



PALO ALTO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
25 Churchill Avenue • Palo Alto, CA 94306
Telephone: (650) 329.3737 • FAX: (650) 321.3810

FILED

SEP 28 2010

DAVID H. YAMASAKI
Chief Executive Officer/Clerk,
Superior Court of CA County of Santa Clara
BY D. ALDYCKI

BOARD OF EDUCATION

September 14, 2010

Honorable Jamie Jacobs-May
Presiding Judge
Santa Clara County Superior Court
191 North First Street
San Jose, CA 95113

Re: PAUSD Response to Grand Jury Report--Looking at Policies Our Schools Use to Find and Place Employees

Dear Judge Jacobs-May

Enclosed are the Palo Alto Unified School District Board of Education responses to the Santa Clara County Civil Grand Jury Final Report: Looking at Policies Our Schools Use to Find and Place Employees,

Grand Jury Finding 1: Per the Districts' current CBAs, internal applicants are given priority over external applicants who may be better qualified for the job.

PAUSD Board Comments: Disagree. In PAUSD, internal applicants are given "consideration" for open positions but do NOT have priority over external applicants.

Grand Jury Recommendation 1: Each Board should revisit this subject in future CBA negotiations to ensure that competency is the determinant factor in the job candidate selection process.

PAUSD Board Comments: Already Implemented. The PAUSD CBAs already have language stating that internal applicants are not given priority over external applicants.

Grand Jury Finding 3: Twenty-two of the 32 Districts have policies covering the hiring of employee and Board member relatives.

PAUSD Board Comments: Agree

Grand Jury Recommendation 3: All boards should formulate and implement policies covering the hiring of relatives, including the disclosure of any familial relationships to the Board, to avoid the appearance of bias or favoritism in the recruitment and job assignment processes.

PAUSD Board Comments: Recommendation requires further analysis. Current board policy on employment of relatives has general language that supports practices that are free of conflicts or the appearance of impropriety. Board may consider policy language with greater specificity regarding hiring relatives of Board members and Superintendent. Timeline: December 2010

Grand Jury Finding 5: The following 18 Districts allow the Superintendent to override the policy of not permitting relatives to be placed in direct reporting relationships to current employees, on a case-by-case basis.

PAUSD Board Comments: Disagree. The PAUSD Superintendent does not have override authority around permitting an employee to supervise a relative. The PAUSD survey response pertained to the Superintendent's ability, on a case-by-case basis, to assign relatives to the same site. It was not meant to indicate that there was override authority for supervision.

Grand Jury Recommendation 5: Boards should adopt a policy of reviewing all Superintendent decisions that override the policy that pertains to the placement of related employees in direct reporting positions.

PAUSD Board Comments: Already implemented. Superintendent does not currently have override authority in placing related employees in direct reporting positions.

Grand Jury Finding 6: Fourteen of the 32 Districts are aware of and/or document the number and names of related employees. The following Districts do not document this information.

PAUSD Board Comments: Agree

Grand Jury Recommendation 6: The Boards of the Districts listed in Finding 6 should implement a policy of identifying familial relationships and tracking such data.

PAUSD Board Comments: Already implemented. Current PAUSD Board policy identifies familial relationships. Certificated and classified applications obtain familial relationships information. District does not formally track data for all relationships but is aware of spousal and dependent relationships of employees.

Respectfully



Barbara Klausner, President
Board of Education