LONG BEACH COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
LONG BEACH CITY COLLEGE
PERSONNEL COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
May 3, 2004

CLOSED SESSION  Pursuant to Section 54957, CA Govt. Code, discussed appointment, employment, discipline or dismissal of public employees. No decisions were made in closed session.

REGULAR SESSION
CALL TO ORDER  Mr. McManus called the regular session to order at 5:00 p.m. and led the audience in the pledge of allegiance.

ROLL CALL  Personnel Commissioners Mr. McManus, Mr. Gaylord and Ms. Carlin were present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES  Motion to approve the minutes of April 19, 2004, made by Ms. Carlin; seconded by Mr. Gaylord. Motion carried 3/0.

OLD BUSINESS
New Classification  Mr. Tortarolo submitted for consideration the new classification of Director - Facilities Management, Management Team Salary Schedule, Range 20, for second reading and approval. Motion to approve made by Mr. Gaylord; seconded by Ms. Carlin. Mr. McManus wanted it noted that problems with salary compression could result by placing this classification at this salary range. Motion carried 3/0.

New Classification  Mr. Tortarolo submitted the new classification of Deputy Director - Building and Grounds, Management Team salary schedule, Range 17, for second reading and approval. Motion to approve made by Ms. Carlin; seconded by Mr. Gaylord. Motion carried 3/0.

New Classification  Mr. Tortarolo submitted the new classification of Project Manager, Management Team salary schedule, Range 14, for second reading and approval. Motion to approve made by Mr. Gaylord; seconded by Ms. Carlin. Motion carried 3/0.
New Classification

Mr. Tortarolo submitted the new classification of Supervisor - Building and Grounds, Management Team salary schedule, Range 12, for second reading and approval. Motion to approve made by Ms. Carlin; seconded by Mr. Gaylord. Motion carried 3/0.

New Classification

Mr. Tortarolo submitted the new classification of Plant Manager, Management Team salary schedule, Range 9, for second reading and approval. Motion to approve made by Ms. Carlin; seconded by Mr. Gaylord. Motion carried 3/0.

New Classification

Mr. Tortarolo submitted the new classification of College Information Assistant, AFT salary schedule, Range 22, for second reading and approval. Motion to approve made by Mr. Gaylord; seconded by Ms. Carlin. Motion carried 3/0.

NEW BUSINESS

Classification Review

Mr. Tortarolo submitted the matter of Student Support Services Program Coordinator (SSSPC) classification(s), used to employ a position in the Americorp program and a position in the TRIO program, and proposed for classification review by AFT. He recommended that, because the two classifications are sufficiently similar, they be recognized as the same. Motion to approve made by Ms. Carlin; seconded by Mr. Gaylord. Mr. Tuitasi, TRIO Director and Interim Dean of Counseling, recalled being requested to provide documentation in June 2003 to explain why the SSSPC in Americorp, was not qualified to assume duties in the TRIO program. This request was prompted by a potential layoff which might have resulted in the Americorp employee to bumping into TRIO. In 2003 Mr. Tuitasi provided a letter from the grant officer indicating that, according to the experience and education listed on the Americorp employee's resume, she lacked required training and would not meet grant standards and requirements. He believed the matter was resolved with this letter, and asked what other information could he have provided to explain the specific requirements of the grant and Department of Education.

Mr. Tortarolo, acknowledging the background provided by Mr. Tuitasi, indicated that the matter became moot in 2003 when funding was found to retain the Americorp employee; however, pending layoffs were, again, prompting review of these two positions. The Americorp employee has more hours in paid service and would be able to displace employee in the TRIO position, if they are deemed to be sufficiently similar by the Personnel Commission. While the letter from the grant officer had expressed doubt about the qualifications of the Americorp
employee, references to specific U.S. Department of Education regulations defining experiential were not provided, although this criteria was requested. The Personnel Commission staff also determined that areas of training, deemed mandatory by Mr. Tuitasi, could be obtained in a reasonable period on the job training of the Americorp employee.

In her current position, Ms. Nejad provides retention and transfer services to participants and works with both underprivileged and disabled students. Mr. Tortarolo added that denying the Americorp employee an opportunity to perform the TRIO duties may be interpreted as creating a barrier to employment, which is prohibited by Ed. Code section 88095. Additionally, there was no District input about the TRIO position during the Nash study, resulting in the determination that the two positions/classifications performed essentially the same duties.

Mr. Tuitasi repeated his earlier claim that he thought the matter was resolved by the letter he submitted in 2003. He then restated his position that the Americorp employee's resume did not display the background necessary to successfully perform TRIO duties and believes the program will not be in compliance with the grant, if his current employee is displaced by layoff.

Mr. McManus advised that if the Personnel Commission was asked to approve a separate classification for the TRIO program, the Commissioners should be provided a copy of the grant proposal guidelines and regulations outlining specific skill sets, which would be included in a new job description. The letter included in the exhibits appeared to reflect Mr. Tuitasi's analysis, with the stamp from the Department of Education attached to it. He added that he saw a flaw in the analysis of the Americorp employee's resume - that often not all experience is, nor can be, listed in such a format. Mr. McManus then suggested that obtaining job descriptions from other colleges employing TRIO funded coordinators would be beneficial. In hiring employees to perform grant duties, he believes cross training benefits all concerned, and that his preference is to hire generalists, and provide training in particular areas. He knows that the requirements in some grants are not very stringent.

Mr. Tuitasi then addressed the process in the current situation, stating that he didn't know this was still an issue until his employee got a layoff notice, and then, didn't have enough time to obtain the regulations requested to support his position. He is concerned that other positions/classifications are in jeopardy of being affected by layoff if job classifications are not specific enough. Referring back to
the Nash study, he perceives this as a District problem (how classifications were reviewed), and doesn't know why his department and employee should be penalized because of this recommendation.

Mr. McManus noted that, while this matter should have been reviewed during the Nash study, many administrators - due to tight schedules and other pressing matters - didn't get involved, while others were very involved in the process. He cited the Business office (Fiscal Operations) area, where the Director offered detailed organizational reports and was very involved in both titling and setting duties and qualifications for each classification. However, classification is an ongoing process, and if Mr. Tuitasi can present evidence of a marked difference between the two classifications, the Commission would consider reviewing the matter again.

Mr. Gaylord suggested including this classification in the next study.

Shannon Willson stated her belief that these two very distinct classes were combined during the Nash study. This was discovered when the former Dean of Counseling was filling the vacancy in the TRIO program. Ms. Willson expressed empathy toward Mr. Tuitasi's position.

Mr. Tortarolo reiterated that, based on the specifications currently under review, the two positions are significantly similar to justify treating them as the same classification. He also found many similarities when he read the employee questionnaires submitted in the Nash study. He advised that when requests come in to fill vacancies, his staff contacts the administrator to determine if there are any significant changes to the existing classification specification that might warrant making changes to reflect technologic, demographic or other relevant factors. The request to modify Student Activities Advisor (on the May 3, 2004 agenda) illustrates an example of classification specification changes, based on the administrator's input.

At the close of discussion, motion carried 3/0.

**Modify Classification Specification**

Mr. Tortarolo submitted the classification of Student Activities Advisor, for modifications to the classification specification. Mr. Tortarolo noted that the Dean of Student Affairs requested this modification to reflect the increased student contact and need for computer skills. This item will be placed on a future agenda for second reading and approval.
Eligibility List
Mr. Tortarolo submitted for approval the eligibility lists for Accountant and Data Software Technician. Motion to approve made by Ms. Carlin; seconded by Mr. Gaylord.  Motion carried 3/0.

INFORMATION ITEMS
Next Meeting
Mr. Tortarolo announced that the next meeting is scheduled for Monday May 17, 2004, 5:00 p.m. in the Board Room, Building I, LAC

Job Announcements
Mr. Tortarolo announced the following active recruitments in the Classified Service (closing date in parentheses): Child Development Associate Specialist, 50% (5/17/04); Research Analyst (5/18/04); Director, Superintendent-President's Office (5/27/04).

COMMENTS FROM STAFF
Mr. Tortarolo announced that luncheons to recognize the support and effort of the classified staff will be held from noon to 1:30 on May 19 (LAC) and May 20 (PCC) and at 6 p.m. on May 21 in the Human Resources Training Room, V111.

COMMENTS FROM COMMISSIONERS
None

COMMENTS FROM AUDIENCE
None

ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.