



Faculty Association Negotiations Update No. 17

2025-2026, Year 1 of 3

STRONGER TOGETHER!

To: All Faculty

From: Herschel Greenberg, Lead Negotiator

Date: 09/11/2026

We met with the District team for the 17th time for 3 hours on Friday, Sept. 11th, 2026.

Team members in attendance, Meeting #17:

District: Tami Pearson, Alexis Carter, Koji Uesugi, Romelia Salinas, and Adam Roman.

FANT: Joshua Christ, David Mrofka, Donna Necke, Gayle Watkins, Sandy Esslinger, Robin Devitt

Absent District: Karelyn Hoover and Kelly Fowler

Absent FA: Herschel Greenberg

FA Stands Firm as District Pushes Back!

Adjunct Longevity Denied: The District shot down our adjunct longevity proposal once more, hiding behind the standard "ongoing parity talks" excuse to kick the can down the road.

Financial Wall: Out of all our financial proposals, the District returned exactly one—and handed us a flat rejection.

Double Standard on Orientation: The District agreed to a new-hire orientation, but with an insulting twist: asking full-time faculty to work it for free, while paying adjuncts for the exact same labor.

Attempted Committee Muzzling: The District is actively trying to strip away our voice by narrowing which committees the FA can sit on and limiting what our designees can actually do.

Zero Concessions: The FA didn't back down. We held the line and re-submitted our percentage-based longevity proposal in full—no compromises, no retreat.

District Responses

Appendix C.5 Advancements

The District rejected the FA's proposal to establish additional longevity steps for adjunct faculty, arguing that adjunct compensation is already being addressed through ongoing negotiations over parity and the Appendix C salary schedule. The District is using the potential cost of the adjunct parity proposal as a reason to withhold additional longevity compensation for adjunct faculty. Rather than recognize adjunct faculty for their continued service, the District wants to delay any consideration of additional longevity until it determines the final cost and structure of the parity proposal. In effect, the District is asking adjunct faculty to wait while it negotiates their compensation, with no commitment to provide additional longevity steps even after those negotiations conclude. The Faculty Association believes adjunct faculty who dedicate years of service to our students and institution should not have their experience and commitment continually pushed aside and used as a delay tactic.

Article 5: Rights of Association and Members

Although the District agreed to the FA's proposal on new-hire orientation, it insists that full-time faculty who are required to attend orientation before the semester begins will receive no additional compensation for that work, while adjunct faculty will be paid for the same requirement. The District also continues to restrict FA participation on committees by narrowing which committees qualify and limiting the role of Association designees within those committees. While the District describes these changes as merely "fine tuning," they would give the District greater control over when faculty can meet with their FA and where the FA can have a meaningful voice in committee work. The FA believes faculty should not be expected to perform required work without compensation or have their contractual right to representation diminished through restrictive implementation language.

FA Responses

Appendix A.5 Service Increments

The Faculty Association rejects the District's response to our proposal to replace the flat-dollar service increments in Appendix A.5 with percentage-based longevity increments and is concerned that the

District has chosen to reject the proposal rather than meaningfully negotiate it. The District's response relies on faulty comparisons to other bargaining units and incorrectly treats faculty salary steps, educational columns, and professional growth increments as though they address the same purpose as longevity compensation. These provisions compensate faculty for experience, educational attainment, and professional growth; they do not recognize the continued service that the FA's proposal is specifically intended to reward. The District also dismisses the fundamental problem with a flat-dollar increment: as faculty salaries increase, the longevity payment becomes progressively less valuable as a percentage of salary, effectively diminishing the reward for long-term service. Therefore, the FA proposed the exact same service increment percentages and returned the same proposal.

Next Negotiations

The next negotiations will be Friday, Sept. 25, 2026, from 9am – 1pm.

The next Board of Trustees meeting is Wednesday, October 14, 2026.