Representing faculty of City College of San Francisco AFT Local 2121, CFT/AFT, AFL-CIO

AFT 2121 Factfinding Presentation – Day 2

Reasons and Evidence for Union Positions

June 6, 2016

Table of Contents – Day 2 AFT binder

(Note: numbered tabs correspond to numbered items below.)

IV. Revenue (including loss of stabilization funding)/Affordability of Union Art. 20.A salary proposal

A. District has seen growth in revenue the since the recession with the passage of Prop 30, Prop A (SF Parcel Tax for CCSF), rising revenues from local Sales Tax, etc. *despite* a huge drop in student enrollment (over 30%) after ACCJC sanction in 2012, thanks to (temporary) stabilization funding by the State. With renewed revenues and a significant decline in the number of faculty, more revenue is available per employee. (Ex. Y & Z) At Mis-spending of some of these new revenues, e.g. Prop A, *away* from the classroom further contributes to stagnant wages. (Ex. 1 & 2) The District also received $12.9 million in one-time monies in refunds for State mandated costs swelling 2014/15 revenues to $219 million.

   Exhibits:
   u. Revenue and Fund Balance table
   v. Decline in faculty numbers
   w. Prop A – text of measure passed by SF voters
   x. Table of Prop A spending – 3 years
   y. 2016/17 Tentative Budget, excerpt – Special Revenue Parcel Tax summary
   z. Faculty salaries expenditures: Budget vs. Actual & other

B. District has a history of overestimating expenditures, leading to surpluses at year's end or transfers to other fund. For faculty salaries, this occurs ongoing, underspending by $5 to $7 million each of the last four years, monies that should have gone to restoring/increasing faculty salaries. (Ex. 4) Other budget areas have likewise seen surpluses. Coupled with the faculty givebacks/takebacks since the recession, these savings massively expanded the District Fund Balance to $38.8 million on June 30, 2015, and an estimated $65 million (or 34%) by year's end, way in excess of the State's recommended 5% minimum. (Ex. Y & U)

C. The District has to decide which path is ahead for the college. One of cuts and downsizing or one of growth in enrollment. We support all efforts to grow our college back. The college's own Enrollment Management Plan if implemented would provide enough growth to more than pay to our salary proposal. Our local has been working on efforts, such as a Free City College proposal and State legislation to help the college receive funding for all of its anticipated growth.

   Exhibits:
   1. Enrollment management plan
   2. Free City (pending)
   3. Enrollment and growth cap legislation
   4. Enrollment plans and very high reserves will compensate for loss of state stabilization funding

D. AFT proposal on salaries is fair and reasonable. Both parties call for restoring faculty salaries to 2007 levels, plus State COLA, but only AFT's proposal provides a real increase. After learning of $12.9 million in one-time monies coming from the State this year, the District modified its proposal, offering a portion of those to AFT unit members in the form of one-time payments (4.68% each year). (The District calls 2% of this "ongoing," but ties the increase to goals unachievable in just one year, i.e. big increases in "productivity" and enrollment growth by July 1, 2017.)

AFT calls for real salary increases, but includes a "trigger" that could lower or eliminate the proposed salary increase in Year 3, depending upon the extent of the impact on the District budget due to the of the loss of stabilization funding. The District skirts the issue by simply calling for only a two-year contract.

AFT also calls for restoration of the "lost salary step" for eligible faculty still suffering that loss each year. (Ex. 8)

With the drug prescription copay reimbursement due to be restored on July 1, 2016, AFT proposes limiting that benefit to lower its cost and administrative burden on the District. (Ex. 5)

The District can afford this proposal. The huge Fund Balance can provide needed funds in the short run while the school rebuilds post-accreditation, including its own efforts to build enrollment, other efforts such as Free City in San Francisco that support growth, and State legislation to insure that CCSF is funded for all of the growth. The doom and gloom scenarios of the District continue the pattern of overstating expenditures (by funding vacant positions, failing to account for attrition from retirements, etc.) and understating reserves savings from declining numbers of faculty. The difference in cost between the District and AFT proposals is: (Ex. 8)

Year 1 $500K
Year 2 $2.3 million
Year 3 AFT-only proposal with budget-friendly "trigger"

Our proposal costs less than $3 million over the next 2 years, which is less than 10% of the available district reserves. While the cost in the third year is $12,5 million, this could very easily be sustained despite the loss of stabilization funds if the district acts now on their enrollment growth plans. Additional funding from new initiatives would enhance revenues even further if realized."

Exhibits:

5. Text of Union proposal, Art. 20.A
6. Comparison of District and Union proposals with cost-out
7. Mediation accord of 2013, including drug copayment suspension/return
8. Cost out of proposals
9. Recent salary settlement in Bay Area and other CC districts
10 Recent salary settlements in Bay Area and other CC districts

V. Public good

Exhibit:

10) Budget and Legislative Analyst Report

Overview:

▪ We are a community college, but in our current situation our ability to serve the communities of San Francisco and the Bay Area is declining.

▪ The District is proposing one possible future for CCSF.
- -- A smaller college
- -- Growing reserves, so money is not available for classes or to pay employees
- -- Keeping faculty salaries low
- -- Faculty leave
- -- The faculty who stay cannot afford to live in SF
- -- Students drop out
- -- Administration has made choices that have reduced enrollment. They have cut classes and programs, failed to fix problems, eliminated majors, and even closed the financial aid office. We call these “push-out” policies.
- -- Administration could chose a different path; they could decide to invest in growth.

▪ District says there’s a looming financial crisis, but their own plans show that we already know how to solve the problem
- -- Their own enrollment management plan shows we can grow enough to cover the loss of stability funding
- -- The money is there. It’s about priorities and choices.
- -- Reserves should be invested to help grown the school.
- -- Prop A and stability funding were never intended to be rainy-day funds.

▪ Public vision for CCSF is different. Prop A and support for Free City show that San Franciscans support growth, accessibility

▪ AFT proposal is fair, affordable, and sustainable

▪ AFT proposal is good for our communities. It will increase access to education

FCMAT recommendations

AFT Views of FCMAT Recommendations:

1. FCMAT recommendations should not be used to pressure the College to make poor decisions, especially about downsizing. We know from department chairs and coordinators that they were denied permission to run classes in high demand areas, forcing them to cut many fully enrolled classes in the coming Fall semester. This is bureaucratic-driven downsizing at its worst, which only insures that CCSF will lose millions in State apportionment when stabilization funding ends.

2. FCMAT ignores the fact that the administration is misspending Prop A monies, ongoing funds that could go towards funding ongoing salary improvements and restore classes. Last year, the District spent a paltry $3 million of the $15 million in Prop A revenues on faculty. Furthermore, this $3 million went to noninstructional faculty; not one penny of Prop A was spent in the classroom in 2014/15. In fact, of the $15 million Prop A revenue last year, the District only spent $11 million total, leaving $4 million for in reserves. The District has misused these funds in their attempt to comply with the 50% law, which requires school districts to spend a minimum of 50% of the “current cost of education” on classroom instruction, namely salaries and benefits of classroom instructors.

   This year, 2015/16, the District has budgeted $9.4 million on academic salaries. In the District's Working Budget again not one penny is for instruction violating the voters intentions in its attempt to meet the requirements of the 50% law. Clearly, there is substantial money here that could and should go to fund classes and restore faculty salaries.

3. FCMAT is warning against using reserves (“one-time monies”) to fund ongoing increases. This ignores a major reason why the CCSF Fund Balance has grown to such high levels - the cutting of faculty salaries. The District projects 51.8M in reserves for Fund Balance (25%). We project nearly 65.8M (35%). The State recommends a minimum 5%. The CCSF Board Policy is between 5%- 9%. The District budgets faculty expenditures at one amount, currently $86 million, then proceeds to spend significantly less, accumulating close to $5 million each year that goes to reserves. This is ongoing money that could have, and rightly should have, gone to restore faculty salaries, which still lag 3.5% below 2007 levels. The District has been hiding ongoing money in the reserves, so it makes no sense to now refer to the reserves as “one-time monies.”

4. FCMAT doesn’t even acknowledge low faculty salaries, much less suggest a balance between the need to fairly compensate faculty with the need for workable District budgets. Latest salary comparisons of full-time salaries place CCSF at the bottom of

Bay Ten community colleges, while part-time faculty earn a fraction of what full-time faculty earn for comparable work. FCMAT equates AFT 2121 demands for ongoing salary increases as pressure on the Board to "compromise prudent fiscal principles." That attitude will continue to divide the College and lead to greater turmoil.

5. FCMAT and the administration continue to claim that the beginning Fund Balance this year, i.e. on July 1, 2015, was $28.4 million, as reported in the Adopted Budget. However, the District's own subsequent report to the State, known as the annual CCFS- 311 report, puts the figure at $38.7 million. Moreover, according to a recent budget scenario documents of the District, the beginning balance is stated as $38.8 million, and climbs to $51.8M by year's end on July 1, 2016 even after factoring in AFT's proposed wage increase.

6. Just to clarify in the original report FCMAT claims that part of the District's "fiscal challenge" is the cost of excessive lifetime health benefits that go to part and full-time CCSF faculty. Not true. Only tenured full-time faculty with 20 years of service fully vest in retiree health benefits gets benefits, part-timers and full-time temporary (categoricals) get nothing.

7. FCMAT recommendation should not unduly influence collective bargaining where management maintains inflexible positions and "surface" bargains, e.g. its refusal to grant an ongoing wage increase beyond restoration and COLA.

Critique of the District's approach to enrollment management

The positions taken by the district in the bargaining process seemed to be in direct contradiction to their positions with respect to enrollment growth. It is as if the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing.

Beginning on the first day of negotiations, the AFT has maintained that the key solution to solving the problems facing the District is to regrow enrollments. Also starting on the first day of negotiations the District has maintained that this is a management prerogative and not a concern of the faculty.

The approach taken by the District is to somehow cut their way into increased enrollment. As is documented elsewhere in our presentation, their plan is to reduce section by 26% over six years. This seems to be in direct contradiction to their Enrollment Management Plan.

The administration plans to push enrollments for Summer 2016 and pull enrollments for Summer 2017 into reported total enrollments for the 2016/17 academic year. In the past, this has been a common practice to maximize the enrollment numbers to determine base funding allocations going forward. Yet at the same time, they are planning on cutting sections during the actual academic year. At a time when the District is trying to maximize base funding FTES, turning students away seems to be irrational. The district should be doing everything it can to **maximize the number of FTES at the present time**. In fact, that was **the stated purpose for stabilization funding**. Raising course "productivity" by decreasing enrollments will not work, will continue to create enrollment declines, and is completely counter-productive.

Another example of counter-productive enrollment management policies concerns the timing of the payment of tuition. It is true that in the past many students have failed to ultimately pay their tuition, which has forced the college to write-off these payments. These write-offs have been between $300,000 to $500,000 per year, which is about 1.5% of total revenues to the college. In the past, students were allowed a grace period of several weeks into the semester to complete their tuition payments. In the Fall 2014, the administration implemented, without sufficient warning, a policy of dropping all students who had registered for classes, but not paid their tuition before the first week of classes. The deadline for payment was set prior to the date students were able to receive their financial aid. This led to an enormous drop in enrollments during the first two weeks of classes, and the administration used these drops in enrollments as a justification for cutting "low enrollment" sections. The response to this ill-advised policy was a massive student protest, and the policy has now been rescinded. However, many students who were driven away by this policy are likely now enrolled in other colleges and have not ome back to CCSF.

The administration's claim is that cutting sections will not decrease overall enrollments because students will simply move to a different section. That might be true at a residential college, where few students have job or family commitments, but at CCSF that is often not the case. Students build their class and job schedules as a unit when they go through the early registration process. When a class is cancelled at the beginning of the semester, these students often just look to find a suitable course at another college. It should be noted, that students who registered during the late-add period were still given until the middle of the semester to make their tuition payments.

Another example of counter-productive enrollment management policies is related to prerequisites. If a course has prerequisites, State law requires they be enforced. Faculty have successfully done this for years. As the head of the Enrollment Management committee, then Vice Chancellor Lamb decided these requirements should be enforced by the Banner system. The enrollment management committee includes some faculty members. The representative from Economics warned that having the Banner system enforce prerequisites would lead to a drop in enrollments because Banner cannot determine if the requirements. Vice Chancellor Lamb assured him this would not be a problem.

He did manage to convince the administration to test the system by only applying it to a limited number of courses. One of these courses was Econ. 15, Statistics. This course requires two semesters of algebra. During the first semester of the test, students were given a very curt message: "You cannot register for the class because you do not meet the prerequisites. If you want to challenge this decision, contact the matriculation office." As a result, enrollments in Econ 15 declined dramatically, and for the first time in decades, a section was cancelled.

Very few students are willing to "challenge" a decision by the college. At faculty urging, during the second semester the message was changed to: "It appears you do not meet the prerequisites for this course. If you think this is an error please contact the matriculation office or Professor X." Many students did contact Professor X and he determined that almost all of the students did in fact meet the requirement by taking the courses at other schools. Many students had complete calculus in high school. Banner is unable to check for that. Faculty on the enrollment management committee have suggested a very simple fix for this problem, but management has rejected it.

Despite these problems, the administration has decided to have Banner check prerequisites for all classes starting this Summer session. So far, 30% of students trying to register for Econ 1, Macroeconomics, which requires one semester of algebra, have been denied registration, including students who have completed three semesters of calculus and a student who has a Ph.D. in educational Psychology and has taught statistics at the university level. This is not the way to grow enrollments.

Previous Interim Chancellors and Special Trustees have done very little to increase enrollments. Special Trustee Lease commented on day one of fact-finding that bad press has likely hinder enrollment growth. This is very likely true. Unfortunately, the press is often just quoting comments from Interim Chancellors and Special Trustees. One of the Interim Chancellors was quoted in in the San Francisco Chronicle saying that she would not suggest that her children should attend CCSF. This despite the fact that, academically, CCSF is rated in the top 1% of community colleges in the United States.

Special Trustee Agrella, in commenting on the fact that Chancellor Tyler, who was being paid $289,000 a year plus travel and car allowances, while spending more than a third of his time traveling away from campus, indicated that he was not confident that the college was moving quickly enough in the areas where changes needed to be made, and that he was concerned that the college would not make it.

In another article, Special Trustee Lease in commenting on the number of unfilled administrative position is quoted as saying: "We're not a very attractive partner right now. People don't know if we'll be open a year from now, and it's expensive to live here." It is very difficult generating good press when the leaders of the college are constantly calling the existence of the college into question.

Finally, the administration recently decided to close the Ocean campus financial aid office and to eliminate the Single Stop counseling office. We highlight these policies because they seem to contradict the stated goal of the District to grow enrollments. It is impossible for the District to cut its way out of its problems.

The decline in enrollments was caused by the attack by the ACCJC on CCSF's accreditation status. The State Legislature recognized this fact, and the importance of CCSF to the City of San Francisco and the State of California. As a result, the legislature passed Senate Bill 965 (Leno) - Funding Stability for City College of San Francisco. The summary of Senate Bill 965 –states:

> This bill provides the San Francisco Community College District (SFCCD) with additional funding for the next 3 years, as specified, **as the college works to restore student enrollment** and maintain accreditation. [Emphasis added]

This bill was <u>not</u> put in place to allow the District time to move to a new "stable equilibrium" as a smaller college, as was stated by both Ron Gerhard and Guy Lease on Day 1 on fact-finding. Having a smaller college was part of the goal of the ACCJC, and apparently their influence is still playing a role in these negotiations.

In our view, the administration has squandered the opportunity to invest the stabilization funds allocated by the legislature in efforts that would allow us to re-grow enrollments. The AFT has maintained from the very beginning that the solution to all of the problems facing the college is to re-growing enrollments. That remains our goal.

District has to decide which path is ahead for the college: Growth or Cuts

Response to Special Trustee Guy Lease
What powers does Special Trustee Guy Lease actually have?

- His testimony about signing off on the budget surprised all of us. It is unclear where he thinks he gets that power from.
- He has already signed off to FCMAT approving a Budget Plan that CCSF should get Stabilization funding for 2016-17.
- In January 2016 the CCSF BOT was returned to power. The assumption among the constituencies is that Guy Lease now has an advisory role only.

District has to decide which path is ahead for the college. Growth or Cuts

- College is talking about both growth and cuts but its action have primarily been one of cuts
- Special Trustee Guy Lease says the college is downsized. Growth could occur in years ahead but assumption is that "fine tuning" is needed that assumes college will be smaller. BOT President Mandelman has acknowledged that cuts have depressing effect on enrollment.
- District's own arguments show cuts are wrong strategy. They will not be able to meet educational needs of San Francisco.
- Ron Gerhard cited data showing 32% decline at CCSF while other Bay Area colleges declined by only 8%. All agree that Accreditation Crisis is a key factor in this decline.
- CCSF, unlike other Bay Area colleges, has more room to grow because Accreditation Crisis has been a factor in lost enrollment not present at other colleges.

District has taken Actions that have depressed enrollment and continue to do so. Here are just some examples:

- Closure of Single-Stop Counseling office. Spring 2016. This office's mission is to connect students with services that will help them stay in schools.
- Civic Center closure - January 2015. Announced closure of campus on Friday before classes began following Monday.
- Continuing problems registering online. Years on end.
- District implying closure of the college to Media. Dec 2015/January 2016. Guy Lease quote in SF Chronicle, our largest daily paper. In speaking about attracting administrative talent, "We are not a very attractive partner right now. People don't know if we will be open a year from now" said Lease "and it's very expensive to live here".

FCMAT Report Critique

- FCMAT doesn't even acknowledge low salaries.
- FCMAT has wrong numbers on Fund Balance.
- FCMAT makes incorrect demographic assumptions. Cites no evidence at all.
- FCMAT ignores reasons for high reserves. Faculty salary cuts.
- FCMAT ignores misuse of Parcel Tax funds in talking about 50% law.
- FCMAT should not be used to make poor decisions about collective bargaining and downsizing.

Enrollment Management Plan and Conclusion

- Enrollment Management Plan has plan for growth.
- College needs to implement its own plan as strategy to meet educational needs of community and salaries needs for faculty and staff.
- If college simply implemented 2 components of its own plan there would be a way forward.

    Police and Fire Academies - 2,500 FTES

    Compressed Calendar - 5,000 FTES

- Our local has spearheaded efforts for a Free City College which will also create future growth for our college.

Part-time faculty pay

The District claims that it cannot afford to pay full-time faculty more because part-time faculty are overpaid.

The Union rejects this view.

Reason #1:
Every employee group at CCSF, except for full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty, are paid above the statewide average of their counterparts in other community colleges. The "Report on Staffing for Fall 2015," of the State Chancellor's Office shows the following salary comparison for employee groups. Data source is: http://datamart.cccco.edu/Faculty-Staff/Staff_Annual.aspx

Fall 2015 Annual Earnings	**CCSF**	**Statewide Average**
Educational Administrators	154,756	141,225
Classified Professionals	80,814	74,451
Classified Support	57,406	54,020
Tenured/TT Faculty	81,234	92,277

CCSF *should* pay employees more than State average given the high cost of living in SF. To target part-time faculty, whom the District exploits by paying wages that are a fraction of what full-time faculty earn for comparable work, is unfair.

Reason #2
Assembly Bill 420, enacted in 1999, declares that the "principle of equal pay for equal work requires that part-time faculty be provided compensation that is directly proportionate to full-time faculty employment" and "more closely resembles full-time compensation." (Ex. XX)
The District's attempt to tie part-time wages at CCSF to "market rates" violates this.

Reason #3
The State required districts to negotiate over a definition of wage "parity" for part-time faculty as a condition for receiving Part-time Faculty Compensation Funds. In 2002/03, AFT and the District reached agreement that parity was set at 100% pro-rata of full-time pay. (Ex. XX)

Reason #4
Part-time faculty instructional pay scales at CCSF are set at 86% pro-rata of full-time salaries. However, because there are only 12 steps on these pay scales compared to 16 on the full-time schedule and other

factors, the *actual* wages earned by part-timers are at best 86%, and often much lower, compared to what a full-time instructor earns for teaching the same class.

Reason #5

The administration regularly messages to full-time faculty that the reason they are underpaid is because part-time faculty wages are too high. They attempt to divide the AFT bargaining unit, pitting full-timers against part-timers. The reality is that part-timers and full-time instructors have comparable hiring and evaluation standards, qualifications, and work. Full-time faculty, many of whom were themselves part-timers, or have part-time faculty colleagues, understand and oppose the exploitation of part-time faculty labor.

Duration of contract

AFT proposes a 3-year contract to expire June 30, 2018.

Reason #1: The parties originally were in agreement on a three year contract until late in negotiations when management proposed two years, allowing them unfettered ability to deal with 2017/18 and the loss of stabilization funding.

Reason #2: AFT favors a three-year agreement, as has been historically sought by the parties, proposing instead to place contingencies on a third year faculty salary increase in the event of the loss of State stabilization funding. The first year of the contract will be the 2015/16 academic year, which is already in the past. If the parties were to sign a two-year agreement, the parties would have to begin preparing for a total contract reopener almost immediately in advance of the June 30, 2017 expiration date. This is impractical and unnecessary.

Art. 20.A ‘trigger’ in 2017/18

AFT proposes a “trigger” to deal with loss of stability funding in Year 3, 2017/18

Reason #1: AFT proposes a “trigger” that would safeguard the District should faculty salary expenditures threaten a balanced District budget. If expenditures budgeted for faculty compensation, including AFT’s proposed salary increase in 2017/18, rise above 67% of the total cost of employee salaries and benefits, the salary increase would be reduced or eliminated to cap faculty salary compensation costs at 67%. The 67% “proportionate share” was negotiated years ago and appears in the salary formula (albeit suspended) language (Art. 20.A.2) of our expired contract.*

Reason #2: This approach would help insure that salary reductions do not again fall disproportionately on faculty as they did from 2012/13 thru the present, when faculty lost in excess of $15 million due to pay cuts below 2007/08 salary levels. (Ex. C, “Faculty Pay Losses, Binder 1)

Reason #3: District claims that AFT’s proposal impinges on management or Academic Senate prerogative are spurious. The proposal calls for “detailed discussions” with the Union over State revenues and savings from budget reductions in the event of a major cut in State funding. Such discussions occurred for years prior to Trusteeship without objection from anyone because they were entirely legal and proper.

**“Proportionate share” language of CBA:*

Art. 20.A.2

2.5 Baseline

Audited figures from the District’s independent audit for 1999-2000 will be used to determine allocation percentages. Eighty percent (80%) of the new revenues shall be available for salary and benefit adjustments college-wide. AFT’s proportionate share of these available revenues shall be equal to its “proportionate share” of salary and benefit expenditures in 1999-2000 (67.19%). The parties shall jointly conduct an annual review in each fiscal year of the Agreement, to determine whether audited data justifies a change in the figure used for AFT’s proportionate share.

2.6 To determine AFT’s “proportionate share,” the academic salaries and benefits expenditures shall be divided by all salaries and benefits expenditures (State Budget and Accounting Manual Categories 1000, 2000 and 3000). “Academic salaries and benefit expenditures” attributable to AFT shall include salaries and benefits of academic department chairpersons and shall exclude salaries and benefits of categorically funded AFT bargaining unit members, administrators, the Chancellor, independent contractors, department chairperson stipends, classified employees and student workers.

District misrepresents salary proposal in "Status of Negotiations" report

The District is telling the faculty that they are "offering to increase all faculty salaries 7.19% over two (2) years and to provide additional one-time payments totaling 5.36% over the same two (2) years." This is what appears on the District website at ccsf.edu, in their "Status of Negotiations;" this is what they *claim they are offering*.

Reading this, if I am a faculty member, I would conclude:

1. I'm getting a 7.19% raise.
2. I'm getting an additional 5.36% increase but only for two (2) years

OK, that's 12.55% increase for two years, with 7.19% of it ongoing.

No! This is patently false; this is not what they are actually proposing!

First, the 7.19% "raise" consists of 3.7% restoration to 2007/08 (agreed) + 1.02% COLA for 2015/16 (agreed) = 4.702%

Second, they still include a 0.47% COLA in 2015/16, which no longer exists in the State budget proposal. Gone…

Third, they include as a raise the 2% *ongoing* increase *conditionally*, i.e. subject to the College meeting certain thresholds of FTES and "productivity," both patently unattainable by July 1, 2017. In other words, the 2% exists for two years only, 2015/16 and 2015/16, then *disappears*.

The *actual* on schedule increase proposed by the District is 7.19% minus 0.47% minus 2% = 4.72%

To reiterate, in fact, the District is only offering to restore wages to 2007/08 levels (3.7%) + 1.02% COLA = 4.72% ongoing.

Let's turn to the additional "one-time payments totaling 5.36% over the same two (2) years." They actually propose 4.68% one-time payments each year, 2% of which they count in the 7.19% salary proposal. So it is really only 2.68% payments in each year.

To summarize, the actual District proposal, as we present in our salary proposal comparison, is:
First, 3.7% restoration on-schedule + 1.02% COLA = 4.72% salary increase effective 2015/16.
Second, plus 4.68% off-schedule payment in each year.
Result:
2015/16 - 4.72% on-schedule + 4.68% off-schedule one-time payment
2016/17 – no further on schedule increase since no State COLA
4.68% off-schedule one-time payment