



Faculty Association Negotiations Update No. 13

STRONGER TOGETHER!

To: All Faculty

From: Herschel Greenberg, Co-lead Negotiator

Joshua Christ, Co-lead Negotiator and FA Vice President

Date: 03/28/2025

We met with the District team for the 13th time for 2 hours on Friday, Mar. 28th, 2025.

Team members in attendance

District: Sokha Song, Lance Heard, Tami Pearson, Koji Uesugi, Shannon Carter, and Adam Roman
FANT: Herschel Greenberg, Joshua Christ, Benjamin Vu, & Robin Devitt

Summary

The District returned 5 proposals. Four of those proposals involved faculty compensation. All 4 proposals were completely rejected by the District. The District did counter our proposal for a raise in 2024-25 by offering COLA for 2025-26 effective September 2025, but contingent on various statewide conditions.

District Responses

Fraudulent Enrollment Side Letter: There were a small number of faculty impacted badly—where their classes were completely cancelled due to "fraudulent enrollment", and they did not receive any other assignment. The FA was understandably concerned about this, and the contract does not cover this type of cancellation. We had asked to "make these faculty whole" by replacing an assignment (regular class, short term class, online class, other assignment that benefits the District), and the District rejected this even though this 1) will not be expensive, 2) would provide mutual benefit to the College operations, and 3) would show the faculty with classes cancelled due to District mismanagement that the District respects the time and effort and scheduling that these faculty gave up in order to commit to the now cancelled class.

The District expressed their sympathy towards those faculty who lost classes due to the last-minute cancellation of Spring semester classes, but they simply saw no other option available to the District to

handle the fraudulent enrollment “crisis” they had known about and were scheduling meetings about since January. When this inaction was called out by a FANT member, District team members took exception to the idea that the Office of Instruction, alone, is to blame for the lack of adequate response. Instead, the District team members asserted it was multiple divisions—Instruction, IT, and Student Services—that worked on this issue. Essentially the entire District failed to adequately address this issue. The FA will be returning this neglectful District response in the coming weeks, seeking to understand how a team of managers who make upwards of \$200,000 each can make all the wrong decisions (or no decisions at all in this case), and it is ONLY the faculty who feel the financial consequences of district mismanagement.

Article 7.A: Salaries: The District rejected the FA’s 2.3% raise. On January 31st, the FA created a list of faculty responsibilities that have drastically increased since 2015, the last time faculty received a raise. The District responded to that list by stating all the wonderful things that District has done to make our jobs easier, not harder. Since so much of our work is automated, and everything we do for our students is a natural evolution of our teaching duties, no raise is warranted. The District wrote:

- **Student-Driven Engagement.** The District values the dedication of faculty to responding to student needs. Many faculty interactions, such as expanded online communication, DEISA+ integration, and course support, directly respond to evolving student needs rather than District directives. Additionally, Appendix F of the contract includes a 2% pay increase for all distance learning professors who are SPOT certified.
- **Technology Streamlining Workflows.** The transition to digital processes has improved administrative efficiency. Many tasks once manual and time-consuming—such as sick leave requests, section transfers, and scheduling—have been streamlined.
 - These improvements were implemented based on faculty and staff feedback and replaced paper-driven processes.
 - The District also recognizes evolving technology, such as the integration of AI. To support faculty, the District has invested in training, resources, and detection tools like Turnitin and K-16 Technology.
- **Legislative Implementation Supported by Reassigned Time.** The District has proactively allocated reassigned time to support faculty efforts in implementing legislative changes such as AB 705, AB 1705, AB 928, and AB 1111. Faculty coordinators for these initiatives have received dedicated support for curriculum alignment and compliance, ensuring faculty engagement and expertise are recognized and compensated.
- **Voluntary Participation in Institutional Initiatives.** Faculty participation in various institutional activities, including enrollment management training, governance committees, and AI professional development, remains voluntary. Opportunities for professional growth, such as the Mt. SAC Enrollment Management Academy and DEISA+ training, have been incentivized through Professional Growth Increment (PGI or PGHI). Article 10.A.3 provides full-time professors 6 hours per week compensation which may be fulfilled through participation in activities directly related to the professor's assignment.
- **Expanded or Alternative Offerings Align with Student and Industry Needs.** The District supports the engagement of faculty to provide flexible programming and course offerings, including the addition of short-term, late-start course offerings and new CTE programs based on student demand, workforce needs, and other factors.

In this proposal, the District offered 2.43% COLA or state-funded COLA for 2025-2026. However, in an unprecedented move, the District added terms and conditions. First, the District added a contingency, stating the 2.43% COLA is dependent on the district receiving confirmation of the funded COLA for the allocated 2025-2026 fiscal year. If the funded COLA amount is adjusted, the district will adjust the allocation to the funded amount. Next, the District added an implementation process, stating these changes will come into effect upon approval of the adopted budget at the September 2025 board meeting and will be paid out in the next payroll cycle.

The District has verbally stated on multiple occasions that the current CEO/President wants to offer state funded COLA on time each year. However, the District still refuses to commit to that idea by accepting the FA pass through COLA proposals.

Article 7.A.1: Pass Through COLA: The District rejected pass through COLA again. The District argued that they must maintain flexibility to respond to economic and local stressors that impact services to the campus and services provided to campus constituents. The District also added a new argument, stating that FTES has increased since 2019-2020, the state has only funded .5% of growth each fiscal year. Therefore, the District has continued to absorb all costs associated with new students, expanded services, and the additional costs of increasing square footage to support growth of students and expand existing programs. Therefore, the District believes that they must maintain control of COLA each year and refuses to offer COLA beyond the 2025-2026 state funded COLA offer.

Article 8.F: Adjunct Health Care Benefits: The District flat out rejected this proposal again, claiming that they have no interest in using the 100% state reimbursement program for adjunct health care. The District claims that the reimbursement is not guaranteed, which makes them worried about budgeting \$11.5 million without knowing how much of that will be reimbursed. Furthermore, the District is concerned that the \$200 million allocated by the state will not last or will be lowered from lack of community college involvement. If this happens, the District would have to cancel the health care granted to adjunct, and the District does not want to take health care away. Instead, the District would rather not use the state's reimbursement program at all even if their fears do not come true. Finally, the District is willing to meet with the FA to discuss other ways to improve access to adjunct health care.

Article 10.B.6: Adjunct Office Hours Pilot: The District changed the order of the prioritization process, placing the list in this order: 1) Adjunct professors who are the only adjunct professors in their discipline. 2) Adjunct professors from disciplines with more than one adjunct professor in which the discipline course success rate is lower than 70% as determined by the Office of Research and Institutional Effectiveness (using course success data from the previous academic year). 3) Adjunct professors with the greatest amount of assigned LHE. Furthermore, the District still maintains that adjunct professors utilizing the pilot program must submit a report based on office hour usage, student attendance, and

impact on student success. Finally, the District added that all qualitative questions on the exit survey would be optional.

FA Proposals

The FA did not offer any proposals during this meeting.

Next Negotiations

The next negotiations meeting is set for Friday, April 4th from 9:00am – 11:00am.