



# THE ADVOCATE

CAYUGA-ONONDAGA BOCES  
OFFICE OF PERSONNEL RELATIONS  
1879 WEST GENESEE STREET ROAD  
AUBURN, NEW YORK 13021-9430

VOLUME XXXVI  
JANUARY/FEBRUARY  
2016

## Office of Personnel Relations

**Randy J. Ray**  
Director of Personnel Relations

**Brent D. Cooley**  
Senior Labor Relations Specialist

**Emily Brown**  
**J. Ryan Hatch**  
**Nicholas Minderler**  
Labor Relations Specialists

**Mark W. Snyder**  
Safety Coordinator

**Linda M. Brown**  
**Kelly M. Walsh**  
Administrative Support

Telephone: (315) 255-7683 or (315) 253-0361  
FAX (315) 255-7625  
Email: [lbrown@cayboces.org](mailto:lbrown@cayboces.org)

*Providing comprehensive  
employment and personnel  
relations services to local  
school districts for over  
40 years.*

## IN THIS ISSUE ....

- A FOND FAREWELL
- WELCOME NICK MINDERLER
- WELCOME NEW CHIEF SCHOOL OFFICER
- FRIEDRICH V. CALIFORNIA TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION: ARE AGENCY SHOP FEES CONSTITUTIONAL?
- A RECENT COMMISSIONER'S DECISION ON ADMINISTRATIVE REORGANIZATION
- AREA TEACHER AND NON-INSTRUCTIONAL SETTLEMENTS
- AREA UNEMPLOYMENT RATES FOR DECEMBER 2015
- CPI FOR JANUARY 2016



## ***A Fond Farewell***

In November of 1990, the “Advocate” featured an article welcoming Brent Cooley to the Office of Personnel Relations. With Brent’s retirement at the end of February, we bid farewell to a long time colleague.

Brent came to the OPR after meeting and studying with another OPR alumni, Dr. Matthew Fletcher, at the Syracuse University College of Law, and he subsequently enjoyed an exceptional 26-year career here. During that time, Brent has served school districts within the Cayuga-Onondaga BOCES components and throughout the OPR’s service in the Finger Lakes Region. Brent has been with the BOCES through our years “on the hill” at the old BOCES site and here at our current campus, negotiated with unions through times of school district prosperity, as well as times of scarcity, and has seen many district administrators come and go.

We will miss Brent’s work ethic and unique sense of humor as he leaves our family. All of us wish him well as he retires to spend time traveling and enjoying his family. To use a phrase Brent often said as he signed off with his clients ~ “take good care, Brent!”

Fondly,

Randy, Mark, Linda, Kelly,  
Emily, Ryan and Nick

## **THE OPR WELCOMES NICK MINDERLER**

The Cayuga-Onondaga BOCES Office of Personnel Relations is pleased to announce the recent appointment of Nicholas Minderler as Labor Relations Specialist for the BOCES.

Nick graduated from Fordham University with a bachelor’s degree in History and Music. After receiving his undergraduate degree, Nick worked in various fields before beginning law school at Thomas Cooley Law School in Michigan. After his first year, he transferred to SUNY at Buffalo Law School, where he graduated magna cum laude. While in law school, Nick worked at a small firm in Kenmore, New York, specializing in public sector labor law.

Following law school, Nick began his career at the DCMO BOCES in Norwich, New York as a Labor Relations Specialist. At DCMO, Nick began honing his skills in negotiations and increased his knowledge base of the wide-range of issues faced by school districts on a daily basis. He is very excited about joining the OPR team and looks forward to meeting all of you.



## **Welcome New Chief School Officer**

The Cayuga-Onondaga BOCES Office of Personnel Relations welcomes and wishes much success to

***CHRISTOPHER STAATS,  
the recently appointed  
Chief School Officer at the  
HANNIBAL CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT***



# Friedrichs v. California Teachers'

## Association: Are Agency Shop Fees Constitutional?

On January 11, 2016, the Supreme Court heard oral argument in the case *Friedrichs vs. California Teachers' Association*, between a teachers union and a group of teachers who opted out of joining the union. The case was brought in California in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals strictly challenging cases upholding agency shop fees – it was based on no facts. If the plaintiffs prevail, unions stand to lose fees from both workers that oppose union positions and those who simply choose not to join while benefiting from the unions' efforts on their behalf.

The case arose because California is one of 25 states that collect fees from non-union members – New York is one of the 25 states that collect such fees. Known as an “agency shop” system, individual employees decide whether to be a part of the union, but if they choose not to become a member, they still must pay the portion of dues that goes to collective bargaining because they are covered by that contract and benefit from the union's bargaining efforts. The Supreme Court previously ruled that these fees are allowable as long as the money does not go towards a union's political activities without the member's permission.

At issue in this case is the court's 1977 precedent in *Aboud vs. Detroit Board of Education*, 431 U.S. 209 (1977), which allowed government worker unions in certain states to collect “fair share” fees

to cover the costs of collective bargaining, even from employees who did not join or support the union. This case eliminated the potential for “free riders.” “Free riders” are members that enjoy the benefits of union membership without paying for the services. However, *Aboud* has received its fair share of criticism. For instance, Justice Lewis Powell wrote in his *Aboud* concurrence that public-sector unions are categorically different than private-sector unions, and everything they do, whether at the bargaining table or in supporting candidates with ads, is an attempt to extract favorable concessions from the government.

In 2014, *Aboud* and agency shop fees were once again under scrutiny when the Supreme Court decided *Harris v. Quinn*, 134 S. Ct. 2618 (2014). However, in that case, the Court avoided the issue of whether agency shop fees were constitutional and merely stated the employees in question, a group of healthcare workers, worked for individual patients and not the state. Nonetheless, the conservative members of the Court began suggesting in *Harris* that the line between a public-sector union's collective bargaining and its political activities is blurred because negotiations to increase the size and cost of government payrolls, for example, could also be considered a political issue. As a result, *Harris* opened the door for other cases challenging agency fees.

The legal dispute in *Friedrichs* began when Rebecca Friedrichs and several other public teachers from Orange County objected to supporting the California Teachers' Association. Full dues for California teachers who join the union are about \$1,000 a year, but even non-members like Friedrichs have to pay about \$650 on average for their share of the cost of collective bargaining. The plaintiffs allege that union shop fees violate their First Amendment Free Speech rights, because the money from the fees supports unwanted political activities. Thus, they argue agency shop fees are unconstitutional.

The pro-union argument dealt with the necessity of agency fees in maintaining proper representation. First, the defendants argued that many union issues are “mundane” and have no political significance, i.e. mileage reimbursement and safety. Second, union fees designated for collective bargaining or general representation helps maintain good working relationships. They argued that it is much more efficient to deal with one large union, rather than many separate unions or individual employees. Third, unions are abiding by the *Abood* decision. In other words, unions are not charging non-members with their share of costs for activities that qualify as political, but all members are assessed a fee for the “chargeable” expenses of representation, i.e., money spent for such things as “research, legal representation, conferring and consulting, communicating with members, trying to ascertain what the positions of all the workforce are before the union presents a policy.” Overturning *Abood*, the defendants argued, would develop “free riders” who reap the benefits of membership without paying dues, which would lead to the general unraveling of union representation.

The anti-union argument was simply that all matters of negotiations are political because they involve the government and public funds. Thus, public employees cannot be forced to pay for viewpoints, whether in negotiations or blatant political activities, they do not support.

Throughout oral argument, the conservative justices led discussion and spoke negatively about mandatory agency fees. For example, Chief Justice John Roberts asked Solicitor General Edward Dumont, arguing for the defendants, for an example of a mundane collective-bargaining issue that “does not present a public policy question.” The Solicitor General mentioned “mileage reimbursement rates” and “public safety.” The Chief Justice quickly struck down this response, saying, “That’s money. That’s

how much money is going to have to be paid to the teachers...And the amount of money that’s going to be allocated to public education...that’s always a public-policy issue.” Since many issues relate to money, the Court did not appear to accept the argument that mundane issues do not involve public policy.

The union’s argument concerning “free riders” was also not well received. Justice Kennedy said, “many teachers strongly, strongly disagree with the union’s position.” Charging teachers a fee, he suggested, doesn’t solve the “free rider” problem, but instead makes them a “compelled rider” on those positions. Justice Kennedy appeared to imply that a member’s right to free speech must be placed above the union’s right to take agency fees.

On the other hand, not all justices were so quick to dismiss the defendants’ arguments. For instance, Justice Breyer said, “We’re talking about six people in a room bargaining about wages, hours and working conditions...That’s pretty far removed from the heart of the First Amendment.” Additionally, other liberal justices defended the *Abood* decision and worried about the stability and legitimacy of the Court, as well as the wide-ranging consequences on public sector bargaining and representation if the decision were overruled.

To make matters slightly more complicated, Justice Antonin Scalia, who many regarded as the swing vote in this case, passed away on February 13, 2016. Before the *Friedrichs* case, Justice Scalia favored upholding *Abood*, but his responses and questions at oral argument appeared as though he was ready to overturn the decision. Throughout the transcript, he appeared unconvinced that outlawing agency fees would lead to union demise. Noting that federal unions do not charge agency fees, Justice Scalia asked a lawyer for the defendants, “Why do you think the union would not survive without these fees charged?” He further said, “You’re

the one that's saying we need to do this because otherwise it won't survive. It seems to me the burden is on you to suggest why that's so." Scalia indicated that he did not believe the defendants met their burden.

Before Justice Scalia passed away, there would likely have been a hotly contested 5-4 decision in favor of overturning *Abood*, which would essentially end agency shop fees throughout the country, including New York. This would severely weaken union bargaining power and likely affect millions of contracts and jobs. Public employees would no longer be required to pay any fees, but could still reap the benefits of union membership. It is no surprise that this would weaken unions, because they would lose a substantial revenue stream that was previously used for paying staff, bargaining, and solving day-to-day union issues.

To put this in perspective, union memberships in states without mandatory agency shop fees are generally smaller than those in states that compel dues payments. Roughly 20 percent of public employees in right-to-work states belong to a union, compared to nearly 50 percent in agency shop states, according to the Union Membership and Coverage Database, which uses federal data to estimate annual membership in both the public and private sectors. The 12 states with the highest levels of public sector unionism are all agency shop states. In California, which ranks sixth in union membership, 55 percent are in a union. Nearly three-quarters of public employees are union members in New York.

Needless to say, public employers in New York State would feel the far reaching effects of a decision ruling that mandatory agency shop fees are unconstitutional, as they would likely be bogged down in litigation to determine how to proceed with unions going forward. If *Abood* is overturned, it is uncertain whether or not public sector contracts would immediately end and/or whom bargaining units would represent.

When and how contracts would have to be negotiated, and on whose behalf, would likely have to be further argued in the lower courts. Furthermore, there would likely be large ramifications on PERB and its governing legislation. Finally, such a decision could have disastrous effects on union membership, since many employees may no longer decide to pay union fees.



## A Recent Commissioner's Decision on Administrative Reorganization

There are many facets to studying and planning an administrative reorganization. It is crucial that you review your school district's plan for administrative tenure areas, as well as any relevant collective bargaining agreements. Further, an administrator, like a teacher, may not be assigned or transferred outside the tenure area of appointment, without the administrators written consent. See *Cowan v. Board of Educ. of the Brentwood UFSD*, 99 A.D.2d 831, 472 N.Y.S.2d 429 (2d Dept. 1984), *Matter of Zamek*, 10 Ed. Dept. Rep. 77, Decision No. 10,035 (1979).

It is important to note that administrative tenure areas are very different from

teacher tenure areas. Specifically, the Commissioner of Education has said, "There are no clearly defined guidelines for determining the parameters of various administrative and supervisory tenure areas." See *Matter of Plesent*, 16 Ed. Dept. Rep. 3488, Decision No. 9,426 (1977). Each school district has the freedom to establish its own administrative structure; however, when challenged, the school district can protect itself by adhering to some "standards" such as:

1. Providing notice to the employee of their tenure status upon appointment to probation and to tenure;
2. Providing the employee with notice as to the duties of the position; and
3. Providing the employee with information as to whether the position is within a collective negotiating unit or not.

Some districts have opted for narrow administrative tenure areas, such as high school principal, elementary principal, Assistant Superintendent for Pupil Personnel Services, or Assistant Superintendent for Business. Other school districts have established broader administrative tenure areas such as administrator, principal, assistant principal, or assistant superintendent. The Commissioner has also upheld a school district's designation and maintenance of a single district wide tenure area of "administrator." See *Matter of Roloff*, 16 Ed. Dept. Rep. 274, Decision No. 9,392 (1977). However, if a school district frequently changes its administrative structure and tenure areas (for example, each time a new Superintendent is appointed), it is likely that the Commissioner will find that the school district has not adhered to the above "standards." As a result, the Commissioner may uphold an appeal involving challenges

to layoff and change of administrative assignment.

In a recent Commissioner's decision, the East Hampton Union Free School District appointed Charles Soriano as an assistant superintendent in the tenure area of "Administrator" in 2003 at a salary of \$140,000. This position was not part of the administrator's bargaining unit in the district. His employment was subject to an individual employment agreement with the board of education for a four (4) year term, which was subsequently extended through July 1, 2012. During the term of that employment agreement, the board of education awarded him tenure in August of 2006. Upon the expiration of his agreement, Mr. Soriano earned a salary of \$205,000.

In June of 2012, the East Hampton Board of Education approved a plan for administrative reorganization. Following the plan, Mr. Soriano was appointed to the position of middle school principal, a position that was included in the administrators' bargaining unit, at an annual salary of \$180,000 effective July 1, 2012. Mr. Soriano objected to the reduction in his salary from \$205,000 to \$180,000, but the Board did not change its actions. Mr. Soriano appealed to the Commissioner of Education.

In his appeal, Mr. Soriano argued that as a tenured administrator his salary and benefits may not be reduced except as a result of a disciplinary action pursuant to Education Law §§ 3020 and 3020-a. He also maintained that the terms of the expired employment agreement's survived. Mr. Soriano sought a decision restoring his salary, retroactive to July 1, 2012 and any intervening salary increases occurring under the terms of the labor agreement.

The school district stated that the reduction in Soriano's salary was reasonable and not arbitrary or capricious.

There was evidence that Soriano's new salary was set after consideration of multiple factors, including the salaries for comparable positions, salary reductions for other administrators, recent budget cuts, and the economic constraints of the district. The district argued that Mr. Soriano's employment agreement had expired and was no longer binding. Further, the district contended that the tenure statutes and the broad administrative tenure area do not require that the district maintain a salary level when an administrator is transferred to a new position within the same tenure area.

Commissioner Elia denied the appeal of Mr. Soriano, finding that Soriano's salary reduction was not a form of discipline. She also concluded that the Board's actions were not arbitrary or capricious, because she found that Mr. Soriano's salary reduction was not the result of any dissatisfaction by the Board of Education with his work performance. Moreover, the Commissioner cited case law standing for the proposition that a salary decrease cannot fall below the individual's starting salary. *See Appeal of Cadicamo*, 15 Ed. Dept. Rep. 274, Decision No. 9,167 (1976), *aff'd sub nom. Bd. Of Educ., Mt. Sinai UFSD v. Nyquist*, Sup. Ct., Albany Co., (Cobb, J. June 23, 1976). The evidence demonstrated that the salary set at \$180,000 in 2012 was above his starting salary in 2003, and thus, did not violate case law. Absent proof that the school board reduced Soriano's salary for some disciplinary reason, the salary reduction was deemed legal.

The Commissioner also contrasted Soriano's case from one involving a permanent civil service employee who suffered a lateral transfer resulting in a reduction of salary. In the classified civil service, such a reduction may only be imposed following a hearing pursuant to Civil Service Law § 75. Commissioner Elia did not extend this principle related to lateral transfers in the Civil Service cases

to transfers within the same educational tenure area.

Next, the Commissioner turned to the arguments concerning the effect of Mr. Soriano being in the unit of administrators represented by a labor organization and the existence of certain terms of a collective negotiating agreement concerning salary. The labor agreement contained terms relating to first year salary for new administrators. Mr. Soriano had already sabotaged a perfectly good contract argument by conceding in his appeal papers that he was not a "new administrator" within the meaning of the agreement. As Mr. Soriano conceded that the terms of the agreement did not apply to him, there was no need for Commissioner Elia to make any decision on this issue.

While this case is interesting and provides a view as to what can happen as a result of administrative reorganization, it is likely to be limited to its facts. Most school districts do not establish such broad administrative tenure areas as did the East Hampton district. In addition, in a similar situation in another school district, the "aggrieved" administrator may well file and prosecute a grievance under the labor contract challenging the school district's actions as a violation of the agreement concerning salary payment. Here Mr. Soriano could not prosecute such a claim, as he conceded that the contract language did not apply to him. A good case could be made that the language could or should have applied to his situation. Another grievant in another school district might successfully assert that the matter should be decided by an arbitrator and not the Commissioner of Education, because the claim may be fashioned to be a claim for violation of the contract salary and benefits provisions. The result could be quite variable, as it could well depend upon the interpretation of the contract language and the view of "workplace justice" held by the arbitrator.

**RECENT AREA TEACHER CONTRACT SETTLEMENTS (shaded areas = contract term)**

<b>CAYUGA-ONONDAGA BOCES</b>												
	<b>Date Settled</b>	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>	<b>2014-2015</b>	<b>2015-2016</b>	<b>2016-2017</b>	<b>2017-2018</b>	<b>2018-2019</b>	<b>AVG.</b>
BOCES	<b>1-16</b>	4.50	4.50	1.50	1.75	2.25	2.25	2.25	2.50			2.69
Auburn	<b>6-12</b>	3.45	3.00	3.00	0.00	2.25	2.25					2.33
Cato-Meridian	<b>6-15</b>	3.80	3.80	3.80	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.70	2.60	2.50		2.80
Jordan-Elbridge	<b>12-14</b>	3.85	3.90	0.50	2.01	2.18	2.50	2.50	2.50			2.49
Moravia	<b>6-13</b>	4.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	2.50	2.50	2.50			2.44
Port Byron	<b>6-13</b>	4.25	3.70	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00					2.66
Skaneateles	<b>5-14</b>	3.75	3.75	1.50	1.50	1.50	2.50	2.60	2.75			2.48
So. Cayuga	<b>4-13</b>	4.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.25	2.25				2.36
Union Springs	<b>6-14</b>	4.25	4.25	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00					2.75
Weedsport	<b>1-16</b>	4.35	4.50	0.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50			2.48
	<b>AVG.</b>	<b>4.02</b>	<b>3.74</b>	<b>1.83</b>	<b>1.73</b>	<b>1.82</b>	<b>2.23</b>	<b>2.47</b>	<b>2.56</b>	<b>2.50</b>		
<b>BROOME-TIOGA BOCES</b>												
Chenango Vall.	<b>4-11</b>	4.10	2.50	2.75	2.75	2.75						2.97
Deposit	<b>9-13</b>	4.25	2.50	2.50	2.00	2.50	2.50					2.71
Maine-Endwell	<b>4-15</b>	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	2.60	2.80	2.95				3.76
Owego-Apal.	<b>1-13</b>	4.35	2.95	2.95	2.95	2.00	2.00					2.87
Union-Endicott	<b>11-10</b>	4.00	\$2,253	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.70					2.96
Whitney Point		3.00	3.30	3.50	0.00	2.20	2.20	2.50	2.60	2.70		2.44
	<b>AVG</b>	<b>4.03</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>3.15</b>	<b>2.48</b>	<b>2.46</b>	<b>2.44</b>	<b>2.73</b>	<b>2.60</b>	<b>2.70</b>		
<b>GENESEE VALLEY BOCES</b>												
Geneseo	<b>1-15</b>	4.20	4.20	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00			2.93
<b>GREATER SO. TIER BOCES</b>												
Hornell	<b>7-13</b>	4.40	4.00	2.20	2.00	2.50	2.75					2.98
<b>OSWEGO BOCES</b>												
Hannibal	<b>6-14</b>	3.50	3.50	0.00	1.75	1.75	2.20	2.20	2.20			2.14
Oswego	<b>12-14</b>	4.00	4.00	0.00	1.75	2.00	2.00	2.00				2.25
	<b>AVG</b>	<b>3.75</b>	<b>3.75</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>1.75</b>	<b>1.88</b>	<b>2.10</b>	<b>2.10</b>	<b>2.20</b>			
<b>TOMPKINS-SENECA-TIOGA BOCES</b>												
BOCES		4.00	4.00	4.00								4.00
Candor	<b>4-15</b>	3.00	3.00		2.00	2.00	1.5 + \$1000	1.5 + \$1000	2.0 + \$500			2.15
Dryden	<b>6-14</b>	4.20	2.60	2.60	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.05			3.06
Groton	<b>3-13</b>	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	2.50	2.60	2.70	2.70			3.06
Ithaca	<b>6-11</b>	2.20	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00					2.03
Lansing	<b>9-12</b>	3.40	3.50	3.50	2.70	2.70	3.00	3.00				3.11
Newfield	<b>5-14</b>	3.50	2.50	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.50	2.75	2.50			2.72

**RECENT AREA TEACHER CONTRACT SETTLEMENTS (shaded areas = contract term)**

<b>TOMPKINS-SENECA-TIOGA BOCES cont'd</b>												
	<b>Date Settled</b>	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>	<b>2014-2015</b>	<b>2015-2016</b>	<b>2016-2017</b>	<b>2017-2018</b>	<b>2018-2019</b>	<b>AVG.</b>
South Seneca	<b>8-15</b>	4.00	4.00	1.50	1.50	2.45	2.45	1.45				2.48
Trumansburg	<b>1-13</b>	4.00	4.20	2.70	2.70	3.00	3.00					3.27
	<b>AVG</b>	<b>3.53</b>	<b>3.26</b>	<b>2.73</b>	<b>2.43</b>	<b>2.58</b>	<b>2.79</b>	<b>2.58</b>	<b>2.75</b>			
<b>WAYNE - FINGER LAKES BOCES</b>												
BOCES		3.00	2.50	1.90	1.90	2.50	2.45	2.45				2.39
Bloomfield		3.90	3.85	3.60	3.35	1.98	2.00	2.00				2.95
Canandaigua		4.20	4.10	3.85	2.00	2.69	2.65	2.57				3.15
Clyde-Savannah	<b>6-15</b>	5.00	5.00	5.00	2.25	2.25	2.25	2.25				3.43
Dundee	<b>1-14</b>	4.00	4.00	2.60	2.50	2.50	3.00	3.30	3.40			3.16
Gananda	<b>11-15</b>	4.00	2.75	2.75	2.60	2.60	2.75	3.00	3.00	3.20		2.96
Geneva	<b>6-15</b>	4.58	4.22	4.15	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.50	3.50	2.50	3.15
Gorham-Middlesex	<b>6-14</b>	3.50	3.50	2.25	2.25	2.50	2.50	2.50				2.71
Honeoye	<b>5-15</b>	4.00	2.60	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.75	2.75	2.90			2.81
Lyons	<b>6-10</b>	4.25	4.66	3.37	3.88							4.04
Manchester-Shortsville	<b>8-14</b>	4.00	4.00	1.80	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.50				2.61
Marion	<b>5-14</b>	4.50	3.50	2.80	2.00	2.00	2.40	2.25				2.78
Naples	<b>5-15</b>	4.00	4.00	2.25	2.25	2.25	2.25	2.50	2.50	2.60		2.73
Newark	<b>10-13</b>	4.00	2.50	2.50	1.25	2.50	2.50					2.54
N Rose-Wolcott	<b>6-13</b>	4.32	4.27	1.00	2.47	1.90	2.00	2.30				2.61
Palmyra-Macedon	<b>4-15</b>	3.20	3.90	3.90	2.48	3.90	2.50	1.75 + \$500	2.75	2.75		3.17
Penn Yan	<b>6-13</b>	4.00	4.00	2.29	2.29	1.90	2.00	2.00				2.64
Phelps-Cl Springs		4.00	2.89	2.89	2.89	2.00	2.00	2.00				2.67
Red Creek		4.50	4.50	2.75	2.75	2.50	2.40	2.40				3.11
Romulus	<b>5-15</b>	3.33	3.33	3.50	3.50	1.50	1.50	5.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.07
Seneca Falls	<b>2-15</b>	3.67	3.91	3.50	3.45	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.75	2.50	2.00	2.88
Sodus	<b>6-15 *</b>	4.15	3.80	3.80	2.00	2.00	2.20	3.00	3.00	3.30	3.30	3.06
								* 2015-16 and 2016-17 3.0 percent settlement for on-step unit members				
Victor	<b>6-15</b>	4.30	4.30	4.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	3.10	3.10	3.10		3.21
Waterloo	<b>5-13</b>	4.05	3.89	3.72	2.00	1.50	1.75	1.95				2.69
Wayne	<b>4-15</b>	4.25	4.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.50	4.00	2.50		3.14
Williamson		4.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.25	2.50	2.50	2.60	2.50		2.71
	<b>AVG</b>	<b>4.03</b>	<b>3.73</b>	<b>3.03</b>	<b>2.41</b>	<b>2.29</b>	<b>2.27</b>	<b>2.69</b>	<b>3.04</b>	<b>2.90</b>	<b>2.70</b>	

**RECENT AREA NON-INSTRUCTIONAL CONTRACT SETTLEMENTS**

(shaded areas = contract term)

<b>CAYUGA-ONONDAGA BOCES</b>												
	<b>Date Settled</b>	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>	<b>2014-2015</b>	<b>2015-2016</b>	<b>2016-2017</b>	<b>2017-2018</b>	<b>2018-2019</b>	<b>Avg.</b>
<b>BOCES</b>												
Aides (CSEA)	07-15	4.50	4.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50		2.67
Tchr. Ass't		4.50	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00						2.70
Non-Instructional	06-15	4.50	4.50	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50			2.75
<b>Auburn</b>												
Aides/Clerical (NYSUT)	06-10	3.45	3.35	3.35	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00				2.59
Bus Drivers (CSEA)	05-13	3.65	3.30	3.30	2.90	0.00	2.25	2.25				2.52
Cust/Maint. (CSEA)	05-13	3.65	3.30	3.30	2.90	0.00	2.25	2.25				2.52
Nurses (SEIU 200U)	04-12	3.50	3.50	2.00	0.00	2.00						2.20
<b>Cato-Meridian</b>												
Aides/Ass'ts (SEIU 200U)		4.75	4.75	4.75	50¢/hr	50¢/hr	50¢/hr	75¢/hr	75¢/hr	75¢/hr		4.75
Bus Drivers (CSEA)	07-13	4.75	3.30	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00			2.51
Cust./Maint. (CSEA)	07-13	4.75	3.30	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00			2.51
<b>Jordan-Elbridge</b>												
Aides/Clerical(SEIU 200U)	09-12	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00					3.00
Bus Drivers	07-11		3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00						2.25
Cust./Maint (SEIU 200U)	09-12	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00					3.00
Cafeteria (SEIU 200U)	09-12	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00					3.00
Transportation	06-13					1.00	1.00	1.00				1.00
<b>Moravia</b>												
Aides/Ass't (CSEA)	07-12	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	0.00	2.00	2.00				2.57
CSEA	07-12	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	0.00	2.00	2.00				2.57
<b>Port Byron</b>												
Aides (SEIU 200U)	01-13	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00					2.33
Cust./Maint. (CSEA)	06-13	3.00	3.00	1.60	1.40	2.00	2.00	2.00				2.14
Cafeteria (CSEA)	06-13	3.00	3.00	1.60	1.40	2.00	2.00	2.00				2.14
Nurse (CSEA)	06-13	3.00	3.00	1.60	1.40	2.00	2.00	2.00				2.14
Clerical (SEIU 200U)	01-13	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00					2.33
<b>Skaneateles</b>												
Aides (CSEA)	04-14	3.75	3.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	2.50	2.60				2.41
Tchr Ass't (CSEA)	04-14	3.75	3.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	2.50	2.60				2.41
Cust./Maint (CSEA)	04-14	3.75	3.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	2.50	2.60				2.41
Nurses (CSEA)	04-14	3.75	3.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	2.50	2.60				2.41
Clerical (CSEA)	04-14	3.75	3.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	2.50	2.60				2.41
<b>So. Cayuga</b>												
Aides (CSEA)		3.70	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	45¢/hr	45¢/hr	45¢/hr		2.53
Tchr. Ass't (CSEA)		3.70	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	45¢/hr	45¢/hr	45¢/hr		2.53
Bus Drivers (CSEA)		3.70	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	45¢/hr	45¢/hr	45¢/hr		2.53
Bus Mechanics (CSEA)		3.70	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	45¢/hr	45¢/hr	45¢/hr		2.53

**RECENT AREA NON-INSTRUCTIONAL CONTRACT SETTLEMENTS**

(shaded areas = contract term)

<b>CAYUGA-ONONDAGA BOCES cont'd</b>												
	<b>Date Settled</b>	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>	<b>2014-2015</b>	<b>2015-2016</b>	<b>2016-2017</b>	<b>2017-2018</b>	<b>2018-2019</b>	<b>Avg.</b>
<b>So. Cayuga cont'd</b>												
Cust./Maint (CSEA)		3.70	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	45¢/hr	45¢/hr	45¢/hr		2.53
Cafeteria (CSEA)		3.70	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	45¢/hr	45¢/hr	45¢/hr		2.53
Nurses (CSEA)		3.70	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	45¢/hr	45¢/hr	45¢/hr		2.53
Clerical (CSEA)		3.70	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	45¢/hr	45¢/hr	45¢/hr		2.53
<b>Union Springs</b>												
Aides (SEIU 200U)	06-14	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50			2.56
Tchr. Ass'ts (SEIU 200U)	06-14	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50			2.56
Bus Drivers (CSEA)	06-14	4.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50		2.61
Bus Mechanics (CSEA)	06-14	4.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50		2.61
Cust/Maint. (CSEA)	06-14	4.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50		2.61
Cafeteria (CSEA)	06-14	4.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50		2.61
Nurses (SEIU 200U)	06-14	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50			2.56
Clerical (SEIU 200U)	06-14	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50			2.56
<b>Weedsport</b>												
Aides (CSEA)		4.00	4.00	4.00	1.95	1.95	1.95	2.50	2.50	2.50		2.82
Bus Drivers (CSEA)		4.00	4.00	4.00	1.95	1.95	1.95	2.50	*2.50	*2.50		2.82
Bus Mechanics (CSEA)		4.00	4.00	4.00	1.95	1.95	1.95	2.50	2.50	2.50		2.82
Cust/Maint. (CSEA)		4.00	4.00	4.00	1.95	1.95	1.95	2.50	2.50	2.50		2.82
Nurses		4.00	4.00	4.00				*Bus drivers @ % + 30¢				4.00
Clerical		4.00	4.00	4.00								4.00
<b>C-O BOCES Avg.</b>		<b>3.72</b>	<b>3.26</b>	<b>2.55</b>	<b>2.09</b>	<b>1.90</b>	<b>2.27</b>	<b>2.32</b>	<b>2.43</b>	<b>2.50</b>		
<b>BROOME-TIOGA BOCES</b>												
<b>Chenango Valley</b>												
Non-Instruct. (NYSUT)		4.10	3.30	3.30	3.30	2.25	2.50	2.90				3.09
<b>Deposit</b>												
CSEA	03-12	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	2.00						3.20
<b>Maine-Endwell</b>												
Cust./Maint.	10-14	\$0.60	\$0.65	2.00	2.00	2.00	50¢/hr	50¢/hr	50¢/hr			2.00
School Lunch	07-08	4.60	4.60	4.60								4.60
Supp Staff	07-08	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50							4.50
Transp	04-15	\$0.60	3.00	3.00	3.00	\$600	\$700	\$800				3.00
<b>Owego-Apalachin</b>												
NYSUT	02-13	3.80	3.90	4.00	0.00	1.99	1.99					2.61
<b>Union Endicott</b>												
Cafe. Workers	11-10	3.90	3.90	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.70					3.10
Cent Office	11-10	2.00	2.00	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.70					2.47
Comp & Tech	11-10	3.90	3.90	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.70					3.10

**RECENT AREA NON-INSTRUCTIONAL CONTRACT SETTLEMENTS**

(shaded areas = contract term)

	Date Settled	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	Avg.
<b>BROOME-TIOGA BOCES cont'd</b>												
<b>Union Endicott cont'd</b>												
Dist Office	11-10	\$0.51	3.90	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.70					2.94
Maint. Workers	11-10	3.90	3.90	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.70					3.10
School Aides	11-10	\$0.42	3.90	2.70	0.00	2.70	2.70					2.94
Transp	11-10	\$0.53	4.00	2.70	0.00	2.70	2.70					2.96
<b>Whitney Point</b>												
Aides/Food Serv (NYSUT)			3.30	0.00	2.25	2.25	2.50	2.50	2.50			2.19
<b>B-T BOCES Avg</b>		<b>3.86</b>	<b>3.72</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>2.57</b>	<b>2.45</b>	<b>2.59</b>	<b>2.70</b>	<b>2.50</b>			
<b>GREATER SO. TIER BOCES</b>												
<b>Hornell</b>												
Paraprofessionals	09-13	4.00	2.45	2.35	2.00	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80			2.75
Supp Staff	08-13	4.00	2.40	2.15	1.90	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80			2.71
<b>GST BOCES Avg</b>		<b>4.00</b>	<b>2.43</b>	<b>2.25</b>	<b>1.95</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>2.80</b>			
<b>OSWEGO BOCES</b>												
<b>Hannibal</b>												
CSEA	11-13	3.50	2.00	0.00	1.75	1.75	1.95	2.00				1.85
HEA	01-09	3.50	3.50	open								3.50
<b>Osw. BOCES Avg.</b>		<b>3.50</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>1.75</b>	<b>1.75</b>	<b>1.95</b>	<b>2.00</b>				
<b>TOMPKINS-SENECA-TIOGA BOCES</b>												
<b>BOCES</b>												
Local		4.00	4.00									4.00
<b>Candor</b>												
Local		5.00	1.90	2.00	2.00							2.73
<b>Dryden</b>												
NYSUT		4.00	2.50	2.50	2.20	3.00	2.85	2.66				2.82
<b>Groton</b>												
CSEA	04-13	4.00	4.00	2.85	2.85	2.50	2.75	2.75				3.10
<b>Ithaca</b>												
ICSDEA		4.10	4.00									4.05
<b>Lansing</b>												
NYSUT	10-13	3.90	3.90	3.90		90¢/hr	3.50	60¢/hr	3.00			3.64
<b>Newfield</b>												
CSEA	04-15	3.25	3.50	1.95	2.25	2.50	1.50	2.25	2.25			2.43
<b>South Seneca</b>												
Local	06-13	4.50	5.00	5.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	2.00				3.07

**RECENT AREA NON-INSTRUCTIONAL CONTRACT SETTLEMENTS**

(shaded areas = contract term)

<b>TOMPKINS-SENECA-TIOGA BOCES cont'd</b>												
	Date Settled	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	Avg.
<b>Trumansburg</b>												
Local		\$0.55	\$0.60	2.00	2.25	2.50	2.50					2.31
<b>T-S-T BOCES Avg.</b>		<b>4.09</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>2.89</b>	<b>2.09</b>	<b>2.50</b>	<b>2.52</b>	<b>2.42</b>	<b>2.63</b>			
<b>WAYNE-FINGER LAKES BOCES</b>												
<b>BOCES</b>												
NYSUT	06-14	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.75	1.90	2.75	2.45	2.45			2.98
<b>Bloomfield</b>												
NEA/NYSUT	06-13	3.40	3.40	3.40	3.40	1.95	1.85	1.85				2.75
<b>Canandaigua</b>												
Cust./Maint. (Unaffil.)		3.85	3.85	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00				3.24
Cler./Aides (NYSUT)		3.85	3.85			3.00	2.40	2.40				3.10
Food Service (Unaffil.)		4.00	3.00	3.50	4.00	2.25	2.25	3.00	3.00	3.00		3.11
Bus Drivers		3.75	3.75	3.75	2.25	2.25	2.25					3.00
Monitors		4.00	3.00	3.50	4.00	2.25	2.00	3.47	2.40	2.35		3.00
<b>Clyde-Savannah</b>												
Support Pers. (CSEA)	09-13	5.00	4.25	4.25	4.00	2.50	2.50	2.50				3.57
Transp. (Unaffiliated)	08-13	5.00	4.75	4.50	4.00	2.00	2.00	2.00				3.46
<b>Dundee</b>												
CSEA	01-15	3.00	3.10	3.20	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00				2.47
<b>Gananda</b>												
CSEA	06-13	4.00	2.50	2.50	1.40	2.80	2.80	2.80				2.69
<b>Geneva</b>												
CSEA	07-15	4.00	4.00	0.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00		2.56
<b>Gorham-Middlesex</b>												
Bus Drivers (NYSUT)	06-15	3.70	3.70	3.70	1.90	2.25	2.25	2.70	2.70	2.70		2.84
Cust./F Serv (NYSUT)	06-14	3.50	3.70	3.70	3.75	3.75	2.70	2.70	2.50			3.29
Teacher Aides (NYSUT)	06-14	3.75	3.75	2.75	2.50	2.25	2.70	2.70	2.50			2.86
<b>Honeoye</b>												
NYSUT	05-14	4.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.75	2.50				2.75
<b>Lyons</b>												
NYSUT	11-14	4.25	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.50	* 2.50	2.50				2.96
							* Nov. '14 settlement is % + 15¢/hr					
<b>Manchester-S'ville</b>												
CSEA		5.80	5.50	1.80	1.00	1.90	1.90	2.50	2.50	2.50		2.82
<b>Marion</b>												
CSEA	03-13	3.50	3.50	3.50	1.75	1.75	1.75					2.63

**RECENT AREA NON-INSTRUCTIONAL CONTRACT SETTLEMENTS**

(shaded areas = contract term)

<b>WAYNE-FINGER LAKES BOCES cont'd</b>												
	Date Settled	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	Avg.
<b>Naples</b>												
CSEA	08-13	4.00	3.25	3.50	3.50	2.70	2.70	2.70				3.19
<b>Newark</b>												
Custodians (CSEA)	05-15	3.80	2.95	2.50	1.25	2.00	2.00	2.40	2.00			2.36
Tchr Aides/Asst (NYSUT)	12-15	3.75	2.50	2.30	1.50	1.50	2.40	2.00				2.28
<b>North Rose-Wolcott</b>												
NYSUT	09-12	3.90	3.75	0.00	1.90	1.90	1.90	1.95				2.19
<b>Palmyra-Macedon</b>												
CSEA	10-12	3.90	3.90	3.90	3.90	2.90	2.90	2.90	2.90			3.40
<b>Penn Yan</b>												
CSEA		3.90	3.90	3.90	2.25	2.25	2.25	2.25	2.35	2.35		2.82
<b>Phelps-Clifton Springs</b>												
Nurses/Food Serv (NYSUT)	06-13	4.05	4.05	4.05	4.05	2.00	2.00	2.00				3.17
Bus Driv/Maint (NYSUT)	06-13	4.05	4.05	4.05	4.05	2.00	2.00	2.00				3.17
Aides/Clerical (NYSUT)	06-13	2.89	2.89	2.89	2.89	2.00	2.00	2.00				2.51
<b>Red Creek</b>												
CSEA	04-15	4.50	4.50	4.50	2.75	2.00	2.00	* 3.50	2.50	2.50		3.19
								* 2015-16 % based on hire date				
<b>Romulus</b>												
CSEA	05-15	4.34	4.32	4.00	1.50	1.50	3.00	3.00	3.00			3.08
<b>Seneca Falls</b>												
NEA/NYSUT	06-15	3.50	3.50	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.75	2.50	2.00	2.53
<b>Sodus</b>												
CSEA	07-13	3.75	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00				2.54
<b>Victor</b>												
CSEA		4.00	4.00	1.00	1.00	1.50	2.00	2.00	2.00			2.19
<b>Waterloo</b>												
NEA/NYSUT	05-13	4.47	4.31	2.00	2.00	1.50	1.75	1.95				2.57
<b>Wayne</b>												
CSEA	12-15	4.40			2.50	2.50	2.70	2.90	2.90			2.98
<b>Williamson</b>												
CSEA		5.00	5.00	2.70	2.80	3.00	2.00	1.75	2.00			3.03
<b>WFL BOCES Avg.</b>		<b>3.97</b>	<b>3.68</b>	<b>3.13</b>	<b>2.82</b>	<b>2.27</b>	<b>2.31</b>	<b>2.44</b>	<b>2.61</b>	<b>2.61</b>	<b>2.00</b>	

# AREA UNEMPLOYMENT RATES

## New York State Rate

Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Ann. Avg.
2015	6.5%	6.4%	5.8%	5.5%	5.3%	5.2%	5.4%	5.0%	4.8%	4.5%	4.7%	4.7%	
2014	7.4%	7.5%	7.1%	6.1%	6.2%	6.2%	6.5%	6.1%	5.8%	5.7%	5.7%	5.6%	6.3%

## Syracuse, NY Metropolitan Statistical Area

Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Ann. Avg.
2015	6.6%	6.3%	5.7%	5.4%	5.4%	5.4%	5.6%	5.0%	5.1%	4.7%	4.8%	4.8%	
2014	7.3%	7.3%	6.8%	5.8%	5.9%	6.0%	6.1%	5.8%	5.6%	5.4%	5.5%	5.5%	6.1%

## Cayuga County Statistical Area

Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Ann. Avg.
2015	6.8%	6.6%	6.0%	5.3%	5.0%	4.9%	5.3%	4.9%	5.0%	4.8%	4.9%	5.1%	
2014	7.7%	7.7%	7.2%	5.8%	5.7%	5.5%	5.8%	5.5%	5.2%	5.0%	5.2%	5.5%	6.0%

## Broome County Statistical Area

Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Ann. Avg.
2015	7.3%	6.9%	6.3%	6.0%	5.8%	5.9%	6.1%	5.5%	5.6%	5.3%	5.3%	5.5%	
2014	8.0%	8.0%	7.4%	6.2%	6.3%	6.4%	6.6%	6.3%	6.1%	5.7%	5.9%	6.1%	6.6%

## Ithaca, NY Metropolitan Statistical Area

Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Ann. Avg.
2015	4.8%	4.3%	3.8%	3.8%	4.1%	4.6%	4.7%	4.1%	3.9%	3.6%	3.7%	3.4%	
2014	5.1%	4.9%	4.4%	3.7%	4.2%	4.7%	5.0%	4.5%	4.1%	3.9%	3.9%	3.7%	4.3%

## Ontario/Seneca/Wayne/Yates Statistical Area

Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Ann. Avg.
2015	6.6%	6.4%	5.8%	5.2%	4.9%	4.8%	4.9%	4.4%	4.6%	4.2%	4.4%	4.7%	
2014	7.1%	7.2%	6.7%	5.6%	5.4%	5.3%	5.3%	5.0%	4.9%	4.7%	5.1%	5.5%	5.6%

## Rochester, NY Metropolitan Statistical Area

Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Ann. Avg.
2015	6.2%	6.0%	5.5%	5.2%	5.1%	5.1%	5.4%	4.8%	4.9%	4.5%	4.6%	4.6%	
2014	6.9%	6.9%	6.4%	5.6%	5.7%	5.7%	5.9%	5.6%	5.4%	5.1%	5.3%	5.3%	5.8%

*Source: New York State Department of Labor  
Labor Statistics  
[www.labor.state.ny.us](http://www.labor.state.ny.us)*

# CONSUMER PRICE INDICES

INDEX 1982-84 BASE YEAR=100	% INCREASE FROM PRIOR MONTH	% INCREASE FROM PRIOR YEAR
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	----------------------------------

## December 2015

### NY-Northeastern New Jersey Area

1. All Urban Consumers	260.558	-0.4	0.7
2. Urban Wage Earners & Clerical Workers	254.441	-0.4	0.5

### U.S. City Average

1. All Urban Consumers	236.525	-0.3	0.7
2. Urban Wage Earners & Clerical Workers	230.791	-0.4	0.4

## January 2016

### NY-Northeastern New Jersey Area

1. All Urban Consumers	260.342	0.2	0.8
2. Urban Wage Earners & Clerical Workers	254.968	0.2	0.7

### U.S. City Average

1. All Urban Consumers	236.916	0.2	1.4
2. Urban Wage Earners & Clerical Workers	231.061	0.1	1.2

# COST OF LIVING UPDATE

## ALL CITIES

## NY - NORTHEASTERN NEW JERSEY

Month	Revised Wage Earner Index	%	All Urban Consumers Index	%	Revised Wage Earner Index	%	All Urban Consumers Index	%
Jan-14	230.0	1.6	233.9	1.6	255.5	1.8	259.6	1.9
Feb-14	230.9	1.0	234.8	1.1	254.8	1.0	259.0	1.1
Mar-14	232.6	1.4	236.3	1.5	255.9	1.3	260.0	1.3
Apr-14	233.4	2.0	237.1	2.0	255.9	1.6	260.0	1.6
May-14	234.2	2.1	237.9	2.1	257.1	1.9	261.2	1.9
Jun-14	234.7	2.0	238.3	2.1	257.1	1.7	261.4	1.7
Jul-14	234.5	1.9	238.3	2.0	257.3	1.6	261.5	1.6
Aug-14	234.0	1.6	237.9	1.7	256.7	1.2	261.1	1.3
Sep-14	234.2	1.6	238.0	1.7	256.9	1.0	261.1	1.0
Oct-14	233.2	1.5	237.4	1.7	256.0	1.2	260.5	1.3
Nov-14	231.6	1.1	236.2	1.3	254.6	0.6	259.4	0.8
Dec-14	229.9	0.3	234.8	0.8	253.2	0.1	258.1	0.3
Jan-15	228.3	-0.8	233.7	-0.1	253.2	-0.9	258.4	-0.5
Feb-15	229.4	-0.6	234.7	0.0	254.0	-0.6	259.2	0.1
Mar-15	231.1	-0.6	236.1	-0.1	254.4	-0.6	259.6	-0.1
Apr-15	231.5	-0.8	236.6	-0.2	254.7	-0.5	260.0	0.0
May-15	232.9	-0.6	237.8	0.0	255.9	-0.5	261.1	-0.1
Jun-15	233.8	-0.4	238.6	0.1	256.4	-0.3	261.5	0.1
Jul-15	233.8	-0.3	238.7	0.2	256.1	-0.5	261.2	0.1
Aug-15	233.4	-0.3	238.3	0.2	256.0	-0.3	261.3	0.1
Sep-15	232.7	-0.6	237.9	0.0	256.4	-0.2	261.9	0.3
Oct-15	232.4	-0.4	237.8	0.2	255.9	0.0	261.5	0.4
Nov-15	231.7	0.1	237.3	0.5	255.4	0.3	261.0	0.6
Dec-15	230.8	0.4	236.5	0.7	254.4	0.5	260.6	0.7
Jan-16	231.1	1.2	236.9	1.4	255.0	0.7	260.3	0.8
Feb-16								
Mar-16								
Apr-16								
May-16								
Jun-16								
Jul-16								
Aug-16								
Sep-16								
Oct-16								
Nov-16								
Dec-16								

# THE ADVOCATE STAFF

## Editorial Assistant & Desktop Publisher:

Linda M. Brown

## Contributors:

Randy J. Ray • Brent D. Cooley • Emily Brown  
J. Ryan Hatch • Nicholas Minderler • Mark W. Snyder • Linda M. Brown

## Published by:

Cayuga-Onondaga BOCES  
Office of Personnel Relations  
1879 West Genesee Street Road  
Auburn, NY 13021-9430  
Telephone: (315) 255-7683 • Fax: (315) 255-7625

*\* All Rights Reserved*

## PAST ISSUES OF “THE ADVOCATE”

Past issues of “The Advocate” can be read and/or downloaded for your reference at your convenience.

Simply go to our website at [www.cayboces.org](http://www.cayboces.org), navigate through Management Services, then Labor Relations Service, then click the link to “The Advocate” newsletter.

## NOTICE OF NON-DISCRIMINATION

The Cayuga-Onondaga BOCES does not discriminate on the basis of an individual’s actual or perceived race, color, religion, creed, ethnicity, national origin, citizenship status, age, marital status, partnership status, disability, predisposing genetic characteristics, sexual orientation, gender (sex), military status, veteran status, domestic violence victim status or political affiliation, and additionally does not discriminate against students on the basis of weight, gender identity, gender expression, and religious practices or any other basis prohibited by New York state and/or federal non-discrimination laws in employment or its programs and activities. The BOCES provides equal access to community and youth organizations.

Inquiries regarding the District’s non-discrimination policies should be directed to:

Emily M. Brown  
Labor Relations Specialist and Civil Rights Compliance Officer  
1879 West Genesee Street Road  
Auburn, NY 13021  
(315) 255-7683  
[ebrown@cayboces.org](mailto:ebrown@cayboces.org)