



Faculty Association Negotiations Update No. 10

2025-2026, Year 1 of 3

STRONGER TOGETHER!

To: All Faculty

From: Herschel Greenberg, Lead Negotiator

Date: 05/15/2026

We met with the District team for the 10th time for 2 hours on Friday, May 15th, 2026.

Team members in attendance:

District: Tami Pearson, Karelyn Hoover, Alexis Carter, Koji Uesugi, Romelia Salinas, and Adam Roman.
FANT: Herschel Greenberg, Joshua Christ, David Mrofka, Donna Necke, Sandra Esslinger, and Robin Devitt.

Absent:

District: Kelly Fowler

FA: Gayle Watkins

Note:

During this meeting, the FA submitted one response and one amended proposal. The District submitted three responses. We're currently awaiting the District's responses to nine proposals, which includes the proposals and responses presented today.

WARNING:

This is a public service announcement: The following negotiations update may cause anger, frustration, and bewilderment. If any of these symptoms remain after reading this update, or you experience new symptoms, please come to the Board of Trustees meeting on June 24th and tell the Board how you feel.

District Response:

Article 14: Class Size

The District proposed major changes to the FA's proposal.

In the original proposal, the FA stated that class sizes would be set between 1-35 students per section, and any class already within those parameters would remain at its current number while any section with more than 35 students would be set to 35 students. For example, if English C1001 is currently set to 25 students, it would remain set at 25 students under the FA's proposal. All available data shows that smaller class sizes improve student success rates, which was an important factor in the FA's proposal.

The District responded by identifying specific types of classes and setting a brand new class size for each type of class. Any class labeled "Lecture Discussion" would be set at 46 students. Any class labeled "Extensive Writing" would be set at 36 students. Any class labeled "Lab" would be set at 24 students. These are not written as "up to" 36 students; it is the actual number the District is proposing. This means English C1001, which is currently capped at 25 students, would now have 36 students!!! If you currently teach a class that is capped at 30 students, and this class falls under "Lecture Discussion," your new class size will be 46. Imagine how much work you will have to do to accommodate 16 more students in your classroom!!!

Furthermore, the District pulled the definition of "Lecture Discussion," "Extensive Writing," and "Lab" from the Course Outline of Record from specific courses. For example, "Extensive Writing" is defined as "Evaluation mostly through writing assignments with a minimum of 6000-8000 words. Writing assignments are assessed for critical thinking, conceptual understanding, structure, style, and mechanics." This is clearly from an English class, and does not apply to all disciplines. More importantly, if your class is designated as "Extensive Writing," you would have to create enough assignments to meet the criteria of 6000-8000 words!!!

The District claimed that there could be exceptions amended with the approval of the department chair, educational administrator, and appropriate Vice President. However, the District did not include language regarding how this process would occur or if any current classes would become exempt.

Furthermore, the District removed the Class Size Committee from the proposal, including striking the committee from the original contract language. The District's policy would more than double the size of many classes and wants these class sizes to be decided by "the appropriate Vice President" and not by faculty and the college working together through the shared governance of the Class Size Committee and the curriculum process.

And all of this was just for credit classes, which includes online classes too! In noncredit, the District proposed no limits to open-entry/open-exit classes, and a cap of 75 students in managed-enrollment classes.

Their response demonstrates what they truly believe is a culture of care—it is larger class sizes and less individualized attention for each student. It is seeing students as numbers and dollar signs, which can be saved when they put as many students in a classroom as possible. It is hearing that the FA is asking for class size equity, and responding by making everyone's lives as difficult as those who sought equity in the first place.

Please consider how all of this would impact your work and the quality of the education you provide to your students. Imagine classes in the Natural Science Division or Humanities Division, where many classes have smaller class sizes based on specific requirements, such as field trips, labs, number of seats in the classroom, etc., suddenly having 16 additional students. Increasing the class size limits to the numbers proposed by the District is irrational, unfathomable, and simply unattainable.

Article 5: Rights of Association and Members

The FA and the District continue to negotiate language that guarantees union rights when new faculty are hired. Most of the District's proposed changes alter sentences slightly. However, the District is still unwilling to allow up to 3 FA representatives paid release time to attend an orientation/onboarding meeting. The District is still unwilling to accept language under 5.H.4 Promotion of Harmonious Public Employment Relations, which allows 10 minutes of time at the beginning or ending of a department meeting to conduct union work. The FA will review and respond.

Article 6: Dues and Payroll Deductions

The District responded by adding the fifth Monday for each primary term to the sentence regarding when they have to turn over requested data pursuant to Government Code 3558 (AB 119). This is a

different deadline than the FA's proposal, which asked for the information on the Monday after the census date. The FA will review and respond.

FA Amendments

Parity Package

The FA re-presented the Parity proposal with amendments, as it was discovered there were unintended consequences that negatively impacted full time baseload that we have corrected. This included correcting hours specific to counselors, librarians, and instructional specialists by returning them to current contract language. The FA also removed charts specific to the hours per week for both full time and adjunct professors. The FA removed a sentence that affected adjunct teaching dual enrollment in relation to their office hours, which are now calculated using the same adjunct office hours as proposed. Finally, the FA aligned the titles of full-time professor and adjunct professor with the rest of the current contract. The District took the amended proposal and will form their responses based on this document.

FA Response

Article 16 Sabbaticals

The FA believes that the contract, which includes sabbaticals, applies to everyone. The FA also believes that the professor should maintain control of their sabbatical and its results. The FA struck out the District's proposed language regarding professors on reduced workload, claiming that a professor on reduced workload is allowed the benefits of this contract and are considered active full-time professors while they are on reduced workload. The FA also proposed a change to Article 16.M.7, using a Sabbatical Acknowledgment Notification system rather than a recommendation system. This will allow the District time to find a substitute for the professor requesting the sabbatical. The District often claims that a substitute cannot be found as the primary reason for rejecting a sabbatical, so the FA's proposal fixes this rationale. Finally, in Article 16.M.16.b Sabbatical Presentation, the FA proposed that mutual agreement between the professor and the Salary and Leaves Committee must be met before scheduling the presentation.

Next Negotiations

The next negotiations will be Friday, May 22, 2026, from 9am – 11am.

The next Board of Trustees meeting is Wednesday, June 24th, 2026.