



Faculty Association Negotiations Update No. 15

2025-2026, Year 1 of 3

STRONGER TOGETHER!

To: All Faculty

From: Herschel Greenberg, Lead Negotiator

Date: 07/28/2026

We met with the District team for the 15th time for 3 hours on Tuesday, July 28th, 2026.

Team members in attendance:

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

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

Absent (District): Romelia Salinas

Note:

During this meeting, the Faculty Association (FA) submitted 2 responses. The District also submitted 2 responses. We're currently awaiting the District's responses to 14 proposals, which includes the proposals and responses presented today.

District Responses

Article 27: Health and Safety

The District rejected the Faculty Association's proposal to include "psychological harm" within the definition of an unsafe condition, stating that such a standard would be subjective and difficult to consistently evaluate or administer. The District argued that the Health and Safety article should remain focused on identifiable physical workplace hazards that can be objectively assessed, mitigated, and corrected. The District expressed concern that including psychological harm could result in inconsistent

claims related to routine workplace interactions, classroom discussions, and academic activities. The District further stated that issues related to employee well-being, including workplace violence, harassment, discrimination, accommodations, and employee support services, are already addressed through existing laws, policies, and other contractual provisions. In essence, the District stated that if a law already exists requiring the college to do something, it does not need to go in the contract. The Faculty Association strongly disagrees with the District's position, maintaining that workplace safety must recognize the full range of conditions that impact employees' ability to work in a safe and healthy environment. The FA believes that psychological harm can be a legitimate workplace safety concern and that excluding it from the definition of an unsafe condition fails to reflect the realities of modern workplaces and the experiences of employees.

Article 10.M.4 Department Chair Elections

We agreed to Tentative Agreement #4! Within this article, the proposed language is intended to clarify the process for selecting the election representative, including establishing a process by which a formal election may be waived when only one candidate is nominated. Additional language also addresses co-chair responsibilities and division of LHE. These revisions are intended to address recurring questions and operational issues identified by department chairs during prior election cycles and to provide a more efficient and transparent process.

District Update

The District provided an update regarding our financial proposals, which is most of the articles they have yet to respond to. The District is claiming that the process of determining the college's financial responses requires multiple hours of meetings every week despite having the May Revise and direction from the Board of Trustees. However, the District has not responded to a single financial proposal, including proposals provided to the District in January and February.

FA Responses

Article 5: Rights of Association and Members

The FA continues to advocate for orientation and training that gives new professors the knowledge needed to understand their employment rights, responsibilities, benefits, and District expectations before those expectations become part of their work, which aligns with Article 9.E. The FA also clarified

that orientation scheduling should not interfere with instructional responsibilities by ensuring classes remain staffed with substitutes and that orientation occurs before the primary term begins. Additionally, the FA rejected language that would permit meetings to extend beyond their scheduled time, citing concerns about changing established faculty working conditions and conflicting with existing contract provisions. Finally, the FA restored language that the District had previously accepted to accurately reflect our prior agreement.

Article 16.M: Sabbaticals

The FA rejected several language changes proposed by the District because they introduced regressive language or addressed issues that were outside the scope of the original article. The FA also maintained that the role of administrators in the sabbatical process should remain limited to planning for potential staffing needs, while preserving the Salary and Leaves Committee's responsibility for evaluating and ranking sabbatical applications. The FA reaffirmed its proposal to establish a minimum annual sabbatical approval rate, noting that similar provisions exist at other California community college districts and are essential to supporting faculty professional growth and maintaining academic excellence. While the FA agreed that written sabbatical reports should be at least 10 pages, it opposed unnecessary prescriptive reporting requirements, emphasizing that reports should remain flexible enough to reflect the wide variety of sabbatical projects and be shared with the appropriate Mt. SAC audience. Finally, the FA proposed revised language that preserves the District's goals of accessibility and opportunities for questions while ensuring those expectations are written clearly and consistently within the contract.

FANT Feelings

The overall sentiment regarding the current negotiations is one of frustration and disappointment due to persistent delays and a perceived lack of commitment from the District. FANT feels that leadership is failing to engage meaningful discussions, with crucial proposals regarding compensation, benefits, and working conditions being repeatedly ignored or met with stalling tactics. FANT has brought 14 proposals to the table, while the District has brought 8. The District has focused most of their responses on a handful of their own proposals while largely ignoring many of the FA's proposals and responses. The "Culture of Care," a phrase often championed by our college leaders, is sorely missing in negotiations. This ongoing situation has led to significant demoralization among professors, and we believe the District's actions threaten established collective bargaining norms and procedures. Ultimately, there is a shared concern that the process is moving away from standard, respectful negotiation practices.

Next Negotiations

The next negotiations will be Friday, August 28th, 2026, from 9:00am – 1:00pm.

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