

**VENTURA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
PERSONNEL COMMISSION**

June 15, 2000

MINUTES

**THREE HUNDRED AND
TWENTY-FOURTH MEETING**

The three hundred and twenty-fourth meeting of the Ventura County Community College District Personnel Commission was held on Thursday, June 15, 2000.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Saynay called the meeting to order. He advised the Commission had received a request from the administration to delete Item # 10.d. from the agenda. He also advised he had received a request to address the Commission regarding Item #9.

1. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Robert Saynay, Barbara Harison, and Tony Grey were present. Patricia Parham, Director of Human Resources and Secretary of the Personnel Commission, was also present.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Prior to approving the minutes, the commissioners agreed the third paragraph of Item #23 should be changed to read "On motion by Ms. Harrison....." The list of those attending the meeting, in Item #2, is changed to reflect "Jack Lipton, District Legal Counsel". On motion by Mr. Grey, seconded by Ms. Harison, and subject to those two changes, the commissioners unanimously approved the minutes of the May 18, 2000 Personnel Commission meeting. (3-111)

1. CORRESPONDENCE

- a. Approval of 2000-2001 Personnel commission Budget by the Ventura County Superintendent of Schools

Patricia Parham reported she received a letter from Dr. Charles Weis advising the Personnel Commission budget has been approved as submitted. She reported the Commission had noted that the staff positions may require adjustments in benefits and salaries depending on COLA and final benefit costs.

5. REPORTS

- a. Board of Trustees Meeting – Marion Boenheim

Dr. Boenheim reported the next Board of Trustees meeting is scheduled for May 24, and she has no new information to report prior to that.

b. Director's Report – Patricia Parham

Ms. Parham distributed a list of current classified recruitments and reported the number of applicants is down because we have exhausted our advertising budget for this fiscal year and have been unable to advertise. Some of the current positions may have to be extended, depending on the number of applicants. Ms. Harison suggested the use of unique publications in which advertising frequently costs less money.

c. Mr. Saynay announced that he had met with Chancellor Westin and President Jacobs regarding the move of the Office of the Personnel Commission Office. They had agreed a July 15 move would be difficult to achieve, and nothing definite has been decided. Mr. Saynay will be meeting next week with Deputy Chancellor Gregoryk to further discuss the issue.

6. OLD BUSINESS

None

7. REQUEST FOR LONG-TERM LEAVE

None

8. APPROVAL OF NEW PROPOSED CLASSIFICATION SPECIFICATIONS

None

9. APPROVAL OF PROPOSED REVISIONS OF JOB SPECIFICATIONS

Prior to consideration of the proposed revisions to the specifications, Mr. Darren Kameya, District Legal Counsel, discussed the nature of the confidential status, as well as related government code and PERB rulings. He cited two court decisions relating to confidential status.

At the request of Mr. Kameya, Mr. Greg Cross, of SEIU Local 535, addressed removing a position from the bargaining unit, and said the union must agree or negotiate, but the contract does not address the issue of putting a position back into the bargaining unit. Ms. Parham said it is important to know that these two positions have been confidential for a long time and were removed from the bargaining unit long ago. Ms. Harison pointed out an apparent vagueness in the regulations and said it appears to her that there is a possibility that certain employees of the Personnel Commission would have access to collective bargaining or labor relations information.

Mr. Kameya discussed the confidential status in the context of the Educational Employment Relations Act, which he feels is very specific. Ms. Parham then reviewed the Government Code and compared it with the Education Code, stressing that any changes or

amendments to the Personnel Commission rules must be reviewed by the classified representative in the District. She pointed out the matrix identifying duties of the Board and the Commission, which states one of the duties of the Commission is to “analyze collective bargaining proposals.” Ms. Parham said she believes there is area within the law to retain the confidential status of these two positions, rather than define it so narrowly that it would exclude them. She distributed a matrix reflecting other school districts and the number of their Personnel Commission employees with a confidential status. Mr. Kameya again discussed a court decision that employees are not considered confidential solely because they have access to budget numbers.

a. Classified Personnel Specialist/Confidential (9-59)

The commissioners discussed the difference between the duties of this position and the Human Resources Technician/Confidential, and the rationale for the different titles. On motion by Mr. Grey, seconded by Ms. Harison, the commissioners unanimously approved the revisions to the specifications of this classification.

b. Classified Personnel Assistant (9-60)

c. Human Resources Assistant (9-61)

On motion by Ms. Harison, seconded by Mr. Grey, the commissioners unanimously approved the revisions to the specifications of these two classifications, and the increase to #230 on the salary schedule.

d. Employee Benefits Technician (9-62)

On motion by Ms. Harison, seconded by Mr. Grey, the commissioners unanimously approved the revisions to the specifications of this classification, and the increase to #240 on the salary schedule.

e. Human Resources Technician/Confidential (9-63)

This job specification had a change only in the reporting relationship. Mr. Kameya objected to the confidential status, then withdrew his objection when he realized the position was in Human Resources and not the Personnel Commission. There was a lengthy discussion regarding involvement in negotiations. On motion by Ms. Harison, seconded by Mr. Grey, the commissioners unanimously approved the proposed revision to this classification.

- f. Director, Personnel Office of the Personnel Commission (9-64)

Ms. Harison pointed out that the next-to-the-last Representative Duty should read "... supervision and motivation of Personnel Commission staff" Mr. Grey suggested the first Representative Duty should include "*Provide technical expertise and propose*" He also suggested the first Representative Duty on page three of the job description should be changed to read "... make necessary arrangements, to include the *supoena* of witnesses" Subject to those changes, and on motion by Mr. Grey, seconded by Ms. Harison, the commissioners unanimously approved the proposed revisions to the classification specifications.

10. **RECLASSIFICATION** (All effective July 1, 2000)

- a. Barbara Lawrence (10-48)
From Clerical Assistant I (SS #190) to Human Resources Assistant (SS #230)

Ms. Harison questioned the increase from SS #190 to SS #230. Ms. Parham said she had done a survey of the work performed by the college offices of Continuing Education and had interviewed Ms. Lawrence. Ms. Lawrence meets the minimum qualifications and Ms. Parham believes she has been performing the functions of this new position.

- b. *This item was removed from the agenda prior to the meeting.*

- c. Diana Harvey (10-50)
From Clerical Data Technician (SS #230) to Human Resources Assistant (SS #230)

- d. Valerie Lee (10-51)
From Clerical Data Technician (SS #230) to Human Resources Assistant (SS #230)

- e. Sally Hale (10-52)
From Admin. Assistant II (SS #230) to Human Resources Assistant (SS #230)

On motion by Mr. Grey, seconded by Ms. Harison, the commissioners unanimously approved the proposed reclassifications (Items 10-48, 10-50, 10-51, and 10-52).

- f. Patricia Olson (10-53)
From Administrative Assistant II/Confidential (CSS #230) to Administrative Assistant, Office of the Personnel Commission/Confidential (CSS #250)

Ms. Parham advised this is a new proposed specification, tailoring it to the functions of the Commission. Mr. Kameya again raised the issue of confidentiality and also questioned the placement at CSS #250 but, in response to questioning

from Ms. Harison, said it was not a legal issue. Ms. Parham spoke in justification of the increase and Ms. Harison said this particular assistant is supporting an appointed body and has duties unlike other assistants, with the exception of the secretary to the board. Dr. Boenheim addressed the equity system and the placement of assistants, and Ms. Harison again pointed out the uniqueness of this particular position. Mr. Grey agreed the duties warranted placement at #250 and further suggested titling the position "Executive Secretary" or "Assistant." On motion by Ms. Harison, seconded by Mr. Grey, the commissioners unanimously agreed to rename the position "Executive Assistant/Confidential, Office of the Personnel Commission, and approved the reclassification at CSS #250.

11. APPROVAL OF PROPOSED REVISIONS OF PERSONNEL COMMISSION RULES

None

12. ABOLISHMENT OF CLASSIFICATIONS

None

13. INTERPRETATION OF MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

None

14. APPROVAL OF PROPOSED SALARY RANGE

None

15–18. Listed as appropriate.

None

19. OTHER

None

20. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

21. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT PERSONNEL COMMISSION MEETING

The next meeting of the Personnel Commission is scheduled for Thursday, July 20, 2000 at 7:00 p.m.

There was a brief discussion of the letter which Ms. Parham sent to the trustees, advising them that she would be out of town for the next Board meeting. Mr. Grey asked that this be officially noted in the minutes.

22. ADJOURNMENT

On motion by Ms. Harison, seconded by Mr. Grey, Mr. Saynay adjourned the meeting at 8:25 p.m.