



**Classified Senate Meeting Agenda
December 11, 2014
1:00 PM – 2:15 PM | Room 1687**

LPC Mission Statement:

Las Positas College is an inclusive, learning-centered institution providing educational opportunities that meet the academic, intellectual, career-technical, creative, and personal development goals of its diverse students. Students develop the knowledge, skills, values, and abilities to become engaged and contributing members of the community.

LPC Concentrated Goals:

- ❖ Equity
- ❖ Completion
- ❖ Excellence

LPC Planning Priorities

- ❖ Support for the curriculum process
- ❖ Technology utilization with an emphasis on staff development
- ❖ Success and persistence through the Basic Skills sequence
- ❖ Accreditation

Officers			
Co-President	Frances DeNisco	X1467	Program Coordinator, Community Education
Co-President	Todd Steffan	X1571	Veterans First Coordinator
VP Communications	Heidi Ulrech	X1640	Telecommunications Coordinator
VP Fundraising	Sharon Gach	X1001	Retired
VP Activities	Janice Cantua	X1541	Admission and Records Assistant
Treasurer	Alesia High	X1633	Fiscal and Administrative Services Technician
Ambassador	Ernesto Nery	X1581	Student Services Specialist II
Ambassador	Julie Thornburg	X1406	Executive Assistant to the VP of Student Services
Secretary	Vacant		

AGENDA

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Review and Approval of Agenda**
- 3. Continuing Business**
 - a. T-Shirt Report – Eddy**
 - b. Treasurer Report – High**
 - c. Any important Committee information?—Committee Representatives**
 - d. Continued Discussion of the Classified Prioritization structure—Heidi Ulrech**
 - e. Writing the Grant for the trip to Leadership Institute 2015—Julie Thornburg**

4. New Business

- a. Finding a replacement for the District Facilities Committee, Facilities and Sustainability**
- b. CCCCO Visit that Todd and I attended, informational**
- c. Minutes to approve if possible—Sharon Gach**
- d. Report on 4CS –Sharon Gach**

5. Good of the Order:

6. Adjourn

Next Regular Meeting: January 8, 1:00 pm Room 1687

Equity Perspective

Ensure that this meeting is fair to all, encourages participation from everyone, considers all constituencies, and acts with relevant information in hand.

Las Positas College

MEMORANDUM

TO: Classified Senate

FROM: Bill Eddy, Cindy Balero, Gerry Gire, Jennifer Farber, Heidi Ulrech

DATE: Dec. 10, 2014

SUBJECT: Classified Work Group on Position Prioritization Process – update/ comments

A group of interested and knowledgeable classified met to identify, discuss, document and brainstorm solutions regarding concerns with the Non-instructional Hiring Prioritization Process as it relates to classified.

Comments:

- Agree with all your points and am impressed with the History and Solutions sections.
- Very impressed with the thoughtful presentation here. These are possibly unintended but very important consequences of changes made by faculty. I am glad this is being addressed, and appreciate your hard work.

(1) Issue: *Is the RAC Non-Instructional prioritization process fair given that faculty have their own process. The classified positions are treated just as instructional equipment is?*

History: At one time both faculty and classified positions were proposed and ranked by the college's former Planning and Budget Committee, now RAC. Academic Senate requested that faculty prioritization move under the sole purview of the Academic Senate due to 10+1 authority.

Currently: The current process for Non-instructional positions was reviewed. It combines requests for classified and administration in one request process using a series of 7 questions aimed at identifying the need for the position- why it is necessary; how it is addressed in Program Review/Strategic Plan/Accreditation; where the individual will work, whom they report to, what equipment/facilities may be needed; what are the consequences of not funding the position; what alternatives have been considered; how it will positively impact the campus community; what other personnel provide support. These are different questions than those asked of equipment requests. A sub-committee of RAC has been assigned the task of developing a rubric for the position requests.

During the review process of the Non-instructional Position request, the question was asked "If the department Dean/ Administrator declined to sign the request would that stop it from moving forward." "No. The request should still move forward and be reviewed and ranked." Thus the Dean, Administrator, VP signature lines do not signify approval but receipt and review.

Solution(s): Any changes made to the Non- Instructional Position process and/ or form (as it relates to classified positions) may be reviewed by the Classified Senate with comments forwarded prior to approval and enactment by RAC.

Comments:

- I am very familiar with how the faculty hiring prioritization committee (FHPC) process works. Once positions are ranked in a FHPC and sent forward to faculty senate, the senate often responds by sending the recommendations back with questions. Once those questions are addressed by the FHPC, they are sent back to the Senate before moving on to the president. So I was wondering in regard to another solution for item one (1) is the Classified Senate allowed to send the rankings back to the RAC with questions regarding the process and/or rankings? Classified Senate might not have time to rank them but they could certainly question something that seems a little off, right?
- The wording should be a little stronger than "may" be reviewed, "shall" be reviewed.

(2) Issue: *Should categorically funded classified positions go through the Non-instructional Position Prioritization?*

History: It was discussed and decided at the October 2014 Resource Allocation Committee (RAC) meeting that "No, categorical positions do not need to go through the Non-instructional Prioritization Process. But, the positions should be requested and presented to RAC as informational."

(3) Issue: *What insures consistency when reviewing Non-instructional Position requests. Individual rankings may be subjective and easy to call into question.*

Solution(s): A sub-committee of RAC including classified has been assigned the task of developing a rubric for the position requests which correlates to the request questions and planning priorities for the current period.

(4) Issue: Faculty positions are approved and hired first and classified positions seem to get what's left.

History: Faculty position rankings are completed early in the fall so that selected positions can be announced and hired in the spring for the next academic year.

Solution: At the September 2014 RAC meeting it was discussed and decided that the Non-instructional process should begin earlier so that it is completed in time for next year's budget development (in January) and thus faculty and non-instructional position needs are considered at the same time.

Comments:

- Educate, communicate and change the perception that faculty is hired first and classified gets the limited spoils. I'm glad the time line has been changed.

(5) Issue: How do we get *more classified involvement in the process*.

Solution(s):

- Encourage more classified to be involved in submitting requests. RAC website changed to indicate this.
- Encourage classified, who are familiar with the request being submitted, to attend the meeting where RAC hears the proposals and be able to answer questions about the request and the need. (it is believed that often times the dean/ administrator isn't as familiar with what is needed as those who work in the impacted area) RAC meeting notice asked Classified to attend the position presentation meeting.
- Concern was voiced regarding having the Classified Senate also rank the positions in that it may create too much duplication and confusion for the President.
- Concern was also noted that it may be too awkward for a classified to present their position at the meeting and that it should remain with the dean/ administrator.
- If timing allowed, perhaps Classified Senate could comment on or rank positions and forward outcomes to RAC or the Classified Senate RAC members.

Comments:

- by saying 'it may too awkward for a classified to present their position at the meeting...' - does this mean that some classified professionals may fee they don't have the authority or 'power' to present effectively, and 'fear of getting shot down'? probably, huh.
- last bullet: I think if Cl. Sen comments on or ranks positions the comments/ranks should go to the Classified Senate RAC members, not to RAC directly. This is because there is nothing in our contract or the Shared Gov. Handbook that gives authority to Cl. Sen. to comment to RAC - i.e., RAC could just ignore it and that could cause worse relationships, or ruin collegiality. (there is a small chance though, that IF Cl. Senate commented to RAC, it could later be codified in the Shared Gov. Handbook... keep track of those things that may give our Senate more clout!)

(6) Issue: *Some requests are submitted with job descriptions that don't match the duties that are being identified, or without any job description at all. What should the process be?*

Solution(s): (A) submit the non-instructional request first without a salary stated and if approved then develop the job description or (B) have the job description written and approved with a salary range then submit the request. This needs to be clarified with HR and included on the request form.

Comments:

- Regarding some job requests including inaccurate job descriptions or none at all, perhaps just an overview statement of what is expected would suffice for RAC purposes. If there is a plan to use an existing description it could just be stated on the overview i.e. this will be an admin assistant, etc. If there are new or changed job descriptions, the union and HR must be involved per contract.
- Job descriptions **are** submitted with the requests. Unfortunately, job descriptions are extremely outdated. We spent a lot of time and money during the compensation study which would have brought us up to date but the process was dropped. Since we are a two college District, any change in job descriptions will affect both campuses so that needs to be considered when creating a new one. I suggest we push to have our current job descriptions updated. Submitting a special job description for one person is not the answer.

(7) Issue: *Often positions are submitted year after year and yet not selected for funding.*

History: It's very frustrating and disappointing to see the same position requested year after year.

Solution(s): No suggestions. Limited funding is one of the drivers. Perhaps the request form could indicate how many times the position has been requested.

Comments:

- I think it is highly important to include how many times a position has been requested. I believe the committee might review differently if it's gone through 8 times.

(8) Issue: *Some requests are submitted after the due date.*

Solution(s): This sets a poor example and precedent, either: (A) reject late requests or (B) deduct points. What determines late – not submitted to the Dean/ Administrator by due date or not submitted to Business Office by due date. What if Administrator is out of the office and unable to submit on

time. Request form could be amended to include the requestor's submission date.

Comments:

- Due dates: LPC is notorious for everything done at the last minute. In my opinion if the due date passes for WHATEVER reason, it is late. I like the idea of deducting points for lateness. It's called consequences for not planning ahead of time.

(9) Issue: *What happens when a position is vacated (resigned or retired)? How is it decided that a vacant position becomes unfunded?*

Solution(s): When a position is vacated have the college president or designee inform RAC of the decision to (A) re-announce if money has already been budgeted, (B) place on hold, (C) defund, (D) re-write job description (E) re-organize department, or (F) remove; and why.

Comments:

- I love this solution, because then there is tracking for all positions as to the Why and where the funds came from
- I'd like to see vacated positions place held for at least a year, with perhaps review status each year until filled. It seems to me that once positions fall off the budget worksheet and organizational chart, it's extremely difficult to get them added back in and be able to hire.

(10) Issue: *In the past, some positions are filled by temporary employees repeatedly & for a long period. (issue is not directly related to the Non-instructional process but is of significant concern to classified)*

Solution(s): The Union needs to work with HR to watch the time limits and prevent this abuse of hiring permanent positions.

Comments:

- **It is more difficult to hire temporary positions now due to HR rules. They have also implemented a 25 hr/wk MAX for p/t temporary employees. From the Student Services perspective, we have temp positions that require specialized skills through DSPS and the Student Health and Wellness Center.**

Next Steps: