



# Faculty Association Negotiations Update No. 3

## 2025-2026, Year 1 of 3

### ***STRONGER TOGETHER!***

To: All Faculty

From: Herschel Greenberg, Lead Negotiator

Date: 2/3/2026

We met with the District team for the 3<sup>rd</sup> time for 2 hours on Tuesday, February 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2026.

#### **Team members in attendance:**

District: Sokha Song, Alexis Carter, Tami Pearson, Kelly Fowler, Romelia Salinas, Koji Uesugi, and Adam Roman

FANT: Herschel Greenberg, Joshua Christ, Sandra Esslinger, Gayle Harris Watkins, David Mrofka, Donna Necke, and Arleigh Kidd.

#### **TA #1**

##### *Article 2: Term of Agreement*

We have our first TA! The District accepted the Faculty Association's (FA) proposal without making any changes. The FA's goal was to update and clarify the intent and timeline of this and future negotiations between the FA and the District. This will expedite the reopener process each year, allowing for a manageable negotiation timeline, which will ensure future negotiations are concluding prior to the contract period that is beginning.

#### **FA Proposals**

##### *Article 14: Class Size*

The FA proposed class size capacity be set at 1 to 35 students. The goal of this change is to bring a clear and logical process, as well as an equitable framework into the class size procedures and decision making, as well as to solve some of the primary issues identified within the recommendations of a Class

Size Task Force, a joint task force of the Academic Senate and Faculty Association. The joint recommendations focused on students needing access to quality instructional time with their professor, equitable faculty workloads among professors teaching similar courses and content with very different class size limits, and class sizes having random variances across, and sometimes within, similar courses and disciplines. The FA believes setting a universal, campus wide, class size limit resolves these issues. Furthermore, by placing a limit of 35 students per class, which aligns with the upper limit of the ASCCC recommendation, this will improve student learning and their educational experience at Mt. SAC. Finally, the FA recognized that some programs have open entry/open exit systems, including noncredit programs and tutoring centers. The FA added language where programs that require a class size capacity greater than 35 get approval from the Class Size Committee, and the Class Size Committee can maintain a list of courses that have received this exemption, along with the rationale for that exemption, to provide necessary institutional memory.

## **FA Response**

### *Article 16.M Sabbaticals*

The FA returned this proposal with several changes and responses. The FA believes that the Sabbatical Leave policy should define sabbaticals as academically oriented opportunities. Approved sabbaticals are now explicitly intended to enhance teaching by enabling faculty to return with increased knowledge, up-to-date expertise, and renewed enthusiasm. This means that professional development outcomes may be shared in varied formats, tailored to the nature of each project and the intended audience—whether students, faculty, or the broader campus community. Nearly all the changes made in this response follow these concepts. The FA clarified language regarding the recommendation process, which would be conducted by the Salary and Leaves Committee. New language was added describing the process where the professor would get feedback on the rationale of their sabbatical proposal. The FA also proposed new language regarding a requirement for the Board of Trustees to approve a number of sabbaticals equally to, or greater than, 5% of the total number of full-time faculty, or the full list of sabbatical applicants, whichever is smaller. This will require the Board of Trustees to properly budget for sabbatical requests. Language was also returned regarding the intent of the District to advocate on behalf of the ranked sabbaticals. Finally, the FA responded to the sabbatical reporting requirements, specifying that the brief summary of the sabbatical range from 3-10 pages and we responded to the District by making the sabbatical presentation under the purview of the professor, not the District.

## **District Response**

### *Article 10.1 Flex Day*

The District agreed that Human Resources will track attendance for Flex activities, and they proposed language to clarify that process. The District also offered additional language specifying the professor's responsibility to submit the required self-certification form and the District's responsibility to open the appropriate leave category to allow for the deduction of hours. The District also clarified that Personal Necessity leave is governed by specific guidelines and is deducted from the sick leave bank, which may be used toward service credit at the time of retirement. A professor may elect to apply Personal Necessity leave if they choose; however, the District did not agree to an automatic deduction from this leave category. Finally, the District responded with language that limits automatic deductions to overload, banked leave, and regular pay, making it clearer than the previous proposal.

## **Next Negotiations**

The next negotiations meeting is scheduled for 2/17/26 at 3:30pm.