

**MINUTES OF THE PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING**  
**FRIDAY, APRIL 1, 2011, 8:30 A.M.**  
**AL SNIPES BOARD ROOM**

Present: President Sechrist, Tad Thurston, Jacqueline Frock, Paul Buckelew, Mat Price, Michael Punches, Akram Taghavi-Burris, Don Coates, Jennifer Harrison, Darby Johnsen, John Richardson, Mike Reeves, Kim Lusk, Lori Johnson, Dallas Worth, Mike Barber, Ron Austin, Brandon Isaak, Nicholas Webb, Paige Landreth, Jessica Martinez-Brooks, Jiapeng Song, Annalyn Gill, and Stu Harvey.

Absent: Cecilia Pittman and Lydia Rucker.

Guests: Paula Gower, Gary Lombard, and Larry Robertson.

Handout: Draft Plan for Transition to Bi-Weekly Payroll

President Sechrist welcomed the President's Advisory Council (PAC) representatives to the meeting.

President Sechrist announced that the dedication ceremony for the Family and Community Education (FACE) Center was held on March 30<sup>th</sup>, and he expressed his appreciation to everyone who worked to make the event a success.

The main topic of discussion was the draft proposal by Human Resources to move to a bi-weekly payroll system in the future. President Sechrist emphasized that, at this time, there has not yet been a final decision made about the College changing its payroll system to bi-weekly payroll.

Many things must be considered before a recommendation is made to President's Cabinet. President Sechrist invited Mr. Gary Lombard, Vice President for Human Resources, to the meeting to discuss and explain bi-weekly payroll in the event that the College does decide to make the transition. Gary Lombard explained that Paula Gower is working on a "Frequently Asked Questions" section on the College employee website concerning bi-weekly payroll for better communication to employees. Mr. Lombard then provided an overview of the topic. A handout was provided to the PAC members and is included as an attachment to the minutes.

He explained that the reason for a possible transition to bi-weekly payroll is because state funds may not be used to pay for services that have not been rendered, and bi-weekly payroll would reduce the possibility of payment to individuals for time not worked. Some of the benefits to employees would include the following: employees would get paid sooner, have more frequent pay dates, quicker payment of overtime, and no change in rate of pay or annual salary. If the College makes the transition to bi-weekly payroll, the proposed date is July 1, 2012.

The bi-weekly payroll would be a "lag-pay system." Employees would be paid approximately two-weeks after the payroll period. To minimize the adverse impact, it is proposed that current full-time employees would have the option to convert any unused leave of up to 80 hours to a

one-time payment. Gary continued to explain that Rebecca McGee from ING has agreed to offer planning and budgeting sessions to assist employees if the payroll transition takes place.

The presentation was followed by questions, comments, and suggestions from the PAC members. Some expressed concern about lower-paid employees and the need to rethink how one pays bills. Mr. Lombard indicated the primary reason for the 80-hour conversion of unused leave was to mitigate the impact on our lower-paid employees. He also explained that since the 80-hour conversion would be in addition to the regular pay, it was a benefit that was being recommended for all impacted employees.

Some asked why we were considering making the change if it was not required. Mr. Lombard responded that most state agencies were required to move to a bi-weekly payroll, but the requirement presently does not include educational institutions. He stated that he believed that at some point in the future educational institutions will be required to do so.

Some expressed appreciation for the opportunity to express concerns and that it appeared that the proposal was trying to reduce the negative impact. Others expressed a desire to move to a bi-weekly system as soon as possible.

President Sechrist concluded the discussion by indicating that the College was seriously considering the draft proposal from Human Resources. He also indicated his strong desire that if the proposal is approved, we want to do it the right way, minimizing the negative impact, and doing it in a timeline that gives employees sufficient time to plan for the change.

President Sechrist provided the following responses to questions that were presented prior to the April 1, 2011 meeting:

1. **QUESTION/CONCERN:** Why does the construction on JMC appear to be connected (or being constructed) right on top of the Child Development Center (CDC)? Also, if they are not going to be joined, has a decision been made as to who will occupy the old CDC?

**RESPONSE:** The new John Massey Center is being constructed near the old Child Development Center, but it is not connected and likely will not be joined at some later date. A decision has not been made as to what will occupy the old CDC. Consideration is being given to administrative function currently in one of the academic buildings/centers that could be moved to the CDC, and therefore, free up space for additional general-purpose classrooms.

2. **QUESTION/CONCERN:** Is it against OCCC policy for full-time exempt employees, who are also adjunct instructing, to work on their course work during their regular professional hours?

**RESPONSE:** It is not against College policy, but employees need to first request approval from their supervisor. Since working as an adjunct is in addition to the normal workload, supervisors generally require that time spent working on the adjunct course during the normally scheduled work time be made up.

3. QUESTION/CONCERN: It seems to me that we had a “leave sharing” process in the past, whereby employees could transfer some of their leave to another employee who has exhausted their leave due to extenuating circumstances. Does the College still provide this?

**RESPONSE: The College has not had a leave-sharing policy in the past, and one is not under consideration. It has been discussed a couple of times, but each time it was concluded that leave earned by an employee should only be available to that employee. The reason is that it would place employees and the College in a difficult situation if employees were allowed to transfer their leave to another employee then later needed that leave back due to an unforeseen circumstance. Each employee must obtain and manage their own leave, retaining it, if they wish, for their own use in case of personal health issues, emergencies, etc.**

President Sechrist thanked the PAC representatives for their commitment to serve on PAC and adjourned the meeting.