



Chapter Email: csea33@smccd.edu

Chapter Website: <http://chapter33.csea.com>

Chapter 33 E-Board Meeting

Wednesday, September 12, 2012

Location: CSM – Building 1-115

5:00 pm – 6:00 pm

Members present: John Martinez, Jeanne Stalker, Maria Lara-Blanco, Linda Allen, Chris Weidman, Kathy Chaika, Annette Perot, Linda Herda, Chuck La Mere, Herb Mintz, Charles Jones, Juanita Celaya

Meeting called to order 5:10pm – Annette Perot

1. MINUTES

The minutes from the E-Board meeting of March 7, 2012 were attached for review. It was moved by Kathy Chaika and seconded by Linda Herda to approve the minutes as submitted. The motion carried with all attendees voting “aye”.

2. TREASURER’S REPORT

Linda Herda reported on the account activity and ending balances for August 2012. The report was attached to the agenda for review. The back page contains detailed expenses for the 2012 Annual CSEA Conference.

Checking Account ending balance: \$ 9,923.93

Savings Account ending balance: \$ 10,941.92 with interest earned .46¢

Annette and Linda donated their monthly stipends to make donations totaling \$201.00 to SMCCCD Foundation stating it was from CSEA. Kathy Chaika proposed we add an agenda item about donation to the foundation to a future meeting.

3. BROWN BAG MEETING AGENDA

The Brown Bag lunch is scheduled for Wednesday, September 25, 2012. A discussion was held on what items should be on the agenda.

- a. The Classified Contract will have already gone to the Board of Trustees for approval on Wednesday, August 19, 2012 so the results of the contract should be included.
- b. Open enrollment for medical changes should be discussed. Member should be reminded that open enrollment closes October 5. Annette will put together a packet with handouts on the increases.

After reviewing the handout (Medical Plan Monthly Premium Increases) Chris Weidman noted that the Classified Supervisory district portion payment seemed a little high to him, and asked when they received this increase, since they had chosen to not put any of their percentage adjustment toward medical, but took it all in salary. Kathy Chaika said we need to go back and look at the ‘out of pocket’ because the district may have just given it to them.

John Martinez noted that it’s really important at the Drive Release Meeting (Brown Bag?) that people know that they really need to look at the handout and consider if they

need to change plans in order to be able to afford to have medical coverage. It might be a good idea to put it on the website or send out an email saying to really pay attention, read your packet. Chris Weidman added that people might not realize that whatever salary increase they see in their September – December paycheck will decrease (amount is dependent on their medical plan) come January 2013. Kathy noted the actual medical increase would be defrayed some because anything over the cap (with medical) is pre-tax – so it comes off the top. (Internal Revenue Code, Section 125.)

The Health Fair will be held on Monday, October 1, 2012 from 12n–4pm in CSM Theater Lobby. Since this is important, and there is a limited window in terms of when you can make the change, Annette will make a request to Vice Chancellor Harry Joel for release time and the notice be sent to all supervisors so their classified employees can attend without fear of reprisal.

- c. An announcement will be made about the officer nominations that are open for election.
 - i. President
 - ii. 2nd VP Canada
 - iii. 2nd VP Skyline
 - iv. Treasurer
 - v. CPAC
 - vi. Union Stewards
4. **HOLIDAY LUNCHEON**

The date for this year's luncheon is Thursday, December 6, 2012. Due to continuing problems we have had at the Wedgewood Banquet Center at Crystal Springs Golf Course, (we received an approximate \$600 credit back last year due to service issues) we looked into the changing this year's venue. Jeanne, Annette & Juanita contacted the Elks Lodge on 20th Avenue in San Mateo, and met with Tim Cirigliano (Director of Catering, Elks Lodge) who is giving us a great deal. Unlike Wedgewood (who charged a room charge, service charge and tip in addition to the cost of the meal) Tim is giving us one price that is all inclusive. We are working on a menu (it has not been finalized) but he's including hors d'oeuvres, punch and dessert, gratis. There is no open bar. The location is central for all three campuses and there is a large parking lot to accommodate everyone. The luncheon will be held in the Terrace Room which has one wall made entirely of glass that overlooks the pool, with nice landscaping behind it.

The cost per person is approximately \$23.50 (for CSEA members) vs. the \$32.00 last year at Wedgewood. Generally, we have approximately 150 people attend, and approximately 15 of those are CSEA's invited guests (e.g., Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, Board of Trustees members, etc.) For the past several years, the union has supplemented CSEA members' cost, as well as paying for our invited guests.

John Martinez suggested at the October 3 E-board meeting, we need to determine the amount CSEA will supplement for its members and agree as the executive board that we make that expenditure. Charles noted that we also sell raffle tickets to help off-set the cost.

Chris Weidman mentioned we previously talked about the possibility of providing a scholarship for students, and having this event raise money toward this endeavor. Kathy Chaika noted that years ago we used to have a more active chapter who was willing to go out and do things (e.g., selling nuts, put together a cookbook) and those proceeds went to scholarships.

John Martinez added that was the original intent of the raffle, but the cost for people to attend this event had become so high, that the raffles intent was changed to supplement members' costs so they wouldn't suffer the loss or not attend. Linda suggested we could clearly advertise

to the members and guests what the raffle money is for. John noted that in recent years we no longer made mention what the raffle is for – it's just a fun event where people can get gifts – and most people just assume that it is used to off-set expenses.

John Martinez thinks, during budget planning, there should be a yearly determination if money should be put aside for a scholarship. That way membership can approve the expenditure and the chapter doesn't paint itself in a corner financially. We don't want to commit funds from the luncheon and find ourselves coming up short on funding the scholarship.

5. **OPEN ENROLLMENT MEDICAL PLAN**

This was discussed in item 3, Brown Bag Meeting Agenda.

6. **COLLEGE/DISTRICT COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS** – Kathy Chaika

We are having difficulty at CSM with the restructuring of committees. There are four (sub)committees (previously there were five), and IPC (Integrated Planning Committee) is the main committee where all decisions are being made for CSM. However, IPC does not have appropriate classified staff representation to ensure shared governance. Example: last Spring she found out that the Budget Planning committee has been changed, and things that go forth in that committee were now looking at the budget only, recommendations as far as new positions (classified, certificated) technology and other needs are being made at IPC, which consists of deans and the chairs (all administrators and managers) of the four subcommittees. To try and resolve the issue this year, they decided that each of the subcommittees would have a co-chair which would be a classified member. (CSEA would still have to approve not only the classified member(s) on these committees but also the classified co-chair.) The problem is, this issue has not been resolved, yet IPC has already held 2 meetings with the same people that were on last year's committee which consists of mostly administrators and Academic Senate members. She has made it clear that appropriate classified representatives must be on these committees to ensure shared governance in a major decision-making body.

John asked if the IPC is the decision-making committee based on recommendations from the four sub-committees. Kathy clarified that division offices go directly to IPC with their needs, and IPC prioritizes accordingly. John interjected, given his experience on the now dissolved Human Resources Committee, the four sub-committees serve little purpose other than window dressing; especially if managers can circumvent the system by going directly to IPC.

Juanita noted that she currently serves on College Council, which used to function as IPC functions now. Since last year, they have been trying to steer College Council into voting to disband, as it no longer serves a useful purpose, which in fact is true. When she questioned the fact that IPC didn't have any classified representatives and therefore there were no shared governances, Jennifer Hughes explained that (paraphrasing) "yes, shared governance does happen. While IPC is made up of deans, administrators and managers, it was not intentional. These people were appointed by the members of subcommittees on which they serve to represent that committee at IPC, and people unintentionally deferred to the highest person on that committee. There is nothing in the Ed Code that says **how** shared governance must happen. Because all of the committees have representatives from all 4 constituencies, and the person who serves on IPC is a representative of that subcommittee, voices from all 4 constituencies are being heard."

John Martinez (who formerly served on the HR committee) commented that Jennifer Hughes is right, classified staff (at all the committees) do defer to the highest ranking member on the committee. Why? Because the amount of assigned to those committees was so voluminous, that you would not be able to do the committee work and your job. Anyway, the HR committee was effectively ignored.

Kathy said our (Union) problem is IPC has one classified representative who is there mostly (she believes) to support the administrative structure. They wanted to change it for this fiscal year (which is fine) but you don't change it midstream or after you have already begun. You don't work through how to get more classified on the committee, but continue to meet. You halt it, because you are making major decisions, some of which impact how we operate which in turn impacts classified.

Charles said the problem is not so much a function of the committee or the internal structure of the committee, what is important is any committee or task force that is created within a community college in this state requires that the exclusive bargaining unit in that community college be given the opportunity to appoint classified members to that committee. It doesn't matter how important (or not) the committee is to the community college, shared governance didn't take place – and that's grievable.

Kathy said she appreciates them working on it, but she wants further IPC meetings halted at this time until we can get our classified members in place. Jennifer Hughes emailed Kathy a list of the current chairs of the remaining four committees and who the co-chairs they want are, which we did approve and appoint, but she wants to add one more classified employee to IPC. But, Kathy just found out they there has already been 2 meetings and none of these people were there, nor have they been notified they are now on 2 committees. So they have not had the opportunity to function on this committee as a committee member. Until we can get this resolved, all meetings need to halt. As of this time she has not heard back. If they don't respond, then action needs to be taken, because this is a body that is approving positions.

John stated that we need to take a look as history to see how this big mess happened. Mike Claire got into trouble with accreditation because he wasn't able to get things done and prove shared governance and prove innovation and movement toward a better college. So he came up with this idea in consultation with the accreditation group and the vice presidents to save accreditation (without accreditation, the district would be in serious trouble.) He put together IPC and the other five committees which were a bunch of fluff that no one was going to pay attention to, but he never disbanded College Council or that infrastructure and he tried to run them at the same time, so they run at loggerheads. So you have 2 hierarchies trying to do the same thing. College Council and that architecture need to go away, and IPC responsibilities need to be expanded and encompass what College Council was doing and its architecture. Then you can address the issue of shared governance. The problem is as long as you have the confusion and no one knows what they are responsible for and what they are suppose to be doing, this situation will continue.

John stated we need to take a look at our shared governance history in connection with accreditation to see where our current problems started. CSM needed to make changes to its shared governance structure to satisfy accreditation standards, in order to do that...the administration came up the IPC concept. This new shared governance architecture was put in place while the old College Council was kept active. This leads to confusion as to roles and responsibilities of both groups, so the College Council and the IPC are at loggerheads. The College Council must be dissolved and IPC responsibilities be expanded to encompass the College Council role. Until these changes are made the confusion and ineffectiveness of shared governance on the CSM campus will continue.

Kathy will give an update on what has transpired with this issue at the next E-Board meeting on October 3.

7. **OFFICER NOMINATIONS**

This was discussed in item 3, Brown Bag Meeting Agenda.

8. **CPAC** – Charles Jones

He stated that if proposition 32 passes, it shows that the people want to turn back all gains made by the states workers.

9. **CPRO** – Herb Mintz

Monthly review is in process of being updated. Herb is burnt out from all the hard work he's been doing toward the passage of prop 30 and defeat of prop 32.

10. **PRESIDENTS COMMENTS** – Annette Perot

Thank you for coming.

11. **GOOD OF THE ORDER**

Thank you for coming.

12. **ADJOURNMENT**

The president asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. A motion was made, and the motion was seconded. Those present at the meeting voted to end the meeting. Unfortunately, note was not taken of who had made the motion for adjournment and who had seconded the motion for adjournment. So at the time of the publication of these minutes, a suspension of the rule for motion of adjournment was made to end this meeting. The proposal for suspension of the rule was made by the parliamentarian and agreed to by the president, 1st Vice President and secretary of CSEA Chapter 33.

Meeting adjourned 6:55pm