



Faculty Association Negotiations Update No. 18

2025-2026, Year 1 of 3

STRONGER TOGETHER!

To: All Faculty

From: Herschel Greenberg, Lead Negotiator

Date: 09/25/2026

We met with the District team for the 18th time for 3 hours on Friday, Sept. 11th, 2026.

Team members in attendance:

District: Tami Pearson, Karelyn Hoover, Kelly Fowler, Alexis Carter, Koji Uesugi, Romelia Salinas, and Adam Roman.

FANT: Joshua Christ, David Morfka, Donna Necke, Gayle Watkins, Sandra Esslinger, Robin Devitt

Absent FANT: Herschel Greenberg

District Guest: Michelle Sampat

Grab your popcorn! The District is at it again! Does this sound like valuing faculty and students?

- Despite packing the Board of Trustees, the district FAILED to respond to the concerns voiced.
- District restructures Appendix E! Which positions are on the chopping block?
- District jeopardizes student learning by holding firm on huge class size increases and eliminating the class size committee.
- District afraid of FA at the table? Why? FANT still pushing for additional faculty representation on committees.

Note:

During this meeting, the FA submitted 1 response. The District returned 2 responses. Despite our repeated requests for the return of our financial proposals, the District only returned 1 financial proposal, Appendix E. At the rate of two proposals per meeting, the District may finally respond to all proposals sometime in December 2026!

District Responses:

Appendix E

The District's response to the FA's Appendix E proposal claims that reassigned-time assignments have become "inconsistent" and therefore need to be reorganized into three categories: CTE coordination, Senate 10+1 assignments, and campus and community service. Rather than addressing the actual amount of time faculty need to perform these important responsibilities, the District offers a vague framework filled with broad language about "institutional needs," "student success," and "operational realities." The District also claims that some assignments should be transferred to classified or management positions, yet provides no clear explanation of which assignments would be moved, why those responsibilities no longer require faculty expertise, or how the District reached those conclusions. Apparently, faculty expertise is essential when the College needs the work done, but becomes unnecessary when the District is deciding who should be compensated to do it. The District further asserts that accountability for these assignments ultimately belongs to management, even while acknowledging that many positions are selected through faculty elections or Senate appointments. This raises serious concerns about the District's attempt to increase administrative control over assignments that are rooted in faculty expertise and participatory governance. Rather than negotiating meaningful reassigned-time allocations, the District appears to be attempting to redefine Appendix E and re-write it in a way that negatively affects faculty. The response does not provide a clear methodology for determining the appropriate amount of reassigned time, nor does it demonstrate how the District's proposed categories would actually address the workload faculty are already performing. Once again, the District has offered a complicated framework that creates more questions than answers instead of engaging in a straightforward negotiation over the reassigned time faculty need to perform the work the District expects of them.

The District proposed removing the following positions from Appendix E:

Aquatics Coordinator
Chemical and Materials Coordinator
Civil Engineering Technology Coordinator
Electrical Coordinator
Emergency Medical Agencies Coordinator
Farm Management
Mechanical Coordinator

Meek Science Coordinator
Software Coordinator
Teacher Prep. Institute Coordinator
All theater coordinator positions
Wildlife Sanctuary Coordinator

The District Proposed lowering the annual LHE from the following positions in Appendix E:

Art Gallery, from 18 LHE to 1 LHE
Fashion Merchandising and Design Coordinator, from 6 LHE to 4 LHE
Geotech Coordinator, from 3 LHE to 2 LHE
Hospitality Management Coordinator, from 6 LHE to 4 LHE
Interior Design Coordinator, from 4 LHE to 2 LHE.
Paramedic Clinical Coordinators, from 4 LHE to 2 LHE
Sign Success Coordinator, from 9 LHE to 6 LHE
Speech Success Coordinator, from 12 LHE to 6 LHE
Vet Tech Director, from 36 LHE to 18 LHE

The District rejected all new positions from the FA's proposal, including:

Drone and Spatial Imaging Program Director
Journalism Program Coordinator
Animal Science Program Coordinator
MESA Faculty Liaison
Robotics Team Coordinator
Mapping Coordinator, Counseling

Based on the total LHE changes proposed by the District in their response, Appendix E will see a loss of 34 LHE.

Article 14: Class Size

The District returned the exact same proposal given to us weeks ago, the one where they think lecture classes can handle 46 students! There was literally no movement in their response. Instead, the District's response spends more time explaining why the FA's fair and workable solution supposedly does not work than actually offering a solution of its own. The District claims that the FA's proposal fails

to address differences in enrollment, instructional methods, and noncredit education, yet its answer is to create a separate set of parameters for noncredit rather than explain why a flexible, equitable framework cannot address those differences. The District repeatedly raises concerns about the Class Size Committee, exceptions, and decision-making, but provides no clear explanation of how its own approach would produce consistent, transparent, and predictable class-size decisions. Most remarkably, after rejecting the FA's framework, the District asks the Association to develop "alternative language" responsive to the concerns—essentially asking the FA to solve the problems created by the District's own counterproposal. The District says it is "prepared to negotiate," but its response provides no concrete language that actually resolves the class-size problems facing faculty and students. Instead of negotiating a straightforward and equitable solution that protects student access and instructional quality, the District continues to add complexity while leaving the fundamental problems unresolved.

FA Response

Article 5: Rights of Association and Members

During the meeting, conversations led to compromises throughout most of the remaining sub-articles in this proposal. However, the FA strongly believes that Article 5.H.5: Appointment to District and Joint Committees, must be done so following Gov. Code 3556-3558.8. The District tried to place severe restrictions on these FA appointments. The FA strongly reminded the District that the proposed language was already accepted on May 15th, 2026, so their proposed language was crossed out. The only compromise included language specifying that FA leadership cannot appoint another FA member to a committee that already has an FA designee on the committee.

Our voices can no longer be ignored. We're counting on each other. Show up. Speak up. Stand strong. A fair and equitable contract, NOW!

Next Negotiations

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

The next Board of Trustees meeting is Wednesday, Oct. 14th, time TBD.