From: <u>Liz Bettencourt</u>
To: <u>Beau Goldie</u>

Cc: Norma J. Camacho; Jim Fiedler; Jesus Nava; Metra Ulloa; Jason Christie; Stanley Young; Cathy Paramo; Glenna

Brambill; Jan Ortiz; John Tucker; Lilian Dennis; Liz Bettencourt; Merna Leal; Michele Keefhaver

Subject: Alternative Work Schedules

Date: Monday, July 06, 2015 5:45:31 PM

Attachments: <u>image001.png</u>

Beau,

What a nice surprise to hear from you on this very important topic—it has been a significant cause of concern for district staff over the past few years. I am extremely happy to hear of your support for the 8-9-8 work schedule in particular, and appreciate that you have stated it publically for all to see.

In your memo you state that you "believe that a flexible work schedule can benefit both employees and the district." We could not agree more. You also state that you "have seen how 8-9-8 schedule has helped employees balance the challenges and issues of home responsibilities and their district duties. I do believe that a work force that doesn't feel so stressed is a more productive work force." Again, we absolutely agree with you. It is particularly important when the workforce is stretched with so much work and so many high priorities.

Staff has been convinced that systematically disallowing or banning compressed workweeks was part of the district's overall workforce strategy, so it is gratifying to now know that is not the case and we are of like mind on the subject. Unfortunately, actions will always betray words, so the consistent loss of such schedules on a fairly broad scale, and management's "reinterpretation" of the MOU language, sends a far different message to the masses.

In your memo you noted, "...flexible work schedules make the district more attractive to prospective employees." We are 3 for 3 on agreements; however, that statement is no longer valid as all internal AND external job postings now indicate each position will work a Monday — Friday, 8a — 5p work shift. Potential external candidates don't even see the potential for flexibility, and internally, staff have had to weigh the loss of their 8-9-8 schedule when applying for promotions. I hope you will be able to address this issue as soon as possible. As you know, for years job postings never listed work schedules—that was discussed between the hiring manager and the selected candidate. Conversely, posting a job and indicating that flexible work schedules may be available is far more attractive to the young minds you are trying to attract to the district.

Lastly, you state that you "...rely on the direct supervisors, together with their unit managers and deputies..." to assess the need for coverage, etc., to determine whether or not an

alternate schedule will work in that position or unit. I wonder if you are aware that in some pockets of the district, alternate schedules are not up for discussion even after an employee has been here for some time. There are also pockets here where whether or not the supervisor or unit manager feels it is a better solution for her/his unit, it is disallowed from the next link up the chain of command. We can assume that direction did not come from you.

Arbitrarily setting a schedule and then not allowing the flexibility to change it, even with a good business case, is not in the best interest of the employee, the team, the unit or the district as a whole. Ideally, staff should have the opportunity to present their business case for a schedule that will enable them to be fully present when they are at work, and the supervisor or unit manager should be able to assess her/his unit to determine whether or not it will work.

On behalf of the EA Board and our membership, thank you again for letting us know that you do indeed endorse the use of alternate work schedules. We hope we can discuss this further, particularly the inconsistencies I've mentioned, at our July 8 meeting with you and the Chiefs.

Liz Bettencourt

President, Employees Association 408-630-2821 www.valleywaterea.com

