



Faculty Association Negotiations Update No. 13

2025-2026, Year 1 of 3

STRONGER TOGETHER!

To: All Faculty

From: Herschel Greenberg, Lead Negotiator

Date: 06/30/2026

We met with the District team for the 13th time for 3 hours on Tuesday, June 30th, 2026.

Team members in attendance:

District: Tami Pearson, Karelyn Hoover, Alexis Carter, Kelly Fowler, Romelia Salina, and Adam Roman.

FANT: Herschel Greenberg, Joshua Christ, David Mrofka, Donna Necke, Gayle Watkins, and Sandy Esslinger

Absent (District): Koji Uesugi

Absent (FANT): Robin Devitt

Note:

During this meeting, the FA submitted 1 new proposal and 2 responses. The District submitted 1 new proposal. We're currently awaiting the District's responses to 13 proposals. The Faculty Association has responded to all but 4 proposals, which includes the proposals and responses presented today.

District Proposal

Article 13: Distance Learning

The District's proposal would significantly revise Article 13, adding significant work for all faculty teaching online without any adjustments to compensation. The proposal updates distance learning language to align with new federal regulations, proposed Title 5 changes, and statewide guidance. It replaces existing terminology with standardized terms and adds definitions related to Regular and

Substantive Interaction (RSI), accessibility, and distance learning expectations. The proposal also expands faculty responsibilities for accessibility, FERPA compliance, third-party instructional technologies, and disclosure of required course technologies directly to the District. These changes would require compliance in nearly all aspects of your online courses.

Furthermore, the proposal establishes a formal RSI review process using trained faculty RSI reviewers and outlines procedures for addressing courses found to be out of compliance. It also links reviewer qualifications to SPOT certification and other specialized training rather than general online teaching experience, which Article 13 has protected for years. The District states these changes are intended to improve consistency, transparency, and accreditation compliance. However, the FA feels it makes the process far more complicated, with less professors capable of completing the RSI certification process. To make matters worse, several parts of the proposal lack a clear process despite the District's desire to add new language to this article, which they admitted when questioned about these processes.

The proposal further revises faculty evaluation procedures by removing language the District considers outdated, eliminating the requirement that faculty guide evaluators through online courses as part of the evaluation process. This is a major change to the evaluation process we have used for years. Most significantly, the District proposes removing the contractual requirement for peer review and permitting managers to conduct online teaching evaluations when deemed necessary, including during special evaluations, student complaints, and probationary reviews. Although the District claims these revisions as modernization and operational improvements, the proposal expands administrative authority, increases contractual compliance obligations for faculty, and reduces existing contractual protections governing the evaluation of online instruction.

FA Proposal

Article 7: Salaries

The FA proposed a 7% salary increase, including appendices (excluding Appendix F). The following rationale was provided to the District:

- 1) COLA for 2026-2027 is 4.31%.
- 2) The Student-Centered Funding Formula shows a 2.5% growth in 2026-2027.
- 3) This total is at least 6.81% financial growth over the previous year.

4) The 7% total salary increase (4.31% from COLA + 2.69% salary increase, proposed to make the percentage a whole number) is only .19% greater than the fund the District will receive in 2026-2027.

5) More importantly, the Association also noted that despite a “budget deficit” each and every year, the District has not once failed to increase the Ending Fund Balance (EFB) at the end of the fiscal year. This is demonstrative of a proposed structural deficit, which is easily refuted when the audited actuals are received. The District is fond of worrying about budget deficits, when these deficits are just “structural” deficits created by the college. In other words, a deficit of \$3 million for the college means that instead of having a surplus of \$60 million they had a surplus of \$57 million. Based on the District’s ability to perpetually add money to the EFB, the FA believes that the District can afford a 7% total salary increase. This will also allow Mt. SAC to maintain competitive salary increases when compared to other colleges in the area, include Chaffey College, Rio Hondo College, Santiago Canyon College, and the Los Angeles Community College District, all of which will see an increase in 2026/2027 from the same state funds Mt. SAC is about to receive.

FA Responses

Article 14: Class Size

The FA disagreed with all of the District’s proposed changes and crossed out all of their language. In the District’s rationale, they stated their response addresses “core concerns,” identified by the joint FA and Senate taskforce, which stated, “In particular, the need for greater consistency and greater access to student instruction.” It is ironic that the District is advocating for creating greater access to students and instruction by increasing class sizes by almost 16 students. Therefore, the FA returned this proposal using the language we originally proposed on February 2nd, 2026. The FA strongly believes that class sizes should be capped at 35 students, and Noncredit Title 5 exceptions can be granted via the Class Size Committee, which was addressed in the original proposal.

Article 10.N Faculty Reassigned Time Expectancies

When the District presented this proposal, they chose to include only 10.N.1.f. The FA believes all of 10.N must be included in order to fully respond to the District proposal, and the full article was added with additional changes by the FA. We focused on creating clear guidelines related to the Appendix I.a form, including establishing expectancies for any reassigned time, not just reassigned time from Appendix E. Other changes clarified the reassigned time process by creating more flexibility for the professor while still adhering to the intent of the reassignment.

Next Negotiations

The next negotiations will be Tuesday, 14th, 2026, from 1pm – 4pm.

The next Board of Trustees meeting is Wednesday, August 12th, 2026, time TBA.