MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING OF THE PERSONNEL COMMISSION
Thursday, November 16, 2006  11:15 a.m. – 1:30 p.m.
Administration Complex, 2714 Pico Boulevard – 2ND Floor, Santa Monica, CA 90405

Any individual or group may address the Personnel Commission during the Comments—Public Forum segment of the meeting regarding any item that is within the Commission’s subject matter jurisdiction. However, the Commission will not take action on any item that is not on this agenda.

Any individual may appear at the Commission meeting to respectfully testify in support of or opposition to any item being presented to the Commissioners for consideration. Individuals wishing to address items to the Commissioners should complete a Request to Address the Personnel Commission card (green form) prior to the start of the meeting.

PUBLIC SESSION: 11:15 a.m.

I. ORGANIZATIONAL FUNCTIONS

A. Call to Order  Meeting called to order: 11:17 am
B. Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioner</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Bancroft</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Press</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Metoyer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Approval of Minutes


Disposition by the Commission:  Motion to approve minutes as presented.

Motion made by: Joseph Metoyer  Seconded by: Dolores Press

Ayes: 3  Nays:  Abstain:

Amendments/Comments:  Motion carried

II. REPORT – DIRECTOR OF CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL  None

III. COMMENTS AND INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

5 Years
Meredith D. Barcega, Programmer Analyst I, Information Management
Yongjian Yan, Programmer Analyst I, Information Management

15 Years
Sheila Walsh, Instructional Assistant – English, English Department

20 Years
Cheng Szu (Frank) Wu, Director Management Information Systems

25 Years
Judy K. Louff, Department Secretary I, Theater Arts

B. Comments from District Personnel Officer. None

C. Comments from Classified Senate Representative. None

D. Comments from CSEA Chapter 36 Representative. None

E. Comments from Management Association President. None

F. Comments from Personnel Commission Staff. None

IV. COMMENTS—PUBLIC FORUM (non-actionable comments from those in attendance)
None

V. COMMENTS BY PERSONNEL COMMISSIONERS None

VI. AGENDA REPORTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENDA ITEMS</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Ratification of Eligibility Lists</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Ratification of Limited Term Positions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Advisory Item – Appointments to Limited Term Positions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Review of Recommended Salary Range</td>
<td>Pulled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Approval of Consultant Services for the Personnel Commission</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Review &amp; Approval of Classification Descriptions – Student Services (Non-Classroom) Family</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA REPORT NO. 1

SUBJECT: Ratification of Eligibility Lists

It is recommended that the Personnel Commission certify the following eligibility lists pursuant to Education Code Section 88091, to be effective for the period as listed.

A. New Eligibility Lists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Title</th>
<th>Field of Competition</th>
<th># On List</th>
<th>Expiration Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systems Administrator</td>
<td>Promotional &amp; Open Competitive</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>11/17/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Systems Manager</td>
<td>Promotional &amp; Open Competitive</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>11/17/07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education Code §88091 Vacancies in classified service; promotional applicants; exemptions.
(a) All vacancies in the classified service shall be filled pursuant to this article and the rules of the commission, from applicants on eligibility lists which, wherever practicable, as determined by the commission, shall be made up from promotional examinations, or appointments may be made by means of transfer, demotion, reinstatement, and reemployment in accordance with the rules of the commission.

DISPOSITION BY THE COMMISSION: Motion to approve item as presented

Motion made by: Joseph Metoyer Seconded by: Dolores Press

Ayes: 3 Nays: Abstain:

Amendments/Comments: Motion carried
AGENDA REPORT NO. 2

SUBJECT: Ratification of Limited Term Positions

The Personnel Commission is requested to ratify the classification of the following Limited Term positions pursuant to Section 7.4.2(C) of the Rules and Regulations of the Classified Service of the Santa Monica Community College District:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Classification</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Aide</td>
<td>Disabled Student Center</td>
<td>07/01/06 – 12/31/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 part-time positions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Aide</td>
<td>EOPS</td>
<td>10/16/06 – 12/31/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 part-time position)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Reference Merit Rule 7.4.2(C): Procedure for Establishment of Limited Term Positions

Limited term positions shall be classified by the Personnel Director subject to ratification by the Personnel Commission at their next regular meeting.

Report Prepared by: Tiffani Jones, Acting Personnel Analyst

DISPOSITION BY THE COMMISSION: Motion to ratify item as presented

Motion made by: Joseph Metoyer          Seconded by: Dolores Press

Ayes: 3                               Nays:

Amendments/Comments:
AGENDA REPORT NO. 3

SUBJECT: Advisory Item - Appointments to Limited Term Positions

The Personnel Commission is advised that the following persons have been appointed to the following limited term positions from currently certified eligibility lists pursuant to Section [7.4.3(A)] of the Rules and Regulations of the Classified Service of the Santa Monica Community College District:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Elig. List Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isolde Franke-Hoff</td>
<td>Counseling Aide</td>
<td>Disabled Student Center</td>
<td>07/1/06 – 12/31/06</td>
<td>08/20/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikki Baber</td>
<td>Counseling Aide</td>
<td>Disabled Student Center</td>
<td>07/1/06 – 12/31/06</td>
<td>08/20/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mia Duran</td>
<td>Counseling Aide</td>
<td>EOPS</td>
<td>10/16/06 – 12/31/06</td>
<td>08/17/2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference Merit Rule 7.4.3 (A) –Eligibility for Appointment- Limited term appointments shall be made from eligibility lists and employment lists in accordance with procedures for regular appointments.

Report Prepared by: Tiffani Jones, Acting Personnel Analyst

DISPOSITION BY THE COMMISSION: Advisory only – no action taken

Motion made by: Seconded by:

Ayes: Nays:

Amendments/Comments: .
AGENDA REPORT NO. 5

SUBJECT: Approval of Consultant Services for the Personnel Commission

It is recommended that the Personnel Commission grant approval to hire Michael Prihar, Esq. to provide hearing officer services to the Personnel Commission to hear appeals of classified employees, review records and prepare reports.

Provider: Michael Prihar, Esq.

Service: Hearing officer to hear appeals of classified employees, review records and prepare reports

Fees: $1,000 per day plus expenses

Duration: 02/01/07 through 06/31/07

Funding Source: Personnel Commission Fiscal Year 2006-2007 Budget

A copy of the Agreement for Personal Services is attached.

DISPOSITION BY THE COMMISSION: Motion to approve agenda item as presented

Motion made by: Joseph Metoyer Seconded by: Dolores Press

Ayes: 3 Nays: Abstain:

Amendments/Comments: Motion carried
AGENDA REPORT NO. 6

SUBJECT:  Review and Approval of Classification Descriptions – Student Services (Non-Classroom) Family

DISCUSSION AND COMMENTS:

Commissioner Bancroft:  I’d like to start out by announcing something – I think we’ve said this at other meetings, but let’s just get it on the record now. As you are aware, the Hay study was started approximately four years ago. It normally takes approximately two years to complete a study of this nature. If it had been studied on time, according to our current Merit System Rules, an individual who was classified or reclassified under that study would not have been able to ask for his or her position to be re-looked at again for another two years. Because the study has taken two years too long, we, as commissioners, voted to waive that 2-year wait rule. So it is not in effect. In other words, no one is being penalized because the study is being implemented two years late because there is not the 2-year wait rule in effect for this study. I also want to make it clear that we are not responsible for recommending or negotiating salaries, merely the classification system that has been recommended by Hay. We are rolling out the Hay study based on the study that was done and has been looked at and reviewed and re-looked at by both Sue and Donna, and we had to have a starting point, and that’s why we have waived this 2-year wait rule. So that if people believe that their jobs have changed significantly since they first filled out their Position Description Questionnaire (PDQ), they can now, after the roll-out of the study, submit a classification study request to the commission and it will be reviewed. But we had to have a starting point from where to begin. We’re rolling it out as if we were doing it two years ago, we’ve waived the 2-year rule where you have to wait, and if you think your job has changed during the last two years, then you can ask for a reclassification study of your position. After all the roll-outs are finished. That would be in January. Because we want to have all this done by December. Our goal is to have this study rolled out by the end of 2006. We really do appreciate everybody’s patience and cooperation as we work through this very difficult process. As you know, we’ve had two different Directors of Classified Personnel. We now have two co-chair acting directors that we have a lot of confidence in – they have a lot of experience in this area – and we think we’re getting things back on track and that we will soon have a new Director of Classified Personnel, hopefully, and get everything back on track. Any salary issues are subject to “meet and confer” between the District and CSEA. If you’re being reclassified to a different position, one that doesn’t previously exist, that’s going to have to be subject to “meet and confer.” If your job classification is merely getting a title change, the existing salary range would still be in effect. All salary changes, whether they’re negotiated or implemented as a result of changing somebody’s title, will have the same effective date, which will be January 1, 2007. So nobody’s going to be penalized because of meeting and conferring and that type of thing. Whenever that’s done, everything would be made effective as of January 1, 2007 as far as salary changes.

Bernie Rosenloecher:  Good day. I wanted to tag on to what you just said by saying that it’s also subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees.

Commissioner Bancroft:  That’s correct. Sorry for that oversight. That’s very important.

Bernie Rosenloecher:  I want to share the same information that I’ve been sharing at the last meetings. Members of the negotiating team and the executive board have been present at all the roll-out meetings, that we have informed the District of our intent to negotiate salaries and terms and effects
of the roll-out implementation. We have an open line of communication with the Personnel Directors. The negotiating team recommends that any concerns or discrepancies should be submitted in writing to the Personnel Directors, Sue Tsuda and Donna Peter, with copies to the negotiating team. And of course any positive statements are welcomed as well.

Commissioners: (Laughter) That’ll be the day!

Bernie Rosenloecher: A couple of things have come to my attention that I wanted to address. In the latest job description roll-out – have included recommended step ranges which was not included on the previous job descriptions, and in the interest of fairness and equitable distribution of information I request that the range steps be included on all the job descriptions as well. I realize that the web page is a work-in-process and a lot of the old, original proposed job descriptions have been either pulled or frozen but some of the job titles, the original proposed job titles which I understand have been changed, the old titles are still posted on the web. So that’s something that I would like you to take a look at, as well. Because there are people coming – concerned members coming to me saying, “I was under the impression that it changed and it still shows up on the web site.”

Commissioner Bancroft: We have had discussions with Dr. Tsang, and he’s very supportive of everything that we’re doing, and I think that the “meet and confer” process will go quickly. That’s my opinion based on the conversations that we’ve had. We really welcome that cooperation that we’re getting from the District with regards to this whole process and what the commission is going through right now. I have a request to speak from Vivian Rankin-Scales.

Vivian Rankin-Scales: Good morning. I’m the Program Coordinator of Emeritus College, and quite frankly I’m a little dismayed at the final outcome of this lengthy Hayes process. It is my understanding that the Hayes process was intended to clean up and update the job classifications and descriptions of the SMC College District uses for personnel recruitment, hiring and to set salary scales. Now that all the findings are in, and this is only permissible by law, I would like to know the criteria used to determine if a particular classification received an upgrade, was down-graded or stayed the same. We at the college community need to know the ultimate outcome of this lengthy process which will result in higher pay for a select few. I am asking for a level of accountability that is now the new paradigm of accountability set forth by the chancellor’s office. Currently all California community colleges are being asked to create an EEO model plan. This plan’s intent is to ensure all qualified individuals have a full and fair opportunity to compete for hiring and promotion on all community college campuses. Since the Hayes process was used to promote as well as reclassify positions, we should be allowed to look at data to see if the process was successful in accomplishing what it was intended to do. What I mean by that is that through the SMC proverbial grapevine I’m hearing – I don’t know if it’s rumor – that certain classifications were shifted to different levels and will eventually have higher compensation? So, to me, that means they were promoted within the classification study.

Commissioner Bancroft: No. They’ve been reclassified. And the salary range is subject to “meet and confer” between the District and CSEA.

Vivian Rankin-Scales: Which ultimately could result in a higher salary.

Commissioner Bancroft: That is an issue that’s between CSEA and the District, not ...
Commissioner Bancroft: The only role that the commission plays is to classify positions, and that’s where our role ends.

Vivian Rankin-Scales: So we submitted information for the study and now with your findings has there been any type of motion in which people are going to receive ... will ultimately receive a higher pay scale, from what they submitted?

Donna Peter: The whole purpose of classification studies is to determine if the person is working under the proper classification. If it was determined that someone, regardless of what their title was at the time, was not actually performing those duties but instead was performing duties of either another current classification or perhaps a classification that still needed to be created, then those people were reclassified. That is not the same thing as a promotion. A promotion is a set recruitment process – it means you have not currently been doing the duties but you are tested and go through a process to then be considered for promotion to those positions. A reclassification means that you have been doing those duties of that different classification for a set period of time. Typically, at least a year, sometimes it’s more than one year, it could be 2-3 ... some people have been doing it for four or five years. In this particular case, the classification study took four years. So there is a chance that someone was operating in a different classification for four years before it was actually recommended for change. In addition, there were several classifications that were condensed down into one classification. In particular, the Admissions & Records Clerks – there were several that have been condensed down into one classification, which is basically a new classification that combines a lot of those duties. Therefore, there is a recommended salary range that goes with that – because each and every one of those was on a different salary range. And once you put somebody into one classification, you can’t have different salary ranges for one classification. In addition, there were positions where it was found that they were not working in class and that they needed to be in a different classification. Those people would have been recommended ... so, conceivably, if they were reclassified to a position that was at a higher range, then they would go to that higher range. An example is the Department Secretary II who became Administrative Assistant I. Yes. They are all going to a higher range because they were reclassified. But the decision was made that they were already doing the work of an Administrative Assistant I, and that’s why they were reclassified.

Commissioner Bancroft: Donna is correct. There is a very distinct difference between a reclassification and a promotion. A reclassification means you just get credit for the job you’re doing right now – a promotion you have to compete for.

Vivian Rankin-Scales: I understand that. The point that I’m trying to stress is that out of this process some people will eventually be paid at a higher range.

Commissioner Bancroft: But it’s based on their duties. It’s not a promotion, it’s based on what they’ve been doing and what they should have been paid for – for their duties.

Vivian Rankin-Scales: My last thing that I would like to know, if it’s possible, is that, since the Hayes process is over now, is there any way that we could see data that shows us how there was a shift in classifications that will ultimately effect our campus community?

Commissioner Bancroft: I’m assuming we’re going to have a summary report at some point that will show all the changes in written format. Right now we’re just trying to roll it out in families to get this done, rather than having one long, protracted meeting that might last all day while we try to do the whole think at once. Once we get through with all the family roll-outs, we can come up with a comprehensive summary of what changes have occurred.
Vivian Rankin-Scales: Good. I also wanted to give you a packet with that and also Emeritus College schedule for the Winter Semester.

Sue Tsuda: I’d just like to respond to your first question as to how the Hay study – what they took into consideration to come to their conclusions. They give points to things that were reflected in the Position Description Questionnaires that the employees returned, the PDQs, and those were “know-how,” “problem solving,” “accountability” and then “environmental considerations,” whether you worked indoors, outdoors, noise, quiet, how many pounds you had to lift and all those kinds of things. Those were the kinds of things on which they based the total number of points that they allocated to each position.

Commissioner Press: I have a question for Vivian. Could you answer a question I have about your memo? Please? I’m particularly interested in the paragraph that says that “all California community colleges are being asked to create an EEO model plan. This plan’s intent is to ensure that all qualified individuals have a full and fair opportunity to compete for hiring and promotion on all community college campuses.” That extracts one sentence or paragraph from what I’m sure is a very lengthy ... this was passed by the state legislature?

Vivian Rankin-Scales: And all the college campuses – well I’m on the DPAC HR subcommittee, and I thought it was really timely that they’re asking all the community college campuses to come up with a model EEO plan, and we’re working on what that will say for SMC. But I think it’s really important that all of the HR or Personnel Commission bodies are aware of this happening right now.

Commissioner Bancroft: And that has to do with hiring and promotion, not a classification study. Because we had that.

Commissioner Press: Well, I’m happy to be informed about this, but ultimately this is going to be on the agenda of the Board of Trustees, right? This kind of decision?

Vivian Rankin-Scales: What’s going to be ... creating this model?

Commissioner Press: Yes. And, do you have a time factor yet?

Vivian Rankin-Scales: No, but I do have a copy that we’re working on if you want to see it. I can leave a copy with you.

Commissioner Press: I would appreciate that. And being informed about when this comes before the – once you know that it will be on the agenda of the Board of Trustees, I would like to know about that. I would probably want to comment on it. Thank you.

Commissioner Bancroft: There is a federal law that’s been in effect for years, which is the Equal Employment Opportunity law ...

***

Commissioner Bancroft: The fact that this college tends ... has a merit system as opposed to colleges that don’t, you really are ensured that there is a competitive and open process vis-à-vis the merit rules and regulations. Whereas in colleges where that doesn’t exist, they may have difficulty showing that they’re meeting the Equal Employment Opportunity law requirements. So I would be
more concerned about ... that’s why we’re just saying that you’re fortunate that this college has that
because in the colleges that don’t, where they can more or less hire as they want, those are the ones
that should be worried about this.

***

**Commissioner Bancroft:** As far as what information we’re going to ... the classifications that were
changed and not by employee name, because that’s really private. Because anything related to a
particular employee is really covered under the privacy laws, both federal and state. I think we can look
at classifications ... but that’s all we can look at.

**Bernie Rosenloecher:** I believe, in speaking to several people, that the distinction between a
reclassification and a promotion – the line is maybe not quite as distinct in this case. During the Hay
study, if there were, say four, five or six people in one particular job description, they all had the same
job description, they were all hired through the same testing process, and all of their job duties
performed were similar. However, possibly in the PDQs, whether or not the District possibly hedged
one a little more or if somebody put in additional job duties or whether they were allowed to do
additional job duties prior to the submittal of the PDQs, then all of a sudden in their job description they
have now become a different classification without allowing the other people in that same level or job
description the opportunity to test or to promote up.

**Commissioner Bancroft:** Bernie, what you have to realize is that when people are hired into a job,
that job doesn’t remain static. In other words, things change – duties are added, duties may be taken
away – no job is frozen in time. And it depends on the operational needs of the work unit in which
they’re hired. That’s why there is such a thing as a reclassification. You could have five people – say,
if the City of Santa Monica hired Staff Assistant IIIs and at the time they were hired they were all doing
the same duties. But over time, because the operational needs of this department changed versus the
operational needs of another department – some individuals may end up getting reclassified and others
not. It’s a matter of meeting the operational needs of the work unit, and that’s how duties change. It’s
not because it was orchestrated or whatever – you can’t just jump to that conclusion.

**Bernie Rosenloecher:** I understand your point of view as well. But if no one else was given the
opportunity to take part in doing those other jobs, it could have been picked out as a favorite, as well.

**Commissioner Bancroft:** But maybe those job duties weren’t required of that other individual. I
mean, you’ve got to look at it on a case-by-case basis. You can’t just assume because everybody was
hired under the same job class on, say, June 1, 2003 that three years later or four years later they’re all
still doing the same duties. Things change over time. No job remains frozen in time. Things change
as operational needs change.

**Bernie Rosenloecher:** However, if a higher job classification would have been created – let’s say we
weren’t going through the Hay study – and we had a need for that position to be filled and we created
that position then it would be open/promotional and you would have to test for that job.

**Commissioner Bancroft:** If they created a higher-level position and added it in their budget process,
yeah.

**Donna Peter:** One of the things I want to clarify, because this has come up in some Emails that people
have sent us, or at least some of the rumblings we hear ... classification is not intended to promote
people or reward people for doing a good job or necessarily designed to tell you the value that that
individual adds to the organization. What classification is supposed to do is look at the job duties and the job duties of the classification, not necessarily how well or how hard the person works. The flip side of that is, I also tell managers, they should not be working people out of class. If they have duties that need to be added to a position, there are several ways to approach that. Sometimes working people or adding them to an existing classification is the only way to go. However, there are other ways to do it, which is to reallocate to a different position, create a new position, and in those cases those typically are handled then through the recruitment process. Classification is not designed ... it's supposed to stay neutral. It is not designed to reward people, and it's not designed to punish people. It's designed to put together skills, knowledge and abilities and what's required in terms of minimum qualifications to ensure that you get somebody with those skills, knowledge and ability, and group people who do like-type work and have like-type requirements into classifications. So I think, unfortunately, it's not ... we don't operate in a pure society here, and there are going to be times when some of these things are going to get mixed in. But the hope of the classification study is to try, to the extent we can, to neutralize that and go based strictly on what people do. Unfortunately, or fortunately, neither Sue nor I have history here. So we don't know what went on and I can't tell you whether people were given an opportunity or not. I can only go by what Hay did, and in addition to that, looking at almost every PDQ that went along with it. We can't re-study everything or it would be another four years before you got this far.

**Commissioner Bancroft**: Well, you’d have a moving target. The City [of Santa Monica] under its civil service rules has a provision that says that a job classification does not preclude the assignment of duties in any way. And if they are changed significantly over a period of time, then you should look at it from a reclassification study standpoint. Because jobs don't remain the same ... and they do change over time. And some people have opportunities to take on new duties, and it doesn’t mean there should be a promotional position, but the requirements of the position have changed. And also if the staff of the Commission – when they go out recruiting for something they should be doing an audit to make sure what they’re recruiting for to make sure it complies with the classification. If a new one needs to be created then they need to put it in a new classification. And then you do a reallocation of the budget process and then an exam is held.

**Bernie Rosenloecher**: In a perfect world. But the water’s become a little muddy here.

**Commissioner Bancroft**: The why for the Hay study system for looking at this is that separate out people – they don’t know the employees, they don’t know their performance. I know that any time we’ve done a study, everybody looks at somebody else that’s in the same job class and they look at that person’s performance. And they tend to get performance confused with duties and responsibilities. They're supposed to pay according to the value of the job, not how well somebody is doing that job. For example, at the City [of Santa Monica] we did a study of all of our managers, the highest level of division heads right under the department head. We actually had an employee, an MTA, who went on a 3-week unscheduled vacation because she was so upset because her job wasn't valued as high as the City Engineer and the Utilities Division Manager. But she was looking at the performance of those two incumbents and not at the duties and responsibilities that we were paying for. So that’s a whole different issue. So you’ve got to separate out performance too. That’s why, with the Hay study, they aren’t looking at performance – they aren’t looking at how well somebody’s doing their job – they’re looking at the duties and responsibilities of the position, what’s required, and then they determine the value of that. It’s up to the supervisors of those people to determine whether the person is doing a good job or not a good job. And act accordingly.

**Bernie Rosenloecher**: Did you do that study in-house or did you ...?
Commissioner Bancroft: We had the Hay Group do it.

Bernie Rosenloecher: For the managers.

Commissioner Bancroft: Yes.

Sue Tsuda: I’d just like to piggy-back on those comments. When Hay did this study, they took the PDQs from every employee who had the same job description and they melded the comments that were on those PDQs from the employees and the supervisors when they made their determination about what their new classification should be. They didn’t pick and choose individuals. So everyone who had the same job title was treated the same. Now, in the interim, some of those people who had that job title may have evolved their job and need to have another classification, and that’s why the Commission has acted to make that possible come January, rather than waiting another two years.

Bernie Rosenloecher: Rather than spend any more time on one or two individual cases, I suggest that we meet separately in the interest of everybody. Thank you.

Marcia Lewis: I am an employment specialist here in the Career Services Center and I really was not prepared to speak here, but I’m listening to you and there are a couple of things that have been said that are making me feel very uncomfortable. You are saying that you’re going according to titles and not according to individuals. Is that not what?

Donna Peter: Not necessarily titles. You’re basing it on the job duties.

Marcia Lewis: OK. I sent out an Email to about 500 colleges and universities last week to defend my position here at the Career Services Center, the BPA organization that we belong to in the Career Services Center. I wanted to put together some information so that I could get more understanding of the Hay study and to put together my position as to what’s classified as a Job Developer, which is not what I do, but that is what my title is. I’m getting the sense ... when we originally sent out information that was requested of us for the Hay study, I got a very strong sense that the information that I wrote about my job duties was not read, and that here at Santa Monica College what I do and what somebody in my position does at another college is completely different. You’re saying that later on we’ll have an opportunity to reclassify. But that it not necessarily the culture of Santa Monica College. I’m listening to you, and you’ve mentioned ... I’m sorry but I didn’t get your name ... but you said that you don’t have a real sense of ... you’re not connected to Santa Monica College. That bothers me, because there is a culture here, and you’re on the outside and you’re saying that this is something ... like you’re setting a precedent that is not part of the culture that’s here. And then when you’re gone, and you tell us in January that we can talk about reclassification but you’ve already spent god-only-knows how much money on this Hay study, and things are going to be implemented, and it’s going to be a long time, and it’s not going to be January before that can be fixed.

Commissioner Bancroft: You know, we’re not going to be looking at reclassifications until starting in January. I learned a long time ago ... I’ve been in the HR PL program 30 years, OK? So I was out in the private sector and I’ve been in the public sector. And just because a job title is called something one place, and may be called the same thing somewhere else, but they’re totally different jobs ... so going by job titles is not a way to look at something. We always ask, when we do studies ourselves internally, to actually have a description of all the duties, responsibilities, MQs, everything to make sure we’re doing an “apples-to-apples” comparison. If you’re just looking at job titles vis-à-vis studying these other entities, you may be comparing apples and oranges.
Marcia Lewis: When I sent out my Email to these 500 people, I said “my job title is job development and here is my job description, this is what I do.” And so I get at least 200 Emails back saying, “OK, this is what I do.” And there were people – you cannot classify all these people that do what I do into one packet because it’s so ...

Commissioner Bancroft: But we aren’t looking at anybody outside of Santa Monica College. Your job was valued by Hay based on the duties and responsibilities, irrespective of your job title.

Marcia Lewis: You said that when you have a specific ... let’s say I started nine years ago and this is what my job description was. And because my department grew, my job description grew, correct?

Commissioner Bancroft: Duties can change over time, yes.

Marcia Lewis: Duties can change over time. And you’re saying ... and correct me if I’m wrong ... what I’m understanding you to say is that, even though my duties have changed, like maybe even doubled, that I should still be under that same ...

Commissioner Bancroft: No. That’s not what we’re saying at all. No. If there has been a significant change in duties and responsibilities, either of a higher level or a lower level ... in other words, you can actually have reclassifications where people go downward because their jobs have changed over time. And we’ve had some of those at the City. And it’s a very painful experience when you have to tell somebody, “You’re no longer a Staff Assistant III, you’re a Staff Assistant II based on your duties.” I’m just trying to tell you, though, that you may be hired under one job description with these duties and responsibilities. Your duties and responsibilities may change over time. That can result in your being reclassified to a different job classification. And it’s based on duties and responsibilities, not job title.

Donna Peter: One other thing. When people say, “My job has doubled” – that can be a quantity issue. Classification, again, does not deal with how much work you are doing. It’s what you’re doing. What may really need to happen is you may need to add another position in that classification. Because what happened is budget cuts, people weren’t doing it, whatever the reasons are ... but quantity is not an issue with classification either. That is a completely separate issue.

Commissioner Bancroft: It’s the level of the duties and responsibilities, it’s not the quantity of work being performed. That is a resource allocation, staffing issue, not a classification issue.

Marcia Lewis: So, who addresses that?

Commissioner Bancroft: The District would have to address that. It’s a workload issue is what it is.

Commissioner Metoyer: I have a question for you, Ms. Lewis, I’m sorry. Does the job description that we have now, that you’ve received from us, does that job description concerning your job look like your job – that you actually do today?

Marcia Lewis: It does now, after we did research and we met with Sue and Donna. But I’m not necessarily just speaking for myself – I was just listening back there – I’m not feeling secure about this whole process and the things that I’m hearing, for various reasons that I tried to explain but maybe I was not able to articulate properly.

Commissioner Bancroft: Well, it’s our goal as commissioners to keep a closer eye on what happens here and to ensure that the next Director actually administers the college’s merit system, rules and
regulations, appropriately. And anytime you implement a Hay classification system, you're supposed to look at it periodically and make sure everything is still in line, and that's what you do periodically. And that's why you set this system up in the first place – so we've got something that we can then refer back to. The positions here at the college haven't been looked at for over 25 years when we embarked on that. But I'm probably the first commissioner you've had that has an HR background, so at least I understand HR, and I understand what a merit system is because I've worked with a civil service system which is exactly the same thing. It all boils down to duties and responsibilities, and the level of those – not the quantity of the work performed, and job titles are really meaningless in a Hay study. They look at valuing those duties and responsibilities, and that's how they do it. It's a more objective way of looking at things than looking at the people and how well they're performing those jobs.

Marcia Lewis: You do understand that the people that are in these positions – and you're saying that you're being objective ... we are the ones that are doing the duties, and it doesn't feel so objective, especially when it seems we're all grouped together.

Commissioner Bancroft: It's really, I think, in your best interest to have things grouped together because it gives you more opportunities for transfer in the event of layoffs, less chance of being laid off – that type of thing. Hay always recommends grouping positions together in terms of responsibilities and duties where you can do that in terms of broad categories. You don't come up with a job description that is so specific that it ... because things never stay the same over time, they change. So you don't make it that specific. You have to have more general categories and look at the MQs for those levels or types of duties and responsibilities, and not make it, “I do exactly X,Y,Z or A,B,C.” You don't get that specific in a classification system where you kind of handcuff yourself. If you have everybody with a different job title ...

Marcia Lewis: Which is what we have now.

Commissioner Bancroft: That's why we're trying to get away from that. Because that's not the approach you should be using. So it may be a cultural shift, but I think it's a shift in the right direction and it will end up being more fair for everybody. And it protects employees to a greater extent. Maybe I'm an optimist, OK? I tend to be an optimist.

Commissioner Press: I just want to address that very briefly -- a point about the culture of the college – I was listening very carefully – and objectivity. I think that it is tremendously advantageous to have people who are neutral and who will look at the mess that it became due to some unfortunate experiences with our directors. I am very pleased to have someone come in with an outside look, who doesn't have built-in relationships with employees and may be getting input that isn't totally appropriate. Trust me. It's very much to your advantage to have ... that's exactly why we hired these two wonderful women that we've had to clean up the mess that had been before. We're sincerely trying to straighten things out and both of these people are experts on the Hay study and classification of many years experience. It's to the advantage of every class and every individual employee that someone with a clearly objective eye, who's not beholden to the administration or the union or whomever is included in this final determination. It's tremendously to our advantage, both for the Commission and for every single employee that's involved in this study, to have outside people, experts, to look at things objectively. That word was used here today several times. And that's what these people have added to this process and that's why it's been speeded up so effectively.

Commissioner Bancroft: Our role here, for those of you who might not be aware, is that the Commission is set up to be an independent body that does not answer to the District, we don't answer to the Board of Trustees, we are here to administer the merit rules and regulations for the college. We
really answer to the State Chancellor, we don’t answer to the college itself. When we get our new
director in, we want to make sure that that delineation is put in place and maintained and that we have
an office that is totally objective and not co-opted by the District or individual managers or CSEA or
whatever. It’s got to be a totally neutral body that works independently and fairly and consistently
administers the college’s merit rules and regulations. And that’s my goal to oversee that that happens
this time. We’ve been through two unfortunate situations here since I’ve been here, and the third time’s
going to be a charm as far as I’m concerned, and failure is not going to be an option. I’m going to make
sure that that happens, and that’s why I agreed to even stay on for a third term, OK? Because I didn’t
want to leave with everything in a mess, and I was the only one here who knew anything about HR.
That’s why I’m here, even though my husband tried to talk me out of it. When I tell him about all the
stuff we’re going through now, he says, “I told you. Don’t sign up again. Don’t volunteer again.” And I
say, “I’ve got to see this through to the end and make sure it’s done right this time. I’m not going to
walk away from this until I know it’s going to be the way it’s supposed to be.” And we’ve worked very
hard to establish our neutrality and the fact that we are independent, and that’s the way we’re going to
act and serve the college in the best interests of everybody, the employees and the District. And that’s
our goal.

Commissioner Metoyer: I wanted to add one thing to the discussion today. That is that, when we
back the reel up to four years ago, I thought it was a very shameful situation that the employees of this
college had waited 25 years to be properly evaluated, to be moved up, or in whatever direction, to bring
the standards up. And this has been a tough road to go through. And I know that many of you have
lots of issues, lots of questions, and I’ve talked to some of you individually about it – I know that exists.
But always go back to before we started the Hay study – 25 years, no study had been done. People
working in wrong classes ... no option to make it any better. And we come along with this Hay study,
and before it became the Hay study we looked at several different options to try to bring standards up,
and it had to be an outside independent source to do it. Hay is just one of several out there that do this
kind of work. We selected Hay. Regardless of which company, somebody had to do this, or we still
would be now, 29 years without a study ... next year 30. And then it’s going to be a process before
some of you realize the money that you so willingly and you’ve earned and you deserve to have, the
increases that you deserve to have – but it’s not a matter that we can push, it’s a matter that the District
has to deal with. That may still be one or two years away – it’s not tomorrow, it’s not January. They
have budgets and things that they have to do. It had to start someplace. Somebody had to drop
anchor and say, “You know what? We’ve got to do this.” And that’s what this commission did, and I’m
pleased to be a part of it because of the fact that I think that in the end, everybody – 100% of the
people here today and on this college campus as employees – will not be satisfied with this study, they
will not be satisfied with any study, because human nature is such that nobody gives us our full due ... nobody gives us all the kudos that we really deserve or the money that we really deserve for what we
do. But I think, by and large, we’re going to happy with it ... happier than we were four years ago, and
certainly 29 years ago. I believe we have to put it in perspective and know that somebody had to do
something about it. I guess that’s what I’m really saying. Somebody had to do something about it ... or
you’d still be asking, “Can we get some kind of reclassification study, can we get some kind of study,
can we get some kind of study – things are not equitable on the campus?” I just wanted to put my two
cents in. That’s my preaching sermon for the day. Amen. It’s over. Thank you.

Commissioner Bancroft: I also want to indicate that – I’ve had several conversations and meetings
with Dr. Tsang, and I think we are going to see a change here at the college, and I think it’s going to be
change for the positive, and I’m very optimistic. He’s working very cooperatively with us and that’s a
great improvement over what we were dealing with during my first two terms here. I am being very
optimistic and I tend to be a cynic at times after having been in the HR business for almost 30 years or
over 30 years now. But we are very optimistic that things are on the right track now and that you may see a cultural shift here at Santa Monica College that should have occurred a long time ago.

Chris Young: I work in Admissions. I just had a question about when you mentioned that the language was melded into the classifications ... it seems that some of us feel that we turned in these reports on our job duties and it seemed that we thought that a reclassification would result from that and it seemed that it did not but the language was instead melded into the classification that were already at, and I was wondering if – was there a lot of reclassification through the Hay study at this point? Or is that just going to happen based on requests from the employees starting in January?

Commissioner Bancroft: I think that we may have created a misunderstanding there. I think, when you've got a bunch of people in the same job class and the duties and responsibilities that they put on their PDQs were similar as far as level of responsibility and duties – that's what they were talking about, but there were distinct differentiations, those reclasses that we’re looking at, we’re not just combining you with somebody else who’s doing something different. So there are differentiations that are meaningful. They are being taken into account. They're not just being glommed in to a group and kept there. We’d be looking at a reclassification.

Chris Young: But, have any reclassifications been done up to this point, or ...?

Commissioner Bancroft: There are going to be reclassifications, yes, as a result of this study. Yes.

Chris Young: I guess the only point I was trying to make is that a lot of us submitted a lot of information and it seemed that we were not reclassed – just that language was melded into the classification specs that we got back from Hay.

Commissioner Bancroft: The differentiations had to be significant enough to warrant a new job classification. Hay looks at it from that perspective – and it's got to be significant, it can't be just ...

Chris Young: And if we feel that they are significant, then it's just a matter of filing for a reclass in January?

Commissioner Bancroft: That’s correct. And a lot of things could have happened since this study first started four years ago.

Kim Clark: Financial Aid Office. I had made an appeal, myself and Tri Le, and we never got anything back from our appeal that we made with regards to the Hay study, and I want to know what procedure should we take with regards to that?

Donna Peter: There were appeals that Hay reviewed and looked at and there were several different outcomes based on those – either there were changes in the job description in terms of changing of wording, additional duties that were missed or duties that were put in there that should not have been in there. There were people who were re-titled, although the job spec basically stayed the same as Hay had written it – the title was at issue and so they gave it a different title. There were people who were reviewed and then recommended for reclassification based on their request for review. There were people who were reclassified based on that into current positions or new positions created, and there were some people where there was nothing done because after Hay’s review they felt that there was nothing significant that needed to occur.


**Commissioner Bancroft:** The appeals were looked at, but maybe it wasn’t communicated back to the people who filed them. If people out there feel they did not get ... let Donna or Sue know, and then we’ll check with Hay to make sure they did look at them, and then get back with some feedback.

**Donna Peter:** One thing I do want to say, though, is that those weren’t ignored. For example, they may not have gotten it communicated back to them, but when we looked at these we reviewed what Hay recommended. So, if we sent out a particular job description, it’s because that’s what Hay had recommended in the review process.

**Commissioner Bancroft:** So what you’re saying is that Hay did look at these but nothing may have been communicated back to the people who ...

**Donna Peter:** Exactly. It does not necessarily mean that Hay did not look at them or make a decision. It may merely mean that it was not communicated to the individual. But we did look at that before we sent these out.

**Kim Clark:** With regards to that issue, we’re technicians and we’re like the backbone of the Financial Aid Office, pretty much, and then a position that had been created in the past has become a Specialist over our position. So I’m just kind of concerned about that. It doesn’t seem like it was ... it’s not fair ... it doesn’t appear to be fair.

**Donna Peter:** What position is the one that came over you?

**Kim Clark:** The Student Services Senior Specialist – Financial Aid.

**Donna Peter:** There is not actually a Student Services Senior Specialist – Financial Aid. And I’m sorry if that didn’t get removed off the list. There is only a Student Services Senior Specialist in Admissions & Records and International Students. So that should have been taken out.

**Commissioner Metoyer:** Donna, I have a question for you. When someone made an appeal, and you said that the appeal was looked at by Hay, and then we have that information ... that information would have been revised and the job description went to the employee, is that correct?

**Donna Peter:** That’s my understanding, and it’s very hard for me to decipher through the files what exactly was sent to the employee because it some cases it looks like a letter was sent with an attached new job description, but I’m not sure if it was very clear to the employee in the communication of the reasons why they were getting that job description – whether it was because we didn’t agree and you should stay the same, or there are wording changes, or whatever – I’m not sure how clearly that was communicated to the specific employee. Unfortunately, I think it probably wasn’t clearly communicated. We have looked at all those. We did not ignore that that had happened. We took into account what Hay recommended based on their reviews of all those appeals. *** This is sort of an evolving process. As much as we can, I am trying to be very ... Sue and I both ... very consistent but if it is general knowledge or acknowledged that a lot of people didn’t get that information, we can send that information out to them. Or if you did file an appeal and you don’t have an answer, Email one of us because we’re pretty good about getting back to people except for, occasionally one that falls through the crack – we respond to everybody who Emails us. Certainly if there’s a general belief that most people were not communicated with, then I can certainly send out “Here’s what Hay recommended,” and you will be receiving the job description that matches what the recommendation is.
Marcia Fierro: I work in the Scholarship Office. And I know most of you here. I did get the new job description and I have to chime in with Kim because I got my new job description, but it’s for financial aid. So, I’m not sure … and I don’t work for Financial Aid. Most of the duties that are listed on that spec have to do with Financial Aid Technician. I tried to bring that to the attention of the office with Sue Tsuda and what transpired was my supervisors had to send here two Emails about my job description not being correct. So, I’m not sure how that’s going to be handled, but I’m not a Financial Aid Technician and I don’t work in Financial Aid. I’m a Scholarship Program Coordinator. So I’m not sure how you all are going to correct that one. But my supervisors are anxious to take care of that right away.

Donna Peter: That’s not what the … the job spec has already been modified to say “Student Services Specialist – Scholarships.”

Marcia Fierro: But the job duties don’t reflect what I do, which is Program Coordinator. They actually state that I’m a financial aid person, and I’m not. I don’t work in Financial Aid.

Sue Tsuda: There is some confusion about … because you don’t work in the Financial Aid Office you don’t do financial aid. Scholarships are financial aid to students. In the Hay study, that is the family in which that particular job falls.

Commissioner Bancroft: So what really what you’re doing is looking at the duty or responsibility and not exactly where it’s housed.

Lynn Fuqua: I work in Disabled Student Service Center. And I’m a Disabled Student Services Specialist. It may seem like a minor concern, but in reading my spec, basically … we’re going to add to them and we realize we’re supposed to talk to Donna and what not about doing that, but I was concerned about the fact that it says that you can do our job with a high school education. The level of maturity, of dexterity, of the complex issues that we have to deal with, and it makes me wonder … it’s certainly above the maturity level that you’re going to find in a high school graduate. When we get the job, it said that we needed at least two years of college, and I think that too … and it worries me that you’ve decided, in looking at the complex things that we do from day to day and the complex level of our job that you think it can be done by someone fresh out of high school, and the idea that that is possible we all found amazing, my boss, my co-worker … and we’re wondering why in the world when generally speaking a high school …I don’t have anything against high school educations … but I’m wondering how you can look at our job description and come to these kinds of conclusions, and I’ve heard other people say the same thing … it’s like – what are you talking about, you can’t do this with just a high school – you know, something out of high school, and I’m wondering if Hayes is making these kinds of conclusions what other erroneous conclusions Hayes is coming to?

Donna Peter: Well, there’s two things – one is that Sue and I did not go back and look at everybody’s educational requirements. That was a determination that was made by Hay. However, you’re not talking about just a high school diploma. The person also has to have four years experience in a higher education setting performing progressively specialized and complex student services or journey-level secretarial duties in a demanding environment. But it’s the experience. In terms of the education, we didn’t look at that. That is what was recommended by Hay.

Commissioner Bancroft: So if the person has to have the four years and they just came right out of high school, I don’t think they’re going to have the four years.
Lynn Fuqua: It’s still ... we don’t agree with ... we’re going to ... now that we know how to place that ... we’re going to re-place the job description ... but I don’t know that ... because I’ve heard other people in the audience say the same thing ... that you did the same thing ... decided that someone right out of high school could do their job.

Commissioner Bancroft: But you know what? You have to look at the entire list of the minimum qualifications, and it sets a minimum standard, maybe, for education ...

Lynn Fuqua: What I’m saying is, when we got the job we had to have experience and ... not work ... we had to have experience and the college. And that was just two years ago when I got this job. You had to have two years of college plus the experience that you’re requiring. Now you’re saying that you can have high school and this experience, and I’m just not sure ... as I said, it’s not just me, my whole department was very surprised that you guys came to that conclusion, and we’re just not sure that that is a reasonable conclusion. My boss said exactly the same thing. And she wanted me to make a comment about that – it was one of the things that she made a comment specifically about. This is my supervisor, not me.

Commissioner Bancroft: Just based on my personal experience working with educational requirements, we had determined that all supervisors at the City need to have a bachelor’s degree. And we soon found that people with bachelor’s degrees and no minimum amount of experience supervising were not good supervisors. And so you can do experience in lieu of education, and we’ve actually eliminated the bachelor’s degree requirement because we found that the actual on-the-job experience was more valuable than just a degree.

Lynn Fuqua: All I’m saying is that when I got the position, there were both ... not one instead of the other ... and I’m just saying that neither I nor my co-worker nor my supervisors agree with that decision. So, you can do what you want, but we do want to be on record with the fact that we don’t think that was a very good decision. We think that at least some college needs to have happened to do a reasonable job in that position, and we all agree with it, because we’re the ones doing the job.

Commissioner Bancroft: But you’re basing that on your own background.

Lynn Fuqua: As I said, if it was me, I would agree with you, but it isn’t just me. My supervisor has been here for 20 years – so, it’s her opinion as well. She’s been running Disabled Student Services since it was Disabled Student Services. So it’s not just coming from my idea. So it’s something I think you should look at because this is not just my opinion.

Donna Peter: I can’t address why Hay made that determination. I can certainly follow up with them and try to find out how they based that decision.

Commissioner Bancroft: Let’s do that. But I also think we need to make it very clear that the Hay Group is an internationally-recognized classification consulting firm, and they look at a lot of colleges and school districts and private sector, public sector, and so they have a much broader perspective than people who have just worked here at Santa Monica College or at the City of Santa Monica or where ever. And I have actually hired people in my own department that had degrees versus people who didn’t have degrees, and the people without the degrees actually were my better workers and performers based on their experience and not the education.

Donna Peter: I’ll be happy to follow up with Hay and try to find out from them how they set the education standards.
**Commissioner Bancroft:** OK, I’ve got a Master’s Degree. Is that really required for my job? I don’t know. And I’m not going to put that requirement on the people in my office or I probably wouldn’t be hiring very many people in my office. I’m looking at somebody who can actually do the job, has the experience and can hit the ground running and do what they’re supposed to be doing, and not just have education be the determining criteria.

**Commissioner Metoyer:** Why don’t we just go back to Hay and ask the question? Let’s find out.

**Donna Peter:** I can find out what they... that have reasons why they set what they set... that is their area of expertise. I don’t know exactly what they evaluated in these positions because I wasn’t here. But I will find out from them what criteria they used to make that determination. Also, it would not technically necessitate a reclass, I would strongly suggest that if people have concerns about minimum qualifications that they put that in writing and that they also submit those for... because at some point you’re still going to have to go back and tweak job specs.

**Commissioner Bancroft:** And we also have to point... just keep reinforcing... that regardless of the MQs, it’s the job duties and responsibilities are valued under the Hay system, it’s not the MQs. It’s what the person’s actually doing in the job that’s important when you set salaries and points for Hay study...

**Donna Peter:** But I will find out what criteria they used.

**Tri Le:** In the Financial Aid Office. I just had a little thing to add to what Kim said.. that we have no Student Services Senior Specialist – we only have Specialist. Based on what we received here, the Senior Specialist’s duties listing is all of what we do. In addition to that, we also have to be a manager of the day, you know, from time to time, and once a week one of us has to be the supervisor for the late shift and we take turns to stay late and the office is open late. My question is how come another department has a Senior Specialist but not Financial Aid office?

**Sue Tsuda:** I think his question is that Admissions & Records has a Senior Student Services Specialist. Financial Aid does not have a Senior Student Services Specialist. They have a supervisor.

**Commissioner Bancroft:** Your saying that you fill in periodically for the supervisor? And that’s your concern. How that’s been handled in other organizations, and I don’t know about here, but that would be a CSEA – District issue, is some kind of assignment bonus or something for that duty when it’s performed and not a reclassification, because it wouldn’t be...

**Donna Peter:** You would have to be doing a certain amount of the duties of the supervisor for it to be... if you perform them one day a week typically, that doesn’t meet that criteria. But that’s a negotiated item.

**Commissioner Bancroft:** It would be a work assignment bonus I would think, not a reclassification issue. Based on how infrequently. If it were occurring every day, then we would looking at a reclass. If you’re doing it periodically, I would be going to your CSEA reps and saying “I want a work assignment bonus.”

**Paul Harris:** I’m the Technician for the Photo Department. I also wrote a reply to the first time I saw the new job descriptions and have received actually nothing, so that’s my first issue. One of the things that I wrote about was that one of the duties which I think is a tremendous responsibility and important
to our department, we hire a whole bunch of student workers. It says very clearly in my description that I have no supervisory power whatsoever over anything. So does not supervisory powers means I don’t keep their time sheets, I don’t enroll these people, I don’t hire these people, all that stuff? And I should just kind of walk away from all that? I wrote a rebuttal the first time I saw this, and I said, “This is a big part of my job.”

Donna Peter: The problem would be that I don’t have that rebuttal. I don’t know what exactly your issues were with it; however, in terms of supervising, supervising means you have the ability to have the final word on hiring – it doesn’t mean you have input into it, it means you have the authority to hire, fire, evaluate permanent employees – classified employees. That’s what the definition of supervision is.

Commissioner Bancroft: That’s actually a federal definition, not just ...

Paul Harris: The student workers are a whole separate category?

Commissioner Bancroft: If they’re not permanent positions, that’s correct. And we’re talking about a federal law here, and it’s not a Merit System Rule.

Paul Harris: Another issue in that same category is, a number of times my “supervisor” has come to me and put me nose-to-nose, toe-to-toe with him, basically, because I share this position with a part-time employee – and he’s been in my face a number of times – I can’t even tell you how many times he’s told me that I have to tell this person to do this and do that, and I’m going, like, “It’s not my job.” And literally I have been toe-to-toe with this person, saying, “Yeah, he’s a part-time employee but I have nothing to do with that.” I mean, sure, we try to work together as well as we can as a team but as far as me bossing him around, that’s a whole totally different story, and it’s expected of me. Again, that also falls under the supervisory category, which is one of the things that I find irritating about the job description, and I guess that’s part of the game is the fact that it’s written kind of vague so you can leave this gray area so people can push you around and all that stuff.

Commissioner Bancroft: OK, the definition of a supervisor, under the Fair Labor Standards Act, which is the federal law, is that the person has to have supervisory responsibility, which is hire/fire authority, performance evaluations over at least two permanent full-time employees. And that is the federal definition.

Paul Harris: Well, you should explain that to my supervisor. ***

Donna Peter: Most of that issue I would probably take to my union representative.

Commissioner Bancroft: If I were you, I would talk to your union representative and have them represent you in that issue. Federal law very clearly defines that, so I would take that up with CSEA.

Maria Bonin: I work in the Transfer Counseling Center. I recently met with both Sue and Donna and they were able to accommodate certain requests and concerns that I had to the job duties that I had received – the latest ones from Kathy Becker – and she had placed me in the Admissions & Records Office, which I have no function of. One of my concerns is the fact that I had requested multiple times to have an adequate desk audit done of the job responsibilities that I have taken on in the last 5-6 years. That never happened. In just reviewing the actual black and white documentation that was submitted, I’m being kept at the same level basically, so all of the computer work that I have taken on, the responsibilities, are not being recognized, I’m not being compensated for that, but they’re going to
be added into my job responsibilities. As working at Santa Monica College, I work with a lot of universities, a lot of 2-year schools contact us, and we are sort of a model for a lot of schools out there – they come to us and ask us what our secrets are as far as ... what makes Santa Monica so unique, so special? And one of the things is the position that I currently hold. Because it is very unique and not a lot of community colleges have the type of position that I have which supports the articulation officer and a transfer center coordinator. It really bothers me that this Hay study has gone on for so long and now it’s been crammed down our throats, basically, and we’ve already appealed one time, and that was never even reviewed. And now we have to appeal again in January, and who knows how long that’s going to take because who knows if Sue and Donna are even going to be here in January, and who knows when you’re get a new individual to step in and review all of the appeals? And I don’t think you have a clear understanding of how many people are actually going to submit requests for reclassification. I think the majority of us in this room right now are going to be submitting one. And that's just one group.

**Commissioner Bancroft:** OK, I just want to caution everybody, that when you submit your request for a reclassification, you have to be able to validate that you have had significant changes in your duties and responsibilities, and it’s got to be significant, substantive changes, not minor ... the ones that would lead to a reclassification, and not just because it’s been tweaked here and there in your job duties but the level of responsibility has not really gone up. You need to understand that it’s got to be significant and substantive.

**Maria Bonin:** Right, I understand that, but people are still going to submit the requests for reclassification.

**Commissioner Bancroft:** And they will be reviewed, and if there’s not significant or substantive change, nothing may happen with those requests. I’m just trying to tell you that right now ... that that’s the way it works. It’s not just because a duty changed. That may not raise it to a level where a reclass is warranted. I don’t want people to get their hopes up that if they submit a request it's going to result in a reclass.

**Maria Bonin:** I understand that. You still have to review the people’s request for a reclassification.

**Commissioner Bancroft:** They will be reviewed.

**Maria Bonin:** But I’m just stating the fact that there are some individuals that were fortunate enough to have a desk audit and they were able to get reclassified prior to the roll-out, and a lot of us did not get that opportunity, and therefore we are going to have the additional duties added to our new job specs but we’re not going to be compensated for those additional job duties.

**Donna Peter:** Well, I’m assuming what they’re talking about is under the Hay study there were positions that were selected. There was a process that was set up under the Hay study to do desk audits on certain positions, I assume ... I wasn’t here then.

**Commissioner Bancroft:** I know that there was a committee that actually had CSEA representatives on it and commissioner representatives and Hay Group representatives and they oversaw the study.

**Donna Peter:** Exactly, so I assume there was a procedure that was agreed to that was followed. We haven’t done desk audits, but we haven’t done desk audits on anybody, because if we were to go out and do desk audits, we would still not be here. However, again, Hay reviewed Maria’s appeal, and what they found was that they revised the class specification, we, I think, fine tuned it even more, but
they did not make a recommendation to change the classification nor did they recommend to change the overall points that they assigned to the position. Whether that’s right or wrong in terms of ... I’m assuming that Hay, based on their expertise, made that determination. I also understand what Marie is saying ... that she’s not happy with that determination. And, in those particular cases, it was not that the appeal was not considered. The appeal was considered. It was denied, basically. Or the choice that was made was to rewrite the job spec to reflect, perhaps, more computers – you know, whatever the technology was that had changed. But Hay did not determine to change the value of the job that was performed. In these cases, if, I assume, people are still unhappy with what Hay told you ... what the Hay determination of the appeal was ... is that they’ll put in for another reclass and it will be reviewed, and if there are, indeed, significant changes or the job class does not adequately represent what that person does, then a reclassification would occur. In terms of the value, that is the “meet and confer” process in terms of salary structure and we can’t determine that. That’s not our area. I understand there are people who appealed and they’re not happy with the outcome of that appeal.

Commissioner Bancroft: And if they think the position should be paid more than it is, that’s an issue that CSEA needs to bring up with the District. That’s not within our purview.

Maria Bonin: I don’t know what level I’m at, but ... my main point is the fact that there were some individuals that had the fortunate ... they were fortunate enough to have somebody come and do a desk audit and actually interview either groups if it’s a multiple position or an individual. There are a lot of us that did not have that and the unfortunate part of it is that we are left the same.

Commissioner Bancroft: Well, they look at benchmark positions. If they can find positions here at the college for which they can find true matches – apples to apples comparisons – those are the ones that will look at. Because if you come up with ... they evaluate all the positions based on the same criteria, and they come up with points assigned. For a lot of positions you’re not going to find exact matches out there in the labor market. They will look at the positions that they call “benchmark positions” where you’re going to be able to find exact matches, and they go out and do their salary survey based on those exact matches, and then they come up with recommendations for salaries. But we can’t get into the recommendations on the salary. We can let it be known what they’ve recommended, but we can’t get involved in that process. That’s between CSEA and the District.

Donna Peter: I would assume in the process that the intent was that Hay would not do 550 desk audits.

Commissioner Bancroft: No. No. It had to be a sampling and it was based on the committee that oversaw this process, and as I said, there was a committee with CSEA rep, people from the Commission, and people from Hay were on that committee that oversaw that. And it has to be a sampling – you can’t be going out and looking at every, single person’s job. You never would do that. That’d be 500 people I think. You take a sampling. And that’s the process. And that is typical.

Commissioner Press: Were people notified when the appeal that they filed was rejected?

Donna Peter: They were sent memos ... a lot of people were sent memos or letters. However, how clear those were to the individuals I’m not sure, because it was sort of like, “Here’s your new attached job spec ... you could be receiving it because we changed the title or we changed some of the wording or we changed your classification ....” It wasn’t specific, I don’t think, to that individual. So I’m not sure how clear the communication was, and I’m not sure ... well, I’m pretty sure from what people are saying is that there was perhaps an intent of follow-up by the two previous directors that didn’t happen. I will go back through the list of everybody I had that had an appeal and make sure that they understand
what Hay recommended. They may not agree with it, but I can at least tell them what Hay recommended. And, also again, we took those into consideration – we looked at that when we Emailed people what was currently happening to them ... sending them their new job classifications. We didn’t pretend that these appeals never occurred.

**Shauna Carter:** I’m an employee in the Financial Aid Office. I’d just like to preface my statement by stipulating that I was not here at the initiation of the Hay study. But I do have some general concerns. It’s primarily between the Student Services Clerk position and the Student Services Assistant position ... I can’t attest to what occurs in the Admissions & Records Office, but I know that my current position as it stands, as Financial Aid Customer Service Clerk, and the position that it directly above is the Financial Aid Clerk, which warranted a difference in pay rate of like 2 scales commensurate upon duties and responsibilities. And after the Hay study, these latter positions, which would be the Student Services Assistant, has moved up seven pay scales. Out of the five people in our office, anyone in here, one being an Assistant Director, can attest that the next position is not commensurate with the amount of work that’s done. The pay is largely or grossly inflated. And I would like to know with whom I would address that to? I believe that you made preface that I would have to address that to CSEA.

**Commissioner Bancroft:** Are you talking about amount of work or the level? Quantity is not an issue.

**Shauna Carter:** We’re talking about duties and responsibilities. The previous job spec had it deemed as two pay scales above. Now there’s a grave disparity between ... there’s seven pay scales, and that is not commensurate with the amount of work that is done in that kind of position. And I just would like to know with whom I would express my ...

**Commissioner Bancroft:** There could have been all kinds of things going on in setting pay scale. That’s a meet and confer issue and that happens at the table. They could have set those up and not properly reflected the level of the job. We’re here to describe jobs.

**Donna Peter:** The Financial Aid Clerk was reclassified to Student Services Assistant, and that’s the scale that was set for Student Services Assistant. So that’s why that changed. In terms of the way the salary works, I would say that you need to address your concerns to your union.

***

---

**DISPOSITION BY THE COMMISSION:** Motion to approve agenda item as presented

Motion made by: 
Seconded by: 
Ayes: 
Nays: 
Abstain: 
Amendments/Comments:

---

**The Community Outreach Family will report out on November 30.**

---
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Minutes of Regular and Special Meeting of November 16, 2006
VII. NOTE: THE NEXT SPECIAL MEETING OF THE PERSONNEL COMMISSION IS SCHEDULED FOR 11:30 A.M. ON THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 2006 IN THE DRESCHER HALL LOFT – ROOM 300-E.

VIII. ADJOURN MEETING NO LATER THAN 1:30 PM

DISPOSITION BY THE COMMISSION: Motion to adjourn the Meeting

Motion made by:               Seconded by:
Ayes:                         Nays:         Abstain:
Amendments/Comments:
Adjourned: ______ p.m.

Submitted By:                 Date:
Sue Tsuda, Acting Director of Classified Personnel & Secretary to the Personnel Commission

The Santa Monica College Personnel Commission does not discriminate against individuals or groups on the basis of disability in the admission or access to, or treatment in, its public meetings, programs, or activities. Requests for assistance or accommodation can be arranged by contacting the Personnel Commission Office in writing to the address below or via phone to (310) 434-4410 or fax to (310) 434-4612 with a minimum 72-hour advance notice.

SANTA MONICA COLLEGE
Personnel Commission
Attn: Sue Tsuda, Acting Director of Classified Personnel
1900 Pico Blvd.
Santa Monica, CA 90405