**District Assembly Work-Group for Human Resources**

**September 10, 2013**

**3PM – 4:30PM**

**District Conference Room #2**

**Present:**

Kathy Crow, Jeremiah Gilbert, Katherine Hendrickson, Ashley Lucht, Jack Miyamoto, Amalia Perez, Julia Sanchez, John Stanskas, Michelle Tinoco, Kay Weiss

**Discussion Items:**

**1. BP/AP 7125** Verification of Employment

The process of re-verification of employment status through I-9 forms was raised. The office of Homeland Security required re-verification of all employees for the right-to-work and identity on a new form from all employers. The administrative procedure states that Human Resources will keep previous forms for up to three years. **Outcome**: The discussion did not find any need to modify board policy or administrative procedure, but suggests the communication regarding the reason for re-verification, and the timing of such a request could be improved in the future. Future processes for such should clearly communicate the impetus for the request from employees and consider the timeframe for the request when many employees are contracted only for 10-months.

**2. BP/AP 7250** Management Evaluation

The administrative procedure spells out the timeframe for regular management evaluations with a hard September 1 deadline written into the procedure. This is not uniformly followed throughout the district. In addition, the policy and procedure are both silent regarding interim management selection and evaluation.

**Outcome:** The procedure should be modified. The district should engage in a dialog regarding an appropriate timeline for management evaluation and the procedure should reflect the result of that dialog. Interim positions for an as-yet-to-be-determined ‘extended’ period should fall under the procedure either explicitly or implicitly when modified. A suggested time-frame for the definition of an ‘extended’ period was greater than one semester.

**3. BP 7345** Catastrophic Leave

This is the only part of the board policies that reference what occurs when an employee runs out of leave time. It is unclear if non-catastrophic circumstances may exist where the donation of leave may be permissible.

**Outcome:** Human Resources will evaluate whether there is language in the Districts contracts that outline this process. If not, a process may be developed or clarified for the donation of leave in other circumstances.

**4. BP/AP 7210, 7230, 7250** Hiring Procedures

Discussion among constituent groups after the flurry of hiring activity during the last year raised several concerns including inconsistencies between hiring committees, inconsistencies between campus processes, uploading files to large for the online application program, and minimum qualification screening.

**Outcome:** Human Resources will evaluate mechanisms to communicate with applicants during the process regarding online application program failures and general improvement of notification to applicants. Human Resources is also advised to engage in dialog among staff to improve the consistency of the process across the district regarding the evaluation of minimum qualifications and managing the work of screening committees.

**5. AP7210 – line 41 (first reference)** Faculty Equivalency Processes

The faculty equivalency process remains poorly defined and varies between the campuses. This is problematic because equivalency is granted by the same Board of Trustees and is valid across the district once granted.

**Outcome:** The Academic Senates are encouraged to draft a process that is broadly defined so that some level of consistency can be maintained while allowing for the differing cultures of the faculty at each site.

**6. BP/AP 7110, BP7500** Student Workers, Volunteers, Short-Term Classified Employees

Discussion was focused on the desire for some workers in these classes to have valid background checks before employment but not in others. There is a strong desire to have every employee or volunteer background checked for legal and ethical considerations. There is also a concern about the cost of fingerprinting and the limited means of many of the applicants for those positions – namely students.

It was mentioned that awaiting board approval before working was problematic in some circumstances given the inherently transient nature of community college students and our local populations.

**Outcome**: The district needs to reflect on what our practice should be given the competing concerns listed above. There could be a universal process of background checks for all, or a limited process dependent on the nature of the work expected and the access to information and/or items of value related to the job site. Management at all levels probably needs to engage in this conversation.

As long as this is the will of the board, there is no means to address the lag time between identification of this class of employee and board approval of the start date. The board could consider permitting limited approval authority by a site manager or Human Resources senior manager prior to board meetings; however, this is a decision that must come from the Board of Trustees.