



Faculty Association Negotiations Update No. 14

2025-2026, Year 1 of 3

STRONGER TOGETHER!

To: All Faculty

From: Herschel Greenberg, Lead Negotiator

Date: 07/14/2026

We met with the District team for the 14th time for 3 hours on Tuesday, July 14th, 2026.

Team members in attendance:

District: Karelyn Hoover, Alexis Carter, Kelly Fowler, Koji Uesugi, and Adam Roman.

District Guests: Joe Dominguez and Ambur Borth

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

Absent (District): Tami Pearson

Absent (FANT): Robin Devitt

Note:

During this meeting, the FA submitted 2 new proposals and 1 response. The District submitted 2 responses. We're currently awaiting the District's responses to 14 proposals, which includes the proposals and responses presented today.

Second Note:

Joe Dominguez and Ambur Borth spoke about COLA at the start of the negotiations meeting. Joe claimed that COLA is 2.87% and not 4.31%. Joe stated that the "augmented" 1.44% COLA is for pregnancy leave only; however, the FA questioned the use of "augmented" vs "discretionary," which also appears in different state documents and implies the 1.44% can be used for other things. The FA is adamant that Article 7.A.1 specifically states that "all" COLA will be given to faculty regardless of what

titles the state labels each part of this “super” COLA. On June 30th FANT proposed a salary increase of 7% (4.31% COLA + 2.69% increase). Although District guests spoke about COLA, the District team provided no official response to FANT’s proposal. The FA will continue to fight for the full 4.31% COLA – in addition to paid pregnancy leave.

FA Proposals

Article 10.M, Article 18.G, and Appendix B: Department Chair

Based on input from chair surveys over the years and support from current chairs, this proposal is attempting to mitigate insufficient release time overall, and the exploitative pay chairs are required to accept during intersession to give up the winter and summer breaks (1 LHE of overload pay for approximately 42 hours of work). We believe we have found an economic and fair way to modify the department chair compensation package:

- Increase of 50% reassigned time for Department Chairs during Fall and Spring
- Increase of Flex LHE by 2 LHE per intersession, with a minimum of 3 LHE served in each intersession.
- The Department Chair salary schedule was increased by 20% because the added 6 LHE of intersession pay at the department chair rate is 20% of load. (Chairs should not be paid at the overload rate.)
- More support for training and workload management — we requested an individualized department chair planner, complete with the necessary faculty to be evaluated, scheduling, budget, curriculum, etc., to be provided with deadlines at the Mandatory Chair Meeting in the Fall.

This proposal is intended to remedy the issues realistically and holistically. The proposal’s 50% increase to regular semester reassigned time is a pragmatic step—a partial correction of an imbalance where most chairs are, in fact, working double their compensated hours. The intersession reform is equally critical: by providing 3 LHE per intersession (matching the time and pay of teaching a single class), the proposal allows chairs to carry over vital duties into the summer and winter, smoothing the workload and ensuring high-stakes tasks are done properly rather than rushed to meet deadlines.

This proposal is not about asking for something extra—it is about finally being respected and recognized for the real, complex, and demanding work department chairs perform every day. It is about restoring

dignity to the role, ensuring chairs have the time to lead, innovate, and support both faculty and students without burning out or sacrificing the quality of their work. Anything less is unsustainable—and the faculty and chairs are united in their expectation that the college will finally do what is right for its academic leaders.

Appendix C.5 Advancements

This proposal adds additional longevity steps to the adjunct pay schedule. Just as our full-time professors are rewarded for their loyalty and service to the college by teaching 10, 15, 20, 25, and 30 years, the college's adjunct professors should also be rewarded. The LHE milestones are in alignment with the current 15-year service increment for adjunct professors (i.e. 15 years and 90 LHE). The time that adjunct professors have remained committed to the college should be similarly honored. Therefore, parity is achieved through service increment years and percentage increases to base hourly pay because it mirrors the proposal for full time professor's service increments in Appendix A.5.

FA Response:

Article 10.M.4 Department Chair Elections

The FA returned this proposal as a separate response to the chair package discussed above. The FA and the District are very close to a tentative agreement. Most of the FA changes were designed to provide clarity and/or to use standard contract language.

District Responses:

Article 16.M Sabbatical Leave

The District's latest proposal significantly narrows faculty access to a contractual sabbatical benefit by arguing that sabbatical leave is not an entitlement, but a discretionary, District-funded investment that should be approved based on operational and fiscal priorities. The District rejected the FA's proposal to allow faculty participating in the Reduced Workload Program to remain eligible for sabbatical leave, despite those faculty continuing to be active employees covered by the collective bargaining agreement. The District also seeks to give administrators greater influence over which sabbatical applications advance by prioritizing proposals that receive unanimous administrative support, shifting the process away from faculty evaluation and toward management's operational concerns. In addition, the District rejected language guaranteeing a minimum number of sabbaticals each year, preserving the Board's

ability to approve fewer—or potentially no—sabbaticals regardless of the recommendations of the Salary and Leaves Committee. The proposal further rejects requiring the administration to advocate for the Committee's recommendations before the Board, allowing District leadership to independently recommend against faculty applications. The District also refused to reduce the required length of the final sabbatical report, maintaining a ten-page minimum while framing the requirement as accountability for the District's investment. Although the District accepted minor revisions to require accessible presentations and time for questions, its overall proposal places greater administrative control and operational priorities ahead of protecting faculty's longstanding contractual rights to a fair and meaningful sabbatical process.

Article 5: Rights of Association and Members

The District rejected the Association's proposal to provide new employees with orientation before their first day of work, citing administrative and legal concerns rather than prioritizing early preparation and support for new faculty. While the District accepted a minor change regarding release time, it added language ensuring instruction cannot be canceled, further limiting flexibility for faculty participation. The District also insisted on maintaining full control over the scheduling and duration of District meetings before allowing Association representatives to meet with faculty, reinforcing management's authority over employee time. Finally, the District wrote a lengthy rejection that guaranteed union representation on committees addressing negotiable issues; however, the District already agreed to this language on 5/15/26, and we had to tell them that this language would not be changed.

Next Negotiations

The next negotiations will be Friday, July 28th, 2026, from 1:00pm – 4:00pm.