Overview
The District provided a quick review of last week’s session, focusing on the District’s intent and desire to foster a positive culture around negotiations. The District again reiterated its commitment to increase the faculty salaries up to the Bay10 median within three years: Reaching this shared goal in the first year of the contract is not fiscally achievable. The District also noted new processes have been implemented to make the budget and budgeting process more transparent to increase awareness and credibility regarding the District’s fiscal challenges.

Budget Presentation
Interim Associate Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration, Luther Aaberge provided an update of the budget information presented last week, noting changes to the projections for F17/18 and FY18/19, as well as a potential plan for FY18/19 that achieves the necessary 5% reserve. Even with an increase in enrollment, at the current rate of spending, the projections for FY18/19 indicate we will end the year with no fund balance which, of course, is unacceptable. Therefore, we must curb our rate of spending while growing enrollment.

Based on input from AFT and members of the District’s Budget Committee, Tentative Budget Goals were developed for FY18/19, identifying a spending plan that provides a sufficient ending fund balance to meet the District’s 5% reserve requirement. While the Tentative Budget Goals are achievable, it will take all of us working together to achieve the target goals, for both increased revenue and a reduction in the spending rate.

District’s Response to AFT’s Salary Proposal
As the District has been communicating, the commitment is to increase faculty salaries to the Bay10 median by the end of the third year. Recognizing that applying the state COLA of 2.51% alone is insufficient as a “good faith down payment” towards that goal, the District discussed applying the equivalent of 5%, or $3.8M towards restructuring the salary schedule in year one and re-openers in years two and three. The 5% is conceptual at this point as the District has not had an opportunity to meet with the Board since the last session to receive formal authorization. The 5% is based on spreading out the cost of raising salaries to the Bay10 median in three years, i.e. it would take approximately 5% each year to make the structural changes to the existing salary schedule.

AFT Response and Discussion
While AFT stated that they “appreciate movement towards the proposal,” their position is the projected budget is conservative and there is still more to be done. They discussed the need to be serious about reaching a tentative agreement by April 19, based on the established negotiations timeline, and shared goal of increasing faculty salaries above the Bay10 median. Essentially, the number/percentage the District presented (5%/$3.8M) does not get AFT up to the Bay10 median and the onus is on the District to develop a budget that demonstrates its commitment to raise faculty salaries to the Bay10 median.
Additionally, AFT noted that the District has not formally responded to its proposal. While the discussion is helpful, AFT needs formal written response, detailing the District’s plan to move the salaries to the Bay10 median by year three of a successor contract.

The District asked for clarification regarding the negotiation priorities. If more specificity is needed to reach a tentative agreement within the agreed upon timeline, that may not happen. The District likely would not have any new information for the next day’s Board meeting to provide specificity in years two and three, thus the re-openers. The District also noted if there are specific compensation commitments in years two and three, the District would need to make adjustments accordingly. One such adjustment is relief from the existing Supplemental Employee Retirement Program (SERP) agreement requiring backfill of positions. For AFT, leaving years two and three to re-openers is a non-starter. The District pressed the issue – reach a TA by next week or have specificity in years two and three regarding compensation. AFT stated that although they would like to reach an agreement by April 19th as originally agreed, they do not want a “bad contract” just to meet a timeline. AFT recognizes the District’s budget challenges, but also noted there is more work that can be done on both sides.

Flex Proposal
AFT presented changes to the District’s counter proposal. The District will review their comments, discuss the reporting with the staff and reach out with any follow up questions before response.

Sanctuary Proposal – TA
The District accepted AFT’s proposed language noting the proposal is consistent with the Board’s resolution.

Outstanding Proposals and Updates
Both parties discussed the remaining proposals on the table that need responses from either side, clarifying the timeline.

Dianna Gonzales, Chief Negotiator for the District

---

The negotiations for a successor contract are guided by the Core Values of the Board of Trustees

1. Students First
2. Sustainability
3. Transparency in Governance and Participatory Decision-Making
4. Diversity and Inclusion
5. Equity in Hiring and Compensation
6. Academic Excellence

And the following Board Goals

1. Strategic Planning. Receive and then adopt a comprehensive college plan for sustainable future for City College.
2. Enrollment Management. Receive and then adopt an updated enrollment management plan that sets out a path to full enrollment funding restoration of 32,000 FTES.
3. Student Success. Hold the administration, faculty and staff accountable to contribute to City College’s progress on student success outcomes, especially student equity and degree, certificate and transfer completions for achievement gap students.
4. College Climate. Develop an effective and mutually supportive relationship with the Chancellor in order to foster a climate of trust and respect among all stakeholders of City College.