**Personnel Committee Meeting Minutes for April 11th, 2012**

1. **Call to Order:** EVP **Caldwell** calls meeting to order at **12:23pm.**

\*indicates members present at the start of the meeting

1. **Roll call**

Members Present Absent Members Guests

\*Chris Caldwell Siddharth Menon Randy Saffold

\*Christopher Prado Stan Hebert

\*Mark Allen T. Laluan

\*Lyla Pehrson

1. **Action Item - Approval of the Agenda**

**Motion: (Prado) to approve the agenda.**

**Motion Carries.**

1. **Action Item - Approval of the March 8th, 2012 Minutes**

**Motion: (Laluan) to approve the March 8th, 2012 Minutes**

**Motion Carries.**

1. **Public Comment -** None

Public Comment is intended as a time for any member of the public to address the board on any issues affecting ASI and/or the California State University, East Bay.

1. **Information Item**– **HR Policy Changes**

The committee will review new Internal Affairs policies that have been added to the new HR Personnel Handbook being crafted for us by Paychecks.

EVP **Caldwell** yields the floor to ED **Saffold**.

ED **Saffold** states that all the things the board passed in the last two months which was the travel policy and the credit card policy; those are all being added to the brand new employee handbook that is being crafted by Paychex. We have the draft and we are going to add those policies. We want to make the executive committee aware that we will be reviewing additional things will be added. The other agenda items such as the educational reimbursement piece are also additions that we want to make to that document. The last time we talked about this, the executive committee felt somewhat out of the loop on it, therefore, we just want to bring it to your attention prior to. There is no need to discuss the policies since they have already been discussed and approved in the executive committee and the board, but there are additional changes that need to be made.

Once the Internal Affairs committee reviews these policies and changes that are proposed, they will write a resolution for the board to adopt the changes to the new employee handbook for the organization. Myself, VP **Pehrson**, and some of the staff are reviewing it now and we will get back to you as we get more final product. I believe I sent draft copies to President **Prado** and EVP **Caldwell**. I want you guys to glance over to make sure that you are familiar with it. Internal Affairs will be going through it more deeply and they will be recommending whether they see any problems. EVP **Caldwell** asks if the handbook will be for the board and staff. ED **Saffold** states that it’s technically not for the board since the board does not have a handbook. The board has an administrative manual that was created, but the policies still hold for travel; it is also how the board travels even though you are not an employee. There are elements that need to work around that. The travel card and p-card polices will be duplicated in the HR Employee manual, but you will also see them in a new document that I am creating with VP **Pehrson** and VP **Menon** which is the budget polices. You guys will be governed by the budget policies more than the employee policies. The bylaws and the articles of incorporation are your manual. The budget policies are also part of your manual for how we do business. Therefore, how we spend money and how we do governance is what your manual is because you are not employees. You travel just like the rest of us, but it will be in the budget policy as to how we as entities of the corporation utilize money. All of those policies apply to the board and staff, but there are some things that only apply to the staff. The one thing that I would suggest you work out with President **Prado** is establishing office hours for board members. We really should be producing some type of office hours so that students looking for their representative will know when they can find them. President **Prado** asks what issues are with changing our system to that. ED **Saffold** states you guys can require people to check in, but not clock in. I believe that our clock-in in system may be used as a check-in to prove that people are showing up when they are supposed to. If you were to make them employees; the issue is that you cannot you cannot be an employee for ASI and a board member at the same time. We can still create a computerized check-in system in which the board can check in when they say that they are going to be in the office. If you guys need a record as to when the board members showed up, I can figure out how to make that happen for you. EVP **Caldwell** states that the idea of having a sign-in sheet was in his original plan, but people may forget to sign in. ED **Saffold** states that he has been keeping a pretty good watch of who has been coming in and has seen everyone. I’m seeing the board come in often as well as the committee members that get a lot of work done. If it becomes a problem that there is not enough room for people to work in the board room area, then we may need to make other arrangements for where other committee members get to work. So far, it hasn’t been too crowded in there. EVP **Caldwell** states that the only issue is keeping the computers up to date. President **Prado** states that there is a computer that is always slow and there are about three that have no problems. ED **Saffold** states that he will handle the issue. 3:00-14:01

1. **Information Item**– **Proposed Position Efficiency Changes**

The committee will discuss which positions within ASI are no longer optimal and how these might be combined or reconfigured.

ED **Saffold** states that the positions are within ASI, the staff, and the board. We have things such as a maintenance person who is not allowed to do any maintenance; therefore we’ve re-tasked that person. The question becomes if we have re-tasked that efficiently and effectively. We need to look at what is a good balance for positions and what needs to be done. We are going to lay out every job function within ASI and arrange all of those things into categories of similar things that make up one job function. What I think we are going to find is that we still have some people within the organization that are doing two thirds of a job; it’s not a whole job. When we had ECEC; we had an employee that only had one third of the job. We can’t afford to be paying a full salary to people that are only doing one third of a job especially when we have other needs in the organization. Furthermore, after talking with Paychex, the HR people, our team, and talking with the chancellor’s people in the audit, we still need to shore up the accounting and HR area. Paychex alone has been a great resource; it’s made us make fewer mistakes, but it hasn’t allowed us to become the company we should be. I would argue that we need to do these efficiencies so that we can figure out how to free up some resources in one place to make sure that they are shored up. EVP **Caldwell** asks ED **Saffold** if the efficiencieschanges are only for FTE’s or are they also for student staff. EVP **Caldwell** states that he spoke with the student staff in the RAW about the level of work and responsibility, and many of them felt as if there wasn’t much for them to do and that there is too many people staffed. There doesn’t need to be three people at the desk when there is no traffic coming through. ED **Saffold** states that what you’ll find is that we’ve spent less this year; Krista cut $198,000.00 off the top for this year of what she was planning on spending. We eliminated many of those positions for some additional staff and areas that had some duplication. For this year’s budget, we are looking at a similar cut as well as where the efficiencies are. We have a position on the books that I want to bring back that is currently not filled; it is the Director of the Administration. One of the things I have been told by the chancellor’s office staff is that we have sufficient people, but they are not experts in the field because they are on a different level. What they need is some direction and some supervision that I can’t provide as the Executive Director because I am doing all of the other stuff. We brought in the Director of Administrative Assistants to replace the old Associate Director. I hope you guys have seen the difference from where we were before I got here, and right now with technology. I’m still waiting on the fruits of our labor in the website that is still coming. They need the time to build that app for us. President **Prado** asks how much the position would be for the Director of Administration. ED **Saffold** states that it will approximately be a $70,000.00 position. We only have one staff member in the program that is at the Director level; that position is somewhere in between $65,000 to $67,000. The new position will be similar to that pay scale. I am gauging that the new position will be somewhere in between $65,000 to $70,000.

This means that as I work through these efficiencies, I would have to find $7,000.00 worth of positions to possibly move, change, or get rid of. VP **Laluan** asks if we are trying to come in under budget. ED **Saffold** states there is an over estimate that we did in benefits for staff this past year. No one in ASI had ever done the budget. Krista Smith and Mohammed Salman did a fantastic job with trying to help and support. I came from a completely different institution, so all we can go on was the previous budget in the past and what was spent. We are currently showing that we are somewhat in the black. There was other money that was supposed to be set aside for retirement and paying, but money hasn’t been set aside for paying every year. We have been accruing it. In our approvals we are at $500,000 to $600,000 in accrued money that we should have put aside. We are supposed to be at about $400,000 in the black this year. Since we did not spend as much in staff, we cut out all those people, we closed the ECEC down, and we are doing better than we thought we were doing. We are very conservative with our spending; we haven’t done anything that we said we were going to do this year which is great. There is $5,000 to $10,000 across the entire budget plus the $180,000 coming from money that Krista didn’t spend on her staff because she had maintenance people in her budget that apparently Mohammed also had in his budget. We didn’t see that, therefore there was a bit of overlap. That’s what they are attributing it to, but when we went through and did our cuts, I am positive that was not there. I think it’s mostly benefits and some other pieces. We must have missed a piece early on. No one has ever done the budget here, so they didn’t necessarily know. With all that said we have to find 70,000 worth of something to make sure that we will be able to get funding. If we are really running $400,000 in the black and we are supposed to be putting $320,000 into retirement every year, we really only have $20,000 left over. So between that $20,000 and other space what we can really look at what we are doing; we may be able to make sure that we fund that position. We may have other pieces that we may not need, but other pieces that we need more of or other pieces that we may need to change. For instance, do we really need a presence on the Concord campus two days a week? Maybe we can make that other position that is there two days a week a more full position for the Diversity Center and I can instill that. I can introduce this as a transitional topic to go from professional staff into the board. One of the key reasons of changing the board structure as far as how many people we had, it was proposed to reduce the total overhead cost of the board. After hearing what was said at the last meeting, VP **Pehrson** and I had talked about positions that did not need to exist. I hear the thing that we are talking about of not diluting the representation of the global student body; therefore I’m going to pull that off the table and not even discuss that with the exception of one position. I am still not convinced that the PR position works from within the board. I would say is that position on the board was only created in reaction to bad press that ASI was receiving three to four years ago. There were some horrible stuff going on, and there wasn’t a person in place to speak on some of that stuff. In my opinion, it is unsafe and unwise to rely on a student that will change annually. I would propose in bringing in a half-time person whose focus is PR to work with Garvin and focus on our image.

We would not be removing PR, but changing the function. President **Prado** states that maybe we can look into making that a different position. Also, I am not in favor of making full-time employees or half-time employees positions where a student can fill that role potentially. Although Melanie may not be at the forefront of PR; her voice is valuable. ED **Saffold** states that the problem with this is that they change every year and they cannot know the history of the org and the cycle. What I need is for someone to come in and do an annual marketing and communications plan for the entire organization. What the board needs is someone to work with Garvin and for board to make sure that all the programs and messages within the board are getting out in a timely manner. They still wouldn’t manage the board’s portion of the Facebook page and things like that. They’re still the communications for communicating everything board, to the organization, and to the campus through Garvin with all of the materials. They are not responsible for the overall global presentation of the organization. That is what I think we are missing. For the other place I want to involve students; I want to involve graduate assistants. Instead of spending $55,000 for a professional staff plus a benefit package, I want to look at possibly shrinking that down and bringing on two or three graduate students to do some of these things. EVP **Caldwell** asks what the hour load would be for graduate students. ED **Saffold** states that it would be a twenty hour load. They would work twenty hours a week, but they are stipend and controlled by a union. There is a way that you can work them so that they don’t fall into the union; I can find out how to do this. What happens is that graduate assistants have to their assisting for an academic department as opposed to an organization like ours. We have to have a partnership with the school of social justice or a partnership with recreation. We can afford two graduate assistants for $50,000 a year and divide that between the two. We can’t afford the full package. What we would focus on is getting local students from California who knows how much it costs to live here and recognize that we are only subsidizing your education for the exchange of you working hard. If you were to get them from the East coast, you would have to house them which we can’t afford. I believe in the graduate assistant model and think that sometimes we are too heavy on professional staff in places where we can bring in that student experience and bring some new ideas from other schools into our programs. VP **Laluan** states he does not necessarily see the utility in watering down Melanie’s position. One thing that I have come to terms with this is that we have a new board and new people, and what they bring to the table is different every year. That the problem in continuity with the business side. On our side as students, it really is what you bring to the table after your election. I see it as an opportunity and a training piece. It gives the board the ability to control their voice and their message to the students. My second point is about the general budget. If we are coming under this year, is there a possibility that the university CFO are managing on less, therefore maybe you can deal with less. ED **Saffold** states that they can’t technically do that, but what they can do is do less in cost recovery and support that they give us. I am not going to reduce the number of board positions, but I am suggesting the one change for PR to become the Director of Communications. That’s more of what I am used to.

President **Prado** asks if it will be a graduate assistant’s position. ED **Saffold** states that it could be if it is established. There is still a perception that we are too staff heavy in ASI by the campus. If the CFO believes that, they’re always going to be looking at where ASI can reduce its FTE. In my opinion, they really don’t think that we should have our own maintenance crew, but we know that if we don’t have our own maintenance crew, there would be no one at the end of an event to clean for a next event. We have a quicker response time to those things. I am not interested in giving that up. EVP **Caldwell** mentions that the building managers also work with the events and a majority of them are students. ED **Saffold** states that anywhere that I can save money with students is what I am trying to do to make sure that I free up enough money to bring on the professional positions that I feel we really need. If I can get the Director of the Administrator Systems on line and get some form of HR person here, we are going to be a better organization. EVP **Caldwell** mentions the position of Director of Administrative systems and asks when that will happen. ED **Saffold** states that the title of the job description will be changed to Director of Administration. For the system of the position we are taking out the role of I.T. My goal is to have the position done by July 1st. It is a position that already exists in the books, it’s just not funded. I will be hiring that person to my staff, and the board such as the internal affairs and personal committee would sit on the hiring panel for all of the people that we interview so that we have good student input. Not only would I want board members on there, but I would want at least one or two students from administration to also be present such as the front desk representative. There would be a committee of staff that works with that, and then it would be me that they would have their final interviews with and with the President as well.

14:09-37:01

1. **Information Item**– **Compensation in ASI**

The committee will discuss cost of living increases, budget constraints, impact of raises not given to staff last year, and politics of raises vs. bonuses. Also explain vacation buy-outs.

ED **Saffold** states that we should not give raises. In this economy, when there is a raise within the CSU’s, just because ASI can afford it, doesn’t mean we should do it. That is part of the reason why we are in the black more than we thought we would be. We did a three percent salary increase projection for all staff and we gave very few; I think to only students. One of the things that I want to propose that another place I’ve been does is that at Christmas time they allow you to buy out half your vacation time. This does two things; it feels like a Christmas bonus without costing the corporation any money, and it takes liability off our books. People who have vacation hours that accrued over time lose vacation hours because they have so many. If that person chooses to leave we would have to pay them for all of those hours. That shows liability in your books from an audit. You have to have enough of a fund assuming that if a business closes tomorrow we have to liquidate because for whatever reason you have to pay that out. So what you want to do is minimize that and pull those numbers off of your books.

One way to do that is to let people buy out portions of their sick time. You have to keep some in your bank; you cannot use all of it because you never know when a vacation will come up.

You never want anyone to have zero vacation days during a buy-out. EVP **Caldwell** asks what the amount of time would be before you lose those hours. ED **Saffold** states that you don’t want to create a system that goes over multiple years of tracking because someone has to track that and there is no system of tracking. The point is that it is a way that does not cost us more money, but it allows us to get the dent off the books. I would have to make this a formal proposal through Internal Affairs and bring it back to you. 37:08-42:08

1. **Discussion Item**– **Educational Reimbursement**

The committee will review the proposed changes for educational reimbursement (previously discussed).

ED **Saffold** states that after talking with VP **Pehrson** he is willing to slightly change his position on his recommendation. VP **Pehrson** states that she was not in full favor of ED **Safford’s** entire proposal. ED **Saffold** explains to the committee what the university does. Right now, we have only one employee taking advantage of the educational reimbursement. It’s a little too stringent for me. You first have to be admitted into CSU East Bay to get the educational reimbursement and you have to come in at junior standing, otherwise ASI will not paying anything for education reimbursement. Currently our education reimbursement cannot be transferred to spouse or children. I’m going to recommend that we keep that, and I will give the reasons to that later. My proposal is that we conduct this the way the university does because we simply cannot afford to match them. The university does not actually pay anything; it is just a fee waiver. We cannot compare ourselves to the university because it is never free for us. For Jonathan Stoll we pay $2,500.00 every quarter. My proposal is that we release the restriction on it only being available to East Bay; why can’t we send it to Chabot College or Ohlone College? It’s because everyone is not going to qualify. There is a reason why we only have one employee taking advantage of this and it is largely because people already have degrees or they don’t meet the criteria of getting into East Bay. I want to open this up so that more people within ASI can take advantage of this educational reimbursement, but we would have to budget for this. This would negatively affect Jonathan Stoll because in my plan, it would only be able to go to two consecutive quarters. That’s a model that comes out of a semester system. This limits how much money we would spend per person. No one would be able to use the whole education reimbursement for a whole quarter. If we change the amount given to Jonathan Stoll, it would give me an extra $5,000.00 to give to someone else to use at other colleges such as Chabot. The compromise I made with VP **Pehrson** was that is someone dies the full education reimbursement; they would still need to be enrolled at East Bay and at least be of junior standing to show that they are serious and have a clear understanding of what career path they are headed in. VP **Pehrson** states that her concern was paying for people who would be taking GE classes when it was their responsibility to have already taken them before starting their upper division courses for their major.

ED **Saffold** states that he can compromise with that were not going allow them to take undergraduate courses for full enrollment, but we will allow them to take individual courses at places like Chabot or Ohlone where we would be paying a portion of the registration and class. I am just trying to make it where you don’t have to only take classes at East Bay; it costs too much money. It is more efficient and effective to allow students to take courses at other community colleges. VP **Laluan** states that the problematic issue that no community college classes are upper division; that’s how it is set up. ED **Saffold** states that this would create more compromises. What I am interested in doing is putting a limit to some of the things we do because we cannot predict how many people are going to a school which is why you do not want to open it up to families. EVP **Caldwell** asks what would happen if the full amount of money offered is under-used for the year can it be rolled over to the next year. ED **Saffold** states that can be possible if you set up a restrict fund for educational reimbursement so that it can be reserved for the next year. EVP **Caldwell** states it’s a good idea to do that because someone may have a higher demand in one year than another year. ED **Saffold** states that he will take this policy, re-work it and bring it back to be reviewed. We will bring it back as an action item. I would like to have this in place by July 1st, 2012. The goal would be to adopt this policy with a new HR employee handbook therefore; this policy can also go into the employee handbook.

43:00-56:58

1. **Discussion Item– Org Structure Revisited (Closed Session)**

The committee will review the plans to hire the approved position of Director of Administrative Systems which went unfilled last year. (Closed Session Requested as we will discuss performance issues previously discussed).

1. **Roundtable Remarks**

**Prado:** the unit limitations are a major issue. The second issue is about the A2E2 committee. They haven’t been meeting regularly. I am just wondering what is going on with that and I wanted to bring those things up. I’m sure that they are willing to come up with some type of deal that can be passed by the committee regarding the eBooks, but that is just speculation. EVP **Caldwell** states that as far as the administrations who sit in the A2E2 committee and the student support, I’ve heard from a person that there was no direction or support within that committee and that it’s a rough process. VP **Laluan** states that it is important to know about the outcomes of the fee regarding the eBooks and the function of the provost and the university itself. Maybe the reason why they are not meeting up is because they are working on the eBooks for a fee that the committee will accept.

**Saffold:** I just want to thank you guys for being open to suggestions. Thank you for your input on some of the issues around the organizational structure. I will be making some recommendations and keeping you guys updated of the future plans.

1. **Adjournment**

**Motion: () to adjourn meeting at 2:01pm.**

Minutes Reviewed By:

**ASI Executive Vice President\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Name: Christopher Caldwell**

Minutes approved on:

**05-04-12**

**Date:**