



Faculty Association Negotiations Update No. 8 2025-2026, Year 1 of 3

STRONGER TOGETHER!

To: All Faculty

From: Herschel Greenberg, Lead Negotiator

Date: 04/17/2026

We met with the District team for the 8th time for 2 hours on Friday, April 17th, 2026.

Team members in attendance:

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

FANT: Herschel Greenberg, Joshua Christ, Gayle Watkins, David Mrofka, Donna Necke, Sandy Esslinger, and Robin Devitt.

Note:

During this meeting, the FA submitted 2 proposals and 2 responses. The District submitted 1 response. We're currently awaiting the District's responses to 8 proposals, which includes the proposals and responses presented today.

FA Proposals:

Article 10.A.7 Scope of Work

The FA proposed a new article affecting all faculty with the intent to clearly define the scope of faculty work and to establish meaningful boundaries that protect faculty from

being assigned duties outside their academic classification. This ensures that faculty time and expertise remain focused on teaching and academic responsibilities, while the professional skills and expertise of our colleagues in CSEA 262 are duly valued and recognized for their work. Tasks that were once handled with simple paper forms now require proficiency with multiple specialized applications, such as Nuventive, WebCMS, Smartsheet, Emburse, and others. Each system requires its own training, often for infrequent or one-time use, adding layers of clerical and technical duties to faculty workloads without corresponding support or compensation. This article addresses “work creep” and delineates clear guidelines for faculty work and the process for completing irregular work assignments. The District asked a few clarifying questions, but one question stood out: who wanted this proposal, faculty, the FA, or FANT (Faculty Association Negotiations Team)? We responded by stating the faculty survey rated “work creep” as a very high priority in this year’s negotiations. It seems the District takes this added work for granted.

It is also worth noting that FANT met with CSEA 262 leadership to review this proposal before submitting it to the District, and CSEA 262 supports the proposal and the FA as it seriously impacts their unit.

Appendix A.5 Service Increments

This proposal is asking for equitable recognition of years of service across the campus by giving full-time faculty the same service increment structure all other employee groups already have. For example, this means the 10-year service increment would be 3.5% above base salary instead of \$456 dollars, and the 15-year service increment would be 5% above base salary (compounded as 8.68% above base salary) instead of another \$456 a month. This would continue when the other service increments are met. During the 2023-24 negotiations cycle, the FA proposed the same changes to appendix A.5 using percentage as service increments instead of dollar amounts. While discussing this proposal in 2023-2024, the District stated at the time that their arguments were “not a

reflection of our appreciation for your dedication and hard work, nor is it a dismissal of the validity of the concerns outlined in your proposal.” The FA believes that it’s time for the District to recognize the importance of respecting every employee’s longevity. The District did not ask any questions.

District Response:

Article 10.I Flex Day

The remaining issue in this article is the consequences for missing the floating flex day submission due date. Currently, the District withholds wages, even if you did the work and can prove it despite missing the due date. The FA proposed a 60-day window to provide the proof of completion and earn back those lost wages. The District responded by claiming the proposed FA language, though presented as a corrective measure, effectively creates a blanket extension for all employees, undermining established deadlines and encouraging routine delays in compliance. The District claimed that by removing meaningful consequences and finality, it weakens accountability and incentivizes late submissions by ensuring an automatic remedy is always available. However, the FA contends that delayed payment is a penalty in itself, if one simply missed the deadline after completing the work. Therefore, the District proposed if there are extenuating circumstances causing the faculty member to miss the deadline, the District and the FA can mutually agree to an extension to the submission deadline. The FA is currently working on a response.

FA Responses:

Article 5: Rights of Association and Members

The FA strongly believes that there is a benefit to both the District and the faculty member to complete an orientation program where every newly hired faculty receives information regarding their employee rights and District policies and procedure. The FA

responded with these ideas in mind, focusing on strengthening language regarding employee and union rights based on Gov. Code 3556-3558.8. The FA and the District agree on some parts of this proposal, but there are a few new sections that were discussed during negotiations.

Article 6: Dues and Payroll Deductions

Based on the conversation with the District on the March 20th, 2026 negotiations meeting, the FA added language clarifying when the information must be provided to the FA, which would be the Monday after the census date of each regular term and then 120 days thereafter. The FA and the District discussed potential logistical concerns meeting the proposed deadline. The article's intent was clearly defined, and the District should be able to respond by the next meeting.

Next Negotiations:

The next negotiations would normally be Friday, May 1st, 2026; however, due to scheduling conflicts, the next negotiations meeting will be Tuesday, April 28th, from 3:30-5:30pm.