



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

Minutes of the HEO Council Executive Committee

April 7th, 1:00 PM

Members Present: Sandrine Dikambi, Michele Doney, Jarrett Foster, Nikki Hancock-Nicholson, Makeda Jordan, Nancy Marshall, Naomi Nwosu, Katherine Outlaw, Janet Winter,

Guests: Ricardo Anzaldua, Kinya Chandler

Members Absent: Inez Brown, Janice Carrington, Johanna Whitton

Call to Order: 1:07 PM

The purpose of this special meeting was to prepare for next week’s meeting between President Travis and the HEO Council, called primarily to discuss the results of the HEO Quality of Work-Life Survey, which was a project of the HEO Council Quality of Life Committee in collaboration with the Office of Institutional Research. That meeting will be Tuesday, April 12th at 3:00 PM in the 9th floor conference room of the New Building.

Great College to Work For Survey: Recently the college announced it would be participating in the Chronicle of Higher Education’s Great Colleges to Work For Survey again this year. A few people at today’s meeting had already received invitations to participate. Mr. Anzaldua briefly discussed the previous Great Colleges survey results for John Jay and their shortcomings vis a vis measuring the views of HEOs. First, based on the generic job categories it uses, that survey does a poor job of capturing who is actually a HEO and who is a member of the ECP or faculty. Second, the number of respondents who were likely HEOs was extremely small. Third, the question design does not measure some of our issues very well. Overall, for our purposes, the HEO Council’s survey is a much better instrument, and our dataset is a much larger and better dataset.

“Conversations with the President” Meetings: On March 11, President Travis announced via email blast his intention to hold pairs of Conversations with the President, which are special

28 meetings in addition to HEO Council, Labor-Management, and Town Hall meetings, and are
29 meant to provide fora for discussion the concerns of students, staff, managers, and faculty
30 separately, because there is ample evidence of dissatisfaction with the current campus climate
31 among all of these groups. After the announcement was made, Ms. Dikambi asked HEOs to
32 respond to her with feedback about how the process of getting into one of these meetings has
33 gone for HEOs. It was also discussed at our EC meeting on March 16. It is clear that the process
34 has not been equally timely and transparent across all divisions. Relying on divisional VPs to
35 disseminate meeting information downward has caused great differences in how and when
36 HEOs in different divisions have been included, and this has generated some negative feelings
37 about the process among HEOs in some areas of the college. There was general consensus
38 among those present today that outreach to HEOs about these types of events should not flow
39 separately through each division, but rather should be accomplished either by direct emails to
40 HEOs (via Important Announcements or the HEO listserv), or through the HEO Council itself
41 (via the HEOCOUNCIL listserv). Not only would these methods ensure that all HEOs feel
42 treated the same way regardless of the division they work for, but it would also be many times
43 more efficient, since it does not rely on emails being forwarded down multiple levels within the
44 organizational structures of each division.

45 This discussion brought up another concern, which is the difficulty we have been having in
46 getting updated lists of active HEOs from Human Resources. Since Brenda Delgado left HR, it
47 has been increasingly difficult to obtain accurate lists on a regular basis. On March 23, Ms.
48 Dikambi and Ms. Hancock-Nicholson met with Raj Singh, Interim VP for Finance &
49 Administration, to express this concern. There are two problems: One is understaffing in HR,
50 and the other is that the list is created manually, which is very time consuming. Several present
51 and today's meeting expressed surprise that this cannot be accomplished with a CUNYfirst
52 query. In any case, VP Singh has assured us we will have a list on the first of every month going
53 forward. Ms. Chandler noted that many of the people in positions of authority within HR are
54 HEOs themselves, and it is a matter of concern that HEOs cannot rely on each other as
55 resources in situations like this. It makes the HEO Council look bad if we cannot rely on the
56 HEOs themselves to get what we need to function. There are too many ways for HEOs to be
57 fractured and discounted, and we need to work toward greater unity and collaboration.

58 Quality of Life Survey: Based on his past observations of HEOs who seem to work excessive
59 hours. Mr. Anzaldúa made sure to include several questions to explore HEO workload issues in
60 the survey.

61 He noted that due to a recent change in the way HEOs are classified in the IPEDS database,
62 many HEOs who used to be classified as something else are suddenly classified as managerial.
63 This information shows up in public-access databases of CUNY employee titles and payroll such
64 as seethroughny.net, and may be part of the reason why people seem concerned about the
65 growth in administrative positions in CUNY.

66 There was some discussion about the importance of focusing on our local campus culture and on
67 "small wins" such as being able to restrict the hours of operation of certain offices to provide
68 some time during the week to catch up with paperwork.

69 Problems with communication and scheduling regarding the HEO Screening Committee were
70 discussed. It was decided that Ms. Dikambi would invite Raj Singh, Donald Gray, and Marjorie
71 Singer to our next regularly scheduled EC meeting to discuss.

72 The group agreed we should debrief with HEOs after each of the “Conversations with the
73 President” meetings so we have some sense of what is being said at those meetings.

74 It was also suggested that we reach out to the leaders of the Faculty Senate and the Student
75 Council to ask them to pass resolutions in support of addressing HEO workload issues, but it
76 may be wise to wait a while on that.

77 Toward the end of the meeting, Ms. Doney shared with those still present the HEO issues that
78 will come up at the PSC Labor-Management meeting, which will be the labor response to the
79 HEO survey results and a request for specific action regarding HEO Screening Committee
80 meetings, especially as they relate to discretionary increases, since management has not done
81 what they agreed to last time.

82

83 **Main Talking Points for Next Week’s Meeting with President Travis:**

- 84 1. Communication intended to reach all HEOs needs to be direct, and not filtered down in
85 different ways and at different rates in different divisions. Either this can happen
86 through the HEO Council itself, in which case we will need to be updated promptly when
87 HEOs join and leave the staff, or through some other direct means. As noted above,
88 relying on divisional VPs to disseminate important information often yields mixed
89 results and damages morale.
- 90 2. HEO Screening Committee: The administration must commit to returning to the old
91 calendar of regular October and March meetings of the committee, and as soon as those
92 dates are scheduled, that information should be disseminated to the HEOs.
- 93 3. Workload Mitigation for HEOs: The HEO Quality of Work-Life Survey uncovered some
94 disturbing information regarding HEO workload and uncompensated overtime that
95 must be addressed. The faculty have had workload mitigation, and it is time for HEOs
96 to have it also. This must include a discussion of the way HEO turnover affects HEO
97 morale, especially when positions are held vacant. This is a two-part conversation to be
98 had with the administration because it concerns both governance and labor. Some
99 specific ideas from Mr. Anzaldua are pasted below.
- 100 4. There is no “Provost for HEOs”. Faculty have a single person who is ultimately
101 responsible for addressing their issues and concerns: the Provost. HEOs have no
102 equivalent person on campus. Instead, we are divided up among divisions. We believe
103 this contributes to the great difference in the ability of HEOs to have their concerns
104 addressed vs. faculty.

105

106 **Ideas from Mr. Anzaldua:**

107 What mechanisms are in place to ensure that a 1 FTE HEO position is defined such that their
108 regularly assigned workload requires only approximately 35 hours per week to perform?

109

110 What recourse does an office/department have when HEO reductions do not result in workload
111 reduction but instead increases the remaining HEOs workload?

112

113 What recourse does a HEO have if their **regularly assigned workload**

- 114 • Is defined to surpass 1 FTE?
- 115 • Requires overtime work even if it was not explicitly assigned as overtime work?
- 116 • Implicitly requires overtime work to meet deadlines?
- 117 • Was assigned without preauthorization and compensation?

118

119 What can be done to mitigate the overtime workload for HEOs? If nothing can be done to
120 mitigate a HEOs overtime workload, what can be done to ensure they are fairly compensated for
121 their overtime?

122

123 Meeting adjourned at approximately 2:30 PM

John Jay College of Criminal Justice
Quality of Work Life Survey, HEO Council
Quantifying HEOs Overtime Work

a. Distribution of HEOs Reported Overtime

HEOs	Number of Weeks Worked Overtime / Month				Overtime Hrs / Week
	1	2	3	4	Avg
N					
11	11	0	0	0	1
19	14	3	1	1	2
14	10	4	0	0	3
12	3	7	1	1	4
21	8	8	2	3	5
6	2	2	0	2	6
6	3	2	1	0	7
9	3	1	1	4	8
3	0	0	1	2	9
14	7	5	1	1	10
4	0	0	2	2	12
2	0	1	0	1	13
2	0	1	0	1	15
4	0	1	2	1	20*
127	61	35	12	19	

b. Calculation of Monthly Overtime

Total Overtime Worked / Month				
N x Weeks x Hours				Total Hrs / Mo
(1 Wk)	(2 Wks)	(3 Wks)	(4 Wks)	
11	0	0	0	11
28	12	6	8	54
30	24	0	0	54
12	56	12	16	96
40	80	30	60	210
12	24	0	48	84
21	28	21	0	70
24	16	24	128	192
0	0	27	72	99
70	100	30	40	240
0	0	72	96	168
0	26	0	52	78
0	30	0	60	90
0	40	120	80	240
Min hrs overtime/mo. =				1686

* = Minimum of 20 hrs is used.

Wks / Mo	x	N	x	Hrs / Wk	=	Total Hrs / Mo
1		11		1		11
2		2		6		24
3		1		10		30
4		1		15		60

PSC contract

1. Employees in the Higher Education Officer ("HEO") series represented by the PSC have a 35-hour workweek as assigned. Those who are non-exempt under the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA") will receive compensatory time for the hours assigned between 35 and 40 hours, on an hour for hour basis, and will receive payment, instead of compensatory time, at the rate of time and one half for hours worked in excess of 40 hours in a week. Employees in the HEO series represented by the PSC who are exempt under the FLSA will receive compensatory time, on an hour for hour basis, for hours assigned in excess of 35 hours in a week. Eligibility for the compensatory time is set forth in paragraph 2 below.
2. Assigned overtime hours are hours a HEO series employee is **assigned to work in excess of his/her usual 35-hour workweek**, as, for example, when a supervisor assigns an employee in the HEOS series to work for three hours on a Saturday in addition to his/her regular Monday to Friday 35-hour workweek.

Assigned overtime hours are also hours a supervisor assigns to a HEO series employee to perform a specific project in addition to his/her usual responsibilities, which, in the opinion of the supervisor, will require the employee to work beyond his/her regularly-scheduled 35-hour workweek for a defined period in order to complete the project on time.

To the extent possible, the supervisor shall provide the employee with 48 hours' notice of the assigned overtime in either of the above-described situations.

Assigned hours beyond the 35-hour workweek must be authorized in advance in writing by such administrator(s) as designated by the College President, and the employee's time records must reflect the additional hours worked. In cases where it is not practical to provide such advance written authorization (i.e., an emergency) such authorization shall be put in writing as soon thereafter as practicable by such administrator(s) as designated by the College President.

QOWL Survey Responses – Workload Related

Change in work Responsibilities	Increased	71.3%
	Decreased	3.8%
	Net Change – Increased	67.5%
Increased responsibilities w/ reclassification/salary increase/etc.	No	72.3%
35-hour week enough time...	Never/Rarely	22.3%
	Sometimes	36.9%
	Not always Enough (sum)	63.1%
Take 1-hour lunch break (out of 5 days)	Less than ½ (Zero, 1, or 2)	57.3%
	Zero	23.6%
Worked overtime - Of those: w/o compensation	Yes	83.4%
	Voluntarily	62.6%
	Involuntarily	9.9%
	Total	72.5%

Disc can match responses to ppl's FLSA status

had to stay to do the work

assigned to work the hours