The four hundred and thirty-eighth meeting of the Personnel Commission of the Ventura County Community College District was held on Thursday, August 18, 2011, at 7:00 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER
Commissioner Gonzales called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL
In attendance were Commissioners David Gonzales, Barbara Harison, and James King. Michael Arnoldus, Director of Employment Services/Personnel Commission and Secretary to the Personnel Commission, were also present.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING AGENDA ITEMS
None

4. MINUTES
On motion by Commissioner Harison and seconded by Commissioner King, the minutes of the Thursday, July 21, 2011 meeting of the Personnel Commission were unanimously approved.

5. CORRESPONDENCE
None

6. REPORTS
   A. Classified Employees Representative’s Report
      Barbara Cogert, Classified Senate President of Ventura College, provided a written report summarizing the college’s classified employee activities for the month of August 2011. Ms. Cogert was not in attendance. Connie Owens, Classified Senate President of Oxnard College and Kim Watters, Classified Senate President of Moorpark College did not submit a report.

      Director Arnoldus contacted all three of the Classified senate presidents regarding changing the time of the Personnel Commission Meeting to an earlier time and learned that elections will be held in the near future. Director Arnoldus was advised to pose his inquiry to the newly elected representatives.
B. BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING REPORT
Director Arnoldus noted the August 9th Board meeting was relatively short compared to past meetings. A point of contention at the Board meeting was regarding the proposed Administrative Procedure 7205 Employee Code of Ethics. This procedure has been a work in progress for approximately 2 years and is applicable to all district employees. A discussion ensued regarding the specific items of contention. Mr. Arnoldus said he would send copies of the proposed procedure and adopted procedure to the Commission for informational purposes.

C. DIRECTOR’S REPORT
Director Arnoldus reviewed the monthly Current Recruitments Report that included three open recruitments and three closed recruitments. The Positions Filled and Pending Report reflected thirteen positions filled and three pending selection.

D. COMMISSIONERS’ REPORTS
None

7. OLD BUSINESS

PERSONNEL COMMISSION MEETING SCHEDULE
At the last meeting a discussion ensued regarding changing the time the Commission meets from 7 p.m. to an earlier time. Mr. Arnoldus emailed Dan Casey, Chief Steward, SEIU, and the three classified senate presidents with the time change proposal. While all individuals supported the change, two classified senate presidents stated that their lack of attendance was due more to the location of the meetings rather than the meeting times. It was noted that elections for classified senate presidents will commence in October. The Commissioners would like to pose the time change to the newly elected representatives when the election is complete. Mr. Casey indicated that the meeting time conflicted with another regularly scheduled meeting. Mr. Arnoldus suggested changing the time from 7 p.m. to 6 p.m. The Commission was in favor and agreed to schedule future meetings to start at 6 p.m.

8. REVISION OF CLASSIFICATION SPECIFICATIONS
Mr. Arnoldus presented the proposed classification specification revisions for Zoo Day Camp Aide and Zoo Day Camp Technician. Mr. Arnoldus explained that the minimum qualifications were being revised for both classifications to eliminate the requirement of coursework in specific disciplines. This recommendation was based on the belief that the educational requirements were too restrictive and that college-level educational preparation in any field was sufficient for providing the candidates with the necessary preparation. Mr. Arnoldus stated that Dean Hoffmans was in support of the proposed changes.

A. ZOO DAY CAMP AIDE
Commissioner King commented on the second paragraph under “Education and Experience” the text “six months experience working with children.” He also noted the preference given to “experience in an organized setting such as recreation programs or education.” Director Arnoldus stated the intent is to remain as broad as possible in order to be as inclusive as possible.
On motion by Commissioner Harison and seconded by Commissioner King the Commissioners unanimously agreed to approve the revision to the Zoo Day Camp Aide classification specification.

B. ZOO DAY CAMP TECHNICIAN
Commissioner King noted a typo in the distinguishing characteristics section and discussed other recommendations for language consistency. On motion by Commissioner King and seconded by Commissioner Harison the Commissioners unanimously agreed to approve the revision to the Zoo Day Camp Technician classification specification.

C. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT SPECIALIST I
Matthew Escobedo, Human Resources Analyst II, explained that the Information Technology (IT) Department management believed the minimum qualifications were set too high for the subject classification. The proposed changes clarified the educational requirement and lowered the experience requirement from three to two years. Commissioner King referred to the 2009 reorganization of the IT function and inquired as to why the classification specification was in need of revision only two years later. Mr. Escobedo stated that the minimum qualifications were brought into question when a presumed “qualified” candidate was not eligible for placement as a provisional employee as a result of not meeting the minimum qualifications. Discussion ensued between the Commissioners and Mr. Arnoldus concerning the proposed language.

On motion by Commissioner Harison and seconded by Commissioner King the Commissioners unanimously agreed to approve the revision to the Information Technology Support Specialist I classification specification.

9. TITLE CHANGE, AMENDMENT, ABOLITION, AND RENUMBERING OF PERSONNEL COMMISSION RULES

Director Arnoldus discussed the basis for the proposed changes to the rules given concerns pertaining to the appropriateness and applicability of the language based on his understanding of best practices and theory pertaining to personnel selection administration.

Director Arnoldus indicated that he sent the proposed changes to Mr. Casey. The Commissioners expressed concern with notifying affected parties at each of the three colleges of the proposed changes. Director Arnoldus stated that he would inform the Vice Presidents of Business Services of the proposed changes.

A. AMENDMENT OF PERSONNEL COMMISSION RULE 131 – EXAMINATION ANNOUNCEMENTS (FIRST READING)

Director Arnoldus stated the change to this rule only affects Item H regarding posting pass points in the examination announcement. Director Arnoldus explained pass points are not typically determined prior to the administration of exams; therefore, such information is not available at the time the job is posted.

Commissioner King recognized the high level of expertise in this area possessed by Director Arnoldus and Mr. Escobedo as evident when he read the proposed revisions to these rules. Commissioner King inquired about test development. Director Arnoldus explained that some
test materials are provided by CODESP, but staff must still determine the appropriateness of such materials and revise the materials as necessary. A discussion ensued between the Commission and the Director regarding the process for setting pass points.

The Commission did not take action with regard to the proposed rule revision.

B. PERSONNEL COMMISSION RULE 134 – SCOPE OF EXAMINATIONS (FIRST READING)

Mr. Arnoldus explained that the primary reason for revising this rule is to remove language suggesting that the screening of applications can be used as a written exam. Mr. Arnoldus stated that the screening process typically referred to as an Evaluation of Training and Experience (T&E) is distinctly different from a written exam and that the two are not interchangeable.

Director Arnoldus also elaborated on the first paragraph indicating that the language designates the Personnel Director as being responsible for determining examination strategies.

Commissioner King asked Mr. Arnoldus about the difference between an exam component and test part. Director Arnoldus replied the terms are synonymous, but he acknowledged that a single term should be used consistently throughout the document for sake of clarity. Mr. Arnoldus agreed to use the term “exam component” anywhere in the document where the term “test part” was used.

Commissioner King asked Mr. Arnoldus about how competency modeling influenced the language pertaining to the District’s examination processes. Director Arnoldus stated that the subject language was applicable regardless of whether the District applied a traditional KSA (knowledge, skills, abilities) or competency-based job analysis approach. Commissioner Gonzales noted that competencies are referred to in the second to the last paragraph of the revised PC Rule 134 language. Director Arnoldus then noted that KSA language was utilized in the last paragraph and that he would revise the language to be consistent with competency model.

The Commission did not take action with regard to the proposed rule revision.

C. ABOLISHMENT OF PERSONNEL COMMISSION RULE 134.2 – WRITTEN EXAMINATION (FIRST READING)

Director Arnoldus explained that he removed this section as he did not feel it was necessary.

The Commission did not take action with regard to the proposed rule revision.

D. AMENDMENT AND RENUMBERING OF PERSONNEL COMMISSION RULE 134.3 – ORAL EXAMINATION (FIRST READING)

Director Arnoldus explained that while he did not believe it was necessary to retain the rule pertaining to written examinations, PC Rule 134.3 should remain due to the specific requirements in the State Education Code pertaining to oral examinations. Further, Mr. Arnoldus explained that the previous language was problematic as it dictated that interview committees must always consist of two technical members. Mr. Arnoldus explained that this is
not necessary when administering a general fitness interview.

Director Arnoldus also addressed changes pertaining to the scoring of examinations. He stated that there are two methods for scoring/weighting examinations with multiple components; multiple hurdle and compensatory. Director Arnoldus further explained that the current language would suggest only a compensatory process can be administered and such language is restrictive and not consistent with common and best practices. Further discussion ensued pertaining to theory and best practices.

Commissioner Gonzales asked about the language in section one regarding the need for a general fitness interview. Director Arnoldus stated that the majority of interviews are technical, but there are some instances wherein this would be applicable. Commissioner King noted the title as “Oral Examination” leads one to understand it is a standalone piece as opposed to it actually being a component. Director Arnoldus stated the term “oral exam” has consistently been used in the District and suggested that the practice continue as it is well understood by District employees. Commissioner Harison questioned line three because the Personnel Commission is required to interview for the Director position. Director Arnoldus clarified this is applicable to the development of an eligibility list and not the final interview.

The Commission did not take action with regard to the proposed rule revision.

E. AMENDMENT AND TITLE CHANGE OF PERSONNEL COMMISSION RULE 135 – SCORING OF EXAMINATIONS (FIRST READING)

Director Arnoldus stated language was added to clarify that pass points are not arbitrarily set. The revised language provides assurance that exams are objectively scored based on established standards and that the candidates’ identities are not considered when determining passing scores.

Commissioner Gonzales expressed concern about intent of the last sentence. Director Arnoldus explained that this allowed for the Director to invite a subset of the passing group to the next examination component when District resources do not allow for the testing of all individuals who passed the previous component. This provides the Director with flexibility in moving additional candidates forward in the selection process should the opportunity to consider additional candidates become available. Director Arnoldus stated while he expects this situation to rarely occur, he would like the rules to reflect that the Director may exercise discretion in this regard. Commissioner King noted the word “part” needs to be replaced with the word “component(s)”. Director Arnoldus confirmed he will make the revision.

The Commission did not take action with regard to the proposed rule revision.

10. PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING NON-AGENDA ITEMS
None

11. RECESS TO BREAK
Break convened at 8:29 p.m.
12. **RECONVENE IN OPEN SESSION**  
Open session reconvened at 8:45 p.m.

13. **RECESS TO CLOSED SESSION**  
Public Employee Performance Evaluation (*Pursuant to California Government Code section 54954.5*)  
Title: Director of Employment Services/Personnel Commission  
Closed session convened at 8:46 p.m.

14. **RECONVENE IN OPEN SESSION**  
Commissioner Gonzales stated no action was taken in closed session.  
Open session reconvened at 9:18 p.m.

15. **CHANGE OF DATE FOR DECEMBER 2011 PERSONNEL COMMISSION MEETING**  
Commissioner Harison stated she will be unable to attend the meeting on December 15, 2011. She proposed rescheduling the meeting to December 8, 2011. The change of date will be reviewed again at the September 29, 2011 meeting.

16. **DATE AND TIME OF NEXT PERSONNEL COMMISSION MEETING**  
The date and time of the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Personnel Commission is Thursday, September 29, 2011, at 6:00 p.m. The meeting will take place in the Dr. Thomas G. Lakin Boardroom at the District Administrative Center at 255 West Stanley Avenue, Suite 150, in Ventura, California.

17. **ADJOURNMENT**  
Commissioner Harison moved to adjourn the meeting and the motion was seconded by Commissioner King. The meeting adjourned at 9:21 p.m.