20.1%
GOBLES	552,421 75.5%	454,794 62.1%	34,205 4.7%	210 0%	52,183	97,257 13.3%	736,276 93.5%	7,162 1.0%	43,271	28,588 3.9% ⁸	815,290 98.3%	12,234 1.7%	224,500 30.7%
HARTF.	866,509 69.9%	718,835 58.0%	36,004 2.9%	1012 .1%	71,901	127,736 10.3%	1,103,162 83.4%	29,477 2.4% ⁹	83,830	4,054 0.3%	1,220,623 85.8%	177,389 14.2%	635,612 51.3%
LAWR.	438,023 75.7%	362,415 62.6%	34,503 6.0%	2737 .5%	44,851	74,476 12.9%	594,590 94.9%	8,680 1.5%	61,603	460 0.1%	665,333 96.5%	19,633 3.4%	135,187 23.3%
LAWTON	546,151 81.6%	465,595 69.6%	37,190 5.6%	0 0%	39,029	81,761 12.2%	704,131 99.4%	11,262 1.7% ¹⁰	68,205	4,009 0.6%	787,607 101.7%	-11,770 -1.8%	110,605 16.5%
MATTWN	854,289 77.0%	699,222 63.0%	45,817 4.1%	0 0%	88,621	189,744 17.1%	1,178,471 98.2%	86,161 7.8% ¹¹	67,506	1,514 0.1%	1,333,652 106.1%	-67,293 -6.1%	26,814 2.4%
PAWPAW	1,303,959 74.1%	1,033,363 58.7%	77,851 4.4%	1419 .1%	103,225	242,953 13.8%	1,729,407 92.4%	21,191 1.2%	100,008	5,823 0.3%	1,856,420 93.9%	107,520 6.1%	383,649 21.8%
S.H.	1,899,631 80.5%	1,592,585 67.5% ¹²	89,095 3.9%	2108 .1%	166,956	339,669 14.4%	2,497,459 98.8%	10,030 0.4% ¹³	274,271	5,596 0.2%	2,787,356 99.4%	10,465 0.4%	292,437 12.4%

1 Includes: teachers, substitutes, librarians, guidance
Excludes: principals, consultants & supervisors, sec-
retaries, clerks, supplies, aides, "others"

2 Maintenance, Operations, & Fixed Charges

3 Community Services, Transfers to Other Districts,
Transfers to Other Funds (footnoted)

4 \$ 19,450 for site acquisition & new buildings

5 \$ 27,301 for new buildings

6 \$ 44,000 transferred to building & site fund

7 \$ 2,415 for site acquisition

8 \$ 26,616 transferred to building & site fund

9 \$ 18,845 for site acquisition & new buildings

10 \$ 7,202 for site acquisition & new buildings

11 \$ 75,638 for site acquisition & new buildings

12 \$ 19,797 for elementary consultants and
supervisors not included.

13 \$ 164 to site acquisition

Table 2.1

RELATIVE SALARY IMPROVEMENT

In the six years of negotiations that have followed the 1965 amendments to the Hatch Act requiring recognition and collective bargaining with public employee groups, teaching salaries in Van Buren County have made impressive gains. These gains are demonstrated by the numbers in tables 3.1 and 3.2. However, the purpose of these tables is to show the rankings of the various salary schedule characteristics for schools in Van Buren County through these years.

These tables are used to create line graphs to show the relative improvement and/or decline over the years in each school district. Table 3.3 demonstrates relatively steady improvement in maximum salaries in Bloomindale over this period of years until the 1972-73 contract. Table 3.4 demonstrates the rise and the fall of the Bangor maximum salaries. The same type of graph could be drawn for minimum salaries, and for each school district in the county. This was done for each school district before the booklet on which this report is based was distributed to each negotiations team in the county. It should be noted that the Van Buren County Intermediate School District negotiated its first contract for the 1972-73 school year, and thus an extra school appears in each list beginning with that year.

When discussing the figures provided in these tables, the question often arises, "How can you tell which is the best salary schedule?" This is hard to answer. One approach to the problem,

generally advocated by school boards is to see which schedule has the highest BA starting salary. Teachers tend to be more concerned about the maximum salary they will receive, which directly affects their retirement income. An important factor for a new teacher is how many years it will take him to reach the maximum salary. If you calculate the thirty year accumulated salary of a Master Degree teacher in Lawton and in South Haven (assuming neither contract ever changed in that period), the result would be the career value of each salary schedule. Lawton's contract would accumulate \$ 343,200.00 while South Haven's was accumulating \$ 387,800.00, a career difference of \$ 54,600.00.

Most commonly, however, teachers judge the value of a salary schedule simply on how high the MA maximum salary is with the BA maximum salary of secondary importance. Traditionally, the minimum salaries, particularly for the BA schedule have been considered the property of the board. Teachers often attempted to keep these numbers low to allow higher maximum salaries, while boards attempted to keep them relatively high so they could hire new teachers. Recent changes in the supply of teachers may have caused some revisions in these attitudes for both parties.

RELATIVE SALARY IMPROVEMENT
FOR VAN BUREN COUNTY
(Dollars)

<u>MA Minimum</u>	66-67	67-68	68-69	69-70	70-71	71-72	72-73						
S. H.	5650	PAWPAW	6500	S. H.	7000	BANGOR	7400	COVERT	8000	COVERT	8458	PAWPAW	8700
BANGOR	5532	COVERT	6400	COVERT	6900	COVERT	7400	PAWPAW	7931	S. H.	8346	GOBLES	8572
PAWPAW	5500	BANGOR	6300	LAWR.	6900	S. H.	7400	S. H.	7918	LAWR.	8358	S. H.	8560
HARTF.	5500	BLOOM.	6300	BANGOR	6800	BLOOM.	7300	MATTWN	7850	PAWPAW	8300	LAWR.	8505
COVERT	5400	HARTF.	6300	BLOOM.	6800	DECATR	7300	LAWR.	7811	LAWTON	8275	COVERT	8500
DECATR	5400	LAWR.	6300	HARTF.	6800	HARTF.	7300	BLOOM.	7800	GOBLES	8246	LAWTON	8450
LAWTON	5400	S. H.	6300	LAWR.	6800	LAWR.	7300	LAWTON	7720	MATTWN	8100	MATTWN	8450
MATTWN	5400	DECATR	6200	LAWTON	6700	BANGOR	7300	BANGOR	7700	BLOOM.	8099	DECATR	8400
BLOOM.	5350	LAWTON	6200	PAWPAW	6700	PAWPAW	7300	DECATR	7700	BANGOR	8029	INTERM	8400
GOBLES	5300	GOBLES	6100	GOBLES	6560	GOBLES	7200	HARTF.	7600	DECATR	8000	BANGOR	8350
LAWR.	5200	MATTWN	6100	MATTWN	6500	MATTWN	7200	GOBLES	7600	HARTF.	7922	BLOOM.	8325
												HARTF.	8259

<u>BA Minimum</u>	66-67	67-68	68-69	69-70	70-71	71-72	72-73						
S. H.	5250	BANGOR	6000	S. H.	6500	BANGOR	6900	S. H.	7400	COVERT	7800	PAWPAW	8100
BANGOR	5232	COVERT	6000	COVERT	6450	COVERT	6900	COVERT	7350	S. H.	7800	INTERM	8100
COVERT	5200	HARTF.	6000	HARTF.	6400	HARTF.	6900	PAWPAW	7348	LAWR.	7779	COVERT	8000
HARTF.	5200	PAWPAW	6000	S. H.	6400	BLOOM.	6900	BLOOM.	7300	LAWTON	7775	GOBLES	8000
PAWPAW	5200	BLOOM.	5900	PAWPAW	6400	HARTF.	6804	HARTF.	7300	PAWPAW	7700	S. H.	8000
DECATUR	5200	LAWR.	5900	BLOOM.	6400	LAWTON	6800	LAWTON	7300	GOBLES	7674	LAWTON	7950
LAWTON	5100	LAWTON	5900	DECATR	6400	MATTWN	6800	MATTWN	7300	BLOOM.	7600	BLOOM.	7925
MATTWN	5100	S. H.	5900	GOBLES	6300	LAWR.	6800	LAWR.	7270	MATTWN	7550	LAWR.	7925
BLOOM.	5050	DECATR	5800	LAWR.	6300	BANGOR	6800	BANGOR	7200	HARTF.	7522	DECATR	7900
GOBLES	5000	GOBLES	5800	LAWTON	6200	DECATUR	6800	DECATUR	7200	DECATUR	7500	MATTWN	7900
LAWR.	5000	MATTWN	5800	LAWTON	6100	GOBLES	6800	GOBLES	7200	BANGOR	7488	HARTF.	7841
												BANGOR	7788

Table 3.1

RELATIVE SALARY IMPROVEMENT
FOR VAN BUREN COUNTY
(Dollars)

MA Maximum

66-67	67-68	68-69	69-70	70-71	71-72	72-73
S.H. 8475	S.H. 9734	S.H. 10815	S.H. 11692	S.H. 13246	S.H. 13962	S.H. 14560
PAWPAW 8057	BANGOR 9720	BANGOR 10557	BANGOR 11488	PAWPAW 12247	BLOOM. 13200	COVERT 14025
BANGOR 7932	PAWPAW 9425	PAWPAW 10500	PAWPAW 11340	BLOOM. 12050	PAWPAW 13200	PAWPAW 13716
HARTF. 7700	DECATR 8840	COVERT 10350	HARTF. 11312	BANGOR 11984	COVERT 13097	INTERM 13712
LAWTON 7542	GOBLES 8600	LAWR. 10200	LAWR. 10930	HARTF. 11935	GOBLES 12806	BLOOM. 13325
COVERT 7395	LAWR. 8550	BLOOM. 9962	BLOOM. 10768	MATTWN 11920	MATTWN 12780	MATTWN 13310
DECATR 7300	BLOOM. 8537	HARTF. 9800	COVERT 10656	DECATR 11840	HARTF. 12715	HARTF. 13256
MATTWN 7200	HARTF. 8525	DECATR 9700	LAWTON 10550	LAWTON 11700	DECATR 12500	DECATR 13200
BLOOM. 7100	LAWTON 8501	GOBLES 9616	DECATR 10540	LAWR. 11606	BANGOR 12475	GOBLES 13132
LAWR. 7000	COVERT 8464	LAWTON 9184	MATTWN 10330	COVERT 11600	LAWR. 12417	BANGOR 12965
GOBLES 6925	MATTWN 8350	MATTWN 9100	GOBLES 10100	GOBLES 11200	LAWTON 12175	LAWR. 12652
						LAWTON 12350

BA Maximum

66-67	67-68	68-69	69-70	70-71	71-72	72-73
S.H. 7875	BANGOR 9120	S.H. 10042	S.H. 10902	S.H. 11618	S.H. 12246	S.H. 12800
PAWPAW 7384	S.H. 9116	BANGOR 9728	BANGOR 10488	BLOOM. 11050	BLOOM. 11725	COVERT 12400
HARTF. 7280	DECATR 8440	HARTF. 9270	HARTF. 10316	BANGOR 10944	COVERT 11700	HARTF. 12154
LAWTON 7242	GOBLES 8300	BLOOM. 9216	LAWR. 10100	HARTF. 10914	HARTF. 11659	INTERM 12127
BANGOR 7232	HARTF. 8225	GOBLES 9216	LAWTON 10500	LAWTON 10900	LAWR. 11486	BANGOR 11844
COVERT 7195	LAWTON 8201	LAWR. 9150	BLOOM. 10030	LAWR. 10735	BANGOR 11388	DECATR 11750
MATTWN 7100	LAWR. 8150	PAWPAW 8970	GOBLES 9760	COVERT 10657	LAWTON 11375	LAWR. 11720
DECATR 7000	MATTWN 8050	DECATR 8940	COVERT 9660	DECATR 10500	GOBLES 11348	BLOOM. 11675
BLOOM. 6800	PAWPAW 8040	COVERT 8901	DECATR 9660	GOBLES 10500	PAWPAW 11200	GOBLES 11674
LAWR. 6800	BLOOM. 7995	LAWTON 8784	MATTWN 9640	PAWPAW 10391	DECATR 11185	PAWPAW 11664
GOBLES 6625	COVERT 7829	MATTWN 8700	PAWPAW 9622	MATTWN 10350	MATTWN 11125	MATTWN 11585
						LAWTON 11550

Table 3.2

RELATIVE SALARY IMPROVEMENT
FOR VAN BUREN COUNTY
(Dollars)

MA Maximum

66-67	67-68	68-69	69-70	70-71	71-72	72-73
S.H. 8475	S.H. 9734	S.H. 10815	S.H. 11692	S.H. 13246	S.H. 13962	S.H. 14560
PAWPAW 8057	BANGOR 9720	BANGOR 10557	BANGOR 11488	PAWPAW 12247	BLOOM. 13200	COVERT 14025
BANGOR 7932	PAWPAW 9425	PAWPAW 10500	PAWPAW 11340	BLOOM. 12050	PAWPAW 13200	PAWPAW 13716
HARTF. 7700	DECATR 8840	COVERT 10350	HARTF. 11312	BANGOR 11984	COVERT 13097	INTERM 13712
LAWTON 7542	GOBLES 8600	LAWR. 10200	LAWR. 10930	HARTF. 11935	GOBLES 12806	BLOOM. 13325
COVERT 7395	LAWR. 8550	BLOOM. 9962	BLOOM. 10768	MATTWN 11920	MATTWN 12780	MATTWN 13310
DECATR 7300	BLOOM. 8537	HARTF. 9800	COVERT 10656	DECATR 11840	HARTF. 12715	HARTF. 13256
MATTWN 7200	HARTF. 8525	DECATR 9700	LAWTON 10550	LAWTON 11700	DECATR 12500	DECATR 13200
BLOOM. 7100	LAWTON 8501	GOBLES 9616	DECATR 10540	LAWR. 11606	BANGOR 12475	GOBLES 13132
LAWR. 7000	COVERT 8464	LAWTON 9184	MATTWN 10330	COVERT 11600	LAWR. 12417	BANGOR 12965
GOBLES 6925	MATTWN 8350	MATTWN 9100	GOBLES 10100	GOBLES 11200	LAWTON 12175	LAWR. 12652
						LAWTON 12350

BA Maximum

66-67	67-68	68-69	69-70	70-71	71-72	72-73
S.H. 7875	BANGOR 9120	S.H. 10042	S.H. 10902	S.H. 11618	S.H. 12246	S.H. 12800
PAWPAW 7384	S.H. 9116	BANGOR 9728	BANGOR 10488	BLOOM. 11050	BLOOM. 11725	COVERT 12400
HARTF. 7280	DECATR 8440	HARTF. 9270	HARTF. 10316	BANGOR 10944	COVERT 11700	HARTF. 12154
LAWTON 7242	GOBLES 8300	BLOOM. 9216	LAWR. 10100	HARTF. 10914	HARTF. 11659	INTERM 12127
BANGOR 7232	HARTF. 8225	GOBLES 9216	LAWTON 10500	LAWTON 10900	LAWR. 11486	BANGOR 11844
COVERT 7195	LAWTON 8201	LAWR. 9150	BLOOM. 10030	LAWR. 10735	BANGOR 11388	DECATR 11750
MATTWN 7100	LAWR. 8150	PAWPAW 8970	GOBLES 9760	COVERT 10657	LAWTON 11375	LAWR. 11720
DECATR 7000	MATTWN 8050	DECATR 8940	COVERT 9660	DECATR 10500	GOBLES 11348	BLOOM. 11675
BLOOM. 6800	PAWPAW 8040	COVERT 8901	DECATR 9660	GOBLES 10500	PAWPAW 11200	GOBLES 11674
LAWR. 6800	BLOOM. 7995	LAWTON 8784	MATTWN 9640	PAWPAW 10391	DECATR 11185	PAWPAW 11664
GOBLES 6625	COVERT 7829	MATTWN 8700	PAWPAW 9622	MATTWN 10350	MATTWN 11125	MATTWN 11585
						LAWTON 11550

Table 3.3

RELATIVE SALARY IMPROVEMENT
FOR VAN BUREN COUNTY
(Dollars)

MA Maximum

66-67	67-68	68-69	69-70	70-71	71-72	72-73
S.H. 8475	S.H. 9734	S.H. 10815	S.H. 11692	S.H. 13246	S.H. 13962	S.H. 14560
PAWPAW 8057	BANGOR 9720	BANGOR 10557	BANGOR 11488	PAWPAW 12247	BLOOM. 13200	COVERT 14025
BANGOR 7932	PAWPAW 9425	PAWPAW 10500	PAWPAW 11340	BLOOM. 12050	PAWPAW 13200	PAWPAW 13716
HARTF. 7700	DECATR 8840	COVERT 10350	HARTF. 11312	BANGOR 11984	COVERT 13097	INTERM 13712
LAWTON 7542	GOBLES 8600	LAWR. 10200	LAWR. 10930	HARTF. 11935	GOBLES 12806	BLOOM. 13325
COVERT 7395	LAWR. 8550	BLOOM. 9962	BLOOM. 10768	MATTWN 11920	MATTWN 12780	MATTWN 13310
DECATR 7300	BLOOM. 8537	HARTF. 9800	COVERT 10656	DECATR 11840	HARTF. 12715	HARTF. 13256
MATTWN 7200	HARTF. 8525	DECATR 9700	LAWTON 10550	LAWTON 11700	DECATR 12500	DECATR 13200
BLOOM. 7100	LAWTON 8501	GOBLES 9616	DECATR 10540	LAWR. 11606	BANGOR 12475	GOBLES 13132
LAWR. 7000	COVERT 8464	LAWTON 9184	MATTWN 10330	COVERT 11600	LAWR. 12417	BANGOR 12965
GOBLES 6925	MATTWN 8350	MATTWN 9100	GOBLES 10100	GOBLES 11200	LAWTON 12175	LAWR. 12652
						LAWTON 12350

BA Maximum

66-67	67-68	68-69	69-70	70-71	71-72	72-73
S.H. 7875	BANGOR 9120	S.H. 10042	S.H. 10902	S.H. 11618	S.H. 12246	S.H. 12800
PAWPAW 7384	S.H. 9116	BANGOR 9728	BANGOR 10488	BLOOM. 11050	BLOOM. 11725	COVERT 12400
HARTF. 7280	DECATR 8440	HARTF. 9270	HARTF. 10316	BANGOR 10944	COVERT 11700	HARTF. 12154
LAWTON 7242	GOBLES 8300	BLOOM. 9216	LAWR. 10100	HARTF. 10914	HARTF. 11659	INTERM 12127
BANGOR 7232	GOBLES 8225	GOBLES 9216	LAWTON 10500	LAWTON 10900	LAWR. 11486	BANGOR 11844
COVERT 7195	LAWTON 8201	LAWR. 9150	BLOOM. 10030	LAWR. 10735	BANGOR 11388	DECATR 11750
MATTWN 7100	LAWR. 8150	PAWPAW 8970	GOBLES 9760	COVERT 10657	LAWTON 11375	LAWR. 11720
DECATR 7000	MATTWN 8050	DECATR 8940	COVERT 9660	DECATR 10500	GOBLES 11348	BLOOM. 11675
BLOOM. 6800	PAWPAW 8040	COVERT 8901	DECATR 9660	GOBLES 10500	PAWPAW 11200	GOBLES 11674
LAWR. 6800	BLOOM. 7995	LAWTON 8784	MATTWN 9640	PAWPAW 10391	DECATR 11185	PAWPAW 11664
GOBLES 6625	COVERT 7829	MATTWN 8700	PAWPAW 9622	MATTWN 10350	MATTWN 11125	MATTWN 11585
						LAWTON 11550

Table 3.4

SALARY DETAILS

Table 4.1 indicates the details of the Van Buren County salary schedules which are not shown in tables 3.1 and 3.2. Most schools have an additional salary supplement for teachers who have earned a certain specified number of hours beyond their BA and/or MA degrees. A few schools have specialist schedules, and all pay for some health insurance coverages. The number of increments (years it takes to move from the bottom of a salary schedule to the top) varies from school to school. All insurance coverages in Van Buren County are through the Michigan Education Special Services Association (MESSA), a non-profit insurance company owned and operated by the teacher-members of the Michigan Education Association.

Optional policies from the same company covering such things as long-term disabilities, automobile insurance, and dental care are available. Teachers can pay for these options, but in some schools, as indicated by the footnotes in table 4.1, the board will allow money not used up by the health insurance coverages to go for these options. This usually occurs when a teacher is covered by the spouse's health insurance, or for single teachers who pay less for health insurance than does a family. Bangor, Lawton, and Paw Paw are the only schools where the money paid for insurance by the board can be used for any insurance option, with no obligation to select any health insurance options whatsoever.

Full-family health insurance costs \$ 606.00 per year per family,

but the amount actually paid for insurance coverage by the board depends on how many restrictions they put on the use of the funds they provide. South Haven is the most restrictive, allowing no options, and completely eliminating duplications (such as a teacher whose spouse is employed in another school district if the other district provides any health insurance coverage at all,) and eliminating the family coverage for any spouse who earns a living, whether otherwise covered by insurance or not. In schools without restrictions, such as Bangor, the board is almost certain to pay out the full amount allowed since some option or another will generally be selected by the teacher to use up all the funds allocated. Teacher-negotiators must look carefully at the value of these options to the teachers they represent at the bargaining table. Sometimes a lesser amount of money, without restrictions, will prove to be more advantageous, and may prevent the wasting of money on duplicate insurance policies. (Insurance policies, including the one provided by Michigan Education Special Services Association, often have clauses to prevent duplicate payments even if two or more premiums are being paid.)

SUMMARY OF 1972-73 SALARY DETAILS

	BA+			MA+			SPECIALIST(SP)		INCREMENTS ¹			MESSA INSURANCES
	Hours	Minimum	Maximum	Hours	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	BA	MA	SP	
BANGOR							8918	14131	13	13	13	\$420.00
BLOOM.	+20	8175	12975						10	12		F.F. ²
COVERT	+35 ³	8500	14025	No MA Schedule			9000	15390	12		13	\$526.32 ⁴
DECATR	+15	8100	11950	+15	8600	13400			11	12		\$540.00 ⁵
GOBLES	+18	8000	11674	+15	8784	13344			11	12		70% of F.F.
HARTF.									11	11		F.F. ⁶
LAWR.	+15	8025	11820	+15	8605	12752			11	11		F.F.
LAWTON	+15	8150	11750	+15	8650	12752			12	13		\$347.52
MATTWN	+18 ⁷	8175	11860	+18	8650	13510			11	12		\$453.60 ⁸
PAWPAW	\$10.00 per approved semester hour ⁹ , not to exceed 30								9	10		\$420.00
S.H.	+20	8250	13050	+10	8810	14810			12	12		F.F. ¹⁰
INTERM				+15	8600	14334	8800	15266	13	13	13	F.F.

- 1 AB+ & MA+ same as BA & MA
2 F.F. is Full-Family Super-Med \$606.00 or less, no options
3 BA+15 at BA+\$225.00 for those hired before 9/1/72 only
4 Toward F.F. only (no options)

- 5 For Health, Dental, Life or Disability only
6 25%, new teachers
45%, other probationary
Some options allowed

- 7 Former BA+15 teachers grandfathered
8 For F.F. only, or \$240.00 in options
1000 Term Life provided in addition
9 Not retroactive
10 No duplications, no employed spouses

Table 4.1

EXTRA-CURRICULAR ITEMS

Table 5.1 indicates the extra-curricular items related to athletics for which teachers are paid salary supplements in each school district. Table 5.2 indicates the extra-curricular items not related to athletics.

The great variations between schools paid for these duties is obvious. Regular salary schedules vary relatively little from school to school within the district, but there is no such uniformity in the extra-curricular schedules. A head football coach in Hartford earns between \$ 800.00 and \$ 1326.00 per year, depending on his experience and degree level. A similar coach in Lawrence earns \$ 763.00 no matter what his experience or degree level.

Even more diverse than the amounts paid for extra-curricular activities are the means by which these amounts are determined. Various schools base the amount on percent of teaching salary, percent of the BA and/or MA base, flat rate, administrative prerogative, limited numbers of increments, or combinations of these methods.

It appears that athletic programs specifically for girls are not extensive. Cheerleading is assumed to be a co-educational activity, though it is primarily an activity for girls in most schools. Some schools allow girls to compete with boys in certain sports, particularly track. Rarely are girls excluded by any official policy since it is uncertain how such a policy would fair if challenged in court. Only a few schools, notably Bloomingdale, have taken any real steps

toward a full program to meet the demands of girls for their own sports activities.

The tables strongly suggest that the coaches of revenue producing sports (football and basketball) are paid higher than coaches in other sports. Also, it appears that only the band and perhaps the driver education teachers receive a non-athletic salary subsidy on a par with the coaches of these two sports. There is no attempt in this report to evaluate any of these activities to determine the amount of time spent or any other factor that might determine their relative worth, only to point out the differences that do exist.

SAMPLE EXTRA-CURRICULAR ITEMS (ATHLETIC) 1972-73¹

	ATHLETIC DIRECTOR	BASKETBALL (Head)	FOOTBALL (Head)	ASST., JH, & JV	No. ² G ³	OTHER ATHLETICS LIST ⁴	
BANGOR	Not Mentioned	9 % 700 15 % ^a 1253	9 % 700 15 % ^a 1253	5% 389 9% ^a 752	4 0	4 % 312 11 % ^a 919	
BLOOM.	4% 317 9% ^{b, d} 893	10.5% 832 10.5% ^c 916	10.5% 832 10.5% ^c 916	2% 159 7% ^c 712	11 3	1.5% 119 5.5% ^c 560	Golf Wrestling
COVERT	9% 720 9% ^e 1262	10 % 800 10 % ^e 1402	10 % 800 10 % ^e 1402	5% 400 6% ^e 842	8 1	2 % 160 9 % ^e 1262	Wrestling
DECATR	Not Mentioned	1050 1050	1050 1050	500 725	7 0	325 850	Wrestling
GOBLES	10% 800 10% ^f 1030	10 % 800 10 % ^f 1030	10 % 800 10 % ^f 1030	3% 240 6% ^f 618	11 2	1.5% 120 6 % ^f 618	Golf
HARTF.	12% 941 12% ^e 1591	10 % 800 10 % ^e 1326	10 % 800 10 % ^e 1326	4% 314 6% ^e 795	7 0	1.5% 118 5 % ^e 663	
LAWR.	11% 800 11% ^b 800	10.5% 763 10.5% ^b 763	10.5% 763 10.5% ^b 763	6% 436 8% ^b 582	7 1	2 % 145 8 % ^b 582	
LAWTON	9% 716 9% ^e 1130	8 % 631 8 % ^e 1004	7 % 557 7 % ^e 879	3% 239 7% ^e 879	4 0	3 % 239 6 % ^e 753	
MATTWN	Not Mentioned	840 840	840 840	383 641	10 2	147 641	Boys & Girls Intramurals
PAWPAW	750 750	900 900	900 900	450 625	13 1	100 8578	Wrestling(2) Tennis, Golf
S.H.	Not Mentioned	12 % 960 12 % ^h 1296	12 % 960 12 % ^h 1296	4% 320 8% ^h 864	15 2	1.5% 120 9.5% ^h 1026	Wrest.(2), Golf Swim(2), Tennis

1 In each school,
1st line is minimum
2nd line is maximum
(all conditions con-
sidered), & method
of determination is
shown by letters:

a % of BA or MA base
b % of BA base
c % of BA up to
6th increment
d 4% for High School
9% for Middle
e % of salary

f % of BA or MA up
to 5th increment
g \$ 525.00 for Girls'
Ath. Assoc. sponsor
if inter-school play
h % of BA base up to
7th increment

2 Mostly for boys
Girls may be allowed.
Includes cheerleading
3 Sports for girls (only)
4 FB, BB, BB, Track, CC and
cheerleading not included

Table 5.1

SAMPLE EXTRA-CURRICULAR ITEMS (NON-ATHLETIC) 1972-73¹

	VOCAL MUSIC	BAND ⁴	CLASS & COUNCIL ADVISORS	DRIVER'S EDUCATION	OTHER NON-ATHLETIC	UNUSUAL NOTES
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
BANGOR	6 % ^a 467 9 % ^a 752 ^a	9% ^b 700 12% ^b 1002	13 35 4% 312	35.00 per st.+ 107.00 per class	11 10% ^a 150 1% ^a 835	5
BLOOM.	Not Mentioned	14% ^c 1110 14% ^c 1425	8 1% ^b 79 2% ^b 204	Not Mentioned	4 1% ^b 79 5% ^b 396	6
COVERT	5 % 400 5 % ^e 631	10% 800 10% ^{e,i} 1262	2 250 250	6.00 per hour	16 300 1500	7
DECATR	Not Mentioned	775 775	5 75 200	Not Mentioned	2 300 500	
GOBLES	2 % ^f 160 2 % ^f 267	6% ^{f,j} 240 6% ^{f,j} 618	6 1% ^f 80 3% ^f 400	5.50 per hour	9 1% ^f 80 4% ^f 534	8
HARTF.	Not Mentioned	6% 470 6% ^e 795	2 100 175	Not Mentioned	4 4% 314 5% ^e 663	
LAWR.	2.5% 182 2.5% ^b 182	10% 727 10% ^b 727	6 \$ 3.00 per hour	Not Mentioned	4 2% 145 3% ^b 254	
LAWTON	1 % 80 1 % ^e 126	5% 398 5% ^e 628	6 1% 80 2% ^e 251	At least 5.00 per hour	11 1% 80 2% ^e 251	
MATTWN	231 231	630 630	0	6.00 per hour ^k	2 315 378	9
PAWPAW	374 374	374 374	1 187 187	6.25 per hour	13 187 417	6 10
S.H.	8 % 640 12 % ^h 1296	8% 640 12% ^h 1296	0	36.75 per st. ¹ 43.75 per st. ¹	13 1% ^h 120 6% ^h 648	11

(Footnotes continued from Table 5.1)
i plus pro-rated extra pay for summer
j summer additional at \$ 5.50 per hour
k Coordinator paid \$ 175.00 additional
1 1st, 2nd(40.25) and 3rd year
4 Also STRINGS in South Haven
5 Agriculture 25%^a+\$150, AV, noon hour

6 Department heads
7 Special Education
8 Forensics, debate
9 Summer School & Adult Education at \$ 6.00 per hour
10 Summer School at \$ 6.50 per hour, clubs etc., camp duty
11 Debate, Elementary & Secondary chairmen, Dolphins(Swim Club), Audio-Visual, Public Address(2), Noon hour

Table 5.2

COSTING-OUT PROCEDURES

To find the cost of a salary proposal, three specific areas of cost must be considered: 1) Direct salary costs, 2) Board-paid insurance premiums, and 3) Costs of the extra-curricular salary activities. (Since the employer's share of Social Security taxes is paid directly by the State of Michigan, rather than by each local school district, these taxes are not a factor.)

Table 6.1 lists the information needed to calculate the direct salary costs for any salary proposal a negotiations team would like to cost-out. Table 6.2 lists the basic calculations that are necessary to calculate the costs from the information determined while completing table 6.1. Table 6.3 provides the procedure used in determining the extra-curricular costs of a proposal, using the three basic methods whereby contract language determines these amounts. A sample problem is recorded on the lower half of table 6.3. The answers to the problem are: \$ 142,600.00 for direct salary costs, \$ 4,648.00 for extra-curricular activities, and \$ 4,200.00 for insurance, making a total cost of \$ 151,448.00 for this proposal.

The basic information needed to calculate the costs of salary proposals is recorded in table 6.1 and used to prepare the first column of one copy of table 6.2 for each salary proposal that is to be costed-out. This information will not change during negotiations unless a change is made in the number of teachers to be hired, or a teacher who had been figured into the calculations resigns, or

some other change occurs in the teachers themselves for whom table 6.1 was compiled. A few extra copies of table 6.2 with column one completed are generally kept on hand during the negotiations process for the rapid calculation of the costs of proposals offered by the Board of Education.

SALARY PROPOSAL COSTING-OUT FORM

Directions

1. Determine these factors for your school for the next school year:

Number of teachers on BA schedule	BA =	_____
Number of teachers on MA schedule	MA =	_____
Number of teachers on BA+ schedule (if any)	BA+ =	_____
Number of teachers on MA+ schedule (if any)	MA+ =	_____
Number of teachers on Specialist schedule (if any)	SP =	_____
Total annual experience increments for all BA teachers	BAi =	_____
Total annual experience increments for all MA teachers	MAi =	_____
Total annual experience increments for all BA+ teachers (if any)	BA+i =	_____
Total annual experience increments for all MA+ teachers (if any)	MA+i =	_____
Total annual experience increments for all Specialist teachers (if any)	SPi =	_____
Total number of extra hours earning extra salary for all teachers (if any)	HR =	_____

2. List these factors for the salary proposal to be costed-out:

BA minimum salary	ba =	_____
MA minimum salary	ma =	_____
BA+ minimum salary (if any)	ba+ =	_____
MA+ minimum salary (if any)	ma+ =	_____
Specialist minimum salary (if any)	sp =	_____
Annual BA experience increment	bai =	_____
Annual MA experience increment	mai =	_____
Annual BA+ experience increment (if any)	ba+i =	_____
Annual MA+ experience increment (if any)	ma+i =	_____
Annual Specialist experience increment (if any)	spi =	_____
Extra salary for each extra hour (if any)	hr =	_____

3. Put these factors into blanks of table 6.2:

4. Follow the directions on table 6.2:

Table 6.1

COSTING-OUT FORMULA

Directions

1. Put the required factor in each blank, using the information listed on table 6.1.
2. Do the multiplication indicated on each line, and record the product in the third column.
3. Find the sum of the third column. This is the direct salary cost.

<u>BA</u>	X	<u>ba</u>	=	<u> </u>
<u>MA</u>	X	<u>ma</u>	=	<u> </u>
<u>BA+</u>	X	<u>ba+</u>	=	<u> </u>
<u>MA+</u>	X	<u>ma+</u>	=	<u> </u>
<u>SP</u>	X	<u>sp</u>	=	<u> </u>
<u>BAi</u>	X	<u>bai</u>	=	<u> </u>
<u>MAi</u>	X	<u>mai</u>	=	<u> </u>
<u>BA+i</u>	X	<u>ba+i</u>	=	<u> </u>
<u>MA+i</u>	X	<u>ma+i</u>	=	<u> </u>
<u>SPi</u>	X	<u>spi</u>	=	<u> </u>
<u>HR</u>	X	<u>hr</u>	=	<u> </u>

 Total Direct Salary Costs

4. Add extra-curricular costs (from table 6.3) and total insurance cost.

Table 6.2

EXTRA-CURRICULAR COSTS

Methods of arriving at extra-curricular pay schedules vary widely. Three basic types, and combinations of these are used.

1. Flat Rate. For those schools paying on a fixed dollar amount. (example: Football \$ 1,525.00) The cost is simply the sum of all the amounts paid, and does not vary with the base salary.
2. Percentage of BA and/or MA base. Figure the total number of percents extra to be paid to all recipients at each base, and multiply these percents the proposal for each base salary.
3. Percentage of Salary. Follow the directions in 2. above. then add the amounts indicated for annual increments by:
 - a. Figuring the total allowable percent/increments of the complete staff at each base (example: MA degree, ten annual increments, and paid 6% extra for coaching) This would amount to $.06 \times 10$ or .60 percent/increments of the MA increment being proposed.
 - b. Multiply each percent/increment total by the proposed annual increment for that degree.

SAMPLE PROBLEM

Figure the total cost of the following salary schedule proposal, including direct salary costs, insurance, and extra-curricular activities based on the following information:

<u>Teacher</u>	<u>Degree</u>	<u>Experience</u>	<u>Extra-curricular Duties</u>
A	MA	7 years	Football Coach
B	BA	10 years	
C	BA	25 years	Cheerleader Advisor
D	MA	1 year	Basketball Coach
E	MA+20	5 years	
F	BA+20	3 years	
G	Spec	10 years	
H	BA	0 years (to be hired)	
I	BA+20	15 years	
J	BA	6 years	Track Coach

<u>Proposed Schedule</u>					
<u>Increments</u>	<u>BA</u>	<u>BA+20</u>	<u>MA</u>	<u>MA+20</u>	<u>Spec.</u>
0	10,000	12,000	14,000	16,000	18,000
1	10,200	12,250	14,300	16,350	18,400
↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
10	12,000	14,500	17,000	19,500	22,000
Extra-curricular: (% of salary)			Football - 10%	Basketball - 10%	
			Track - 9%	Cheerlead. - 5%	
Insurance - \$ 420.00 per person					

Table 6.3

CONCLUSIONS

The information necessary for the success of a negotiations process must be carefully prepared and understood by the negotiator. A great deal can be done on a county-wide basis to provide comparative information that would take many hours for each set of teacher-negotiators to prepare locally. For Van Buren County, this report is a good start in making such information available. In the course of using this information, much was discovered about the need for other information. Such needs include:

- 1) Comparisons of Pupil-Teacher ratios.
- 2) Uses and costs of teacher-aides and/or other non-professional personnel for teaching and supervisory duties.
- 3) Relationship of salaries to rural/urban factors.
- 4) Fourth-Friday enrollments, over a period of years.

It is obvious that schools which adopt large class-size policies incur less expenses than do school districts with smaller class-size policies. There is no adjustment in the State Aid Formula for the class-size factor. This area needs further study.

This report, even at its writing, is out of date, and its period of usefulness has already passed. It represents a project that must be undertaken every year, and separately in each county (or other appropriate grouping of similar schools) in the State of Michigan, if it is to be useful to the teacher-negotiators of Michigan. It seemed to be this year.