PERSONNEL COMMISSION MEETING
MINUTES
SAN BERNARDINO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

April 22, 2009

A meeting of the Personnel Commission was held in the Community Room at the Board of Education Building. Present were Mr. George Bohn, Chairperson; Ms. Rhonda Early, Vice-Chairperson; Gino Barabani, Member; and Mr. Jeff Josserand, Executive Director.

I. CALL TO ORDER
Mr. Bohn, Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. and Lorena Aceves led the pledge of allegiance.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES
On the suggestion of Ms. Early, the Commission decided to defer the approval of the minutes of the Personnel Commission meeting on May 28, 2008 until the next meeting pending review from the Commission. Mr. Bohn moved to approve; Mr. Barabani seconded. The motion was approved unanimously. Ms. Early moved to approve the minutes of the March 25, 2009 Personnel Commission meeting; Mr. Barabani seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

IV. MATTERS BROUGHT BY THE PUBLIC
My name is Joette Spencer Campbell, classified employee. I'm the Sociological Services Specialist for the District. I have some questions that I had asked at the Personnel Commission office and I need answers to those questions. The first question is who’s responsible for all the changes taking place with Classified Personnel? Who’s the responsible person that I should contact to ask questions? I want to know who is responsible if I have questions regarding Classified Personnel like applications and different functions information that I need as a classified employee who should I ask? I know that there is the Personnel Commission, and then there’s the Classified Personnel Human Resources. If I have questions or concerns to whom should I direct those?

Mr. Josserand: I would suggest, Mr. Chairperson, either one that you can start at. They are well trained enough, if you have questions in Classified Personnel that they can’t address, they’ll switch you to the Commission or vice versa.

Ms. Campbell: But I asked who’s in charge?

Mr. Bohn: It depends on which area you are talking about. In a whole process, there’s a process of the District that decides if it needs employees and authorizes to hire those employees. The Commission’s job is to make sure that we advertise and we test for those positions and come up with the very best employees we can on a ranking system based upon the test. Those are approved by this three Commission panel. At that time they are given to the District and the District chooses off the top of the list for a position. For example, if it would be a Principal’s
secretary, the Principal would contact the District and say they need to have a position and the reason they should have a position. We look for employees to fill that position and put a rank on them. That ranking goes back to the District and the District gives a number of individuals to interview. The Principal chooses one and contacts the District and says he would like to hire that one. Then at that point, the individual goes through a final security check and then the District authorizes the hiring of that person. We are in the middle of the two processes. The District has control of who, what, and when they want to hire for a position. We have control of finding people for that position and making sure that everybody is fairly treated in the testing process.

Ms. Campbell: And since those duties have been split and I’m only accustomed to dealing with one office is it possible to get something in writing that tells me what function each of those departments have? Can you send me something in writing; tell me yes or no, if it’s possible to get that?

Mr. Bohn: You’re really asking for what is in the State Code and also what is written in the Personnel Commission handbook. This is the handbook and the guideline that controls most of that. This is the guide that we use to follow, that we all agreed on.

Ms. Campbell: And that is new to Classified Personnel?

Mr. Bohn: It’s not new. No, this book has been here and they have had one for years and years and years. Periodically, that book is updated to meet the current needs of what’s going on and how it reflects and interacts with the classified contract. The contract has precedent over the Commission Rules. The District, the Commission, and the CSEA can agree upon rules that we’re going to follow. Then in negotiations with the District, CSEA can add to those Rules or take something away from a particular section of the Rules that the District and CSEA agree with. So there is no particular person that you can go to answer every single question, but certainly Jeff or the Assistant Superintendent, Ms. Ortega can help you or their offices can help you find the direction that you want to go with that.

Ms. Campbell: Where can I get complete information when applying for any classified position that should become available?

Mr. Josserand: The Personnel Commission Office.

Ms. Campbell: Which office should I submit my application?

Mr. Josserand: Personnel Commission Office.

Ms. Campbell: What office do I call to follow up on the applications that I’ve submitted?

Mr. Josserand: Personnel Commission Office.

Ms. Campbell: There were two positions that were open recently, Personnel Commission Analyst and Senior Analyst. How is the information disseminated to the community at large about the information regarding the two certificated positions being flown under EdJoin?
Mr. Josserand: It was placed in the hall where all the jobs are advertised, it was placed on the District website, and it was also placed on EdJoin. It’s the Commission’s desire to embark on utilizing a system called NEOGOV which is an applicant tracking system and hopefully, if everybody agrees, will be up and operating by the start of the fiscal year and that would be July 1, 2009 and that will be the one place where you can go and do everything. As an example, you can type in your resume, you can type in some information on your application, and you can repeatedly use that same effort as you apply for different jobs with the District.

Ms. Campbell: Is this the time that I would comment, when the information was trying to be completed on EdJoin, it wasn’t possible.

Mr. Josserand: If there was a difficulty with EdJoin, that is since we didn’t have an online capability when we flew those three jobs, we went to Certificated. It’s not uncommon in most Districts to utilize EdJoin for Certificated; many also use it for Classified. We weren’t aware of any difficulties with EdJoin, but if an applicant had a good faith effort to apply and found technical difficulties with EdJoin, what can happen is that they can just write the Executive Director a letter, give us the facts and we’ll take it under review. How that process would work is, say I’m an applicant for the Senior Analyst position I couldn’t make EdJoin work or I was an applicant for the Analyst and couldn’t make EdJoin work, given the time base problem and some sense of the difficulty and that you are desiring to have an opportunity to apply for these positions, we’ll take that under advisement. From there the Executive Director will review the technical flaws for EdJoin and work collaboratively with that organization to see if we could duplicate or assess or support that assertion that it was down for that period and then the Executive Director would make then a decision and that decision since it came in writing will go back in writing. Then if the person didn’t like the Executive Director’s decision you can then ask for the Commission to hear it on appeal. Then what would happen in a meeting just like this we would agendize it for a public hearing and the original letter from whoever sent it would be in the agenda and my letter, as the Executive Director, in response making the initial first line ruling would be in the package then the Commission would have the opportunity to review those first documents. It’s normal practice that they would then make a decision based on what is written in those first documents. That’s why it’s very important when you send the letter of appeal in to be very thorough and very complete and my office can help you do that if you choose too. Sometimes, this is kind of technical stuff and we don’t want to take technical questions and have that used against you. Additionally, if you are a classified employee I’m certain that CSEA will help you construct that letter of appeal and you can do that in as a timely manner as possible. Once the Commission makes a decision, that decision is binding. It is possible in that public hearing for the Commission to ask either the Executive Director or the individual making the appeal a question or two if they have any. Does that answer your question?

Ms. Campbell: Yes. How will classified staff and the community at large be notified of the forth coming changes?

Mr. Josserand: I think that is an excellent question. I think working collaboratively with all members of the community. There are a number of stakeholders. CSEA, as an example, has
some reference to how long and where positions have to be posted in the labor contract, that’s also binding on the District. Additionally, the California Education Code talks about how positions need to be posted and how information is provided. The Education Code says that the request for applications has to be posted in a conspicuous place that has normal access for a minimum period of fifteen days. There has been a practice in the District to notify people on a weekly basis and we believe that the fifteen days is more compliant so we are moving toward the compliant level. I would suppose that after July 1, before successfully obtaining resources and working successfully in collaboration with our stakeholders, that NEOGOV will be up and operating and that would be the one stop shop for everybody that has access to the internet. There are number of features for NEOGOV, let’s say if there is a classification or a job that we are not recruiting for now and that you have interest for applying for that job or someone else does, they can ask to be notified by e-mail when that job opens. So we’re going to try to use electronic resources and technology to make things work. However, there is a concern that we all have, that everyone does not have access to technology all the time, so to try to deal with that, what many Districts have done in the past is to come with a list of community organizations, churches, sometimes community groups based on whatever brings people together and then to mail copies of those flyers to those groups. Hopefully, the Commission will obtain resources to facilitate that in the future. In an adverse community it’s very important that we recognize the socio-economic difficulties that people face and to give people adequate notice and adequate opportunity, part of that, as an example, is when we go to the NEOGOV standard it’s our hope to have computer access in the Personnel Commission office so somebody can come in and take advantage of the NEOGOV system. Type their application in and make that application in our office if they don’t have access to technology. Then, that would allow my staff, working for the Commission, to evaluate each and every application without anybody’s name, without anybody’s defective class, they just don’t know who the person is. So you make a determination on who advances to the test based on what is written on the application minus the name or any other information by which you can discern who the person is. That is why, as a Commission, we are trying to embrace NEOGOV as the best technology solution for those of us who want to try and make this fair and impartial. One way that this list of community organizations, if the Commission chooses to use that, once we have the resources that can be a collaborative process, you can participate in that, the CSEA can participate in that, any number of organizations in the community could be invited and extensively that is that the flyers you’ll see outside of Classified Personnel conditionally will be mailed prior to the start of recruitment and will be notified on a recurring basis. That’s the District politics and also I also think it’s good business but we’re not there yet but that’s our intent. Does that answer your question?

Ms. Campbell: Yes. I’ve revised this because I have submitted several copies for the Commissioners to the Personnel Commission office and I just don’t know the process for doing that protocol.

Mr. Josserand: We make it easy. We had three letters that were sealed and they were delivered to the Commissioners tonight. If you would like to update that or modify what you submitted to the Commission you can give it to the secretary and she’ll make sure that they get it. Does that answer your question?

Ms. Campbell: Yes. Well, these aren’t sealed.
Mr. Josserand: She is confidential.

Paperwork was given to Elizabeth Carreon, Secretary to the Commission.

Mr. Barabani: I have a couple of questions? Did you end up having problems with EdJoin?

Ms. Campbell: It’s located in certificated and not in classified. When I was told the information was in EdJoin I tried to go into EdJoin, it wasn’t under classified it was under certificated.

Mr. Barabani: What was the outcome of that? Did you end up being able to put in an application?

Ms. Campbell: No. I was doing it for some other people and I had some questions about it.

Mr. Barabani: One other question. Do you have any suggestions for improvement?

Ms. Campbell: No, I don’t have any suggestions. I think management or administration would be able to look at some of the concerns that I had and maybe management can excel and come up with suggestions on how to disseminate this information, for everyone that’s part of this process.

Mr. Bohn: Thank you. Do we have any other speakers? Very well, we’ll move on to the report of the Executive Director of Classified Personnel and Personnel Commission.

V. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Mr. Josserand: Today is Administrative Professional’s Day. Since many of our classified employees fall into that category I would like to thank them for the wonderful work they do for our children. All of our classified employees do wonderful things for kids.

The Commission has presented for a first reading all but the chapter on discipline. There is a request from CSEA and the Administration to create a schedule and move forward to review the chapters collaboratively. The Administration has notified me that they have an interest to make a few changes to Chapters one and two. They were kind enough to share them with me and I believe that they are going to provide those in writing. It’s incumbent upon your staff to keep both the labor union and Administration by law, advised of the processes as we move forward. So in regards to Chapter one and two, we’ll bring that forward and if there are any suggested changes from the Administration that are accepted by Commission staff and recommended to you. They will be noted clearly and if for some reason the Commission staff can’t resolve it, that will be noted to you and in the next meeting would be the second reading for those rules and then we would adopt the changes. It’s also incumbent upon staff to keep CSEA informed of the District’s desired changes and outcomes of those discussions if they’re not a collaborative meeting to accomplish that or vice versa.

We have a presentation on the budget for next year. We understand we are in tough times but staff has an obligation to make sound recommendations to the Commission. Nothing we do is intended to be provocative to any party. Staff is hopeful that we can collaboratively work together with interested parties to provide excellent service to the district and arrive at a sound
funding level. But we are in a time of change. I think it’s a very positive change. Hopefully everybody can see that for all concerned.

I am pleased to report that staff had a successful meeting with the leadership of the IT Department, the subject of the meeting was to address their possible concerns with the adoption of NEOGOV. I believe all concerns were satisfactorily addressed and we can move forward as part of the budget process to gain funding and support for NEOGOV’s adoption in the next month.

We are moving forward with recruitments related to Commission staff and anticipate having one or two analysts on staff and two specialists on staff by our next meeting. We used EdJoin because we had some difficulties in transition with the District’s website and we wanted to cast as wide a range as possible. We’ll investigate the concerns that were earlier shared. We are very pleased to announce that we got about 38 applications and those are in the review and the testing process for those positions has begun. Commission staff may exercise authority to begin some recruitments in the very near future in anticipation of a possible relaxation of the hiring freeze at the start of the fiscal year. To utilize resources efficiently we may have some recruitments as Promotion Only to facilitate support of the budget. It is not uncommon for the district to be in a situation to promote and hire internal employees. It is congruent with the guidance of ED Code that places regular permanent classified employees in priority over all others.

There are a few pay documents that I could not approve at this time. I have notified the Commission. The protocol is that if I can not sign, the document is brought to the Commission for public hearing and a decision. Since the reason I could not sign, could easily be resolved, I have not added the documents to the agenda, in the hopes I can rapidly gain agreement with the interested parties to resolve the difficulty, which will allow me to approve the payroll documents.

I want to thank the Commission staff, Mr. Albiso, Ms. Ortega, Karen and everybody else for their spirit of collaboration. It takes great courage and hard work on part of all to move forward.

That concludes the Executive Director Report.

III. ACTION ITEMS:

A. Consider approval of the following Job Description Revision: Public/Communications Relations Technician (Writer/Photographer).
Item pulled for possible revision.

B. First reading of minor changes to Personnel Commission Rules: Chapters one and two.
Discussion on possible revisions from the District, Commission Staff, and CSEA. First reading approved. Second reading will be at the next Personnel Commission meeting on May 27, 2009.

C. First reading of new Personnel Commission Rules: Chapters three through twenty two with the exception of nineteen.
Discussion on possible revisions from the District, Commission Staff, and CSEA. First reading approved. Second reading will be at the next Personnel Commission meeting on May 27, 2009.
D. Personnel Commission Budget 2009-2010:
First reading of the Personnel Commission Budget 2009-2010 approved. Second reading will be at the next Personnel Commission meeting on May 27, 2009.

E. Approval of the recruitments:
Ms. Early moved to approve. Mr. Barabani seconded. The recruitment list was approved unanimously.

F. Approval of the eligibility list:
Ms. Early moved to approve. Mr. Bohn seconded. The recruitment list was approved unanimously.

X. COMMISSIONERS REMARKS:
The Commission thanked and congratulated the Commission staff for their excellent work.

XI. CLOSED SESSION:
Personnel Commission moved into closed session with no action to report.

Adjourned: 6:45 p.m.