



Faculty Association Negotiations Update #14

STRONGER TOGETHER!

To: All Faculty

From: Sandra Esslinger, Lead Negotiator

Date: 07/15/2024

We met with the District team for the 16th time on Monday, July 15, 2024.

Team members In attendance:

District: Sokha Song, Alexis Carter, Francisco Dorame, Tami Pearson, Delana Miller, Morris Rodrigue, and Michelle Sampat (Absent: Kelly Fowler and Lance Heard)

FANT: Emily Woolery, Joshua Christ, Herschel Greenberg, Benjamin Vu, David Mrofka, and Robin Devitt (CTA)

Overview: The faculty rallied with CSEA at the last Board meeting and made calls to several politicians. One of them, Senator Josh Newman, sent a staff member to read a statement of support at the Board meeting. It is likely this additional “outside” pressure convinced the District decision makers to finally agree to pay faculty retroactive COLA – a benefit it was more than willing to pocket until a state Senator supported faculty.

- Despite this significant progress, (see Article 7 bullet below) the District continues to withhold any benefit increases to faculty that are needed to keep up with inflation. Because the FA was highly committed to closing negotiations in June, it did not exercise its right to reopen any part of the contract, except for the automatic reopeners— Appendices, Benefits, and Salaries. This decision was made in the hope of shortening the amount of time that faculty work without an agreement for the 23/24 academic year. However, the District’s continuous delay tactics and refusal to budge on the monetary issues took us well into the summer when the District knew faculty would not be available to show up at Board meetings. This is no longer primarily a salary issue. Negotiations are now about equity and the lack of respect the District has shown us for years on having to “fight for COLA and appropriate benefits contributions.” **This is the FIRST year the District has proposed FULLY FUNDED COLA for the current academic year.**
- While claiming that the District cannot afford to pay our other cost proposals, the District has still been able to miraculously find and prioritize money to hire more managers, increase the salary of some positions as much as 35%, spend nearly \$70,000 to rent space at hotels when they can use the Student Services building (that does not include grant money or restricted funds), pay for administrators to have catered lunches at their meetings, and transfer up to \$500 of unused conference money to each manager’s 529 plan. The District can find money for these expenses that benefit managers but cannot find the money to increase faculty health care coverage contributions, even though the school received an 8.22% increase to its base allocation from the state. And even though over 50 managers and faculty retired early, saving the District quite a bit of money, the District cannot find the money to fund a much needed 15-year longevity step for faculty.

- Quite unexpectedly, the District has offered a way to allow us to have these cost items, but the “price” is utilizing and taking back some undetermined percentage of the funded COLA they finally offered that is supposed to be going toward the salary schedule! ***This is unprecedented for the faculty contract.*** Ultimately it requires that we utilize already negotiated funds within the contract or that we give up some portion of our one-time retroactive COLA and/or ongoing part of COLA. **Is this showing any RESPECT for FACULTY?**

District Proposal:

Appendix E—Reassigned Time for Special Assignments: The District claims to have provided a “cost-neutral” proposal by striking for deletion/reduction 48 LHE and recommending the addition of positions that match their “strategic priorities” for a total of 33 LHE. How is the loss of 15 LHE to faculty reassignment “cost-neutral”? **Is this showing any RESPECT for FACULTY?**

District Proposed Eliminations/Reductions	District Proposed Additions
<p><u>Eliminated Positions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AB 705 Coordinators - AMLA (8 LHE) • AB 705 Coordinators - English (8 LHE) • AB 705 Coordinators - Math (10 LHE) • Fashion Merchandising & Design Coordinator (6 LHE) • Hospitality Management Coordinator (6 LHE) • Interior Design Coordinator (4 LHE) <p><u>Reduced LHE</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vet Tech Director (reduced from 36 LHE to 30 LHE) 	<p><u>Proposed New Positions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clinical Coordinator - Public Safety Programs (8 LHE) • Commercial Music / Audio Arts Program Coordinator (3 LHE) • Geotech Coordinator (3 LHE) • Interpreting Program Coordinator (3 LHE) • Makerspace Director (2 LHE) • Sound Design, Technical Theater Production, and Project/Media Design Coordinators (3 LHE) • Vocational Nursing (VN) Program Director (9 LHE) <p><u>Increased LHE</u> The District proposed LHE be increased from 36 to 38 LHE for Academic Senate officers (Vice President(s), Secretary, and Legislative Liaison.) This language is in article 10.H.3.b.</p>

District Responses:

Article 7—Salaries: The proposal from the District on salaries was presented as **fully retro remaining COLA of 4.11** to total 8.22 for the 23/24 academic year and a **surprising fully funded 24/25 COLA at 1.07** (or higher if the state modifies it) beginning 7/1/24. This retro amount will not be paid until ratification and will include retirees who participated in the incentive program. Interestingly, the order of presentations from the District did not make it clear in this presentation that their intent was for us to deduct portions from either the 4.11 or the 1.07 to pay for longevity costs.

Article 8—Contract Benefits: The District once again did not offer any increases to our health and welfare benefits, stating that if we want equitable health insurance we would have to switch to SISC. The District received 8.22% on their SCFF base allocation which is general fund dollars used for benefits as part of COLA, yet, they refuse to pass this on as a minimum. We would like a similar formula as the CSEA’s to cover Kaiser. Currently, CalPERS Kaiser plans are about \$111 more than SISC monthly, but they currently are entering into a cutting-edge agreement to lower rates. Additionally, with the current Chancellor’s Office health insurance program, CalPERS is one of the few options for adjuncts because they allow for opting out, which would not require all adjuncts to take our health care plans, should we be able to negotiate part time health care benefits at 100%. **Is this showing any RESPECT for FACULTY?**

Article 8.H—Tuition Reimbursement (New): The District again rejected this proposal and explained that even with faculty enrollment counting towards overall FTES of the college, there is a limit to the funding received by the college from growth above the year prior, which is capped at .50%. The District projects that Mt.SAC will hit this .5% growth without faculty enrollments. While the FA is disappointed by the District’s reluctance to grant this seemingly easy benefit, it does understand that cost is an important factor to all proposals, and now has the understanding that enrollments for the 24/25 school year are already at peak funding levels and there need not be a push for further enrollment and growth than the efforts that are already underway.

Article 10.B.5—Adjunct Student Office Hours: The District offered a contingent \$5 per hour increase to adjunct office hours, from \$40 to \$45 per hour effective 25/26, as long as they are receiving funding from the State for 75% for adjunct office hours in 24/25. This proposal would have to be considered “contingent” on future funding at a specified level and is in no way guaranteed. **Is this showing any RESPECT for FACULTY?**

Appendix A.6—Adjunct Professors [Professional Growth Hourly Incentive]: The District offered to fund six (6) additional hours toward adjunct professors’ Professional Growth Hourly Incentive, for a total of twelve (12) hours, BUT ONLY IF faculty agree to use the designated “conference and travel funds” defined in Appendix A.7: Professional Development. **Is this showing any RESPECT for FACULTY?**

Article 10.M.4—Department Chairs: The District is agreeable to some language clean up and clarification regarding department chair elections. The District is not agreeable to allowing adjunct faculty without rehire rights the opportunity to vote. Why is the District so invested in how faculty departments conduct faculty business? **Is this showing any RESPECT for FACULTY?**

Article 10.S + 18.G.9—Contract Clean Up: This proposal was an attempt to fix the issue that Department chairs have been scheduling virtual meetings since the pandemic and are required to offer adjunct faculty online access to department meetings. However, there was old language from the pre-zoom era in the expectancy section of our contract that mentioned holding on-campus meetings. **The District responded that they wish to require the department chairs to conduct in person meetings**, despite the ongoing practice of both options.

Article 10—Dual Enrollment (MOU): We reached an agreement on this, so that there is clarity for those who teach in dual enrollment that they too will be paid for office hours when they teach outside of the primary terms.

Appendix A.4—Initial Salary Placement: The District is not in agreement to using the Taxonomy of Program (TOP) code for determination of placement on the academic or vocational salary schedule. This response is inconsistent

with past practice and provides new faculty with disparate experiences. The District is agreeable to language cleanup and clarification proposed by the FA.

Appendix A.5—Service Increment (Longevity): The District supports the proposed longevity structure change IF the funding comes from the District proposed COLA (July 15, 2024). This means that the percentages (vs. the fixed dollar amount) and the 15-year longevity step being added would be allowed as long as we are willing to pay for it through COLA. **Is this showing any RESPECT for FACULTY?**

Appendix C—Adjunct Longevity: The District supports the proposed longevity structure change if the funding comes from the District proposed COLA (July 15, 2024). **Is this showing any RESPECT for FACULTY?**

Faculty Proposal:

Article 10.G.8.c—Full-time Noncredit Professor’s Load: The FA proposed weekly expectations of the full-time noncredit professor’s load, including limitations to teaching hours and requirements for paid hours for preparation and evaluation of student work.

Faculty Responses:

Appendix C—Faculty Overload and Other Rates: The FA accepts that the District may need a semester to determine accurate column placement for newly hired adjunct faculty. However, the FA is working for retroactive compensation once accurate column placement is finalized.

Article 20—Grievances: The FA accepted the majority of the District’s last response but remains concerned that the District lead indicated a possible mistake in their last response. We feel the changes will make for a more streamlined, fair, and easier to understand process.

We know that you have plans for the summer, but we need your ongoing commitment to this process.

Please join us at the August 7th Board of Trustee meeting at Founders Hall (TIME TBA).

We still need your full support to be seen as we fight for RESPECT for FACULTY! Please communicate to the District to accept our very reasonable financial proposals.

- 15-year longevity step and an equitable structure like all other employee groups.
- Necessary and affordable adjustments to the District’s Health and Welfare contributions.
- Protection of our professional autonomy and integrity.

To learn other ways to support the negotiations team, please contact Maya Alvarez-Galván, FA Organizer, at malvarez_galvan@hotmail.com.

Please also sign up for text notifications: Text “Join FT” or “Join PT” to 424-334-0655.

United We Are Stronger!