

**Berkeley Unified School District**  
**Personnel Commission Meeting Minutes**

May 31<sup>st</sup>, 2023 – 3:00 pm

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was held in a hybrid format, live in the Board Room and via Zoom meeting #852 7339 2873. The meeting was called to order at 3:03 pm.

**2. Roll Call & Establishment of Quorum**

Chairperson Zenor-Davis, Vice-Chairperson Goldstein and Commissioner Roter were present, and a quorum was established.

**3. Public Comments**

None.

**4. Approval & Adoption of Agenda**

Vice-Chairperson Goldstein moved to proceed with the agenda, moving agenda item 5b ahead of 5a; Commissioner Roter seconded the motion, Approved, 3-0

**5. Discussion Items**

b.) Classification & Compensation Study: Phase 1 Review

Jan Brannen, Rick Labib-Wood and Sandra McCoy from Eric Hall & Associates (EH&A) presented a review of Phase 1 of the Classification & Compensation Study, including an overview of the process, timeline, scope of the project and some examples of revised job descriptions.

Vice-Chairperson Goldstein asked about the School Administrative Assistant II /Sub Specialist job description. Ms. Brannen explained that the position is quite robust and not quite like anything she has seen before. Ms. Brannen presented the job description in track change format, demonstrating changes based on information from the Job Content Questionnaire (JCQ) and interviews with the incumbent and supervisor.

Vice-Chairperson Goldstein asked about the consistency of duties for the School Administrative Assistant ECE job description, based on who was interviewed. Ms. Brannen said she met with both incumbents and supervisors though no JCQ was submitted for this role. She also spoke with the program coordinator whose recommendation was that there is a distinct difference between the job of the two incumbents who were reclassified and the job of the two who were not.

Commissioner Roter asked if EH&A gives equal consideration to input from employees and supervisors. Ms. Brannen said EH&A takes a 360-degree view of the job. Employees can give input three ways: via the JCQ, attend an interview and provide input on the revised job description. She said that equal weight is given to employee and supervisor input since the job does need to be reviewed from both directions. Mr. Labib-Wood

said that they did not notice many discrepancies between what an employee and supervisor said about the job and reiterated that the starting point for the job description review is an assumption that the employee knows the job they are doing.

Commissioner Roter asked if the 30% JCQ completion rate is low, if it is a good representation for the jobs being studied, and if it could be an undercount since employees can give input in other ways? Ms. Brannen said that 30% was rather low for the JCQ but that it does vary from district to district; 50-60% completion is typical for other studies. Employees do not always want to take the time to complete the JCQ even if they are being paid to do it, but she said they often participate via an interview or by filling out an input form after reviewing the revised job description.

Commissioner Roter asked what the expectation is for the Personnel Commission once the revised job descriptions are in hand? Mr. Labib-Wood said the Board will approve the job description and certify the duties for each classification. The Personnel Commission will then review the report for any changes to the job or the relationships, and if any are noted, it would be within the purview of the Personnel Commission to determine where a job fits into the classification plan.

Chairperson Zenor-Davis asked for a process clarification when an employee and supervisor disagree about the revisions to the job description. Ms. Brannen said that there were some instances when the supervisor had a different view of the job than the employee. These issues were resolved by direct conversation with the employee and supervisor, and by involving the steering committee or other entities to provide more clarification. Ms. Brannen reminded the Personnel Commission that even when the final drafts of the job descriptions are presented, they are still only recommendations that must be approved by the Board and then negotiated with the Unions.

Vice-Chairperson Goldstein asked about unique participants for the JCQ, interviews and input forms in regards to total participation in Phase 1. Personnel Commission staff did not have the information on hand but agreed to provide it for the commissioners at a later date.

Jocelyn Foreman, BCCE President, said some members experienced lockout from email due to the two-step authentication process with Google; this was addressed along the way on an individual basis. Ms. Foreman said that no one wanted to do the JCQ during the work day and that some members could not see the benefit of this classification and compensation study based on the experience of the 2016 study. Ms. Foreman said she had spoken candidly with the Executive Director, Classified Personnel, about making this a positive experience for everyone, especially when it comes to compensation. Chairperson Zenor-Davis appreciated Ms. Foreman's comments and feels that compensation must be addressed appropriately in this Study. He was disappointed to hear about the two-step authentication process being a barrier to participation with the JCQ. Ms. Foreman said that the School Safety Officers do not have access to computers. Secretary Castillo said he is working with Mark Griffin, School Safety Officer, on solutions for this classification. Vice-Chairperson Goldstein asked Ms. Foreman for

clarification as to why employees did not want to do the JCQ even though they were offered pay? Ms. Foreman said that on top of the regular workload and where the JCQ fell in the year, there was too much for employees to do. She said that specifically, the Instructional Assistants do not have time to even check email during the work day. Mr. Griffin said that School Safety Officers could not do the JCQ because of the workload and no access to a computer. Frank Hernandez, BCCE, said that everyone is too busy and asked for deadlines to be extended. Mildred Scherr, BCCE, said that the Steering Committee needs to meet more frequently and the entire process needs to slow down to give everyone the opportunity to participate. She asked for the Phase 2 JCQ deadline to be extended and about the status of Margo Wilson's desk audit.

Chairperson Zenor-Davis asked about options for slowing down the Study. Secretary Castillo said that it is a budget issue; the contract will not be extended past November 30. Ms. Brannen said that extending the Phase 2 JCQ deadline to June 22 will make it very difficult to finish the study by the end of the contract. She said that a year long study for a District the size of BUSD is ambitious. Secretary Castillo said he and Samantha Tobias-Espinosa, Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources, could ask the Assistant Superintendent of Fiscal Services to extend the contract, but there are no guarantees. Vice-Chairperson Goldstein proposed strategy based on 10, 11- and 12-month employee schedules to make sure everyone can participate. The deadline for Phase 2 JQQ's was extended to June 9.

Vice-Chairperson Goldstein asked what else can be done to help supervisors carve out time for full-time employees to participate? Secretary Castillo and Ms. Tobias-Espinosa agreed to communicate together with the supervisors. Ms. Tobias-Espinosa explained the MOU was only for part-time employees since they are "on" the entire time they are on the clock.

a.) Update on approved 2023-24 Personnel Commission Budget

Secretary Castillo said that even though the Personnel Commission had approved the budget and it had been sent to the County, the District has not given its blessing and SBAC voted 13-1 against the budget.

Commissioner Roter said this is of great concern. The Personnel Commission spoke about the budget at two separate meetings and that Secretary Castillo invited the Assistant Superintendent of Fiscal Services to the two meetings; she is extraordinarily busy and did not come. The Personnel Commission spoke at length about the need for the 0.5 FTE Administrative Assistant III. The department requires administrative support for the various reports it produces and the many meetings to be scheduled and organized. He appreciates Mildred Scherr for showing up and expressing her concerns but reiterated, the budget is asking for a 0.5FTE role. He has never heard of a department in this District, especially one holding public meetings, not having administrative support. He believes that SBAC was not properly informed since the Personnel Commission was not invited to present. He believes the Personnel Commission has engaged the District and asked Ms. Tobias-Espinosa to take his comments back to the Superintendent. This is ultimately the decision of the County

Office of Education and the Personnel Commission has complied with what is required according to the education code. He will write to the Superintendent and copy the Board to address this concern. He urged his fellow commissioners to do the same.

Vice-Chairperson Goldstein said that funding sources are changing and some difficult decisions will need to be made at the District level. SBAC is not interested in funding jobs that are not student facing; these jobs are not popular and are difficult to defend. She sees a set of priorities for a number of non-student facing positions, and the Personnel Commission is at the end of that list of priorities. Her understanding of the process is that the Personnel Commission is a small, independent agency when it comes to funding. Historically, the Personnel Commission has worked with the District to come to terms with what the Personnel Commission's funding should be; this is reported to the County, everyone agrees and the County records it. There is also a provision for a process if the Personnel Commission and the District cannot agree on the budget. Vice Chairperson Goldstein is prepared to go to the County for that discussion.

Chairperson Zenor-Davis expressed his concern since steps were taken to get folks involved and by inviting them into this process. For whatever reason, those opportunities were not taken; to be accused of not following the process is insulting. He commended Secretary Castillo for wanting to do things the right way even in a system where not doing things the right way has become normalized. He said that he was sure the issue would be resolved but cautioned that disfunction should not be a mode of operation or normalized, especially when it concerns working for our young people.

Ms. Scherr reiterated her position that there is more need of administrative support in the Admissions department than in the Personnel Commission.

Vice Chairperson Goldstein said she hopes the Personnel Commission can talk this through with the District because the intent is not to go to the County. The two sides have until June 30 to work something out.

Commissioner Roter said this should not be an adversarial process; everyone is working on behalf of the students of the District and of the Classified employees. He agrees that the Admissions department absolutely needs administrative support, but so does the Personnel Commission. He said the conversation should continue with the Superintendent.

Secretary Castillo appreciated Ms. Scherr's comments and agreed that the Admissions department needs more staffing. The District should fund both positions.

Commissioner Roter again urged the other commissioners to email the Superintendent, copy the Board and the two Assistant Superintendents involved and explain why this position is necessary.

## **6. Public Comments**

None.

**7. Next Meeting**

The next regular meeting will be on June 1 from 4:30-7:30 in the Board room. A Special meeting is scheduled for June 7 at 4:00 in Room 126.

**8. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 pm.