Call to Order
Mr. Manfredi called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m.

Members Present
Members of the Personnel Commission present were:
  Ron Manfredi, Chairperson
  Patt Taylor, Vice-Chairperson
  Lindsay “Cal” Johnson

Members of Commission staff present were:
  Nancy Kast, Director of Classified Personnel
  Elba Garcia, Administrative Secretary
  Marissa Gonzales, Human Resources Analyst
  Robin Fox, Personnel Technician

Public Comment
Mr. Manfredi mentioned that the commission had received one communication dated August 27, 2007 from Mr. Rowe. Ms. Kast asked the Commission what direction they wanted to take regarding the communication item and advised they would have to be careful not to violate the Brown Act when discussing it. Mr. Manfredi asked if Mr. Rowe had any comments regarding the communication item. Mr. Rowe responded that he was not aware the item was on the agenda. Mr. Manfredi apologized and explained that there was a communication error and the item was supposed to have been there.

Ms. Taylor asked if the Commission was allowed to discuss the communication item. Ms. Kast responded that she thought they couldn’t and asked for clarification from Mr. Maddox. Mr. Maddox advised that the communication can be discussed, but no action can be taken on it. Mr. Manfredi asked Mr. Rowe if he wanted to address the issue. Mr. Rowe responded that he would like Ms. Clerou to respond, but that it was very unnerving to be asked to respond to an item that the district was not prepared for. Ms. Taylor then suggested that the communication item be received and discussed at a later meeting. Mr. Manfredi agreed with Ms. Taylor and acknowledged the memo received by Mr. Rowe and addressed to Ms. Kast regarding reclassification of position 2075 to Accounting Technician II. Mr. Manfredi requested the item be put on the October 16, 2007 agenda.

Introduction of Guests
The following guests signed in:
  Lisa Maciel, RC, CSEA
  Karen Durham, RC
Approval of the Minutes
Ms. Taylor moved to approve the minutes of the August 20, 2007, Regular Meeting. Mr. Manfredi seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

Action Items
Action Items (Tabled from August 20, 2007 Regular Meeting)

Consideration and Approval of Revised Classification Specifications [07-28 thru 07-53]
Ms. Kast began by asking the Commission if they would like to discuss each item separately or if they wanted to group them. Ms. Taylor suggested they do two separate groups and take questions from the audience instead of doing them one at a time. Mr. Manfredi explained that the Commission would start with the Accounting series which included items 07-28 through 07-40 and then they would discuss the Instructional Technician series which included items 07-41 through 07-53.

Ms. Gonzales mentioned that changes needed to be made on the two Accounting Technician I specifications as well as the Accounting Technician II specifications. Ms. Gonzales stated that on the Accounting Technician I specification under the examples
of duties section, in the third line after the word “audits,” the semi colon needed to be changed to a comma. Ms. Gonzales continued that in Accounting Technician II some of the wording was left out: in the experience section of Employment Standards the first line should read “Experience in a lead capacity, performing a wide variety of highly responsible,” and to continue from there.

Ms. Kast then began by summarizing how the accounting revisions came into place. Ms. Kast explained that all the revisions were sent to the incumbents and their supervisors and that any suggestions made were incorporated into the specifications. Ms. Kast mentioned that they had met with representatives from Ms. Clerou’s office to make sure the standard language was agreed upon. Mr. Manfredi asked if Ms. Taylor had any questions or suggestions regarding the revisions. Ms. Taylor responded that she did not.

Ms. Manfredi asked if the ranges were to remain the same on the Accounting specifications. Ms. Kast responded that, yes, they were to remain the same and that no surveys or recommendations were made. Mr. Manfredi moved to approve the revised classification specifications listed as items 07-28 through 07-40 as amended. Ms. Taylor seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

Mr. Manfredi then began the discussion for the Instructional Technician series listed as items 07-41 through 07-53. Ms. Kast suggested that item 07-54 be discussed as well since it was part of the Instructional Technician series. Ms. Kast then proceeded to give the Personnel Commissioners an updated copy of the Instructional Technician – Greenhouse. Ms. Kast began by briefly describing the history of why the Instructional Technicians needed to be updated. Ms. Kast discussed the process that was used to update and revise the classification specifications and explained that they met with each of the incumbents individually. Ms. Kast also mentioned that they met with the Vice Presidents of Instruction and the Deans of Instruction at each campus to discuss the revisions and salary structure.

Ms. Kast explained that after the revisions were completed they were sent out to everyone again for further input. Ms. Kast continued by explaining that during that time, they started working on the salary surveys and structures. Ms. Kast mentioned that they also met with Ms. Clerou and her staff to discuss the standardized wording. Ms. Kast explained there was a mistake at the last Commission meeting regarding the agencies that they had surveyed and clarified that it was brought to her attention they had not
surveyed the private sector. Ms. Kast described that they went back and surveyed the private sector agencies in a matter of two weeks.

Ms. Kast advised that she had received a letter from Ms. Clerou dated August 23, 2007 regarding the salary recommendations. Ms. Kast responded to that letter on September 7, 2007 and advised the Commissioners that copies were sent to them as well. Ms. Kast then described how the Instructional Technicians were currently grouped and that they were all at the salary range of 50. Ms. Kast explained that her recommendation was to split the specifications into three groups; Sciences, Vocational and Other.

Mr. Manfredi asked if Ms. Taylor had any questions or comments regarding the revisions. Ms. Taylor responded that she did not. Mr. Manfredi asked if the district had any questions or concerns regarding the revisions. Ms. Clerou responded that she did have concerns and that they were listed on her memo submitted to the Commission on August 23, 2007. Ms. Clerou stated that at the time the salary survey was done no local employers were surveyed nor were the Central 14 college districts. Ms. Clerou requested that the salary survey contain information from the Central 14 districts as well as from private employers that are comparable and that the surveys be completed this way in the future. Ms. Clerou stated that she was aware that there were some colleges that were not comparable to our district and explained that it would be ok to compare with other districts not in the Central Valley.

Ms. Taylor commented that she has seen inconsistencies over periods of time with the agencies surveyed. Mr. Manfredi was concerned that the salary surveys may not have been specific enough regarding the jobs that were compared. Mr. Manfredi’s concerns were followed by a brief discussion regarding salary surveys. Mr. Manfredi stated that he was not comfortable approving the classification range changes as presented and then requested comments from the audience.

Ms. Taylor commented that she agreed with the salary recommendations and the survey that was done and asked Ms. Clerou if she saw all of the Instructional Technicians remaining under one range. Ms. Clerou responded “not necessarily.” Ms. Taylor then asked how the negotiations were done for the Instructional Technician – Child Development Lab and how they had agreed to a range 53. Ms. Clerou responded that she could not remember the specifics, but one of the items they looked at was that the job specification required a Bachelor’s degree.
Ms. Maciel commented that CSEA appreciated the work the Personnel Commission staff did to revise the Instructional Technician job specifications. Ms. Maciel mentioned that CSEA did not see an issue with the salary recommendations that were given. Ms. Maciel advised that historically salary recommendations have not been given prior to negotiations. Ms. Maciel stated that the salary recommendations were a great place to start for negotiations and that they helped address the concerns they had in the first place which was internal equity in the hierarchy of the educational experience that was required.

Mr. Manfredi then asked for comments from the audience. Mr. Mesten commented on the Instructional Technician – Biological Science and informed the Personnel Commission that the position has grown and has much more responsibilities. Mr. Mesten explained that the person is in charge of safety within the lab and training students. Mr. Mesten discussed the salary survey and other examples of duties that have changed within the job specification. Mr. Manfredi then asked Mr. Mesten if he would weigh this position the same as a Biology teacher in high school. Mr. Mesten responded in the affirmative because of the Instructional Technician’s technical ability and knowledge in preparing labs.

Ms. Elizondo commented that the revisions to the job specifications will assist in the district retaining the employees. Ms. Elizondo explained that the training curve was fairly long and that employees were leaving for better paying jobs after the training was completed. Ms. Elizondo discussed some examples of what the training entails. There was a lengthy discussion regarding the education requirements, job duties and the salary recommendations for Instructional Technicians in Biology, Chemistry and General Sciences.

Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Manfredi why he did not go along with the methodology of the salary surveys. Mr. Manfredi responded that the Personnel Commission did not give the staff direction as to how the salary survey should have been done. Mr. Manfredi explained that he did not agree with the agencies that were surveyed and had concerns that local agencies were not looked at. Ms. Taylor moved to approve the revised classification specifications listed as items 07-41 through 07-53 with the recommended salary ranges. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion. Mr. Manfredi opposed. The recommendations were approved 2-1.

**Action Items**

Consideration and

Ms. Taylor moved to approve the revised classification
Approval of Revised Classification Specification for Instructional Technician – Greenhouse [07-54]

specification of Instructional Technician – Greenhouse with the recommended salary range. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion. Mr. Manfredi opposed. The recommendations were approved 2-1.

Consideration and Approval of Revised Classification Specification for College Business Manager, Fresno City College [07-55]

Mr. Manfredi asked Ms. Kast if she wanted to address items 07-55 and 07-56 together. Ms. Kast responded that they should be addressed together but the Commission may decide to address them separately if they wished. Ms. Kast gave a brief historical overview of the job specification. Ms. Kast informed the Commission that the Board of Trustees approved two sets of duties for the classification: one for Fresno City College and one for Reedley College. Ms. Kast explained that the Board of Trustees revised the titles of the previous Deans and changed them to Vice Presidents; she continued that during that time the title of College Business Manager was improperly changed to Vice President of Administrative Services. Ms. Kast explained that the title could only be changed by the Personnel Commission and that they may choose to that during this meeting.

Ms. Kast recommended that the Personnel Commission keep only one job classification instead of two. Ms. Kast explained that she made one change: bookstore services in the Fresno City College description and food services in the Reedley College description was changed to auxiliary services. Mr. Manfredi asked if that was the only difference. Ms. Kast responded that was correct. The Commissioners all agreed they preferred only one job description. Mr. Rowe commented that the District only wanted one as well and followed it by a brief discussion regarding the change in wording. Mr. Johnson moved to approve the revised classification specification of Vice President of Administrative Services as one job description only. Ms. Taylor seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

Consideration and Approval of Revised Classification Specification for College Business Manager, Reedley College [07-56]

See above, this item was merged with item 07-55.
Consideration and Approval of Eligibility Lists: [07-57]

It was moved by Mr. Johnson, seconded by Ms. Taylor, and unanimously carried to approve the eligibility lists as listed below to be effective for one year unless otherwise stated:

a. Instructional Aide – Child Development Center, effective 8/31/2007

Consideration and Approval of Moratorium on Reclassification Studies [07-58]

Ms. Taylor began by explaining that the Commission has almost completed a cycle of reclassification requests and personally felt that in critiquing the process, there was room for improvement. Ms. Taylor requested that the Commission consider a moratorium of six months to allow for a response from the Board of Trustees, the district, and CSEA regarding a district wide classification study. Ms. Taylor commented that there was a great opportunity for error when reclassifying individual positions.

Ms. Taylor requested that the Personnel Commission develop and approve a detailed process for the revision/update of families of classification specifications; develop and approve a template clarifying standards for classification specifications which include all elements of the specs except “Examples of Duties,” which are approved by the Board of Trustees, using Personnel Commission Rule 3-10 as a base; develop and approve, for salary survey purposes, a core listing of agencies to generally be used for recommending salary placement, inviting the District Human Resources Office and CSEA for input. Ms. Taylor provided a brief explanation of what each of these requests will entail.

Mr. Manfredi wanted to clarify that the Commission will be engaging in a discussion with the District/Board of Trustees regarding the approval of a district wide reclassification study. Mr. Manfredi also explained that Ms. Taylor is requesting that specific standards be created solely for the purpose of reclassification studies. Mr. Manfredi asked Ms. Kast if she could provide examples of some of the concerns that might come up if the Commission had a moratorium. Ms. Kast began by explaining that having a moratorium can create another backlog of reclassification requests and the perception that the Commission is not doing its job.

Mr. Maddox advised that the moratorium should not apply to reclassification requests that had already been submitted. Ms. Taylor then clarified that the moratorium would not apply to requests that had already been received by the Personnel Commission. Mr. Manfredi asked Ms. Taylor if the Commission
should re-visit the item in 90 days. Ms. Taylor responded that it would depend on what the progress is, but otherwise she would not have a problem with re-visiting the item. Mr. Johnson agreed with Ms. Taylor.

Ms. Maciel stated that CSEA appreciated what the Personnel Commission was trying to do and wanted to address the perception issue that was discussed by Ms. Kast. Ms. Maciel stressed the current Commission has done a tremendous amount of work in convincing classified staff that they are a functioning Commission. Ms. Maciel then requested the Commission entertain the possibility of opening a three month period where reclassification requests may be submitted if the moratorium does move forward. Ms. Taylor responded that that could be something that can be looked at.

Ms. Clerou commented that the District applauds the Commission’s effort in trying to have a consistent and standard process. Ms. Taylor moved to approve the Moratorium on individual reclassification study requests for a period of six months, the progress to be re-visited in three months with regard to the following items being developed and approved by the Personnel Commission:

a. Develop and approve a detailed process for the revision/update of families of classification specifications.

b. Develop and approve a template clarifying standards for classification specifications which include all elements of the specs except “Examples of Duties,” which are approved by the Board of Trustees, using Personnel Commission Rule 3-10 as a base.

c. Develop and approve, for salary survey purposes, a core listing of agencies to generally be used for recommending salary placement, inviting the District human Resources Office and CSEA for input.

Mr. Johnson seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. Mr. Manfredi and Ms. Taylor clarified that any reclassification requests in the current cycle would not be included. Ms. Kast informed the Personnel Commission that she would send out a “mail-all” email to all the employees notifying them of the decision.

Ms. Kast began by discussing the Personnel Commission’s 2007 Annual Report and explained to the Commission that there had not been one produced since 2003. Ms. Kast explained that the intent of the annual report is to report back to the Board of Trustees on the activities of the Commission. Ms. Kast informed the Personnel
Commission that both Commissioner Manfredi and Johnson were at the Board of Trustees meeting in September and that she had received good feedback from that meeting. Ms. Kast informed the Commission that staff had attended the Mayor’s Job Fair and had some good results from that. Ms. Kast discussed the CODESP training that staff hosted on job analysis and job classifications. Ms. Kast advised the Commission that Ms. O’Hare had provided her with notes regarding the Personnel Commission Rules and would like to re-visit those with the Commission’s permission, as well as other revisions that may be needed.

Commissioner’s Report

Ms. Taylor wanted to thank everyone who participated during the meeting for their continued support. Ms. Manfredi commented that he was happy to report that he received good feedback regarding their presentation at the Board of Trustees meeting.

Adjournment

At 7:05 p.m. Ms. Taylor moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

___________________________________
Nancy Kast, Director of Classified Personnel
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