

This document is an extract of a larger publication.

civilgrandjury.org is a project of UnGovr.org, a US-based 501(c)(3) nonprofit dedicated to government transparency and public accountability.



Table of Contents

Letter from Yolo County Grand Jury Foreperson	5
2013-2014 Yolo County Grand Jury Members	6
About the Grand Jury	7 - 8
Investigations	9 - 74
Yolo County Promotion Practices: Need for Standards and Oversight . . .	10 - 18
Implementing Major Changes in Education at the Local Level:	
Building a Plane in Midair	19 - 25
Yolo County Coroner's Division	26 - 35
City of Woodland: A Real Estate Lender	36 - 41
Mental Health Crisis Services in Yolo County	42 - 53
Proposition 218 Protest Election Process: "The Yolo Way"	54 - 61
Yolo County Sheriff: Leadership Practices from the Wild, Wild West . . .	62 - 74
Appendix	75 - 104
Responses to 2013-2014 Grand Jury Report	75
Yolo County Promotion Practices: Need for Standards and Oversight	76
Mental Health Crisis Services in Yolo County	77 - 79
Responses to 2012-2013 Grand Jury Report	81
Yolo County Probation Department:	
Evaluating the Risks of Recidivism	82 - 84
Yolo County Probation Department:	
Slow Response to Needed Change	85 - 87
Yolo County Finance: Tracking Changes	88 - 95
Yolo County Detention Center: Facing Challenges	96 - 97
Yolo County Adult Services:	
Protecting Seniors and Dependent Adults	98 - 100
Putting Students First: Oversight of Yolo County Charter Schools . . .	101 - 104



GRAND JURY

County of Yolo

P. O. Box 2142
Woodland, California 95776

June 30, 2014

The Honorable Daniel P. Maguire
Superior Court of California, County of Yolo
725 Court Street, Woodland, CA 95695

Dear Judge Maguire:

The 2013-14 Yolo County Grand Jury is pleased to present our Consolidated Final Report to you and to the citizens of Yolo County.

This year the Grand Jury received and reviewed 27 citizens' complaints. Several complaints were duplicative and were combined into two investigations. Two investigations were initiated by the Grand Jury, two were the result of new complaints and one was referred from the 2012-13 Grand Jury. The Grand Jury received many complaints very late in our term and those have been referred to the 2014-15 Grand Jury for consideration. In addition to civil investigations, the Grand Jury participated in one criminal indictment hearing at the request of the District Attorney.

The Grand Jury produced seven reports covering a wide range of important and timely topics affecting the operation and management of a variety of publicly-funded entities within Yolo County. In addition, the Grand Jury reviewed the holding facilities in four city jails as part of its mandated inspection of detention facilities within Yolo County. These inspections produced no significant findings and did not result in a report.

This was a year full of challenges for the 19 dedicated citizens who made up the 2013-14 Grand Jury. We experienced a number of juror resignations throughout the year resulting in an incredible amount of additional work for the remaining, original jurors as well as for the incoming alternate jurors. I want to express my deep appreciation, admiration and thanks to all of the jurors who worked tirelessly to produce seven excellent reports, especially to those jurors who took on leadership roles and, without complaint, shouldered a great deal of extra work.

I also want to express the Grand Jury's profound appreciation to each and every one of the Jury Services personnel and Yolo County employees and officials who provided us with support of every kind during this year. We could not do what we do without you.

We are proud of our work this year. We hope it will be of benefit to the citizens of Yolo County. It has been our privilege to serve together as the 2013-14 Yolo County Grand Jury.



Jane E. Naekel, Foreperson
2013-14 Yolo County Grand Jury

**The 2013-2014
Yolo County Grand Jury**

Jane Naekel, *Foreperson, Woodland*

Maggie Campbell, *West Sacramento*

Tom Carlton, *Davis*

Beth Coehlo, *Woodland*

Richard DeLiberty, *Woodland*

Richard Elmgren, *Davis*

Lois Fitzgerald, *Woodland*

Al Freitas, *Bryte*

Jane Jimenez, *Woodland*

Marie Kearney, *Dunnigan*

Ann Kokalis, *Davis*

Susan Langsdorf, *Woodland*

Roberta Paul, *Woodland*

Chalon Rogers, *West Sacramento*

Marcia Rosenstein, *Davis*

Gregg Roy, *Davis*

Dennis Turnipseed, *Davis*

Enid Williams, *Woodland*

Jim Zuniga, *Woodland*



ABOUT THE GRAND JURY

The United States Constitution's Fifth Amendment and the California Constitution require that each county appoint a Grand Jury to guard the public interest by monitoring local government. Per California Penal Code Section 888, the Yolo County Superior Court appoints 19 Grand Jurors each year from a pool of volunteers. These Yolo County citizens, with diverse and varied backgrounds, serve their community as Grand Jurors from July 1st to June 30th. The Yolo County Grand Jury is an official, independent body of the court, not answerable to administrators or to the Board of Supervisors.

FUNCTION

The California Grand Jury has three basic functions: to weigh criminal charges and determine whether indictments should be returned (Pen. Code, § 917); to weigh allegations of misconduct against public officials and determine whether to present formal accusations requesting their removal from office (Pen. Code, § 992); and to act as the public's "watchdog" by investigating and reporting on the affairs of local government (e.g., Pen. Code, §§ 919, 925 et seq.). The purposes of any Grand Jury civil investigation are to identify organizational strengths and weaknesses and to make recommendations aimed at improving the services of county and city governments, school districts, and special districts under study. Based on these assessments, the Grand Jury publishes its findings and may recommend constructive action to improve the quality and effectiveness of local government.

Recommendations from the Grand Jury are not binding on the organization investigated. The governing body of any public agency must respond to the Grand Jury findings and recommendations within 90 days. An elected county officer or agency head must respond to the Grand Jury findings and recommendations within 60 days. The following year's Grand Jury will then evaluate and report on the required responses.

The findings in this document report the conclusions reached by this year's Grand Jury. Although all the findings are based upon evidence, they are the product of the Grand Jury's independent judgment. Some findings are the opinion of the Grand Jury rather than indisputable

statements of fact. All reports included in the document have been approved by at least 12 jurors. Any juror who has a personal interest, or might be perceived to have a personal interest, in a particular investigation is recused from discussion and voting regarding that matter. All reports are reviewed by the Grand Jury's legal advisors to ensure conformance with prevailing laws.

While the Yolo County Grand Jury's primary function is civil review of government agencies, it is also called upon to participate in criminal indictments, usually based on evidence presented by the District Attorney. On its own initiative, the Grand Jury may investigate charges of malfeasance (wrongdoing), misfeasance (a lawful act performed in an unlawful manner), or nonfeasance (failure to perform required duties) by public officials.

The Grand Jury investigates complaints from private citizens, local government officials, or government employees; initiates investigations based on ideas generated from the jury; and follows California Penal Code that requires it to inspect the county's jails.

Copies of the Grand Jury's comprehensive final report, consisting of each year's individual reports on departments and agencies and responses to the prior year's report, are available in hard copy at the courthouse, in all public libraries, and on the Grand Jury's website, <http://www.yolocounty.org/grand-jury>. The report may also be obtained by contacting the Yolo County Grand Jury at 530 -406 -5088 or at P.O. Box 2142 in Woodland, CA 95776.

Grand Jurors and all witnesses are sworn to secrecy and, except in rare circumstances, records of meetings may not be subpoenaed. This
(continued on next page)

ABOUT THE GRAND JURY

secrecy ensures that neither the identity of the complainant nor the testimony offered to the Grand Jury during its investigations will be revealed. The Grand Jury exercises its own discretion in deciding whether to conduct an investigation or report its findings on citizens' complaints.

HOW TO SUBMIT A COMPLAINT

Complaints must be submitted in writing and should include any supporting evidence available. A person can pick up a complaint form at the county courthouse, the jail, or any local library; can request a form be mailed by calling 530-406-5088 or by writing to the Grand Jury at P. O. Box 2142, Woodland, CA 95776; or by accessing the Grand Jury's website at <http://www.yolocounty.org/grand-jury>. Complaints should be mailed to P. O. Box 2142 in Woodland or sent to the Grand Jury's e-mail address, grand-jury@sbcglobal.net. It is not necessary to use the printed form as long as the essential information is included in the complaint. Complaints received after February, when the Grand Jury's work is coming to a close, may be referred to the next year's Grand Jury for consideration.

REQUIREMENTS AND SELECTION OF GRAND JURORS

To be eligible for the Grand Jury you must meet the following criteria:

- You must be a citizen of the United States.
- You must be 18 years of age or older.
- You must have been a resident of Yolo County for at least one year before selection.
- You must be in possession of your natural faculties, of ordinary intelligence, of sound judgment and fair character.
- You must possess sufficient knowledge of the English language.

- You are not currently serving as a trial juror in any court of this state during the time of your Grand Jury term.
- You have not been discharged as a Grand Juror in any court of this state within one year.
- You have not been convicted of malfeasance in office or any felony.
- You are not serving as an elected public officer.

In addition to the requirements prescribed by California law, applicants for the Grand Jury should be aware of the following requirements:

- Service on the Grand Jury requires a minimum of 25 hours per month at various times during the day, evening and weekend. During peak months, 40 hours a month is typical, with more hours for those in leadership positions.
- Jurors must maintain electronic communications to participate in meeting planning, report distribution, and other essential jury functions. Such communications can be supported by computers at local libraries or personal electronic devices.

Each spring, the Yolo County Superior Court solicits applicants for the upcoming year's Grand Jury. Anyone interested in becoming a Grand Juror can submit his or her application to the Court in the spring, usually in April. Application forms are available at the courthouse or from the Grand Jury's website at <http://www.yolocounty.org/grand-jury>. Applications are managed by the Jury Services Supervisor, Yolo County Courthouse, 725 Court Street, Room 303, Woodland, CA 95695, telephone 530-406-6828. The Court evaluates written applications and, from these, identifies and interviews potential jurors to comprise the panel of nineteen citizens. Following a screening process by the Court, Grand Jurors are selected by lottery as prescribed by California law.

INVESTIGATIONS

2013–2014 YOLO COUNTY GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT



Yolo County Promotion Practices: Need for Standards and Oversight

SUMMARY

The Grand Jury reviewed rules pertaining to department promotions in Yolo County and, specifically, how they are applied at the Department of Planning and Public Works, Roads Division.

The Grand Jury found:

- No countywide policies or procedures exist for departments to follow once Department of Human Resources sends them a list of candidates eligible for a promotion.
- There is little to no oversight of department promotion practices by Human Resources. In this vacuum each department is left to develop its own methods for handling promotions. These methods vary greatly with some departments following a comprehensive, written promotion process and others relying on a past practice that is inconsistently applied.
- While the oral interview is the most important determinant in the promotional process, some departments do not apply any minimum standards for selection or training of oral interview panelists, have no consistent procedure in place for vetting panelists for bias, maintaining confidentiality of interview materials or communicating promotion selections to candidates.

The Grand Jury calls on Yolo County to develop policies and procedures covering department promotions and to require greater oversight, education and guidance in this area from the Department of Human Resources. This will ensure a promotional process countywide that provides greater uniformity, fairness and decreases potential legal risk to the county.

BACKGROUND

The Grand Jury received multiple complaints regarding departmental promotion practices at the Department of Planning and Public Works, Roads Division (Roads Division) alleging:

- Department promotional interviews were conducted in an unfair manner resulting in promotions based on favoritism rather than merit;
- Morale among some employees had deteriorated within the Roads Division due to perceived favoritism and failure of department managers and Human Resources (HR) to address these concerns.

Yolo County Promotion Practices: Need for Standards and Oversight

There are limits to the Grand Jury's "watchdog" function as set forth in California Penal Code Section 925. The Grand Jury does not review specific personnel decisions. However, these complaints prompted a review of countywide rules and practices pertaining to department promotions and, more specifically, how they are applied at Roads Division. This Grand Jury investigation focused specifically on department promotions.

METHODOLOGY

The Grand Jury interviewed managers and staff from several Yolo County departments including: Department of Public Works, Human Resources, Yolo County Library, Child Support Services and Auditor/Controller. The Grand Jury also reviewed the following documents:

- Yolo County, CA Code of Ordinance, Chapter 6, Personnel Merit System;
- County of Yolo Personnel Rules and Regulations, Draft (Rules and Regulations);
- Yolo County Oral Interview Panel Examination Outline for Panel Members, revised November 2010 (HR Outline)
- Candidate Promotional Files from Roads Division
- Notes and emails from HR regarding: 1) department hiring managers, 2) HR liaisons, 3) Roads Division inquiry;
- Yolo Training Academy Course Description;
- Yolo County Values Statement, adopted July 24, 2012;
- Flyer for "Avenues for Yolo County Employees."

Note: the last interviews for this report were completed on January 21, 2014.

DISCUSSION

Overview of County Personnel Rules for Department Promotions

The Yolo County "Personnel Director"¹ is responsible for administering the county's system of recruitment and promotion based on merit and for establishing methods and procedures needed for the merit system to function (County Code, Section 2-6.03). These methods and procedures are found in the Yolo County Personnel Rules and Regulations, Draft (Rules and Regulations).

Yolo County currently operates under Rules and Regulations that have been in draft form for several years. HR has not been able to complete the draft due to staffing shortages and

¹ The job title "Yolo County Personnel Director" no longer exists. The position currently is known as "Director of Human Resources". Human Resources is a division of the County Administrator's Office.

Yolo County Promotion Practices: Need for Standards and Oversight

other priorities. Once complete, HR will submit the draft Rules and Regulations to the ten county employee union groups for review and then to the Board of Supervisors for adoption. There is no definite timeline for final adoption of the Rules and Regulations.

The draft Rules and Regulations set forth principles for selection and recruitment by which the county abides. They include the statement that selection for hire and promotion “.....shall be on the basis of job-related skills, knowledge, demonstrated abilities and quality of performance.”

According to the draft Rules and Regulations, when a county department has a position open for promotion, the department notifies HR which posts the opening along with a statement of the Minimum Qualifications (MQ's) for that position. HR receives the applications, screens them to identify candidates meeting the MQ's and sends a list of eligible candidates to the department hiring authority. Generally, the department hiring authority is a department head. The department head may designate other managers or supervisors to oversee hiring and promotions in that department.

In some cases, HR works with a department hiring manager to develop and apply what is known as “Best Qualified Screening Criteria” to the list of candidates who meet the MQ's for the open position. The “Best Qualified Screening” is an undefined process by which HR and department hiring managers identify qualifications most important and apply them to the list of employees who meet the MQ's to determine those “best qualified” for the open position. There is no definition of “Best Qualified Screening Criteria” in any county rule or regulation. There is no written procedure defining when or how the criteria is developed or used. The Grand Jury learned that some department hiring managers were not aware that such a procedure existed. The Grand Jury also learned that promotion candidates who otherwise met the MQ's were not advised that the use of Best Qualified Screening Criteria eliminated them from the list of eligible candidates.

HR's required oversight of the promotion process ends when it sends the list of eligible candidates to a department hiring authority. At that point, a department is required to offer each eligible candidate an opportunity for an oral interview to be conducted by a panel. The Grand Jury learned that the oral interview is the single most important determinant of a promotion. The Rules and Regulations do not contain:

- minimum qualifications for oral interview panelists;
- minimum standards for experience or knowledge regarding the open position;
- requirements or guidelines for recusal or removal of a panelist for bias;
- requirements or guidelines for securing interview materials; or
- standard procedure for notifying candidates of the results of the promotional process.

Yolo County Promotion Practices: Need for Standards and Oversight

A six page written guideline entitled, “Yolo County Oral Interview Panel Examination Outline for Panel Members” (HR Outline) is HR’s only written guidance to department hiring managers and oral interview panelists. The HR Outline is included in a binder of interview materials given to the panelists on the day of interviews. The HR Outline sets forth the responsibilities of the panel members and contains an overview of the candidate rating process. The Grand Jury also learned that department hiring managers do not always review this HR Outline with panel members or verify that they read, understand and apply it to their role as a panelist when interviewing candidates.

Department Promotional Practices Vary

In the absence of countywide policies and HR oversight, each county department has been allowed to develop its own methods and practices for handling department promotions. The Grand Jury conducted an audit of Roads Division and three other county departments to gain an understanding as to how each handled promotions. The Grand Jury learned that the structure and integrity of the promotion process varied widely among these departments.

During the audit, the Grand Jury learned of one department that had developed internal written guidelines for selection and training of oral interview panelists, required panelists to sign confidentiality agreements and routinely met with non-selected candidates in order to provide feedback. Two departments had less formal procedures in place. These department hiring managers participated in the promotion process from beginning to end; selected experienced interview panelists; had procedures for securing interview materials; and, provided feedback to non-selected candidates.

The audit further revealed that the department promotion process at Roads Division was informal, based on past practice and not well understood or communicated among employees and managers. The hiring manager at Roads Division has delegated much of the oversight of the promotion process to other managers or supervisors who have no training in employment matters.

The Grand Jury learned that Roads Division:

- did not apply any minimum standards for selection of oral interview panelists;
- did not provide training to panelists but did provide them with the HR Outline at the time of the interviews;
- did not consistently screen interview panelists for potential personal bias for or against promotion candidates, relying on panelists to bring these issues to the department’s attention; and
- did not follow a consistent practice for notifying non-selected candidates of the outcome of the promotion.

Yolo County Promotion Practices: Need for Standards and Oversight

The Grand Jury learned of an instance where a newly hired probationary road worker was selected to serve on an interview panel for a supervisory position. Additionally, this probationary road worker was a personal friend of one of the candidates for promotion. The Grand Jury also learned of an occurrence in which the non-selected candidates first became aware of the outcome of a promotion during a group safety meeting at which the name of the successful candidate was announced.

Roads Division has not violated any county policy or code in managing its department promotions since none exists. Roads Division's practices, which lack written minimum standards, consistency and transparency, have led to the perception, expressed by some employees, that they do not have a fair opportunity to earn a promotion and that to take any measures to increase chances at future promotions would be futile.

Recently, Roads Division has been working more collaboratively with HR to improve its promotion practices. Roads Division has included HR in the process of selecting and training panelists, drafting interview questions and sitting in on interviews. HR and Roads Division believe this will make the process fairer, both in practice and in perception.

Human Resources: Advisory or Regulatory?

HR sees itself as having an advisory, not a regulatory, role in overseeing department promotions. HR does not routinely monitor or intervene in department promotion practices for two reasons: 1) lack of enforceable countywide policies and procedures and 2) lack of resources and resulting limitations on staff availability.

Lack of Policies and Procedures:

County Code mandates the Director of Human Resources develop policies and procedures to administer the county's promotional system.² As discussed in the previous section, policies and procedures do exist up to the point the list of eligible candidates is sent to the department for interview and promotion selection. The Director of HR has the mandate to adopt policies for departments to follow in the promotional interview and selection process but, thus far, has not done so.

Lack of Resources and Staff:

Even if policies on department promotions were adopted, HR currently does not have the resources or staff to ensure compliance by all county departments. HR has taken steps to

² Yolo County Code Section 2-6.03

Yolo County Promotion Practices: Need for Standards and Oversight

meet the need for more oversight of county promotions within its limited budget and staffing. HR recently developed curriculum for two courses to be offered in February, April and June 2014 through the Yolo Training Academy.³ The courses are entitled: “Coordinating Effective Hiring Interviews” and “Hiring Interview Panel”. The course descriptions cover some of the problem areas identified in this Grand Jury report. Course attendance is not mandatory and it is not known whether the courses will be offered beyond 2014. As of February 2014, six (6) employees were registered for the February class, two (2) for the April class and none for the June class.

Need for Countywide Policies on Department Promotions:

There are compelling reasons for the county to enact minimum standards for department promotion practices and to require HR oversight to ensure:

- **Legal Compliance:** The HR Outline lists nine state and federal anti-discrimination laws that apply to the oral interview process which, if violated, may place the county at legal risk;
- **Fairness:** In the absence of fair and consistent promotional practices, employees may decline to interview at Yolo County believing their chances for promotion or hire are based on factors other than merit;
- **Morale:** Employee morale suffers when the promotion process is not fair, systematic and transparent. Employees may give up on improving skills and education if they do not believe they have a fair chance at earning a promotion. This would be a loss to employees, managers, and to the county. Poor and inconsistent promotion practices may lead to promotion of less qualified individuals which may, in turn, lead to other personnel issues later, such as discipline, demotion, resignation or termination.

Human Resources: Need for prescribed complaint process

During this investigation, the Grand Jury learned that HR assumes departmental promotion practices are fair unless it learns otherwise. What HR does if it learns of a potential problem or receives a complaint is not well defined. Currently, the county has no prescribed process for employees to file a formal or informal complaint regarding personnel issues, for HR to conduct any type of investigation or for HR to bring the issue to closure with affected employees and managers.

Yolo County has shown its intention to create an environment where employee concerns can be raised. The Yolo County Values Statement provides that it is “...committed to doing

³ Yolo Training Academy provides classroom training to county employees and partner agencies in subjects relevant to county employment tasks.

Yolo County Promotion Practices: Need for Standards and Oversight

right by others through public service and maintaining the trust of our residents and peers. Together, we will continue to foster a healthy, supportive and professional environment, striving always for excellence.”

Yolo County also has developed a program called “Avenues” for Yolo County employees to report workplace issues through various resources including supervisors, HR and/or the Employee Assistance Program (EAP). The “Avenues” program opens the door for employees to seek assistance with workplace issues. The Grand Jury could find nothing in the description of the “Avenues” program that would address how an employee issue, such as alleged impropriety in departmental personnel practices, could be investigated and resolved.

The Grand Jury learned that employees of Roads Division met with HR to voice concerns over the promotion practices of Roads Division. HR assured the employees that it would look into the concerns but would not conduct a formal investigation. The Grand Jury learned that the employees believed that HR would inquire into their concerns and report back to them.

After speaking with Roads Division hiring managers and reviewing documents, HR concluded that Roads Division did not violate any county rules in the promotion. The Grand Jury learned that HR’s review raised “red flags” about Roads Division’s promotion practices prompting it to work more closely with Roads Division hiring managers to provide advice in selecting and training interview panelists, draft interview questions and sit in on interviews. None of this was clearly communicated to the affected employees. As a result, they believed their concerns had been ignored.

FINDINGS

- F1:** Yolo County currently operates according to Personnel Rules and Regulations that have been in draft form for a number of years. There is no definite timeline for completion by HR, review by employee union groups or adoption by the Board of Supervisors.
- F2:** Although the oral interview is required and is one of the most important events in a departmental promotion process, Yolo County has no written rules, regulations or guidelines covering the selection or training of oral interview panelists, the confidentiality of interview materials or feedback to selected and non-selected candidates.
- F3:** HR provides no oversight of department promotion practices unless requested to do so by a department. In this area, HR acts in an advisory role and assumes county departments are conducting promotional practices in a fair manner unless it learns otherwise.

Yolo County Promotion Practices: Need for Standards and Oversight

- F4:** Human Resources has failed to adopt rules and regulations addressing departmental promotion processes. As a result, HR's role in the departmental promotional process has been solely advisory.
- F5:** In the absence of countywide rules and HR oversight, department hiring managers develop their own methods for conducting the oral interview and promotion selection process, which vary widely.
- F6:** The department promotion process within Roads Division lacks written minimum standards for selection and training of oral interview panelists, method for recusal for bias, requirements for confidentiality or a process for meaningful feedback to non-selected candidates.
- F7:** Although Roads Division has not violated any policy or code relating to promotions, the lack of standards, consistency and transparency in Roads Division's promotion practices has led to a perception among some employees that the promotion process itself is unfair and biased.
- F8:** Development of countywide policies covering promotion practices, including use of objective screening criteria, along with more HR oversight for policy compliance, would ensure a standardized promotional process, improving uniformity between departments, increasing fairness and decreasing potential legal risk to the county.
- F9:** HR has taken steps to meet the need for more oversight of County promotions by offering elective courses through Yolo Training Academy in 2014.
- F10:** Currently, HR reviews department promotion practices only if a problem is reported. HR has no prescribed complaint process that requires investigation, accountability and communication of investigation results to concerned employees.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- R1.** Within the next 90 days, HR should conduct a survey of each department's current promotion practices to identify problem areas and to learn from departments that have created successful internal models that address promotional processes.
- R2.** By October 1, 2014, HR should use the information obtained from the survey to develop and adopt, as part of its Personnel Rules and Regulations, unified policies that create minimum written standards for department promotion processes. These policies

Yolo County Promotion Practices: Need for Standards and Oversight

should address selection and training of oral interview panelists, confidentiality and feedback to selected and non-selected candidates.

- R3.** HR should work with Roads Division immediately to create comprehensive written guidelines covering department promotion and hiring and to provide training to department hiring managers and oral interview panelists. These guidelines should be shared with Roads Division employees to restore transparency and trust that the department promotion process is operating in a fair manner.
- R4.** HR should ensure that courses recently added to the Yolo Training Academy on how to properly conduct hiring or promotional interviews become part of the Academy's permanent curriculum and that all county staff participating in hiring or promotion interviews be required to attend.
- R5.** Within the next 60 days, HR should develop and publicize a process by which complaints regarding personnel issues can be reviewed, evaluated and acted upon with results reported to complainants.
- R6.** By December 1, 2014, HR should complete the Personnel Rules & Regulations and develop a specific timeline for review by employee union groups and adoption by the Board of Supervisors. HR should report bi-monthly to the Board of Supervisors on its progress until such time as the Rules & Regulations are finally adopted.

REQUEST FOR RESPONSES

Pursuant to Penal Code section 933.05, the Grand Jury requests responses as follows:

From the following individuals and departments:

- Director, Human Resources Department: Recommendations R1, R2, R3, R4, R5 and R6
- County Administrative Officer: Recommendation R4.
- Director, Department of Planning and Public Works, Roads Division: Recommendation R3

From the following governing bodies:

- Yolo County Board of Supervisors: Recommendation R6

Implementing Major Changes in Education at the Local Level: Building a Plane in Midair

SUMMARY

The Grand Jury reviewed how the Yolo County Office of Education (YCOE) and the five Yolo County school districts are implementing the Common Core State Standards and the new K-12 finance system adopted by the State of California. The Grand Jury discovered:

- Common Core State Standards are being implemented in Yolo County, on schedule, with clear implementation guides and plans as provided by the California Department of Education (CDE).
- School Districts and YCOE are required to implement the new K-12 finance system, which includes the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) and the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) during the current school year for the 2014-2015 school fiscal year. At the same time, the templates and regulations for LCAP and LCFF are still undergoing design and approval at the State level.
- YCOE is responsible for evaluating the LCAP for each Yolo County school district and the independent charter school. The Grand Jury learned that this year YCOE faces challenges in evaluating the LCAPs without assessment tools from the California Department of Education (CDE).
- The Yolo County school districts and YCOE are moving forward to implement as much of the K-12 finance system as possible, as regulations and guidelines become available from CDE.

Because of the ongoing changes and delays in CDE providing information to local education agencies, YCOE and school district employees describe the process of implementing the K-12 finance system as “...*similar to building a plane in midair.*”

The Grand Jury commends YCOE and the five Yolo County school districts for their work in implementing these major changes to the education system while waiting for the completion and adoption of needed regulations and guidelines.

REASON FOR INVESTIGATION

The State of California and the State Board of Education (SBE) have enacted significant changes in educational curriculum and financing. The CDE is the state agency charged with developing regulations and templates for implementing these changes. As the SBE adopts regulations, the CDE informs county offices of education, local school districts, and direct-funded charter schools who are responsible for implementing these changes.