

AGENDA

HR STAFFING PLAN TASKFORCE

Monday, September 23, 2013; 8:00 a.m.

OAB 126; AC1 270; RC PCR

It is the charge of the Human Resources Staffing Plan Taskforce to engage in districtwide collaboration to make recommendations to Chancellor's Cabinet that ensure:

- 1. sufficient staffing resources are allocated for the effective operations of the colleges, centers, sites, and district office/centralized services;*
- 2. integration of the colleges', centers' and district's HR staffing plans with the other planning processes in the district, i.e. strategic plan, facilities, technology, resource allocation; and*
- 3. human resources planning and decision-making processes at each college, center, site and district office/centralized services align with districtwide human resources planning and resource allocation decisions.*

There should also be a recommendation regarding the formation of a standing districtwide human resources planning committee including its purpose and composition.

AGENDA (10th meeting)

1. Review/revise/approve minutes from September 9 and 13, 2013 Meetings
2. Process check, rumor control, heads up, and elephants
3. Review definition agreed to for decision making – “*qualified consensus*”
4. Review list of desired components/critical elements
5. Review Section 1 Draft
6. Review Section 2 Draft
7. Agree on Assignments for Next Meeting

Next Meeting Date: Monday, October 7, 2013



The meeting was called to order at 8:05 a.m.

Present at the meeting: Wendell Stephenson, Jason Gardner, Samerah Campbell, Bill Turini, Mary Helen Garcia, Barbara Wells, Amie Voorhees, George Railey, Lorrie Hopper, Jennifer Johnson, Ed Eng, Diane Clerou and Jothany Blackwood

1. **Minutes** - the minutes from the previous meetings, September 9 and September 13, 2013, have not been completed so they were not approved at this time.

2. **Process check, rumor control, heads up, and elephants**

There were no comments.

3. **Review definition agreed to for decision making – “qualified consensus”**

The following definition was distributed to the taskforce members: If two people do not vote in favor of the motion then it is called a qualified consensus. Those two people explain their reason(s) for not supporting the motion to the rest of the committee. After listening, if anyone else on the committee requests a new vote, a vote will be taken. However, the two who originally dissented cannot ask for a vote, that request must come from one of the committee members who initially supported the motion.

4. **Review list of desired components/critical elements**

The following list was agreed to by taskforce members on March 15, 2013 and distributed again for this meeting to the taskforce members. It was agreed that this is a “living” document and can be added to as we work through the process. There was the addition of “District” in item 2 below.

Critical Elements

1. Gap Analysis
2. **District** prioritization process – is it going to be a standardized process throughout the district, or will colleges/campuses/district office have different prioritization processes?
3. Program review/program needs
4. Regular review of hiring plan
5. Transparency
6. Simplicity
7. Succession planning
8. Legal requirements on staffing
9. Integrating with other plans
10. Efficiency goal

5. **Review Section 1 and Section 2 of the HR Staffing Plan Draft**

Discussion was held regarding the executive summary. It was agreed that once the rest of the plan is completed the executive summary will change to reflect what the plan will become.

Where there was agreement/consensus, the document was edited. Those edits/changes appear as strikeouts or as “purple font” in the latest version of the document.

Follow-up from section 1

- Possibly change title of section 1 as it is repeated in section 2
- Figure 1 needs to reflect SCCCD information
- Figure 2 needs to be clear to explain how all of the plans work together, strategic plan, facilities plan, HR plan; Jothany will add explanation language as to how the integration of the plans work
- Figure 2 may make better sense if moved to paragraph 1.4
- Add links to the various other plans in section 1.4
- Add the flow chart for the Resource Allocation Model to page 6
- Address what we mean by diversity; don't assume it is understood
- Figure 6 needs to be updated to include SCCCD information
- Figure 7 - Decide on the number of years the staffing plan will be in effect prior to review and insert that in a flow chart. Jothany will work on this and add the ASUR calendar so it represents district office units.

Follow-up from Section 2

- Add to glossary definition of “planning horizon,” “optimum staffing levels”
- Figure 8 may not be necessary and may be removed
- Add to glossary definition of “minimum”, “actual”, and clarify “rates of attrition”
- Under section 2.2 - Prioritization may be further broken down into a 2.2.a. – district prioritization and 2.2.b. – campus prioritization
- Work on gap analysis as a group and see what is logical and will work
- Need to clearly identify the factors to be used for the gap analysis and prioritization as people will want to know that information
- Ensure timelines in section 2.4 coincide with the budget planning process so that new proposed positions can be considered prior to the adoption of the budget. Rework paragraph to align with the budget process
- Revise the “Annual Plan Update” graph on page 16

6. **Agree on Assignments for Next Meeting**

Read sections 3 and 4 and critique. It was agreed that while reading sections 3 and 4 note points from sections 1 and 2 that need to be revisited. Make a note of those concerns and they will be discussed at the next meeting.

Items for the glossary

- EEO staffing plan
- HR staffing plan
- Planning horizon
- Optimum staffing levels
- Attrition
- Prioritization
- Minimum
- Actual
- Rates of attrition

**Next meeting – Monday October 7, 2013 at 8:00 a.m.
OAB 126; AC2-233; RC PCR**