



Faculty Association Negotiations Update No. 12

2025-2026, Year 1 of 3

STRONGER TOGETHER!

To: All Faculty

From: Herschel Greenberg, Lead Negotiator

Date: 05/29/2026

We met with the District team for the 12th time for 2 hours on Friday, May 29th, 2026.

Team members in attendance:

District: Tami Pearson, Karelyn Hoover, Alexis Carter, Koji Uesugi, and Jose Ramirez

FANT: Herschel Greenberg, Joshua Christ, Donna Necke, and Sandra Esslinger

Absent (District): Kelly Fowler and Romelia Salinas

Absent (FANT): David Mrofka and Robin Devitt

Note:

During this meeting, the FA submitted 1 response. The District submitted 1 response and 2 new proposals. We're currently awaiting the District's responses to 9 proposals, which includes the proposals and responses presented today.

PSA:

If you found the last negotiation update disturbing, or find the District's proposals and responses frustrating, please contact the FA to learn how you can share your thoughts.

District Response

Article 10.A.7 Scope of Work

The District's response acknowledges that higher education operations, instructional methods, technology, legal compliance obligations, accreditation standards, and student support systems have evolved significantly over time. The District expressed concern that the FA's proposed language attempts to narrowly define faculty work in a modern community college environment by simultaneously identifying faculty responsibilities, such as assessment, shared governance, and accreditation activities, while also attempting to exclude operational systems, documentation processes, reporting functions, and communication platforms necessary to perform those same responsibilities. The District further stated that it does not agree that incorporating evolving technologies into professional responsibility diminishes the academic nature of faculty work, and expressed concern that the proposal creates an artificial distinction between academic work and operational/compliance functions. The District also noted concern that portions of the proposal characterize administrative responsibilities as inappropriate for faculty, which they argued unnecessarily diminishes the contributions of classified professionals and administrators.

The FA felt the District's response contained a condescending undertone directed at our view of faculty being superior to members of CSEA 262. This could not be further from the truth—not only are they colleagues, this proposal was written through direct consultation with CSEA 262 leadership, and they expressed support for our proposal, including its intent and rationale. The FA is working on a response.

District Proposals

Article 10.M. Department Chair Elections

The District proposed several changes to the department chair elections portion of the contract based on questions and concerns raised by current department chairs. According to the District, the proposed language revisions were intended to provide adequate time and procedural clarity for the department chair nomination and election process. One of the primary factors affecting the timeline is the due date for department chair evaluations. Additional proposed language was intended to support the selection of the election representative and establish an option to bypass a formal election when only one candidate is nominated. The District also added language intended to further clarify the procedures while preserving each department's existing culture and practices surrounding department chair

elections. Finally, the District proposed revisions to the timeline for department chair evaluations. The FA is working on a response.

Article 10.N. Faculty Reassigned Time Expectancies

The District proposed new contract language specific to 10.N.1.f. Fulfilling Responsibilities. The proposed language was intended to strengthen accountability and ensure the ethical use of District resources. Specifically, the change clarifies that reassigned time associated with District roles must not be used for personal gain or to secure advantages outside the scope of professional responsibilities. Additionally, it establishes that professors with identified performance deficiencies must first address those deficiencies before being considered for additional reassigned time. The District believes this new language promotes fairness, transparency, and alignment with institutional priorities while safeguarding the integrity of reassigned time allocations. The FA asked several questions regarding the intent of this new language, and we are working on a response.

FA Response

Article 27: Health and Safety

The FA responded with changes that add clarity to the proposal based on our conversation with the District on 5/22/26, which include the possibility of psychological harm, rights to a safe work environment, and modifications to the Workplace Violence Prevention Plan language. The main source of contention in this article is the definition of “unsafe condition.” The District believes that an unsafe condition is any environmental or mechanical hazard that exposes a professor to injury, illness, or death. In other words, it is only considered unsafe if the hazard poses physical harm. The FA strongly believes that psychological harm should be considered as part of the definition of an unsafe condition. Certainly, hazards can cause more than just physical harm; they can cause emotional and psychological harm, which can be just as damaging as physical harm. The District tried to come up with examples that would exclude psychological harm, but the FA countered those examples by showing how a hazard could have psychological consequences.

Next Negotiations

The next negotiations will be Tuesday, June 30th, 2026, from 1pm – 4pm.