



Faculty Association Negotiations Update No. 16

2025-2026, Year 1 of 3

STRONGER TOGETHER!

To: All Faculty

From: Herschel Greenberg, Lead Negotiator

Date: 08/28/2026

We met with the District team for the 16th time for 3 hours on Friday, August 28th, 2026.

Team members in attendance:

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

FANT: Herschel Greenberg, Joshua Christ, David Morfka, Donna Necke, Gayle Watkins, and Sandra Esslinger

Absent (FA): Robin Devitt

District Insults Faculty Again!!!

- The District said NO to full-time longevity!
- The District said NO to the FA parity package proposal!
- The District continues to DELAY Appendix E!
- The District continues to DELAY Adjunct Health Care!

Brief Summary:

Parity Package: The District offered a 3% hourly rate increase for prep and grading, but all adjunct will have to sign an acknowledgement statement that the new hourly rate covers all of prep and grading. Furthermore, the District redefined parity as 75% rather than the current 85% already in the contract.

Appendix A.5: Service Increments: The District flat-out rejected the percentage increases for longevity steps.

The Details:

District Responses:

Parity Package

The District's response to the FA's parity package proposal was insulting and falls far short of meaningful pay parity. To weasel out of any liability, the District wants to redefine the standard for parity while refusing to commit to when adjunct faculty will actually receive it. Rather than agreeing to a three-year salary schedule that would establish a clear path to parity, the District offered only a **3% increase** in adjunct hourly rates, which amounts to somewhere between \$3 and \$4/an hour for prep and grading...MINIMUM WAGE FROM 1980! How respected does that make you feel? The District's proposal makes it the lowest offer compared to every other community college attempting to solve their prep and grading lawsuits. Comparing the college's offer to other colleges that have settled parity is nonsensical; the latest settlement came from San Mateo where adjuncts will be paid their full hourly rates for hours in the classroom and equal hours prep and grading, and all faculty will receive a 13% increase over the next three years. The District's proposal would leave adjunct professors waiting indefinitely for compensation that approaches the pay of their full-time colleagues while continuing to perform essential instructional work.

The District is basically asking faculty to accept isolated improvements while it preserves maximum flexibility to postpone meaningful parity into the future. For adjunct professors who routinely perform the same essential instructional responsibilities as full-time faculty, this response sends a troubling

message: the District will continue to demand they do the work, and evaluate them accordingly, while paying them an additional 3%.

Even more of an insult for full-time faculty teaching winter and summer, your time prep and grading is worth exactly \$0/hour!!! Nothing in the District's proposal recognizes the work faculty perform, and the District is unwilling to commit to paying anyone equitably for that work!

Furthermore, the District proposed a new Appendix A.2 establishing an overload compensation schedule that would pay full-time faculty less than half of their regular rate for overload work and potentially less than the rate paid to part-time faculty for comparable instructional work. The District also added language stating that each LHE represents 42.67 hours of work while explicitly recognizing additional service and office-hour responsibilities that would be required without additional compensation. The FA strongly objects to a compensation structure that places a lower value on the work of full-time faculty while adding further complexity to an article that was designed to bring parity to all faculty.

All faculty should be deeply concerned with the District's proposal; there is no way the District thought paying \$3-\$4/hour for prep and grading would be accepted. There is no way full-time faculty should accept less pay for overload classes. Until the District realizes the importance of parity for everyone, all faculty will continue doing essential work for substantially less compensation.

Appendix A.5 Service Increments

The District rejected the FA's proposal to create equity in longevity compensation between full time faculty and other bargaining units, choosing instead to maintain the existing flat-dollar service increment despite the significant disparity between faculty and other employee groups. Rather than addressing the inequity in how long-term service is recognized, the District argues that faculty should simply accept a different compensation structure because faculty have other ways to increase their salaries. The District points to faculty salary steps and educational columns as justification for denying faculty the same percentage-based longevity increases available to other employee groups, effectively treating professional advancement and longevity as interchangeable forms of compensation. This argument ignores the fundamental issue: faculty who dedicate years of service to the institution should not be penalized simply because their longevity compensation is structured differently. Under the current system, the value of the service increment does not increase with a faculty member's salary, meaning

the purchasing power and relative value of that longevity recognition diminish as salaries increase. The District acknowledges that its proposed percentage system would provide greater compensation to higher-paid faculty but uses that fact as a reason to reject the proposal rather than recognizing it as a way to appropriately reward experienced faculty. The District also dismisses the FA's argument regarding the District's financial position, emphasizing future obligations while offering no meaningful commitment to share the institution's fiscal resources with the faculty whose continued service makes the District successful. Most troubling, the District frames the issue as merely a disagreement over compensation methodology rather than acknowledging that faculty are asking for a more equitable recognition of years of service. The District's refusal to modify Appendix A.5 sends a clear message that it is unwilling to invest additional resources in recognizing faculty longevity, even when the FA has identified a specific mechanism for doing so.

Article 11.E Internship Program

The District withdrew their proposal. The contract will remain status quo.

FA Response:

Article 27 Health and Safety

The FA continued to argue that psychological health is an essential part of this article. The FA provided quotes from the World Health Organization (WHO), U.S. Surgeon General, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), and the Center for the Study of Social Policy. Therefore, the FA added "psychological" to the list of the District's responsibility to investigate in 27.A.2 and to the list of a professor's ability to mitigate situations in 27.A.4.

Note:

During this meeting, the FA submitted 1 response. The District returned 3 responses. We're currently awaiting the District's responses to 12 proposals, which includes the proposals and responses presented today.

Next Negotiations

The next negotiations will be Friday, Sept. 11, 2026, from 9am – 1pm.

The next Board of Trustees meeting is Wednesday, Sept. 9, 2026.