



**I. INTRODUCTION**

This is an impasse arbitration held pursuant to Section 20.22 of the Iowa Public Employment Relations Act. The undersigned Arbitrator was duly selected pursuant to the Act and the procedures of the Iowa Public Employment Relations Board. In an independent impasse agreement (Joint Exhibit 1), the parties have agreed to waive the statutory deadlines for commencement of the hearing and for service of the award. They have agreed that the Arbitrator's Award must be completed prior to June 30, 2013.

At the hearing held on May 29, 2013, at the administrative offices of the School District, an electronic recording of the proceedings was made by the Arbitrator. Both parties were given the opportunity to present such evidence and argument as they desired, including an examination and cross-examination of all witnesses.

In evaluating the parties' final offers on each impasse item, paragraph 7 of Section 20.22 requires the arbitrator to consider, "in addition to any other relevant factors":

- a. Past collective bargaining contracts between the parties including the bargaining that led the up to such contracts.
- b. Comparison of wages, hours and conditions of employment of the involved public employees with those of other public employees doing comparable work, giving consideration to factors peculiar to the area and the classifications involved.
- c. The interests and welfare of the public, the ability of the public employer to finance economic adjustments and the effect of such adjustments on normal standard of services.
- d. The power of the public employer to levy taxes and appropriate funds for the conduct of its operations.

***Impasse Arbitration: Cedar Falls CSD and EA  
No. 117/2, 2013-2014 Contract  
Page 3***

These statutory factors, as well as other relevant factors discussed below, have been considered by the Arbitrator in determining which of the parties' final offers on wages is most reasonable, as required by Section 20.22 (9). In reaching her decision, the Arbitrator has considered all evidence and argument offered at the hearing, even if that evidence and argument is not specifically mentioned or discussed herein.

**II. BACKGROUND, ISSUES, and the PARTIES' FINAL OFFERS**

The Cedar Falls Community School District (the District) includes the City of Cedar Falls and certain unincorporated areas in western Black Hawk County, Iowa. The District is located entirely within the County and encompasses approximately 61 square miles. The District has 392.4 full-time equivalent (FTE) professional employees (teachers/administrators) and 236.3 support staff. Of the 379 teaching staff, approximately 52.% have advanced academic degrees.

The Cedar Falls Education Association (the Association) is the certified employee organization for the District's professional employees. The Association was first certified by the Iowa Public Employment Relations Board on June 30, 1975 in PERB Case No. 26. The District and the Association have negotiated collective bargaining agreements for the school years from July 1, 1976 through June 30, 2013. While the parties have participated in two fact-finding proceedings, this is the first time the parties have reached impasse requiring the services of an arbitrator to resolve their negotiations.

The parties have reached impasse on two items, wages and hours. On wages, the

***Impasse Arbitration: Cedar Falls CSD and EA  
No. 117/2, 2013-2014 Contract  
Page 4***

Association's final offer is to add \$750 to the current base of \$34,500, resulting in a new base of \$35,250. The District's final offer is to add \$685 to the current base, resulting in a new base of \$35,185. The total package cost of the Association's offered increase is \$1,141,172, representing a 4.42% increase, while the total package cost of the District's offer is \$1,094,311, a 4.23% increase. The Association's offer is \$46,861 more than the District's. The parties agree on this costing analysis.<sup>1</sup>

On hours, the District's final offer is a modification to Article 12.1 of the current agreement (2012-2013) that would keep the "official standard teaching day" of seven hours and fifty minutes, but would increase the length of the pupils' school day within that period by fifteen minutes. (The proposed language is set out in the analysis below.) The Association's final offer is to keep the status quo, the language of the 2012-2013 contract.

### **III. ANALYSIS OF THE ISSUES**

#### **A. Comparability groups**

In resolving contract impasses over wages and other common economic terms of employment, arbitrators have frequently found the second factor listed in Section 20.22(7) - "Comparison of wages, hours and conditions of employment of the involved public employees with those of other public employees doing comparable work, giving consideration to factors peculiar to the area and the classifications involved" - to be highly

---

<sup>1</sup> In its final offer, the Association has specified that the total package cost of \$1,141,172 "includes the cost of insurance increase paid by the district" and that the offer "includes previously T/A supplemental pay positions" and "does not include compensation for Building Learning Leaders and Subject Area Managers." These caveats, and the Association's offer of "current contract language and compensation for department head positions," do not appear to be in dispute.

***Impasse Arbitration: Cedar Falls CSD and EA  
No. 117/2, 2013-2014 Contract  
Page 5***

significant, if not the most significant consideration in determining which final offer is the most reasonable.

In this case, the parties have not agreed on the appropriate group of communities for comparison. Because this is the parties' first impasse arbitration, and the two prior factfinders failed to identify a single comparability group, there is little precedent between these parties to consider in determining which communities should be used for this comparison.<sup>2</sup>

In defining an appropriate group of comparable communities for this arbitration, the Association has proposed two groups, the athletic conference in which the District competes, the Mississippi Valley Athletic Conference, and a "six up, six down" grouping of Iowa school districts with similar student enrollments. The former, the Association urges, provides a group of school districts (Cedar Rapids, College Community, Dubuque, Iowa City, Linn-Mar, and Waterloo) similar in size to the District and in relatively close proximity to Cedar Falls.

The student enrollment data for the athletic conference districts are as follows:

---

<sup>2</sup>In the 1979 fact-finding, the Association proposed two comparability groups, the largest 25 school districts, and the Big Eight athletic conference schools. The District proposed a comparability group consisting of Fort Madison and 20 of the 25 largest school districts in the state, excluding the five largest. Fact Finder Sinclair Kossoff did not identify a single group, instead using data from all of the communities provided by the parties. In the 1990 fact-finding, the Association proposed the 25 largest school districts and the group of statewide settlements. The District proposed a group of similarly size school districts from around the state and the Big Eight Conference schools as two comparability groups. Again, the Fact Finder, Peter Feuille, did not identify a single comparability group but relied on data from all of the sources provided by the parties.

**Impasse Arbitration: Cedar Falls CSD and EA  
No. 117/2, 2013-2014 Contract  
Page 6**

<b>District</b>	<b>October 2012 Enrollment</b>	<b>State Rank</b>
<b>Cedar Falls</b>	<b>4862</b>	<b>18</b>
Cedar Rapids	16,651	3
College Community	4568	20
Dubuque	10,513	8
Iowa City	12,774	6
Linn-Mar	6880	14
Waterloo	10,804	7

The average October 2012 enrollment among these communities (excluding Cedar Falls) is 10,365; the District's enrollment is 53% less than this average.

The six up, six down group includes College Community and Linn-Mar from the athletic conference group, but adds Ames, Bettendorf, Burlington, Johnston, Marshalltown, Muscatine, Ottumwa, Pleasant Valley, Southeast Polk and Waukee districts:

**Impasse Arbitration: Cedar Falls CSD and EA**  
**No. 117/2, 2013-2014 Contract**  
**Page 7**

<b>District</b>	<b>October 2012 Enrollment</b>	<b>State Rank</b>
Waukee	7721	12
Linn-Mar	6880	13
Southeast Polk	6400	14
Johnston	6269	15
Marshalltown	5308	16
Muscatine	5300	17
<b>Cedar Falls</b>	<b>4862</b>	<b>18</b>
Burlington	4656	19
College Community	4568	20
Ottumwa	4531	21
Pleasant Valley	4230	22
Ames	4229	23
Bettendorf	4046	24

These districts are spread geographically throughout the State, but their average October 2012 enrollment (excluding Cedar Falls) was 5345; the District's enrollment was 9 % below this average.

The District has proposed a different group for comparison purposes: Nineteen other school districts that have a certified enrollment within 2000 students of the enrollment of the Cedar Falls District:

**Impasse Arbitration: Cedar Falls CSD and EA  
No. 117/2, 2013-2014 Contract  
Page 8**

School District	October 2012 Enrollment
Linn-Mar	6880
Southeast Polk	6400
Johnston	6269
Marshalltown	5308
Muscatine	5300
<b>Cedar Falls</b>	<b>4862</b>
Burlington	4656
College	4568
Ottumwa	4531
Pleasant Valley	4230
Ames	4229
Bettendorf	4046
Clinton	3966
Mason City	3751
Ft. Dodge	3712
Indianola	3409
Urbandale	3387
Newton	3006
North Scott	2979
Western Dubuque	2977

The average enrollment among this group (excluding Cedar Falls) is 4400. The enrollment of Cedar Falls exceeds this average by 10.5%.

The District has presented an analysis of the 45 impasse arbitration proceedings involving school districts, cities or counties in the past three years. According to the

***Impasse Arbitration: Cedar Falls CSD and EA  
No. 117/2, 2013-2014 Contract  
Page 9***

District's analysis, the arbitrator made "some discernable identification of the appropriate comparability group" in 43 of these cases, and the most common factors used to determine the comparability group were 1) the enrollment of the district or population of the employing entity (a measure of size) and 2) geographic location of the proposed comparable entities.

The Arbitrator has not read and analyzed all 43 of these awards, but just considering the fourteen arbitration awards issued in school district units, notes that in the twelve instances where a comparability group was used, the arbitrator selected a group based on size and location in seven cases (Clarke, Glenwood, Jefferson and Wapsie Valley in 2010; Carroll and Dubuque in 2011, and New Hampton in 2012); a group based on size alone in two cases (Iowa City and Woodward in 2010); and a group based on athletic conference in three cases (Fairfield in 2010, and Aplington-Parkersburg and Hudson in 2011).<sup>3</sup> Given the similarities of funding, operational interests and common statutory and other political structures and constraints for school districts, some of which are inapplicable to counties and municipalities, it is unnecessary to consider the awards for units other than school districts to see that size, perhaps with additional considerations of location, is the criterion most frequently generally recognized in Iowa as yielding a universe of other school districts that may appropriately guide an impasse arbitrator in determining pursuant to Section 20.22 which offer is most reasonable on a particular issue. However, this record also shows that the school district's athletic conference has been accepted as the guiding criterion in some cases.

---

<sup>3</sup>No comparability group was identified in the awards for Central Lee and Fort Madison in 2010.

***Impasse Arbitration: Cedar Falls CSD and EA  
No. 117/2, 2013-2014 Contract  
Page 10***

Without a detailed analysis of each of the cited awards (or a consideration of awards that predate 2010), it is impossible to conclude that a size-based grouping must or even should be selected in preference to an athletic conference grouping in any particular case. It remains necessary to consider the overall characteristics of the groupings proposed to determine which is most likely to enable the arbitrator to make the most accurate “comparison of wages, hours and conditions of employment of the involved public employees with those of other public employees doing comparable work, giving consideration to factors peculiar to the area and the classifications involved.” (Paragraph 9(b) of Section 20.22)

In the present case, each party’s proposed comparison group has particular strengths and weaknesses. The athletic conference grouping proposed by the Association has the virtue of geographic proximity, but the sizes of the districts in the Mississippi Valley Athletic Conference vary widely, from as many as 16,651 students in the Cedar Rapids CSD, down to as few as 4568 students in College CSD. Four of the seven districts in that conference have enrollments in excess of 10,000, over twice the size of the Cedar Falls CSD. In light of economies of scale and other impacts of size on the financing and operation of a school district, this wide disparity of size within the Mississippi Valley Athletic Conference militates against its use as the basis for the comparability group in this impasse arbitration.

The Association’s proposed size-based comparison group presents a more relevant universe for comparison. The size of the districts in this group ranges from Waukee CSD, with an enrollment of 7721, to Bettendorf, with an enrollment of 4046. Cedar Falls CSD’s

***Impasse Arbitration: Cedar Falls CSD and EA  
No. 117/2, 2013-2014 Contract  
Page 11***

enrollment of 4862 is the median of the group, and only 9 % below the mean. The District's proposed group includes all of the Association's six up/six down group, other than Waukee at the higher end, but adds eight smaller districts (Clinton, Mason City, Fort Dodge, Indianola, Urbandale, Newton, North Scott, and West Dubuque). The enrollment of Cedar Falls is roughly 10.5% higher than the mean enrollment of the school districts in the District's proposed group.

The arbitrator has considered the data provided by the parties for these districts and concludes that a group resulting from the combination of the District's proposal and the Association's "six-up, six-down" group is the most appropriate group for comparison. This group provides the advantage of a broad range from the District's larger group, but also includes Waukee, from the Association's proposal, which counterbalances the greater number of districts significantly smaller than Cedar Falls in the District's "plus-or-minus 2000" group.<sup>4</sup>

Accordingly, the comparison group to be considered is:

---

<sup>4</sup>Waukee is the district next in size to Linn-Mar, the largest district in the District's proposed group. It is geographically proximate to Urbandale, which is included in the District's proposed group.

**Impasse Arbitration: Cedar Falls CSD and EA  
No. 117/2, 2013-2014 Contract  
Page 12**

School District	October 2012 Enrollment
Waukee	7721
Linn-Mar	6880
Southeast Polk	6400
Johnston	6269
Marshalltown	5308
Muscatine	5300
<b>Cedar Falls</b>	<b>4862</b>
Burlington	4656
College	4568
Ottumwa	4531
Pleasant Valley	4230
Ames	4229
Bettendorf	4046
Clinton	3966
Mason City	3751
Ft. Dodge	3712
Indianola	3409
Urbandale	3387
Newton	3006
North Scott	2979
Western Dubuque	2977

The average enrollment of this group, excluding Cedar Falls, is 4566. Cedar Falls' enrollment of 4862 exceeds this average by 6.4%. Thus in this hybrid comparison group,

***Impasse Arbitration: Cedar Falls CSD and EA  
No. 117/2, 2013-2014 Contract  
Page 13***

the enrollment in Cedar Falls is closer to the average than in either party's proposed groups.

Having identified the appropriate comparison group, we turn to the parties' offers on the two impasse items.

**B. Impasse Issue: Wages**

As noted in the introduction, the Association's final offer on wages is to add \$750 to the current base of \$34,500, resulting in a new base of \$35,250. The District's final offer on wages is to add \$685 to the current base, resulting in a new base of \$35,185. The total package cost of the Association's offered increase is \$1,141,172, representing a 4.42% increase, while the total package cost of the District's offer is \$1,094,311, a 4.23% increase. The Association's offer is \$46,861 more than the District's.

The parties have provided comparison data on wages at a variety of points in teachers' careers. An illustrative comparison of various 2012-2013 salary benchmarks is set out in the table on the following page. The table indicates that Cedar Falls' salary rates fall roughly in the middle of the pack, except at the highest steps in the highest lanes of the salary schedule, where the Cedar Falls wages are the highest in the group.

School District	BA Minimum Yr. 1	MA Minimum Yr. 1	BA 10 <sup>th</sup> Year	MA 10 <sup>th</sup> Year	BA Highest Lane/Step	MA Highest Lane/Step
Ames*	33,175	40,015	43,435	50,275	63,695	57,115
Bettendorf	34,770	39,971	47,484	52,974	57,020	62,220
Burlington	31,132	35,802	45,484	49,811	46,698	56,038
Clinton	37,751	39,918	45,461	50,413	55,365	58,770
College	36,996	42,087	49,554	57,360	60,757	66,527
Ft. Dodge	33,600	37,632	44,688	49,896	55,910	62,899
Indianola	42,468	48,418	49,758	55,708	65,168	68,608
Johnston	42,626	47,406	51,061	57,351	62,026	71,716
Linn-Mar	35,844	40,862	47,314	55,200	60,218	64,878
Marshalltown	39,604	44,171	50,369	59,502	59,665	65,536
Mason City	39,170	44,226	46,283	52,177	62,324	68,007
Muscatine	35,019	41,272	45,024	52,528	60,259	61,823
Newton	34,207	37,738	44,800	50,981	51,569	59,514
North Scott	36,508	41,037	48,587	54,627	58,553	61,875
Ottumwa	36,941	38,769	44,103	48,140	57,823	57,823
Pleasant Valley	38,499	42,908	53,781	56,133	59,659	64,068
Southeast Polk	37,671	41,306	45,933	51,220	58,046	61,681
Urbandale	39,383	44,263	47,498	53,153	63,606	68,429
Waukee	40,146	44,846	50,046	54,746	50,046	68,111
Western Dubuque	32,375	35,800	43,582	49,808	54,400	59,692
<b>Average</b>	<b>36,894</b>	<b>41,422</b>	<b>47,212</b>	<b>53,100</b>	<b>54,959</b>	<b>63,267</b>
<b>Cedar Falls (rank)</b>	<b>36,747 (11)</b>	<b>40,790 (12)</b>	<b>46,854 (10)</b>	<b>51,572 (13)</b>	<b>69,113 (1)</b>	<b>75,368 (1)</b>
Difference	(147)	(632)	(358)	(1,528)	+14,154	+12,101

***Impasse Arbitration: Cedar Falls CSD and EA  
No. 117/2, 2013-2014 Contract  
Page 15***

The District also provided an analysis of 2013-2014 school district settlements to the date of the hearing, showing total package increases averaging 3.67% according to ISEA data for 3 districts in the comparison group, 3.75% according to IASB data for 10 districts in the comparison group, and 3.80% according to data obtained by the District's outside counsel for 13 districts in the comparison group.<sup>5</sup> Both party's final offers exceed all of these rates. Accordingly, the comparison group does not mandate the selection of one offer over another.

Considering the financial data submitted by the parties, there is no question that the District has the ability to pay for the increases sought by either party. The District is in sound financial shape. Its solvency ratio is healthy as measure by the targeted solvency position determined by ISCAP, and its cash reserves and Ending Fund Balance have increased steadily in recent years. It has accomplished this while maintaining one of the lowest tax rates among the comparison group of school districts.<sup>6</sup> Nonetheless, impasse arbitration is at heart a conservative process. Where both offers are higher than the trend among comparable communities, and there is no strong imbalance in the district's position on wages within that comparison group, the lower offer, in this case, the District's offer of

---

<sup>5</sup>The District would not have included Waukee in these calculations, but a review of the source documents indicates that data for a Waukee settlement was not available from any of those sources.

<sup>6</sup>According to the District's figures, which do not include Waukee, Cedar Falls ranks 18<sup>th</sup> in the total tax rate and general fund tax rate for 2012-2013 among the other 20 school districts in the comparison group.

4.23%, is the more reasonable.<sup>7</sup>

**C. Impasse Item - Hours**

On hours, the Association's final offer is to modify Article 12.1 as follows (language to be deleted struck out, language to be added in **bold** type):

The official standard teaching day i.e. work day shall consist of seven (7) hours and fifty (50) minutes, and shall include scheduled lunch period of at least thirty (30) minutes. Employees shall report for duty at least ~~thirty (30)~~ **twenty (20)** minutes prior to the beginning of the pupils' school day, and shall remain at their places of assignment, as determined by the principal, for at least ~~thirty (30)~~ **twenty five (25)** minutes after the close of the pupils' school day. On Fridays and days immediately preceding a holiday or vacation, employees may depart their buildings fifteen (15) minutes prior to the end of the standard work day.

The Association's proposal is to maintain the current contract language, the status quo.

The parties agree that the District's proposal would have the effect of increasing the pupils' school day, now 6 hours and 50 minutes, by 15 minutes, while keeping the length of the work day 7 hours and 50 minutes. The length of the official standard teaching day has remained unchanged in the parties' collective bargaining agreements since the parties' first contract, for the 1976-1977 school year. According to Dan Conrad, Director of Secondary Education, the District has had concerns about student achievement. While

---

<sup>7</sup>The Association argues that its proposal of an increase of 4.42% is very close to the historical average of 4.41% for total package settlements for Cedar Falls from the 1985-1986 contract to the present. However, such a long-term average is less significant here than current trends and the District's standing within the comparison group, particularly in the absence of any explanation why the Association failed to include the years from 1976-1977 to 1984-1985 in the "historic average."

***Impasse Arbitration: Cedar Falls CSD and EA  
No. 117/2, 2013-2014 Contract  
Page 17***

the District's students score well in comparison to the rest of the state, those scores have decreased in recent years: The proportion of non-proficient students has increased, while the proportion of advanced students has decreased. The District's task changed as the proportion of students for whom English is a second language and the proportion of students impacted by poverty have increased. For these reasons, the District has adopted the Professional Learning Communities model, which envisions a collaborative culture in which teams are given time during the work day to meet on a regular basis, and which is intended to provide added time for interventions and enrichment for students during the school day. The District reports that the emphasis on having the interventions and enrichment during the school day is based on research suggesting that these efforts are most successful when scheduled during the regular school day rather than before or after school when students are not required to attend.

Accordingly, the District announced to the Association in Spring 2012 that it intended to lengthen the school day for these purposes. The Association filed a grievance asserting that the action would violate the parties' collective bargaining agreement. Because of the timing, the District decided not to implement the change for the 2012-2013 school year.

In the fall of 2012, the District once again met with the Association to explain its decision to lengthen the school day, which District administrators considered to be a permissive topic of negotiation. On December 3, 2012, the District notified the Association that it intended to remove from the contract for the 2013-2014 school year the language of Article 12 that it considered to be a permissive topic of negotiation. The Association

***Impasse Arbitration: Cedar Falls CSD and EA  
No. 117/2, 2013-2014 Contract  
Page 18***

objected in a letter dated February 12, 2013, that the District lacked the legal authority to delete the language unilaterally, and in March 2013, the District requested that the Iowa Public Employee Relations Board (PERB) provide an expedited ruling on the negotiability of the language in question. On April 3, 2013, PERB ruled that the proposal was a mandatory subject of bargaining. The parties included the topic in their mediation on April 4, 2013, and after failing to obtain a voluntary settlement on the topic, the District has included the proposed change as its final offer on the issue of hours.

The Association's objections are two-fold: First, the parties have had a long-standing practice, which the Association characterizes as a "culture," that expects that teachers have 30 minutes before and after the pupils' school day for a vast array of tasks that are essential to the effective performance of their teaching role during the school day and other activities that the teaching mission of the District. Some of these tasks involve contact with students who have come in before the school day or stay late, others are administrative and even clerical tasks necessary for their professional preparation, while others involve collaboration with teachers and other District staff. The Association's survey of teachers resulted in a list of over 150 types of teaching-related activities that they perform during the 30 minutes before and after the student day, a list that the District does not challenge.

The Association's second objection is that the proposal fails to provide additional compensation, or any other quid pro quo, for the change, which will necessitate that teachers perform on their own time some of those listed activities now accomplished during the contractual pre- and post-school day periods, and which will increase their pupil-contact time by 15 minutes.

***Impasse Arbitration: Cedar Falls CSD and EA  
No. 117/2, 2013-2014 Contract  
Page 19***

It is undisputed that the language providing the “official teaching day” of 7 hours and 50 minutes, consisting of the 6 hour, 50 minute pupil day, and the 30 minutes before and after that pupil day, has been in the contract essentially without change since 1976.<sup>8</sup> That has been the parties’ practice throughout that time. As a result, the District faces a difficult task in seeking to justify the change it proposes. As Arbitrator Christine Ver Pleog stated in an August 2006 award, *Fairfield Community School District and Fairfield Education Association*, 06-ARB-255 (August 12, 2006), p. 9:

All neutrals recognize that a party that seeks to change previously negotiated contract language faces a heavy burden. Neutrals are reluctant to unilaterally change contract terms. They agree that those are matters best left to the give and take of the bargaining table, absent proof of extraordinary problems and unreasonable refusals by one party to deal with those problems. . . . In short, arbitration is rarely an appropriate forum for changing negotiated contract language, and that is true under these facts.

In this case, while the District has cited legitimate concerns over declining student scores and the need to provide additional interventions and enrichment for students, the District has failed to prove the problems it faces are so extraordinary that its chosen solution should be imposed by an arbitrator without the fine-tuning that would necessary result from “the give and take of the bargaining table.”

This is particularly true where the proposed change will exact a quantifiable toll on the teaching staff. Assuming that the District’s teachers continue to perform their duties as they have in the past, they will have 15 paid minutes less per school day to perform

---

<sup>8</sup>In the 2011-2012 contract, the section, by then numbered Section 12.1, was modified to clarify that the “official teaching day” was the “work day.” Even though the parties discussed Section 12.1, the District failed to seek through negotiations the change that it seeks now.

***Impasse Arbitration: Cedar Falls CSD and EA  
No. 117/2, 2013-2014 Contract  
Page 20***

those duties, and will be forced either to spend less time on their responsibilities, to the possible detriment of their and the District's ability to deliver effective educational service, or to spend more uncompensated time on their tasks. This has significant ramifications for teachers' job performance. As the Association observes, the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria include criteria for teacher evaluation that necessarily require that teachers devote time outside the instructional day. The reduction in available planning time may impact teachers' ability and strategies for meeting those criteria. Yet in its final offer the District has made no effort to provide additional compensation or other *quid pro quo* for the change.<sup>9</sup> The problem of declining student scores, while a significant concern, is not "extraordinary," and the Association's objection to the lack of some compensation for the loss of 15 minutes of daily non-instructional time does not amount to an "unreasonable refusal" to deal with that problem.

In sum the District has failed to satisfy the burden generally imposed on a party seeking a significant unilateral change to negotiated language. The District has failed to prove that the current language has created a significant operational problem that requires correction, or that the proposed language, reasonably designed to resolve the problem, has been offered with an appropriate counterbalancing *quid pro quo* of the type that one would normally expect to be the outcome of effective collective bargaining between the parties. See, e.g., *City of Cherokee and IUOE Local 235* (Yaeger, 2005). For these

---

<sup>9</sup>The District presented testimony that some of its suggestions in mediation involved trading off the change in Section 12.1 for greater flexibility in the use of contractual leave. However, those proposals have not been included in the District's final offer. At most, the testimony reinforces the point that the District has chosen to seek a unilateral change without offering a counterbalancing *quid pro quo*.

reasons, the Arbitrator finds that the Association's proposal on hours, to maintain the *status quo*, is the most reasonable.

**AWARD**

For the reasons stated above and incorporated herein, the Arbitrator makes the following Award:

1. The District's final offer is the most reasonable of the parties' final offers on wages.
2. The Association's final offer is the most reasonable of the parties' final offers on hours.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Lisa Salkovitz Kohn, Arbitrator

**Impasse Arbitration: Cedar Falls CSD and EA  
No. 117/2, 2013-2014 Contract  
Page 22**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on the 26th day of June, 2013, I served the foregoing Arbitration Award upon each of the parties to this matter by mailing a copy to them by United States First Class Mail at their respective addresses as shown below, having also sent the Award by email to the email addresses indicated:

Shelly Staker  
NE ISEA Uniserv Director  
ISEA  
3356 Kimball Ave Suite 100  
Waterloo, IA 50702  
sstaker@isea.org

James Hanks  
Ahlers & Cooney  
100 Court Avenue  
Suite 600  
Des Moines, IA 50309  
JHanks@ahlerslaw.com

I further certify that on the 24<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2013, I submitted this Award for filing by mailing it to the Iowa Public Employment Relations Board, in care of Susan A. Bolte, Administrative Law Judge, 510 East 12th Street, Suite 1B, Des Moines, IA 50319, and by email to Susan.Bolte@iowa.gov.



Lisa Salkovitz Kohn  
Impasse Arbitrator