



Faculty Association Negotiations Update #7

STRONGER TOGETHER!

To: All Faculty

From: Sandra Esslinger, Lead Negotiator

Date: May 10, 2024

This update provides our members with a very general summary of what is happening in negotiations. The Faculty Association will present the specifics of any TAs at the Representative Council. Each representative will then share with the department members.

We met with the District team for the 8th time on May 10, 2024, from 9:00 am to 1:00 pm.

Team members In attendance:

District: Sokha Song, Kelly Fowler, Alexis Carter, Tami Pearson, Lance Heard.

FANT: Sandra Esslinger, Herschel Greenberg, Benjamin Vu, Joshua Christ, Robin Devitt (CTA)

Overview:

The Faculty and the District will be negotiating two weeks in a row; the next meeting is on Friday, May 17th. ***The FA is very interested in closing in June and is keen on resolving Article 13: Distance Learning ASAP so that the Academic Senate and Mt. SAC can implement their regular and substantive interaction (RSI) plan for accreditation.*** (Please see the District Response to Article 13 below.) A signed agreement is needed by May 31st to resolve the RSI issues in time for the Academic Senate to take action on their recommendations.

Additionally, we have not received from the district any responses about Salary, Longevity, PGH, and Adjunct Office Hours, which all involve 2023-24 monetary commitments. Some of these requests are not for large amounts of ongoing money, and the largest commitment is salaries from 2023-24. Yet, the District requires waiting until the “May Revise” for the 2024-25 year.

The May Revise comes from the Governor's office and is the penultimate draft of the state budget. It rarely changes significantly after that. Despite the massive deficit, it was generally ***good news for higher education. 2024-25 COLA was increased to 1.07%, although whether it is funded is to be determined.*** Members should have received a memo from CTA on May 10th. Thank you, CTA/CCA, for your work with the legislators!

The FA is very concerned that District's approach to DL and RSI and their lack of responses to monetary proposals will delay the faculty's ability to implement the RSI plan in a timely manner.

District Proposals and Responses:

Article 13—Distance Learning: Article 13 was mutually opened/sunshined between the FA and the District to negotiate the RSI rubric.

The “rules” of negotiations allow us to negotiate anything in the article once it is open. It had always been the faculty’s intent to resolve the RSI issues. However, the District has complicated these efforts with the proposals you have heard so much about, which the greater faculty finds unacceptable. To try to resolve these issues, the FA forwarded a “package proposal” to close all of Article 13 and get immediate resolution for RSI.

You may recall: The FA responded to all of the district proposals regarding Article 13 because it was concerned about the management proposals, which would create more management supervision, increased workload, reduced pay, and increased control over faculty purview, such as the right to determine modality by leveraging accreditation.

In light of the “Senate Taskforce—Accreditation and RSI” report approved by the Academic Senate on April 11, 2024, detailing the “Specific and Achievable Recommendations from the Academic Senate for Addressing RSI,” the FA Proposed a package offer to conclude all negotiations related to Article 13.

This package proposal included a Side Letter for Phase 1, allowing the Academic Senate to begin immediately addressing RSI, and a MOU for Phase 2 for ongoing review of RSI to be included in the contract.

The District responded with a short-sighted solution without long-term planning, which deviated in details from the original task force agreement. The Senate Taskforce—Accreditation and RSI recommendations state, “...this task force strongly suggests that ***all recommendations be funded and implemented...***” The Faculty Association believes that our package proposals are true to the desires of the Academic Senate and in our understanding, the President of the College, Dr. Garcia.

Instead, the District team dissected our package proposal and only forwarded the side letter that required heavy revision, because of inconsistencies and substantial challenges to implementation. Furthermore, our short, concise one-page side letter ballooned to almost five pages because the District felt the need to outline every single responsibility for the RSI positions recommended by the task force, despite that those responsibilities were submitted by the Academic Senate for Appendix E reassigned time.

The District is willing to hold on to its earlier and problematic proposals despite preventing progress on the package to support RSI and its implementation.

The District has voiced continued interest in the following:

- Assignment of DL courses is the purview of management and is not voluntary
- Management evaluating DL classes
- Merged shells are double-ticket courses (not paid as 2 courses, but as 1.25)

Specifically, the District cited interest in merged shells and double ticket issues. This interest is not consistent with promoting and supporting RSI and faculty in teaching online.

Article 10. B.—Dual Enrollment: The District proposed an MOU to amend Adjunct office hours to allow for office hours when the high school semesters do not align with the college calendar. The proposal was unclear in defining whether this would add the number of hours to a faculty member’s pay if they were teaching both Mt. SAC and dual enrollment classes. The FA will respond.

FA Responses:

Article 8.F.—Retiree Benefits: The FA responded to the retirement benefits by adding language regarding Medicare benefits requirements for clarification. The practice would be status quo. We are very close to our first TA.

Article 20—Grievance Procedure: The FA responded to the District's proposal for the grievance process. The faculty agreed to many changes but rejected expanding the lower levels to include higher-level managers as support for the manager grieved. This process would make filing a grievance more intimidating than it already is to faculty.

Article 21—Disputes and Mutual Agreement: The District had proposed removing the *entire* article. The FA responded by retaining mutual agreement processes.

The Faculty Association Negotiation Team is working hard to protect our profession! We need you to support negotiations. Please contact Loni Nguyen at askme@loni.net to learn how you can support FANT.

United We Are Stronger!