

# Civil Service Commission

1055 MONTEREY STREET, SUITE D250 ♦ SAN LUIS OBISPO, CALIFORNIA 93408 ♦ (805) 781-5959



MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION  
Robert Bergman, President  
Arthur Chapman, Vice President  
Jeannie Nix  
Jay Salter  
Bill Tappan

## The San Luis Obispo County **Civil Service Commission**

### **Regular Session Meeting Action<sup>1</sup> Minutes**

**Wednesday, October 25, 2006, 9:00 a.m.**

County Government Center, 1055 Monterey Street, Suite D271, San Luis Obispo, CA

## **MINUTES**

Present: Vice-President Arthur Chapman, Commissioner Jeannie Nix, Commissioner Jay Salter and Commissioner Bill Tappan

Staff present: Commission Secretary Richard Greek and Acting Clerk Heather Gunderlock

Counsel: Commission Attorney Deputy County Counsel Ann Duggan

Absent: President Robert Bergman

### **1. Call To Order:**

Vice President Chapman called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m. and led the flag salute.

### **2. Public Comment Period:**

Vice President Chapman addressed the audience asking for anyone wishing to speak to the Commission during the Public Comment Period. Being no public comment, Vice President Chapman closed the Public Comment Period.

### **3. Minutes: (Action)**

Wednesday, September 27, 2006 (Regular Session)

Motion to approve the meeting minutes was made by Commissioner Tappan. Second by Commissioner Salter. Vice President Chapman asked for a roll call vote. Motion passed. 4-0-1. Mr. Bergman was absent so abstained.

### **Roll Call – Wednesday, September 27, 2006 (Regular Session):**

Commissioner Nix	Yes
Commissioner Salter	Yes
Commissioner Tappan	Yes
Vice President Chapman	Yes

# Civil Service Commission

## 4. Quarterly Report:

Mr. Greek distributed the quarterly report for July, August and September 2006 to Commissioners and interested parties. Ken Tasseff, Personnel Analyst and Duane English, Departmental Automation Specialist, were present to answer questions. Mr. Greek stated that this year, for the first time, the report will contain only data from the new SAP/HRIS system and Jobaps. Staff's goal is that the report be "useful" and "rock-solid." He also stated that Personnel plans to automate the report after additional refinements. The Commission and Personnel staff engaged in a page-by-page review of the report. Mr. English presented page 3 of the report, "Application Summary by Status." There were no questions from the Commission. Mr. Greek stated that the graph shows an increase of 200 applications received by the Personnel Department this fiscal year. He also stated that a portion of the "Failed Out" category now represents those who failed background checks, which is a new procedure since last year. Mr. Chapman suggested the report show the difference in the number of applications between last year and current.

Regarding page 4, "Application Summary by Recruitment Number 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter (July 1, 2006 to September 30, 2006)," Mr. English explained that the page demonstrates the breakdown of the number of applications by position. Mr. Chapman suggested that the "Failed Out" column be moved between "Failed Oral" and "Eligible for Referral." Mr. English will make the suggested change.

Regarding page 6, "Service and Maintenance Positions," Mr. English explained that the graph indicates the number of Service and Maintenance applications received is very similar to last year. Page 7 represents the number of "Clerical and Support Position" applications received this fiscal year. Page 8 represents "Requisitions by Category." Thus far, the Department has received 53 requisitions for new recruitments. Regarding page 9 "Total Requisitions by Type," the graph demonstrates the type of requisitions received thus far. Mr. Greek stated that this graph is "on track" from what the last fiscal year showed. Page 10 "Existing List and Miscellaneous Action Requisitions," Mr. English stated that the Personnel Department received 49 requisitions for existing eligible lists. Mr. Greek stated that currently, the Department has reached 50% of last year's total.

Page 11 "Average Days for Regular Recruitments," Mr. English explained that there has been a decrease in the average number of days for conducting regular recruitments, a 26% decrease from fiscal year 04-05. Mr. Greek summarized that we are conducting recruitments an average of 20 days faster than last year. He stated that he has not forgotten Mr. Tappan's request for information regarding the time to the initial hire off an eligible list. He stated that staff is pursuing this and the information will be provided in a separate graph in the future. Ms. Duggan asked Mr. Greek if this efficiency reflects the Rule of 10 change from Rule of 3. He responded that a portion of it does reflect the change. Mr. Tasseff clarified that the Rule of 10 came into effect in FY 04-05 and that Personnel improved 13% between FY 04-05 and FY 05-06 and since FY 05-06 there has been an additional 13% improvement rate. Mr. Tappan asked if the new background check is a factor; Mr. Greek responded that it is not. The graph represents the time taken for Personnel to provide the hiring department with an eligible list, whereas the background check process takes place later in the process. Mr. Greek added that complex law enforcement recruitments skew the efficiency totals as well. Vice President Chapman opined that Sheriff Department recruitments should not be included and should be broken out since they skew the total. Mr. Greek responded that at a more detailed level we do assess types of recruitments, but that at this high level it is important to include the Sheriff's recruitments. Ms. Nix pointed out that the graph represents first quarter activity, when positions in the new budget are a significant factor and departments are recruiting heavily. Mr. Greek stated that Ms. Nix is correct and in addition, there was a release of a Health Agency hiring freeze and an overall County vacancy rate of 8%, the highest it's been since Mr. Greek has been with the Personnel Department.

# Civil Service Commission

Regarding page 12, "Clerical and Support Recruitments Status by Job Class," Mr. English explained that the average days for Personnel to provide a hiring department with a Clerical and Support eligible list is 0-2 days. Page 13 "Service and Maintenance Recruitment Statistics by Class" shows that the average number of days for Personnel to provide a hiring department with a Service and Maintenance eligible list is also 0-2 days. Page 14 "Summary of Recruitment Activity: Current Period – 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter FY 06-07" represents a comprehensive summary of all hiring information in table format. Additionally, the table shows that first quarter hires are nearly 50% of the total hires in FY 05-06. In regard to page 15 "Applications EEO – Gender," Mr. English asked if Commissioners would like him to add last year's EEO information to the report. The Commission declined.

However, Ms. Nix did request that the chart include County population percentages versus the County workforce percentages. Mr. English responded that the chart could be modified to incorporate Ms. Nix's request. Page 16 "Applications EEO – Race" Mr. English stated that there was nothing new to report. Mr. Chapman asked if the "US Census Bureau – Race Census 2000" represents the County's census information or nationwide Census information. Mr. Greek responded it represents Census information for the County. Mr. Chapman added that this information is important in ensuring that there is no "adverse impact" on minorities in the County. Mr. Tasseff stated that Jobaps performs adverse impact analysis. Mr. Chapman asked what Jobaps is comparing the data to. Mr. Greek responded that he will research and report back. In regard to page 17 "Applications EEO – Disability," Mr. English stated that the graph represents the totals for those who chose to respond to the survey on the employment application. Mr. Greek stated that Personnel receives occasional requests for special accommodation, a few for hearing-impaired and reading disabled applicants. Regarding page 18, "Applications EEO-Age," Mr. English stated that the 21-29 year age group continues to constitute the largest percent of the applicant pool. Ms. Nix stated that the graph is helpful to the new generation committee since it shows that there have been 493 applicants in the 50-59 year category. She stated that there has been some discussion that people of retirement age are leaving County employment, but that the percentage shows that that a significant number of individuals of retirement age are applying for County jobs.

Regarding page 19 "Grievances/Appeals Filed," Mr. English reported Personnel has received a total of eight appeals for the quarter. Page 20 demonstrated the department breakdown of "Grievances/Appeals Filed by Department. Regarding page 21 "Reason for Grievance/Appeals" Mr. English reported that there has been no significant change since last year. Ms. Nix stated that the report "has really evolved," that it has become a "real working tool" for Commissioners and that she appreciates staff's efforts. Mr. Tappan stated he appreciated that the report was made available electronically.

## 5. Future Agendas:

Mr. Greek distributed updated calendars for November, December and January. He requested tentative January meeting dates from Commissioners. Commissioners offered January 11, 18 and 25, 2007. These dates are pending Mr. Bergman's availability. Mr. Greek reported that the November 8 and 9 Special Meetings are still scheduled at this point in time. The Commission's attorney is available and staff has provided preliminary information to him. It's possible that we will need to provide a law enforcement report exhibit related to the hearing after distribution of the November 8 agenda packet. Mr. Greek reported that Personnel has 13 active grievances/appeals which are being worked on and that there are six that are over the six month timeline which are being worked on "more assertively" than others. The current grievances/appeals represent a range of issues: five are in the pre-hearing stage; two are currently being scheduled for pre-hearing; three are scheduled as hearings or related to presenting specifications to the Commission.

# Civil Service Commission

## 6. New Specification: (Action)

Animal Shelter Coordinator – Sheriff-Coroner Department by Mark McKibben, Personnel Analyst  
Mr. McKibben stated that the specification was originally brought to the Commission at the September 27, 2006 regular meeting. At that time, Commissioners expressed a concern about the disparity between the Minimum Qualifications' Education and Experience and the levels of responsibility of the position. Mr. McKibben subsequently met with Dr. Anderson, Director, Animal Services. Mr. McKibben and Dr. Anderson affirmed that the Education and Experience were appropriate in order to make the position a "career tree" position, so their focus was the level of responsibility which the Commission found to be inconsistent with the Education and Experience requirements. Mr. McKibben made the following changes to the specification:

On page 6(4), line 11: "care, adoption and euthanasia of shelter animals; coordinates volunteers programs;"

On page 6(5), line 3: "~~acts as liaison~~ coordinates activities between the community, volunteers and departmental staff."

On page 6(5), line 6: " Monitors shelter operations; ~~assists in the development of~~ implements policies and procedures for assigned areas to ensure the delivery of safe and effective animal care."

On page 6(5), lines 9 and 10: "Oversees ~~the administration of~~ and personally administers medications, vaccinations, and microchips-; performs procedures to assist in the detection of rabies, leukemia and other conditions related to public health and animal welfare."

On page 6(5), line 12 through 14: "Maintains records, ~~and~~ correspondence and statistics regarding ~~the~~ volunteer programs; ensures accurate record keeping of animal sheltering. ~~Makes recommendations~~ Provides input for on proposed outreach activities and programs."

On page 6(5), lines 18 and 19: " May ~~assist in identifying~~ collect and provide information on funding sources available to ~~administer~~ support and expand volunteer and animal welfare programs."

On page 6(5), lines 21 and 22: "May provide input on budget and assist with inventory control of shelter equipment and related supplies."

On page 6(6), line 3: "~~Basic practices~~ Accepted methods of employee training and supervision"

On page 6(6), line 9: "~~Develop and~~ Implement and maintain programs to promote the adoption of shelter animals"

On page 6(6), line 11: "Effectively communicate verbally and in writing ~~and orally~~"

On page 6(6), line 14: "~~Develop~~ Conduct basic training programs in support of staff and volunteers"

On page 6(6), lines 15 and 16: "~~Prepare reports, documents and correspondence~~ Complete standardized reports to record shelter activities"

Christine Brown, SLOCEA, requested to speak in regard to Item 6. Ms. Brown thanked Mr. McKibben for acknowledging SLOCEA's feedback and implementing their suggested change so quickly. She explained that this change was made because Kennel Workers have historically performed rabies checks on animals which require "dearticulation," the decapitation a dead animal and removal of animal brain matter. There have been some Kennel Workers who have claimed they were unaware of this required duty and have quit upon learning of it. The change in the specification language is designed to clarify this duty as

# Civil Service Commission

a Typical Task. Dr. Anderson stated that dearticulation is a necessity in Animal Services and in the specification language.

Motion to approve the Animal Shelter Coordinator specification as amended was made by Commissioner Nix. Second by Commissioner Salter. Motion passed 4-0-1.

## 7. **Approved Specifications – Final CSC Review:**

- a. Right-of-Way Agent – Public Works Department, by Christina Wong, Personnel Analyst  
(September 27, 2006 revisions) (*Action*)

Ms. Wong made the following change per the Commission's request:

On page 7A(3), lines 16 through 18: "In addition, Either A: three years of experience ~~in a position comparable to performing duties as~~ an Associate Real Property Agent with the County of San Luis Obispo or in a position equivalent or comparable to an Associate Real Property Agent"

She also added the standard ADA language:

On page 7A(4), lines 6 through 13: "This classification generally describes the duties and responsibilities characteristic of the position(s) within this class. The duties of a particular position within a multi-position class may vary from the duties of other positions within the class. Accordingly, the essential functions of a particular position (whether it be a multi-position class or a single-position class) will be identified and used by medical examiners and hiring authorities in the selection process. If you have any questions regarding the duties or the working conditions of the position, please call the Human Resources Department at (805) 781-5959."

Motion to approve the Right-of-Way Agent specification as amended was made by Commissioner Tappan. Second by Commissioner Salter. Motion passed. 4-0-1.

- b. Assistant Social Services Director – Social Services Department, by Trish Stamper, Personnel Analyst  
(*Information*)

Ms. Stamper made the changes the Commission recommended at the October 12, 2006 regular meeting.

The Commission took a brief recess from 10:10 a.m. to 10:20 a.m.

## 8. **Report by Commission Representatives – Open Session:** Planning for the Next Generation Committee (*Action/Information*)

Ms. Kimberly Daniels, SLOCEA, addressed the Commission regarding Item 8. She stated that she is "pleased the committee has been formulated," but expressed disappointment at the pace of the committee's progress. She stated that SLOCEA would like to be able to provide recommendations to the Board of Supervisors in February of 2007 and is concerned about the limited time frame between now and then. In addition, she requested that the committee be provided with statistics (quarterly report data) regarding the number of County employees between the ages of 35 and 45 and 45 to 55 because she feels this information will be "very beneficial for what the Committee will be dealing with." Ms. Nix stated that she is in agreement with Ms. Daniels. She expressed that the process could have been accelerated by the committee being provided available data prior to committee meetings. She also expressed disappointment that the data will not be provided to the whole committee but only made available to a small subcommittee. She is concerned that the group may be "fractured into small subcommittees rather than taking a more global view." Mr. Chapman announced that he and Ms. Ginger Fisher, Personnel Analyst, will facilitate the next meeting and he expects the meeting to "move along quite well." Mr. Chapman asked Ms. Fisher if additional information could be

# Civil Service Commission

made available to the Commissioners. Ms. Fisher responded that it might be possible and she will check into it. She stated that she has preliminarily reviewed the data and sorted it but needs to make some adjustments to the report. She will then send the data to the committee. She also offered to re-sort the data if the committee prefers it in a different format.

Vice President Chapman announced that the date of the next committee meeting is November 16, 2006. Mr. Tappan asked Vice President Chapman about the progress of the committee meetings. Vice President Chapman responded that the committee has met twice, that their goal will be to identify issues and present recommendations to the Board of Supervisors regarding succession planning. Mr. Salter asked Vice President Chapman and Ms. Nix whether they thought that the committee would be provided usable data to support the hypothesis that there will be a "sudden disappearance of leadership" in San Luis Obispo County. Ms. Nix responded that thus far, there has not been definitive information provided that would substantiate whether or not this is a problem for this County at this time.

**9. Time Reserved for Commission President**

No report.

**10. Time Reserved for Commission Counsel**

No report.

**11. Item 12 - Closed Session - (Closed Session per Gov. Code, section 54957.6 -- Conference with County Labor Negotiator): 2005 Civil Service Rule Changes (Action)**

Vice President Chapman called the meeting into Closed Session. Upon reconvening into Open Session, there was no reportable action.

**12. Item 11 - Time Reserved For Commission Secretary**

a. Report and Response Regarding Reorganization Proposal – Mr. Greek provided a summary to Commissioners. He stated that he worked with Counsel, Ann Duggan, Commissioner Salter and staff to frame the overall project. Mr. Greek provided an overview of the report and introduced Mr. Joe Pisano and Mr. Don Nguyen, Santa Barbara County Senior Personnel Analysts. They were present to address questions from the Commission.

In regard to the Commission's concern regarding "the deletion of the Risk Manager specification on the representation that the classification was vacant and obsolete," Mr. Greek stated that the specification was found to be obsolete in 2002 or earlier and remains obsolete based upon the findings of the classification study by Santa Barbara County. He stated that the Commission acted to reinstate the specification on February 28, 2006 and that the process that Personnel used for removing the specification in 2004 was parallel to the process that he inherited when he came to the Department. In addition, Mr. Greek acknowledged Ms. Duggan's process improvement suggestion for future specification deletions. The Personnel Department will include the rationale with the request in order to clarify the reason the specification is being deleted.

In regard to the Commission's concern that "the lack of 'characteristic duties' related to the very specific risk management functions in the Principal Administrative Analyst specification;" Mr. Greek stated that the classification study concluded that "Ms. Hossli is performing duties within the Principal Administrative Analyst Classification."

Vice President Chapman thanked Mr. Pisano and Mr. Nguyen, Santa Barbara County Senior Personnel Analysts for appearing before the Commission and asked Commission members if they had specific questions for them.

# Civil Service Commission

Mr. Salter stated that he assisted Mr. Greek in crafting the request for the Santa Barbara analysts to conduct the classification study. He provided an additional exhibit, page 11 A (89) "Class Study Request – Principal Administrative Analyst and Risk Manager Class Specifications July 2006" to Commissioners and interested parties. Ms. Duggan asked Mr. Greek if his classification study request was included in the agenda packet; he responded that it was not, but that he was in possession of the classification request document. Ms. Duggan asked the Commission whether or not they wanted copies of the request. Mr. Salter interjected that this might not be necessary.

He stated that his concern was whether or not the analysis was "sufficiently in depth to determine whether or not in 2002, Ms. Hossli was working out of class" in addition to evaluating whether or not she is currently appropriately classified. Mr. Nguyen responded that he was not sure that they "understood the scope of the study to be that;" they understood the scope to be whether or not she is currently working within the classification of Principal Administrative Analyst, if not, whether or not the Risk Manager classification is the most appropriate classification and if neither, for them to provide recommendations of an appropriate classification. Mr. Nguyen stated that as part of their study, they looked at the differences between the present and when the Risk Manager position had been filled, but they were not specifically looking at what Ms. Hossli's duties were in 2002. Mr. Pisano concurred with Mr. Nguyen regarding the scope of the study. Mr. Salter stated that the study seemed to indicate that Ms. Hossli is not currently carrying out Risk Manager duties. Mr. Nguyen responded that "it is not that her current duties are unrelated to Risk Management," but that in terms of information gathered by interviewing employees in the Risk Management Department, they identified that the change that took place between the time that a Risk Manager personally administered the risk programs and the transition of the administration of the risk programs to Ms. Hossli's staff. Her role is now focused on budget, fiscal, policy and overall guidance of the risk program; the day-to-day administration falls to her staff. Mr. Nguyen stated that they assert that she is currently classified appropriately because she is functioning as a supervisor in the County Administrative Office and is performing complex analysis. He stated that the detailed technical work is not part of her role and therefore does not need to be included in the Employment Standards for this position as they exist at this point. Mr. Salter asked Mr. Pisano what Ms. Hossli's basis was for referring to herself as 'Risk Manager.'" Mr. Pisano responded that she manages a staff who administers the Risk Program and provides policy direction. For instance, she determined that workers' compensation claims be managed more aggressively, which required a change in third party administrators, a management decision, but delegated locating an alternative administrator to her staff. Mr. Nguyen stated that although he cannot speak for Ms. Hossli, the use of working titles in Santa Barbara County is fairly common and offered that this might be the reason she referred to her title as "Risk Manager." Mr. Salter asked whether the Santa Barbara analysts were able to ask Ms. Wilcox questions about why Ms. Hossli was identified as "Risk Manager," rather than "Principal Administrative Analyst." Mr. Nguyen stated that they were "unaware this was an issue" and did not question Ms. Wilcox.

Ms. Nix asked whether the analysts focused on the duties of both job titles in order to determine whether the incumbent is the "best fit." The analysts stated they did. She asked about the method the analysts used to determine how the incumbent spends the majority of her time. Mr. Pisano spoke to Ms. Hossli, her subordinates, her supervisor and reviewed the specifications. He stated that it "became pretty clear that's she is working within the existing job specification." The analysts also reviewed the JAWS (Job Analysis Worksheet) and found that the technical expertise resided at a lower level, that a Risk Manager would have to have those qualifications, and that they found her to be better classified as a Principal Administrative Analyst. Ms. Nix stated that the Commission did not receive a copy of the JAWS that Ms. Hossli completed. Mr. Greek offered it but Ms. Nix declined. She asked whether the analysts had determined whether the incumbent attended training to develop the competencies necessary to supervise Risk Management. Mr. Nguyen answered that they discussed her background but that they did not recall that question being asked specifically. He stated that they found that technical knowledge existed in other places, with staff and with a third party administrator, so this knowledge was not critical for her current position. Mr. Nguyen stated that due to this fact, he would not have placed great emphasis on Ms. Hossli's attending training. Mr. Pisano stated that he agreed

# Civil Service Commission

she is appropriately classified because she makes fiscal, budget and policy and staffing decisions. He offered Mr. Estrada's role an example of a staffing decision made by Ms. Hossli. Previously, Mr. Estrada was assigned to Client Services and Benefits and she subsequently decided that his role would be better served administering the program rather than explaining the program to employees. Ms. Nix asked whether the analysts studied the Risk Management Analyst classification to determine whether the movement of technical responsibilities that "moved down" fit into that classification. Mr. Nguyen responded that they did not, that it was "outside of the scope of the study they were asked to do." Ms. Nix asked the analysts, in their experience, when duties are shifted from manager to staff, would they be required to study the underlying class and specifications. Mr. Nguyen answered that it could indicate such but "not in every case," and that "it would not necessarily require reclassification." He stated that day-to-day administration of the Risk Program is not necessarily appropriate at the management level, whereas management of the program and policy decisions are appropriate at that level. Ms. Nix stated that their report concluded that "comparable counties were not relevant" and asked the analysts how they would determine the correct pay for the classification. Mr. Pisano replied that he would research Principal Administrative Analyst salaries in comparable counties. He clarified that Risk Manager specifications in comparable counties were not studied because San Luis Obispo County is organized differently than other counties. Mr. Nguyen stated that he agreed with Mr. Pisano and that the way in which other counties are organized doesn't help to determine the appropriateness of a San Luis Obispo classification. Ms. Nix asked the analysts if Santa Barbara County has a Risk Manager. Mr. Nguyen replied that they do not, that the classification is part of the General Services Department and does not handle employee benefits. He stated that the Santa Barbara Risk Management Department deals solely with liability and workers' compensation issues. Mr. Nguyen explained that in place of the Risk Manager classification, Santa Barbara County created three positions which are designated as Risk Program Administrators: one of whom manages workers compensation; one who manages general liability and medical malpractice and one who manages actuarial issues. He stated that in Santa Barbara County, the reason for replacing the Risk Manager was that the Risk Manager was "stretched too thin," thus responsibilities were dispersed among the three Risk Program Administrators. Mr. Nguyen stated that in his experience, County risk organizations handle matters quite differently, are responsible for different functions and are organized based on the particular needs of the individual county.

Mr. Tappan expressed that the study did not address the Commission's concern regarding the initial appointment of Ms. Hossli as Risk Manager and her qualifications for that position at that time. He stated that he cannot trust the study's results without the necessary documentation and so remains concerned about the study's methodology.

Mr. Chapman asked the analysts if in Santa Barbara, new classifications were created when their General Services Department redistributed the duties of Risk Management Program Analysts. Nguyen responded that one specification was created and currently there are three program administrators who occupy that job title; each specializes in different areas within that job specification. Mr. Chapman asked for confirmation from the analysts whether the study showed that the fiscal and policy decisions were not "delegated down." Mr. Pisano confirmed that Mr. Chapman was correct. Mr. Chapman asked whether the analysts looked at the Principal Administrative Analyst specification to see if the fiscal and policy work was included in the specification. Mr. Pisano answered that they looked at the specification and concluded it is a "broader management role", so may not include specific risk functions identified with the Principal Administrative Analyst specification. When they analyzed the work that Ms. Hossli is currently doing, they concluded that they do fall within the current specification. He stated that her "area of expertise has become risk" but may, at some point, "be something else." He stated that the work is being effectively performed within the structure the Administrative Office has chosen. Mr. Chapman asked whether in Santa Barbara County, the Principal Administrative Analyst is traditionally, solely responsible for administrative duties, such as budget. Mr. Pisano stated that in Santa Barbara County, this is not the case, that one administrative analyst may track legislation while another is responsible for the local cable franchise. Mr. Chapman asked if such tasks would be included in

# Civil Service Commission

Representative Duties and Mr. Pisano responded that they would not. Mr. Nguyen stated that the Representative Duties for the position would be broad, such as the conducting of analytical studies and the oversight of project teams because the job and assignments change. Mr. Nguyen stated that his understanding of the San Luis Obispo County specification is that it is very similar to that of Santa Barbara County in this regard, that the duties expressed in the job specification are broad and much of what Ms. Hossli does is that kind of work, i.e., she is charged with determining the best way to operate worker's compensation, general liability and employee benefits. Mr. Nguyen stated that it is his opinion, based on the information they received from everyone involved that organizationally, "this seems to have worked pretty well." He cited the County's reduced cost of worker's compensation and the decreased workplace injury rate as examples. He stated that the overall duties fit because the specification is written "very broadly." Mr. Chapman asked if that is "a typical classification procedure." Mr. Nguyen and Mr. Pisano both agreed that it is. Mr. Chapman stated that currently, the Principal Administrative Analyst is assigned to the Administrative Office and asked how Santa Barbara County would handle broadening the classification to allow the individual to work in another department. Mr. Pisano responded that the analyst would be reassigned or "loaned" to another department. Mr. Nguyen clarified by stating that Santa Barbara County has done so in the past and offered the Santa Barbara County Auditor's Office - Financial Systems Analyst as an example. The Auditor's Office created this specification and it only existed in the Auditor's office. Subsequently, the Treasurer's Office made significant changes to the Santa Barbara property tax system and the decision was made to broaden the use of Financial Systems Analyst to other departments. The specification was rewritten to incorporate its inclusion in other departments. Mr. Nguyen stated that another way this could be handled is by the creation of another job classification which would pertain to other departments but stipulated that this process could be "administratively cumbersome."

Mr. Salter reviewed the Risk Manager specification's Typical Tasks with the analysts and item-by-item asked whether or not Ms. Hossli performs the task or whether the task has been assigned to her staff:

- 1) "develops, manages and evaluates all lines of the County's insurance coverage including, but not limited to, perils to public and institutional property, automobile and general liability, hospital liability, airport liability, construction liability, crime, worker's compensation, employee group benefit insurance and County Dependent care programs." Mr. Nguyen responded that Ms. Hossli performs some of these duties, but San Luis Obispo County now purchases insurance through CSAC Excess Insurance Authority so the County is self-insured to certain limits for general liability and workers' compensation. Thus, this duty is no longer performed. Ms. Duggan asked Mr. Nguyen if the analysts were provided with the exact date the responsibility changed; he responded that he could not recall the specific date. He stated Ms. Hossli does evaluate levels of insurance, but does not perform this duty fully because this function has changed.
- 2) Mr. Salter asked whether or not Ms. Hossli currently "directs activities with insurance carriers, claims administrators and insurance brokers." Mr. Nguyen responded that this duty has been "pushed down" to staff. Mr. Pisano agreed but said that if Ms. Hossli were not in agreement about these activities, she would initiate changes.
- 3) Mr. Salter asked whether Ms. Hossli currently "reviews, processes and oversees casualty claims, including claims for damaged County property." Mr. Nguyen answered that this task has been "pushed down" to staff, though Ms. Hossli may perform this task if there was significant fiscal or policy impact associated with the claim.
- 4) Mr. Salter asked whether Ms. Hossli "performs accident investigation and loss prevention analysis." Mr. Nguyen answered that she does not because the County has appointed a County Safety Officer who has assumed this responsibility.
- 5) Mr. Salter asked if Ms. Hossli "performs analytical studies of insurance rates and experience modification factors." Mr. Nguyen and Mr. Pisano responded that she does perform this function.
- 6) Mr. Salter inquired whether Ms. Hossli "periodically assesses known and prospective risks to determine adequacy of the County's insurance protection." Mr. Nguyen answered that she performs this task in conjunction with her staff.
- 7) Mr. Salter asked if Ms. Hossli "investigates and analyzes occupational safety and health hazards." Mr. Nguyen answered that she does not, that the County Safety Officer is now responsible for this task.
- 8) Mr. Salter asked if Ms. Hossli "determines basic liability limits, excess coverage and deductible levels." It is Mr. Pisano and Mr. Nguyen's opinion that this is done in conjunction with her staff.
- 9) Mr. Salter asked whether Ms. Hossli "advises County Administrative Officer, Board of Supervisors, department heads and others on insurance matters and

# Civil Service Commission

related employee benefit programs." Mr. Nguyen answered that she performs this function. 10) Mr. Salter inquired whether Ms. Hossli "collects and maintains insurance data files." Mr. Nguyen answered that this has been pushed down to her staff. 11) Mr. Salter asked if Ms. Hossli "prepares reports and correspondence." Mr. Pisano stated she does. 12) Mr. Salter asked whether Ms. Hossli "prepares and administers the insurance program budget." Mr. Nguyen answered that she does. 13) Mr. Salter asked whether Ms. Hossli "supervises subordinate staff." Mr. Nguyen and Mr. Pisano both agreed she does.

From his line of questioning, Mr. Salter concluded that approximately 50 percent of the Risk Manager functions are still being performed by Ms. Hossli. Mr. Pisano stated that although he didn't know the definitive number of tasks that remain with Ms. Hossli, this makes sense because she is "ultimately responsible" for the risk program. Mr. Nguyen stated that "simply because duties exist in one job spec doesn't exclude them from existing in another." He cited Mr. Pisano, Senior Analyst, as an example who shares duties with the Employee Relations Manager. Mr. Nguyen further explained that Ms. Hossli does perform some risk tasks, but that they also fall within the broad concepts that are included in the Principal Administrative Analyst specification.

Mr. Salter asked if the analysts had the opportunity to review the County's classification manual. They responded that they did. Mr. Salter asked the analysts' opinion regarding whether they thought it would have been appropriate for Ms. Wilcox, Ms. Hossli's supervisor, to come before the Civil Service Commission and apprise them of these changes. Mr. Pisano stated that "it may not have been necessary," that if a County has a job specification, an incumbent working in that job class and the incumbent's duties are changed and assigned in a consistent manner, he would not feel this was a matter for the Commission. Mr. Nguyen agreed with Mr. Pisano because the Principal Administrative Analyst supervises a division or function of the Administrative Office and Risk Management is a division of that office; he would not have felt it necessary to bring it before the Commission, though he stipulated that he did not feel qualified to answer whether anyone in San Luis Obispo County should have brought it forward.

Per the discussion, Ms. Nix stated that it is her understanding that Ms. Hossli performs eight of the thirteen functions mentioned in the Risk Manager specification. Ms. Nix compared the Knowledge requirement for Risk Manager to that of Principal Administrative Analyst. The Knowledge requirement for Risk Manager states: "Knowledge of basic principles of insurance, types of insurance, insurance contract formulation and administration; techniques of risk management and loss control and asset protection programs; Federal, State and local laws relating to insurance management, claims processing, and occupational safety regulations," whereas the Knowledge requirement for the Principal Administrative Analyst states: "Knowledge of the principles, methods, and techniques of public administration; the principles and practices of governmental budgeting; the principles and applications of data processing." She asked how the analysts reconciled the Knowledge requirements between the two positions. Mr. Pisano responded that they concluded that the need for technical knowledge resided now with Ms. Hossli's staff. Mr. Pisano said that the Principal Administrative Analyst specification states: "Confers and advises department heads and administrative staff on administrative and budgetary problems" and stated that it is his opinion that insurance falls under "budgetary problems." He stated that in her capacity as Principal Administrative Analyst, Ms. Hossli possesses the necessary skills to "learn programs at the level that she's being asked." He stated that the technical knowledge of the specific programs resides more appropriately with her staff. Mr. Nguyen stated that in his opinion, it is not necessary for incumbents to possess technical knowledge, but that the resources exist. He opined that this knowledge does exist in the County.

Ms. Nix agreed with Mr. Tappan's concern regarding whether Ms. Hossli was properly classified as Risk Manager in 2002. She stated that the knowledge requirement for Principal Administrative Analyst is "vague," while the knowledge requirement for Risk Manager is "very specific." She expressed a concern about the County's liability if the Principal Administrative Analyst makes an error. Mr. Nguyen stated that it is his opinion that the incumbent was not simply placed into a different job specification by the Administrative Office, but that senior-level management evaluated Ms. Hossli's skill-set and made the

# Civil Service Commission

determination that she was qualified for the position and that she would successfully enable the County to function under an acceptable level of risk.

Ms. Nix stated that the Commission is attempting to evaluate whether the Civil Service Rules and classification process were followed in this case and to determine what process was used when making the determination that a Risk Manager was not needed and that a more general manager was. Mr. Nguyen stated that in 2002, a supervisory relationship existed between the Risk Manager and Ms. Hossli and that at that time she was assigned the oversight of the Risk Manager and risk management program. Ms. Nix asked Ms. Duggan, whether it would be appropriate for members of the public to address the Commission at this point in the meeting. Ms. Duggan responded that the Commission could ask audience members if they wanted to address the Commission on this matter.

Mr. Tappan clarified that his concern is not that Risk Management isn't functioning well or properly; he is concerned about the process that was followed. Mr. Tappan thought he recalled that the Risk Manager had retired by the time Ms. Hossli assumed the position of Risk Manager. Mr. Greek stated he didn't recall the exact dates since this occurred prior to his coming to the Personnel Department. Mr. Pisano stated he didn't have precise dates but his notes indicate that in 2001, the Risk Manager went on medical leave and the supervisory duties were redistributed to Ms. Hossli. Mr. Tappan asked Mr. Pisano whether Ms. Hossli performed supervisory duties under the direction of the Risk Manager in 2002. Mr. Pisano responded that she did not, that she supervised the Risk Manager at the time he left County employment.

Mr. Chapman asked the audience in attendance if they wanted to address the Commission regarding this issue. There was no public comment.

b. Introduction of Lisa Winter, Human Resources Analyst Aide by Mr. Greek:

Mr. Greek introduced Ms. Winter to the Commission. Ms. Winter provided the Commission with information about her employment background. She stated that her primary duties in Personnel are working in the SAP system and ensuring that data is entered correctly. She will also be responsible for entering performance evaluation data into SAP and ensuring that eligible lists are provided to departments in a timely manner. Prior to beginning employment in San Luis Obispo County, she was employed in Human Resources for a large medical group in Torrance, California, where she worked for six years. Mr. Salter stated that some individuals claim that it is difficult to move to this County and to locate housing. He asked Ms. Winter about her experience. She indicated that she understood that the housing in the City of San Luis Obispo is expensive, so she re-located to a suburb of the city and currently commutes to work.

The Commission recessed for lunch at 12:45 p.m. Vice President Chapman reconvened the meeting at 1:59 p.m.

13. **Closed Session – (Closed Session per Gov. Code, section 54956.9 – Conference with Legal Counsel, Pending Litigation):** San Luis Obispo County Superior Court, State of California, Case No. CV 050945, County of San Luis Obispo, Department of Social Services (Petitioner) vs. County of San Luis Obispo, Civil Service Commission (Respondent), Cesar Bedroni (Real Party in Interest)

The Commission adjourned into Closed Session to discuss Item 13. Upon reconvening into Open Session, Ms. Duggan distributed the amended Findings and Decision and a copy to the Commission. She reviewed the documents with Commission members and indicated she would file the document in Superior Court. She indicated that in accordance with the Court's statement of decision, Line 11, Subsection B2 was amended. Vice President Chapman signed the document as Acting President. A motion to approve was made by Mr. Tappan, second by Mr. Salter. Ms. Nix abstained. Motion carried 3-0-2.

# Civil Service Commission

## 14. Continuation of Item 11: Time Reserved for Commission Secretary

c. 2006 Findings & Decisions – Mr. Greek stated that the Commission had instructed staff to provide the Board of Supervisors with copies of all 2006 Findings and Decisions. This has been completed. In addition, at the Commission's direction, staff has updated procedures to reflect that for Open Session Findings and Decisions names are not to be redacted before distribution to Department Heads and the Board of Supervisors.

d. Annual Report – Mr. Greek stated that the current goal for Personnel is to accomplish the completion of the annual report by November 2006.

e. Personnel Workload/Staffing – Mr. Greek stated that he is continuing to work on staffing documents that are needed for the budget process. The department has also distributed a survey to comparable counties. Mr. Greek stated that he is still gathering information. He met with Ms. Nix regarding Personnel staffing issues and asked if Ms. Nix had any additional information to add. She stated that after speaking with Mr. Greek, she is in agreement that additional documentation will enable them to provide additional facts to substantiate workload increase and staffing decreases. She indicated she would like the Commission to assume the role as advocate for a staffing level increase on behalf of the Personnel Department with the Board of Supervisors rather than taking the position that a midterm appointment of additional personnel is necessary at this point. Her biggest Personnel Department staffing concern is the amount of time Personnel Analysts are spending in overtime. She stated that she is concerned this will reduce staff efficiency and effectiveness.

f. Additional – Mr. Greek provided the Commission with an update on the Water Systems Worker specification. He stated that Personnel completed a draft specification which was distributed to Public Works and is currently awaiting feedback from the department. He stated that Personnel is "getting closer to the final target."

## 15. Item 11 a continued: Time Reserved for Commission Secretary

Mr. Greek reviewed additional highlights of the classification study report for the Commission. In regard to 11 a(3), he stated that per the CSC's request, Personnel hired an outside group to conduct the classification study which addressed the following two of the Commission's concerns: 1) "the deletion of the Risk Manager specification on the representation that the classification was vacant and obsolete," and "the lack of 'characteristic duties related to the very specific management functions in the Principal Administrative Analyst specification.'" Regarding their concern about "the lack of a Principal Administrative Analyst position in the organizational charts you submitted in support of the recommendation to the Commission to approve the proposed Deputy Director position," Mr. Greek stated he was following normal practice. He indicated that he later realized how it related to the transitional process and the Principal Administrative Analyst specification. He noted that as a result of dialogue with the Commission, a process improvement is suggested since it is a typical practice to move critical administrative positions outside of their "home" departments. Specification updates are on the To Do list for review and consideration.

Regarding the Commission's concern about "the predetermination that Ms. Hossli would be appointed to the Deputy Director position," Mr. Greek stated that Mr. Edge directly addressed the Commission regarding this concern. Mr. Greek provided Mr. Edge's response as an attachment in the meeting's agenda packet. Mr. Greek stated that initially, he wasn't completely clear of the direction of the Administrative Office, but that it became evident in April-May 2006 and at that point, the process that was ultimately selected required a competitive process. He stated that per the Commission's advice, the recruitment will be an Open recruitment. He also suggested that hiring an outside consultant to conduct the recruitment could, were it to occur, be appropriate as a "safeguard for perceptions and realities."

# Civil Service Commission

Regarding the Commission's concern "regarding the Deputy Director of Human Resources 'the Commission prevailed over your objections, to include significant human resources experience and education in the job specification,' "Mr. Greek stated that he presented the Commission with a specification that included five years of experience. He opined that the experience should not be limited to public sector Human Resources experience; he feels that this would be an arbitrary barrier in allowing the largest number of qualified applications possible to compete for the position. He stated he is an advocate for broader specifications and that he recognized the education and experience that can be beneficial in a position, but doesn't want private sector experience to be ignored.

Regarding the report's statement that "personnel staffs' qualifications were questioned," Mr. Greek responded that personnel staff met the minimum qualifications for their jobs and most have substantive experience that goes well beyond the minimum qualifications. He stated that his ideal would have been to have a team of both senior and new people as Personnel underwent such dramatic change, but the senior team left and Personnel now has a fresh team addressing Personnel business process. In discussions with staff, Mr. Greek pointed out that generally, the Commission has acknowledged the work and improvements the Personnel Department has been making, that the Department is applying the laws correctly and that the Commission gives Personnel grace "at times when things haven't gone as well as they could."

Regarding the Commission's statement that "You stated that you wished to interpret job specifications in the broadest fashion to allow the ease and movement of talented staff," Mr. Greek stated that his intent was never to infer that this meant "regardless of merit principles." He indicated that he made this statement in the context that he favors a classification plan that has clear career "trees" that keep employees engaged. He apologized if this statement was interpreted differently.

In regard to the Commission's concern about the statement "We 'learned that the Risk Management Division would not be coming down," Mr. Greek stated that in February-March, he conducted an assessment of the Human Resources office to determine if Risk Management staff could physically locate to the Human Resources office. He determined that additional staff would not fit. He stated that not having both departments "under one roof" would not be unusual. He reminded the Commission that Risk Management was previously located on South Higuera Street.

Regarding their concern about "the direction you have taken from the CAO regarding the window classification study period," Mr. Greek stated that he found this statement frustrating because on his own initiative, he saw that Personnel Department rules, procedures and guidelines were outdated and brought these forward to the Commission. He stated that the dialogue with the Commission and substantive assistance from Ms. Duggan resulted in a "far better package." He stated that the Classification Manual and guideline documents need to be improved, and as an example, the Personnel Department writes specifications differently than outlined in these documents. Further, Mr. Greek stated that "as staff gains additional experience and training, enabling them to work more efficiently and independently," the classification process could potentially move to a "flow-basis."

Mr. Greek concluded by stating that it is his hope that all parties benefit from considering the lessons learned individually and collectively and he is interested in moving forward with the critical work at-hand. Mr. Greek asked for questions or comments from the Commission.

# Civil Service Commission

Mr. Salter stated that Mr. Greek, Ms. Wilcox or Mr. Edge should have come to the Commission and apprised them of the ramifications associated with the succession planning process. He asked if Mr. Greek could see how the information "coming to the Civil Service Commission as it did" could prompt the Commission to ask questions regarding merit principles. He stated that Mr. Edge "chastised" the Commission for asking such questions and suggested perhaps Ms. Wilcox would like to participate in the Commission's discussion. He stated that time and resources were devoted to the issue because the parties disagreed. Mr. Greek stated that he has been pretty consistent in his belief that the dialogue proves the process works, agreed the Commission raised legitimate questions and flags and the Personnel Department responded. Additionally, the next generation committee was formed and will be looking at the rules and making recommendations regarding future practices and procedures. Mr. Greek reminded the Commission that he and the interested parties approached the Commission before anything had been put in place; they were not attempting to "hide anything."

Ms. Wilcox, Deputy County Administrative Officer, addressed the Commission. She stated that she agreed with Mr. Salter that the process of communicating with the Commission in terms of the next generation committee's efforts have only recently come together and she expressed frustration with the time the process takes. She stated that the committee has met twice and "it's going a little slower than her taste." She stated that "communication is key" and that "sometimes you think you're doing the right thing but don't necessarily bring everybody in at the appropriate time." She stated the succession planning is a growing concern in the County and that a lot of experience is "walking out the door." She said that the next generation committee is addressing the issue within the context of the merit system and asking what initiatives can be pursued in this regard. Ms. Wilcox stated that although she cannot speak for Mr. Edge, he has expressed some frustration that succession planning in other County departments, where there is clearly an individual in-line for the job, has not been challenged but that the Administrative Office has. She said that it seems like a different standard has been set for their office. She stated that there is lot of potential regarding succession planning in working together so that it is merit-based, in asking employees what kind of path they want to take in County employment and what kind of skills training can be provided by the County. She believes this can be accomplished within the context of the merit system. She cited the Employee University as an example and stated that it has been "very successful." Ms. Wilcox stated that the Administrative Office has received a lot of positive feedback with regard to the Employee University. She said that the Employee University's curriculum is a direct result of a survey of County employees' interests, for example, training for supervisors. She asked the Commission for questions.

Mr. Salter said that he was glad to have her express her views. He stated that he wanted to convey to Ms. Wilcox, Mr. Greek and Mr. Edge that his perception is that the Administrative Office and sometimes the Personnel Department "look upon this Commission as kind of a vestige order" that it's "gotten past its usefulness," and that the Commission constitutes "a bump in the road on the way to streamlining government." He clarified that he is not speaking for his fellow Commissioners; he is offering his opinion.

Ms. Wilcox responded by stating that on her and Mr. Edge's behalf, they are not interested in the County becoming an organization full of hand-picked, incompetent people, that this would be "horrible." She stated that their goal is "a high-performance organization that provides the highest level of service to the public as possible," which is "the noble service to which we've been called." That is why they are absolutely committed to the highest quality, why they are advocates of the High Performance Management and of "getting supervisors to coach, set expectations and to hold people accountable when they're not doing a good job."

# Civil Service Commission

Mr. Chapman stated that the Commission has been working to reform the Civil Service Rules to be in alignment with the High Performance Management principles. He stated that the Commission is trying very hard to work in concert with these changes and make this a "workable system." He stated that he hopes the Commission is not a vestige, that they remain relevant.

Ms. Nix addressed Mr. Greek's statements on page 11a(4), "The position control bottom line during this transition period is to ensure that a department does not exceed its allocated Full Time Equivalent Staffing level. I simply did not differentiate Personnel's reorganization from the others that your Commission reviews. My focus was on being sure you were presented with the ultimate structure..." Ms. Nix opined that these statements imply that documentation exists to support this statement. She expressed that she had hoped that if there were other re-organizations that used a similar process that a document would be provided that demonstrated the Principal Administrative Analyst position and how it transitioned from "Department A to Department B" in a re-organization. She does not see documentation to prove that this process "happens routinely." Mr. Greek stated that he didn't differentiate between Personnel and other reorganizations. He stated that the situation that was unique to Personnel in this instance was the addition of another full unit. He said that he did not include this documentation, but understands that if Risk and Personnel combine, the Commission would expect to see this. He stated that Personnel does not typically provide interim documentation when Personnel is "moving positions in and out." He now understands that Personnel needs "to create a better road map" when "taking units out and moving them around so the Commission can see the ramifications of those moves. Ms. Nix said that she asked this question because when the Health Department reorganization occurred, there were several staff members who stated they were "shifted around," and were significantly affected. Ms. Nix stated she was trying to draw similarities between the Personnel and Health Department re-organizations and wanted to prevent staff from potentially questioning and raising concerns about the process. She asked about the possibility of Personnel providing additional data so the Commission can see the re-organization and classification progress and "how people move from one place to the next." Mr. Greek responded that in light of the Health re-organization, it would be "excruciatingly difficult" for Personnel to provide the Commission with that level of detail. He stated that in the re-organization process, Personnel staff works with a "very complex matrix" in the context of the Civil Service Rules. He stated that he recognizes that Personnel does need to plan re-organizations in a way that makes the process clear, but stated that at this point, there is no "simple route" since every individual situation is so different. He stated that Personnel is tasked with the key responsibility of ensuring that the class plan is aligned with a specific job specification that has been created or allocated in a way that's consistent and fair. Ms. Nix stated that her understanding of the process is that when a decision is made in a department to change a position, the department would propose the position to the Commission and the Commission would review and classify the position. Ms. Nix asked Mr. Greek if this is his understanding. He replied that in this instance, the Administrative Office worked with Personnel to look at the consequences relative to the class plan and at job specifications and as a result, the Commission ultimately was shown a new class specification. Ms. Nix stated that a gap exists between the classification "detail work" that Personnel possesses and how it is presented to the Civil Service Commission. She suggests the gap needs to be bridged to better enable Commissioners to provide input and to make wise decisions with regard to classifications. Mr. Greek will consider how Personnel can create a clearer picture to the Commission without overwhelming Commissioners with data. He cited the Health Agency re-organization as an example, wherein the differences between "what was" and "will be" in the department was a set of overlapping class plans for two to three months and as one position was filled, another was removed. He offered that an explanation of where the new specification fits into the organization might be helpful to Commissioners. Ms. Nix agreed that "we could start there." Mr. Greek also stated that with regard to the Risk Manager classification, he worked with Mr. Salter to determine the level of detail to provide Commissioners and Mr. Salter suggested that a summary was adequate. Ms. Nix stated that she would agree it is difficult to balance the Commission's desire to know and the details they don't need to know.

# Civil Service Commission

In regard to page 11a(6), "Personnel staffs' qualifications were questioned." Mr. Tappan stated that the Commission thinks that staff is "very well qualified." He said the Commission's concern has been the "learning curve" for new staff. He expressed frustration when Mr. Edge approached the Commission and challenged the Commission's questioning and reasoning. Ms. Wilcox responded by stating that Mr. Edge is a "big picture vision guy" and others are expected to complete associated tasks. She stated that she thought Mr. Edge's frustration was with the time that the process was taking and felt that individuals were looking into Ms. Hossli's qualifications prematurely, before any application had been submitted for the position. Mr. Tappan responded that it was not necessarily Ms. Hossli's qualifications that were called into question, but the individual's qualification's for taking the position. Ms. Wilcox disagreed and stated "it's her name that keeps getting used." Mr. Tappan stated that her name is only being used "because the name was put to us" and that if they had not been provided with a name, they wouldn't have used it.

Mr. Greek stated that the parties did not have a problem with the Commission asking questions and suggested perhaps it was the "tone, texture and manner and context" in which certain questions were asked.

Regarding Mr. Greek's statement on Page 11a(5), "I continue to believe that limiting the specification's minimum qualifications to public sector HR experience, unnecessarily creates a smaller applicant pool by excluding qualified individuals from the private sector," Mr. Chapman agreed that a combination of both public and private experience at the Deputy Director level or higher is desirable, however, he asserts that at that level, " they should be able to walk into that job and have virtually no learning curve" with the exception of an individual relocating from outside the County. Mr. Chapman allowed that it would take such an individual a learning curve to understand our County's unique characteristics. In order for that person to do the job properly, he or she would need significant public sector experience because public sector employment is "categorically different than private sector experience." He cited the merit system, rules and regulations as some examples. Mr. Chapman does not believe the public sector experience requirement constitutes an artificial barrier. As an example, he asked Ms. Wilcox if she would be willing to hire an individual with private sector experience as a Deputy Director and expect that person to be able to produce a budget in six months, with all the complexities involved in public sector budgeting. Ms. Wilcox replied that she agreed that public sector experience is very important at that level in the organization, but stated she currently has a staff which consists of both public and private sector experience and it "works out very nicely." She stated that she would recommend that the decision be left to the hiring authority in the screening process. Mr. Chapman stated that if an Experience requirement becomes an artificial barrier for any job, the department needs to make a recommendation to the Commission that the specification is no longer relevant. He stated that the classification system needs to "mirror" job specifications.

Vice President Chapman asked for public comment. Kimberly Daniels, SLOCEA, addressed the Commission regarding Item 11a. She stated that although she agrees that some private sector experience could benefit a Deputy Director of Personnel or Human Resources, she agreed with Vice President Chapman regarding requiring public sector experience for the position. She stated that "public sector employment is an animal in and of itself." She stated at that level significant public sector experience should be required. She stated that this person would be in charge if the Director is out and that staff would be looking to that person for guidance and leadership. She stated that's it is not beneficial to the department or County to have an individual in a decision-making position who is struggling with a learning curve. Ms. Daniels clarified that this statement pertains only to the position, not any one individual. Regarding Mr. Salter and Ms. Nix's comments, SLOCEA's concern was that a specific individual was named to be placed in a position that was just being created and didn't exist previously in the County. She stated that she is aware of at least two individuals who would qualify for the position. Ms. Daniels stated

# Civil Service Commission

that there was not a discussion about their interest in the position, that the position was presented as "this is what's going to happen," which "caused tremendous concern" for SLOCEA, since it "seemed to violate the merit system principles." She stated that communication is "critical" between all parties, even if such communication is not necessarily required. Ms. Daniels asserted that the proactive approach would have been to have brought the plans to the Commission. She agreed that the next generation committee is addressing some of these issues so that employees who are interested in pursuing advancing via a career ladder have an opportunity to see what the position is like before promoting. At that point, they may decide they don't like it or don't want the position. In addition, Ms. Daniels stated that it is her belief that Employee University Supervisory Training be mandatory "to protect the County, supervisor and employees."

Mr. Tony Krause, SLOCEA, addressed the Commission in regard to Item 11a. He stated that he believed the Commission was "on target" when they examined this issue. He said he understands that the Administrative Office is interested in obtaining the most competent individual they can, but that Mr. Edge's letter refers to a particular individual he wanted to transition. The letter also refers to the Rule 5.05a policy which he asserted would not be applicable in this instance since there are other interested and qualified individuals for the position. In regard to page 11a(6), Mr. Greek stated: "the former senior staff made their individual employment/retirement choices as Personnel moved forward with new automation..." Mr. Krause opined that this statement implies that senior staff left due to automation projects and that he believed this was not the case. He commended the Commission on the questions they asked the Santa Barbara analysts.

Ms. Nix asked the Commission whether they wished to file the report or whether they wished to craft a response. Ms. Duggan verified that the Commission does have the discretion to write a follow-up response. Mr. Tappan responded that all of his questions have been answered. Mr. Salter offered that he thought it might be appropriate for the Commission to craft a written conclusion to the issue and asked the opinion of the other Commissioners. He stated that there were some issues that were not addressed in the report, for example, if the Personnel Director should be a member of the classified service. Ms. Duggan stated the issue could be deferred until all members are present since President Bergman was not present to address the issue. Vice President Chapman stated that he doesn't have a need to respond further and would like to hold it in abeyance. He suggested if members have additional questions, that they bring them forward at the appropriate time. Although Ms. Nix expressed that she isn't sure if the report answers all of her questions, Ms. Nix is willing to leave the issue in abeyance for the moment. Mr. Tappan suggested that since Mr. Salter had unresolved questions that he would support crafting a response regarding those questions. The other Commissioners agreed. Ms. Nix asked if Ms. Duggan could assist with the wording of the document, if after meeting with Mr. Salter, they determine that a written response is appropriate. Ms. Duggan replied that she can review the document and to the extent that legal issues are addressed, her review would be appropriate.

## 16. **Item 14: Closed Session – (Closed Session per Gov. Code, section 54957) – Personnel Director's Performance**

The Commission went into Closed Session to address Item 14. Upon reconvening into Open Session, there was no reportable action.

*Note: A complete record of the hearing packet is on file with the Human Resources Department.*

## 17. **Adjournment**

Being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 4:57 p.m.

<sup>1</sup> Note: These minutes reflect official action of the Civil Service Commission in open session. A taped record exists and will remain as the official, complete record of all proceedings by the Civil Service Commission. Language in *italics and quotes* reflects specific words used by the speaker, recorded on the record and transcribed by the Clerk of the Commission or typed from a written statement for accuracy.

P:\CSC\MINUTES\2006\October 25, 2006 Regular Meeting.doc