

Classified Senate Meeting

Thursday, May 6, 2021

Attendee List

Name	Position	Attendance
Josh Pelletier	President	Present
TBA	President Elect	
Christine Mangiameli	Treasurer	Present
Al Guzman (temp)	Recorder	Present
Manny Diaz-Alvares	Classified Segment	Present
Chris Chavez	Classified Segment	Present
Danmin Deng	Classified Segment	Present
Alex Favela	Classified Segment	Present
Janie Garcia	Classified Segment	
Al Guzman	Classified Segment	Present
Konstatin Kalaitzidis	Classified Segment	Present
Jackie Lauese	Classified Segment	
Andre Meggeron	Classified Segment	Present
Jerry Robredo	Classified Segment	
Catalina Rodriguez	Classified Segment	
Itzel Sanchez Zarraga	Classified Segment	Present
Adrienne Hypolite	Classified Member	Present
Adiel Valasquez	Classified Member	Present
Doreen Finkelstein	Classified Member	Present

Classified Senate – Regular Meeting – May 6, 2021

Agenda

1. Approval of April 22 Minutes
2. Work Culture at Foothill College (Continued)
3. Review and approve CS statement supporting AS request for a Shared Governance Task Force
4. Review and approve a response to FH Cabinet's offer regarding classified service on governance councils
5. Classified Senate nominations for 2021-22
6. Adjourn: Next Meeting **May 27, 2021**

Minutes:

Date: May 6, 2021

Location: via Zoom

Meeting convened: 2:15 PM

Meeting adjourned: 4:05 PM

1) Approval of April 22 Minutes:

- a) (move, 2nd)
- b) VOTE – Minutes approved by Senate.
- c) Before getting to the second Agenda item **Josh P** announced appointments to the LRC Dean Committee. The three Classified reps are: Elvia Herrera, Katherine Lee, Melia Arken.

2) Work Culture at Foothill College (Continued)

- a) **Josh P** wanted members to share, sometimes just listening is useful.
 - i) One member observed that the online environment has no real breaks between meetings, phone calls, projects and reports throughout the day, day after day, for over a year and all this is not healthy. This started an expression of ideas and thoughts from senators:
 - (1) **Blocks in schedule - Josh P** suggested idea that FA uses, 1 hour work equals 50 minutes plus 10 minute break. **Christine M** suggested an adoption of a College Master Calendar for every meeting. She asks “How many times have Classified Senate meetings been cancelled because someone scheduled a meeting at the same time?” Engagement is wonderful, the number of meetings is crazy. Many at the meeting agreed that an additional obstacle many of us have is that our jobs are unique to our area. When we step away from our job, there is no one else to do our work. So, when we go to meetings, our work piles up. **Chris C** suggested that perhaps we might consider starting meetings at 10 minutes past the hour to allow time to go to the restroom, get water, or grab a bite to eat. He mentions that the counselors use the practice of building into their calendars time for calls and emails (p and m time). **Josh P** agrees this is a good idea but does not believe many members have the type of job where you can build in p and m time. Many jobs are not that structured in a way to allow p & M. Another senator suggests an idea of blocking off time, when possible, on Monday morning to catch up on all the emails, calls and inquiries made over the weekend. A member said his schedule is not conducive for blocking time because in his job there are many things going on in the background and it requires usually having to address issues before they escalate. If one thing goes wrong, escalation happens. Every day is different, sometimes just a few issues, sometimes many. Likes the idea of possibly having the institutional practice of 1 hour equals 50 minutes plus 10 minutes break. Members agree with Konstantin, many things going on in the background. **Josh**

P says, as supervisor, blocking out time in his schedule does not really work, especially for ½ hour breaks. Perhaps the Classified Senate should consider a conversation with the campus to build in release valves or have a more workable environment. **Christine M** adds you can end up not eating for hours without breaks. **Chris C** points out our situation is symptomatic of Classified Staff at Foothill being understaffed. The only way he can serve students is to create blocks in his schedule. He is fortunate to have a flexible supervisor.

(2) **Generic Email for department or area - Konstantin K** adds another good strategy for efficiency is to use a generic email address for the area you work, like LRC@fhda.edu.

Christine M agrees having a separate email specifically for an area can cut down on too many emails in a personal email box. Suggests a vacation type notice to point to generic address if sent to personal email. Can also use notice in the signature area.

b) **Josh P** asks “How many of you feel you can maintain healthy boundaries at work?”

Boundaries like being able to have time to respond to emails or work with your students or have all your meetings. How many of you can move through your day comfortably without being overtaxed or stressed by the work environment?

i) **Boundaries between work hours and personal hours - One member** mentioned receiving a text at 6pm and then at 11pm still trying to schedule a very important meeting. This comment spurred immediate suggestions. **Andre M** pointed out that a members personal time is important and getting texts on personal time is toxic. There is a reason for an 8 or 10 hours work shift. Labor laws cover that, when you are off work, you are off work. **Josh P** adds if you want to address that behavior go to ACE contract, every text you get is 15 minutes overtime. Another member points out that every time you get called in to work, after you left for the day, is automatically 4 hours overtime. Members agree that it can be difficult to address when you are a professional, you have pride in your work and want to get the job done. Change is going to be uncomfortable but needs to be done. At Foothill College, we are understaffed compared to other colleges, we become overworked and things logically will not be done. **Josh P** said that **Chris White’s** advice to all of us is if there is not labor in the department to cover the work you can only prove that by letting some things not get done and be okay with that.

ii) **Single point of failure - Josh P** also points out that many of us are the only ones doing the specific job in our department. If we don’t do the work, it will not get done. The structure is not set up in this instance to be able to create boundaries.

iii) **Let’s work together toward a solution - Josh P** says, in agreement with Andre M and Chris C, what gives us strength is being part of a bargaining unit, in being in conversation with each other here, and having a conversation with the college. It is not just one person saying the situation is untenable, many of us are in similar situations. Let’s figure out how to address this. It might mean that the college needs to invest more in hiring Classified Staff positions. But we need conversations to get us there. It is hard for one person to advocate for a healthy environment, but with organizations like ACE, Classified Senate, together we can work toward a solution.

3) Review and approve CS statement supporting AS request for a Shared Governance Task Force

- a) Update: Josh P - The Task Force has already been approved. Just wanted to make sure that we are all okay with the Task Force letter Josh P has drafted. He already sent a draft to Thuy and the Advisory Council and it has been approved. Are you all okay with me sending it as is, or, is there anything we want to add/change before I send out the final version of it? If okay, then send out again with the word "Draft".
- b) Final version will go in the minutes of the Accreditation Report.
- c) No objections, approved by consensus of the Senate.

4) Review and approve a response to FH Cabinet's offer regarding classified service on governance councils

- a) **Josh P** summarizes overall proposal. The Classified Senate sent a proposal asking for overtime compensation. Josh P and then President Elect Mike M met with Cabinet and the letter is in response: (LINK TO LETTER). We want to consider how we want to respond.
 - i) Near beginning administrators state: "We also acknowledge that we are entering new territory with few to no state colleges offering compensation to their classified professionals for participation in shared governance. We are pleased to engage in this important discussion."
 - ii) Objectives: 3 year pilot. Not written in stone, going to be continually evaluated and make sure it meets intended objectives. Ultimately, this is about compensation and representation - Only option for Admin or Executive Assistants.
 - iii) Options: Three separate options listed with stipulations regarding those on PIP or Probation
 - (1) PGA option
 - (2) De Anza option (caveat - only option for Admins or Executive Assistants)
 - (3) Overtime pay option
 - iv) 2 year rotation on all positions and other exclusions.
- b) **Senate commences on detailed discussion on options (section 4.a.iii)**
 - i) **Option 1 - Chris C** asks if there is only one option? **Josh P** confirms the answer is yes. Some members argue that Option 1 is already a negotiated benefit, automatic, granted to all Classified through contract, should not be termed as option, and should be taken off the table. In addition, no other bargaining units are asked to take options, why single out Classified Senate? **Christine M** suggests that taking more than one option, especially overtime, is seen by administrators as redundant (double-dipping?) and that is why she thinks they want to limit options to one. Perhaps they see PGA as a lifetime? Suggests that if they raise minimum credit limits allowed for governance service, to her that can be a possible consideration.
 - ii) **Option 2 - More detailed discussion**
 - (1) **Need to modify or eliminate wording** - **Josh P** says that the administrators made an incorrect statement. What is spelled out in the proposal is not what De Anza agreed to. Either change the proposal to match De Anza or take out reference to De Anza.
 - (2) **Addendum to Option 2 re: Admin Assistants of Ex Officios** - Here administrators require that all Admin (Executive?) Assistants of ex officio administrators can only take option 2. **Josh P** says this seems at odds with the objective of allowing members to volunteer or diversify representation. He also confirmed with **Chris White** that this is part of the duties spelled out in the job description for Executive Assistants. **Josh P** said **Simon Pennington** explained options still exist and that an executive assistant could be a recorder on one council and get overtime on another. **Adrienne H** pointed

out that when this new governance redesign structure was introduced, all positions, including Recorder, were supposed to be voluntary. The purpose of the redesign was to diversify the ways in which people could be involved in governance, not necessarily just a classified staff member and in particular an Admin for an Ex Officio. Also, what happens when an Ex Officio does not attend, is the Admin still committed? This practice was not standard, this practice was not written in, this practice was not formalized in the new governance structure. **Christine M** added that it always seems that classified staff are picked to take minutes.

(3) **Considerations for being a Recorder in a Committee** - In addition to the lack of choice for certain Classified members of being a recorder, **Adrienne H** also pointed out that being a recorder on a committee:..."is probably the most time consuming position of them all." Other members agreed with the assessment. Others added that if someone was a recorder on one council, who in their right mind would sign up for another council, especially if they are an Admin Assistant? What manager is going to say yes to this? How do we address this? What is the fairness of: 1) picking predominantly (exclusively?) classified staff members to be recorders 2) forcing the issue on certain classified members 3) eliminating opportunity of freedom of choice of other options as all other classified staff members enjoy 4) not wanting to compensate for overtime 5) creating a governance structure that does not support voluntary roles; 6) not overtasking certain people.

(4) **10% formula in option 2 does not work if understaffed** - **Danmin D** pointed out that for some programs, taking away 10% to do a job is not a reality. Perhaps if you have someone else to share the work responsibilities in your department. She further explained "...there is no way to reduce the work" because during this SIP period, many situations are new and not regular. This requires a lot of personal time between meetings to organize and prepare for the next meeting. And this is on top of doing what is expected for regular work.

(5) **Circular logic of 10%** - **Chris C** commented that if a recorder is already part of assigned duties, then reducing the workload 10% does not do anything if already part of regular work week. Agrees with other members that it puts them at a disadvantage.

(6) **10% Proposal offered only during week meeting scheduled** - **Adrienne H** adds that doing the minutes does not just take place just during the week the meeting is scheduled, but usually has to be done the week before to get the agenda out.

iii) **Option 3** -

(1) **Low time estimates and recorders not included** - Some members see the time estimate proposed as too low for the actual amount of time needed to do work. Other members argued that especially tri-chair and facilitator positions take more time and all estimates are too low. **Chris C** points out there is no mention of recorder in option 3?

(2) **Option 3 for 9 months of year with \$50/hr as estimate, would depend on the actual salary rate.** **Josh P** says everyone needs to track their council time to gather data to get an accurate baseline, so later we can adjust.

iv) **Rotations and exceptions** - Included in the proposal was a 2 year mandatory rotation on all positions. One question if this also includes admins of ex-officios? Also included in the

proposal is the stipulation that probationary employees or those on “Performance Improvement Plan” (PIP) be excluded from governance service. One senator commented this is not something that the cabinet tells us, this is something we should determine. Many senators were disappointed with the stipulation regarding either probationary employees or those on PIP. Another added that if a manager did not want someone on the council, put them on PIP. Our proposal was to attempt to create incentives to serve, the limit to specific options, rotations and exceptions do the opposite.

5) Announcements

- a) **Classified Senate nominations for 2021-22 - Josh P**
- b) **Professional Development Day May 14th - Josh P**
- c) **Open forum for the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources (next week) - Chris C**

6) Adjourn:

- a) Next Meeting: **Thursday, May 27, 2021**

DRAFT