

0:0:0.0 --> 0:0:1.150

Scott Stauffer

I think we may have a quorum.

0:0:1.160 --> 0:0:1.440

Scott Stauffer

Hi, Emily.

0:0:8.280 --> 0:0:8.440

Emily Gothard - She/Her

Hello.

0:0:10.870 --> 0:0:11.480

Scott Stauffer

All right.

0:0:11.530 --> 0:0:13.360

Scott Stauffer

Uh, good afternoon, everybody.

0:0:13.370 --> 0:0:19.810

Scott Stauffer

I think we'll go ahead and call this meeting of the Public Records Advisory Council Bylaw Subcommittee to order.

0:0:20.630 --> 0:0:25.10

Scott Stauffer

Uh, hopefully it's a pretty quick one, but we'll see where the conversation takes us.

0:0:25.540 --> 0:0:29.570

Scott Stauffer

Uh, I've called this to order a Todd before you review the agenda.

0:0:29.580 --> 0:0:30.640

Scott Stauffer

Do you wanna do?

0:0:30.650 --> 0:0:30.940

Scott Stauffer

We do.

0:0:30.950 --> 0:0:33.720

Scott Stauffer

We satisfy the roll call requirement.

0:0:33.800 --> 0:0:36.990

ALBERT Todd \* PRA

We do do, we have 4 out of 6 voting Members present.

0:0:38.500 --> 0:0:39.510

Scott Stauffer

Thank you very much.

0:0:39.740 --> 0:0:43.50

Scott Stauffer

OK, so the agenda, this is a pretty informal meeting I think.

0:0:43.120 --> 0:0:53.400

Scott Stauffer

So I didn't prepare a PowerPoint, but the agenda is essentially to hear a report on some of the research done on the hiring process for the public records advocate position.

0:0:54.60 --> 0:1:3.570

Scott Stauffer

Take questions from the subcommittee and hopefully we get to a point where we can have a vote by this subcommittee in terms of recommending the process outlined.

0:1:4.380 --> 0:1:4.900

Scott Stauffer

Hello, Andrea.

0:1:6.150 --> 0:1:8.780

Scott Stauffer

Umm outlined in the material presented.

0:1:8.790 --> 0:1:11.80

Scott Stauffer

I did have a couple little minor modifications.

0:1:11.90 --> 0:1:19.500

Scott Stauffer

I'll I'll note when we get to that point, but the agenda is pretty much called the order review and potentially vote on that process and then adjourn.

0:1:19.510 --> 0:1:23.300

Scott Stauffer

Is there any questions or comments or proposed changes to that agenda?

0:1:26.840 --> 0:1:29.260

Scott Stauffer

Seeing none, I'll entertain a motion to approve that agenda.

0:1:31.550 --> 0:1:32.120

Mark Landauer

So moved.

0:1:34.910 --> 0:1:35.310

ALBERT Todd \* PRA

Back in the.

0:1:34.890 --> 0:1:36.700

Scott Stauffer

Have thank you.

0:1:36.710 --> 0:1:43.260

Scott Stauffer

It's removed by member Landauer, seconded by Todd to approve the agenda as presented.

0:1:43.350 --> 0:1:44.250

Scott Stauffer

Any further discussion?

0:1:45.600 --> 0:1:46.210

Scott Stauffer

Uh in favor?

0:1:46.220 --> 0:1:47.200

Scott Stauffer

Say I raise your hand.

0:1:48.540 --> 0:1:48.990

ALBERT Todd \* PRA

I.

0:1:50.490 --> 0:1:53.100

Scott Stauffer

Agenda is approved unanimously amongst Members present.

0:1:53.110 --> 0:1:53.740

Scott Stauffer

Thank you very much.

0:1:53.750 --> 0:2:6.430

Scott Stauffer

So right into the meat of the today's discussion, I'll start sharing my screen just to show you a version of what was posted online as a an exhibit for this meeting.

0:2:6.440 --> 0:2:11.520

Scott Stauffer

And that's this proposed hiring process for the public records advocate office.

0:2:11.890 --> 0:2:18.810

Scott Stauffer

So, uh, we went over most of this, this version of that was presented at our last bylaws meeting.

0:2:18.820 --> 0:2:30.430

Scott Stauffer

I appreciate that most of the Members couldn't be present, but Mark Todd and I had a good discussion on it and hopefully members were able to take a look at that recording or get it clean for what was there in the last few months.

0:2:30.440 --> 0:2:41.600

Scott Stauffer

We've spoken to a couple of other agencies and then just yesterday Todd and I were able to meet with Members, our DAS Human Resources representative and we got some pretty good feedback from them.

0:2:41.870 --> 0:2:51.900

Scott Stauffer

So I'm I'm generally what I took away from all that research and all those discussions and emails was was this process, this general flow chart flow chart that you see here on the screen.

0:2:52.350 --> 0:2:53.720

Scott Stauffer

I think it's pretty straightforward.

0:2:53.730 --> 0:3:1.220

Scott Stauffer

Most of us, I think, could have been involved in recruitment and hiring processes of various forms or some fairly basic elements, and I think we tried to capture that here.

0:3:1.990 --> 0:3:4.840

Scott Stauffer

Having said that, this is, you know, a proposal.

0:3:4.850 --> 0:3:9.840

Scott Stauffer

So this is the subcommittee that will have a first opportunity to correct to make tweaks.

0:3:9.850 --> 0:3:12.0

Scott Stauffer

You know, whatever questions you have, let's do that.

0:3:12.550 --> 0:3:16.930

Scott Stauffer

But I will say the things I did take a couple three things away from yesterday with HR.

0:3:17.580 --> 0:3:22.750

Scott Stauffer

Uh, First off, they definitely see themselves as our partner when it comes to commitment.

0:3:22.760 --> 0:3:43.530

Scott Stauffer

So when we get, whether it be this year or in the future, when we get, when the crack gets to a recruitment phase, dash R would come to that meeting and work with the the full Council to talk about

what the recruitment looks like, what publicity funding needs to be contributed or allocated from the public records advocate Agency, if that's warranted.

0:3:44.40 --> 0:3:47.320

Scott Stauffer

So there there to be our partners with that and the shepherd received.

0:3:47.700 --> 0:3:53.480

Scott Stauffer

Yeah, the the applications, there's different levels of reviewing and vetting of applications that could be done.

0:3:53.490 --> 0:3:59.980

Scott Stauffer

And we can have that conversation when we get to a recruitment and then they would help us through the interview process and selection process.

0:3:59.990 --> 0:4:1.900

Scott Stauffer

So that was underscored.

0:4:1.910 --> 0:4:5.910

Scott Stauffer

They saw this flow chart and I didn't receive any.

0:4:5.920 --> 0:4:8.100

Scott Stauffer

I sent it to them and we talked about it in person.

0:4:8.110 --> 0:4:13.760

Scott Stauffer

And they didn't have any direct feedback in terms of changing anything drastically from what you see proposed.

0:4:13.990 --> 0:4:20.980

Scott Stauffer

They did suggest that we would want to begin with with a understanding that our current record advocate contract ends in October.

0:4:20.990 --> 0:4:32.180

Scott Stauffer

They suggested we don't start this any later than June, so at this point I think our goal is to start this process as flow chart no later than June, potentially earlier depending on where the Council goes.

0:4:32.190 --> 0:4:33.690

Scott Stauffer

So everything else is as presented.

0:4:34.270 --> 0:4:38.740

Scott Stauffer

Uh under recruitment there was some discussion.

0:4:38.750 --> 0:4:39.240

Scott Stauffer

Uh.

0:4:39.410 --> 0:4:45.840

Scott Stauffer

The public records advocate as an agency is a non RS240 agency, which I won't pretend to know.

0:4:45.850 --> 0:4:48.710

Scott Stauffer

I know all of that means, but it means enough to know that.

0:4:49.10 --> 0:4:56.440

Scott Stauffer

How we go about recruitment and we don't fall under certain umbrellas in terms of how employees of the agency are treated.

0:4:56.450 --> 0:5:9.530

Scott Stauffer

And then Todd, please correct me if I say something incorrectly, but what that means for our process is generally non or US 240 agencies, the chair and the vice chair of the Council or board would leave the recruitment and negotiation process.

0:5:9.540 --> 0:5:14.630

Scott Stauffer

So they didn't say that was a hard and fast rule, but that's just sort of the the general guidance I suggested.

0:5:14.840 --> 0:5:21.230

Scott Stauffer

They did say there's room for a subcommittee of the PR, a of the PRAC to be identified and doesn't have to be the chair and vice chair.

0:5:21.240 --> 0:5:24.800

Scott Stauffer

But that was just sort of the general guidance, not necessarily you must do it this way.

0:5:25.590 --> 0:5:31.60

Scott Stauffer

Umm, I think I think those are things that come in notes real quick.

0:5:32.140 --> 0:5:32.760

Scott Stauffer

Uh.

0:5:32.800 --> 0:5:36.260

Scott Stauffer

Todd, do you wanna say anything else about our conversations with other agencies and HR?

0:5:39.150 --> 0:5:40.570

ALBERT Todd \* PRA

No, I think there's pretty on point.

0:5:40.580 --> 0:5:45.630

ALBERT Todd \* PRA

You know, as a non 240 agency, we have flexibility that's kind of it.

0:5:47.330 --> 0:5:47.740

Scott Stauffer

Yeah.

0:5:47.760 --> 0:5:50.560

Scott Stauffer

I'm just trying to think I had other notes.

0:5:52.840 --> 0:5:53.580

Scott Stauffer

I guess that's it.

0:5:53.640 --> 0:6:2.480

Scott Stauffer

So uh, with that, this is sort of what you see on the screen and this is the flow chart and it's it's written out down here below and this is my best effort at this.

0:6:2.490 --> 0:6:11.720

Scott Stauffer

And I'm open to any edits people wanna make, but I think I'll I'll turn open to the full subcommittee then if anybody has any questions, comments, thoughts.

0:6:13.730 --> 0:6:15.930

Scott Stauffer

And I see Andrew Smith raised his hand.

0:6:15.940 --> 0:6:18.150

Scott Stauffer

Uh, Andrew, I don't forget me.

0:6:18.160 --> 0:6:18.470

Scott Stauffer

Am I wrong?

0:6:18.480 --> 0:6:21.270

Scott Stauffer

I don't believe you're a member of our subcommittee, and I don't know.

0:6:21.280 --> 0:6:26.400

Scott Stauffer

We have public comment built into this this meeting today, but do you wanna identify yourself real quick?

0:6:30.290 --> 0:6:30.640

Scott Stauffer

Ohh.

0:6:26.810 --> 0:6:33.780

Smith Andrew

Sure, I'm here today on behalf of Representative Anderson, so if it's not appropriate for me to ask a question, I won't.

0:6:33.790 --> 0:6:36.890

Smith Andrew

I just have a question on the chart, but but I can certainly hold it.

0:6:35.800 --> 0:6:41.420

Scott Stauffer

Ohh I apologize you even put him comment to that effect in the chat and it just went right over my head.

0:6:41.430 --> 0:6:43.160

Scott Stauffer

I apologize, Andrew, please go ahead.

0:6:43.170 --> 0:6:45.630

Scott Stauffer

You're you're representing a ex official member, yeah.

0:6:44.700 --> 0:6:50.410

Smith Andrew

OK, so the question would be just as I you know, engage my boss to catch him up on today's discussion.

0:6:50.680 --> 0:6:54.310

Smith Andrew

Does the flow chart have any recommended for the process?

0:6:54.320 --> 0:7:11.980

Smith Andrew

How long it takes and I know that could be very specific to every situation, but like for example, how long does a typical if you did a 360 review, how long would that take or I don't know if that's an important piece to talk about if that would help or at this point maybe it's not helpful, but I would just just a comment when I see the chart.

0:7:12.670 --> 0:7:20.360

Scott Stauffer

Now I think that's a very helpful question and and forgive me for your floppy introduction there and I appreciate you being here on behalf of Representative Anderson.



0:7:21.920 --> 0:7:36.410

Scott Stauffer

Let's see, when I we asked that question to HR yesterday and they sort of agreed that about a recruitment process, which would include the 360 review you're looking at probably about four months, it can go a little quicker, can go a little slower depending on how things play out, of course.

0:7:36.640 --> 0:7:47.860

Scott Stauffer

But for months, and if that's giving one to two months for the recruitment part here, then I would expect that a review probably a month, but I haven't actually gone with myself, Mark.

0:7:49.890 --> 0:7:50.340

Mark Landauer

No, it's a.

0:7:50.350 --> 0:7:59.480

Mark Landauer

It's a good question, Andy and and thanks for joining us today and congratulations with the your appointment to wrap Anderson's staff.

0:7:59.810 --> 0:8:37.200

Mark Landauer

Umm, you know, we did discuss the 360 review in our meeting previous meeting of this subcommittee and you know we came to I think a a fairly general consensus that we didn't want to do a massive 360 review rather you know probably review seek feedback from some individuals who have gone through the mediation process, probably a few individuals on the counsel itself and any further public feedback that we got.

0:8:37.210 --> 0:8:42.830

Mark Landauer

But I don't think we wanted to do a massive outreach on this.

0:8:42.920 --> 0:8:58.880

Mark Landauer

Rather more of a strategically narrowed 1 to get any feedback in the event that the existing advocate wants to continue to serve in this capacity, which I presume is the case.

0:9:1.890 --> 0:9:2.900

Scott Stauffer

Thank you, mark.

0:9:3.30 --> 0:9:3.600

Scott Stauffer

Uh, Emily.

0:9:3.610 --> 0:9:5.100

Scott Stauffer

Did I see your hand up at the moment?

0:9:10.820 --> 0:9:11.210

Emily Gothard - She/Her  
Sorry.

0:9:11.220 --> 0:9:13.280

Emily Gothard - She/Her  
No, umm, my question has been addressed now.

0:9:14.10 --> 0:9:14.260

Scott Stauffer  
Alright.

0:9:16.620 --> 0:9:21.880

Scott Stauffer  
So probably about a month, month and 1/2 and that would add to an overall process of about four months. Andrew.

0:9:23.970 --> 0:9:42.270

CHIAPELLA Andrea \* DAS  
You don't think this group being on 240 agency would fall under this at all, but Governor Kochek has kind of set a standard for time to fill a 50 days and that time to fill is from the day the recruitment opens to the day of Job offer is made to the candidate.

0:9:42.330 --> 0:9:47.510

CHIAPELLA Andrea \* DAS  
And so maybe that could be a good thing to align with, although that's not required.

0:9:47.520 --> 0:9:51.90

CHIAPELLA Andrea \* DAS  
You know from this group, so just putting that out there too.

0:9:53.370 --> 0:9:56.720

Scott Stauffer  
Yeah, that to me that still falls in that one to two month time period.

0:9:56.730 --> 0:9:57.620

Scott Stauffer  
And I would, I would.

0:9:58.70 --> 0:10:1.400

Scott Stauffer  
I would hate to see a recruitment stretch beyond many, many more than two months so.

0:10:4.330 --> 0:10:8.130

Scott Stauffer  
Any other questions or thoughts on this proposed process?

0:10:14.180 --> 0:10:14.850

Mark Landauer

Well, I'm.

0:10:14.920 --> 0:10:21.710

Mark Landauer

I'm prepared to make a recommendation that the subcommittee forward this proposal to the full committee for approval.

0:10:23.280 --> 0:10:23.990

Scott Stauffer

I hear a motion.

0:10:24.0 --> 0:10:26.360

Scott Stauffer

I also saw Todd's hand go up at the same time.

0:10:26.370 --> 0:10:27.200

Scott Stauffer

Did you want to say anything?

0:10:27.210 --> 0:10:27.890

Scott Stauffer

At this moment, Todd?

0:10:30.470 --> 0:10:32.760

ALBERT Todd \* PRA

Uh, well, I don't know if it'll be helpful or not.

0:10:32.770 --> 0:10:34.920

ALBERT Todd \* PRA

I think the long Term Care Ombudsman did.

0:10:41.480 --> 0:10:41.680

Scott Stauffer

Umm.

0:10:34.930 --> 0:10:50.440

ALBERT Todd \* PRA

There are 360 before they decided if they were going to reappoint or recruit new candidates, and I didn't know if this group wanted to consider that alternative or decide about as we have it here, reappointment or recruitment.

0:10:50.450 --> 0:10:53.710

ALBERT Todd \* PRA

And then move to 360, I guess in one of those events.

0:10:59.560 --> 0:11:0.170

ALBERT Todd \* PRA

Would be more like.

0:10:55.30 --> 0:11:1.340

Scott Stauffer

So it's almost like 1/2 step, half between four and five, depending on how the yeah.

0:11:1.370 --> 0:11:4.20

ALBERT Todd \* PRA

Sorry, I think we need more like 2 and three would be reversed.

0:11:6.100 --> 0:11:6.920

Scott Stauffer

Reverse two and three.

0:11:10.0 --> 0:11:10.210

ALBERT Todd \* PRA

What?

0:11:10.220 --> 0:11:10.450

ALBERT Todd \* PRA

Yeah.

0:11:10.460 --> 0:11:11.60

ALBERT Todd \* PRA

What? Just.

0:11:10.220 --> 0:11:14.540

Emily Gothard - She/Her

I think you would put two is 4 and then three and four would come before 2.

0:11:17.520 --> 0:11:19.140

ALBERT Todd \* PRA

Yeah, three and four before 2.

0:11:20.450 --> 0:11:20.650

Scott Stauffer

OK.

0:11:21.90 --> 0:11:22.350

Emily Gothard - She/Her

I would support that change.

0:11:23.910 --> 0:11:24.650

Scott Stauffer

1342.

0:11:24.370 --> 0:11:26.660

Mark Landauer

Yeah, I I'd be fine with that as well.

0:11:28.100 --> 0:11:28.450

Scott Stauffer

Andrea.

0:11:29.940 --> 0:11:31.430

CHIAPELLA Andrea \* DAS

Just a question for Todd.

0:11:31.440 --> 0:11:38.340

CHIAPELLA Andrea \* DAS

Are you on a normal cadence of 360 reviews or is that no, you're you're not part of the?

0:11:43.60 --> 0:11:43.990

CHIAPELLA Andrea \* DAS

Ohh yeah.

0:11:36.970 --> 0:11:50.860

ALBERT Todd \* PRA

No, I had one in 2019 as a member of the leadership Oregon cohort and I, umm, I'm actually not 100% sure if I'm currently in the group that will be required to get one. Ohh.

0:11:50.520 --> 0:11:50.890

CHIAPELLA Andrea \* DAS

You like?

0:11:50.900 --> 0:11:51.640

CHIAPELLA Andrea \* DAS

Probably not.

0:11:53.690 --> 0:11:58.350

CHIAPELLA Andrea \* DAS

But yeah, other sorry the the requirements of my head are.

0:12:0.680 --> 0:12:7.350

CHIAPELLA Andrea \* DAS

But I there's a normal cadence now for agency directors to get a 360 review.

0:12:7.360 --> 0:12:15.60

CHIAPELLA Andrea \* DAS

And so I if if the position is in that normal cadence it might be of interest to take that into consideration.

0:12:15.70 --> 0:12:20.320

CHIAPELLA Andrea \* DAS

But it sounds like it's not so and yes, but also would support moving that up in the process.

0:12:23.920 --> 0:12:24.570

Scott Stauffer

Thank you, Andrea.

0:12:24.680 --> 0:12:36.100

Scott Stauffer

I hear I hear committee support for 134 in terms of removing that and if that's where we land then I will happily make that adjustment and share it with via Todd with the entire Council before our meeting on Friday.

0:12:38.890 --> 0:12:42.50

Scott Stauffer

OK, Mark, if I may be so Yep.

0:12:40.740 --> 0:13:0.420

Mark Landauer

All motto all modify my motion then and I recommend that the modification be in order 1342 for this portion and then I'll make a motion to afford this to the full crack.

0:13:0.430 --> 0:13:2.960

Mark Landauer

I think that would probably be the in order.

0:13:2.970 --> 0:13:4.70

Mark Landauer

Is that right, Scott?

0:13:5.100 --> 0:13:6.210

Scott Stauffer

You're so you're making.

0:13:6.300 --> 0:13:9.280

Scott Stauffer

There wasn't 2 motions or one motion with two stops.

0:13:13.750 --> 0:13:13.950

Scott Stauffer

OK.

0:13:7.950 --> 0:13:32.370

Mark Landauer

So I I'll, I'll, I'll, I'll, I'll I will table my previous motion and move that the current proposal be renumbered as described previously and that the modified flow chart be recommended for approval by the full PRAC at its next meeting.

0:13:34.130 --> 0:13:34.560

Emily Gothard - She/Her

Seconded.

0:13:34.230 --> 0:13:35.40

Scott Stauffer

Thank you, mark.

0:13:35.740 --> 0:13:36.60

Scott Stauffer

Thank you.

0:13:36.70 --> 0:13:37.260

Scott Stauffer

Mark, it's been moved and thank you.

0:13:37.270 --> 0:13:47.380

Scott Stauffer

Umm, it's been moved by Mark and seconded by Emily to renumber the proposed flow chart for the hiring process to number 1342 and then 5678.

0:13:47.910 --> 0:13:59.40

Scott Stauffer

And then to forward that revised flow chart process to the full Council for its consideration at the Council's next full meeting, which is this Friday, any further discussion on that motion?

0:14:1.450 --> 0:14:2.680

Mark Landauer

Well, I, I'll.

0:14:2.690 --> 0:14:8.880

Mark Landauer

I'll take the liberty of thanking Scott for doing quite a bit of work on this Scott.

0:14:8.890 --> 0:14:13.620

Mark Landauer

Thank you very much for taking this on and leading this this group.

0:14:13.630 --> 0:14:14.720

Mark Landauer

I I very do.

0:14:14.870 --> 0:14:19.160

Mark Landauer

I really, truly do appreciate your work and thought that you put into this.

0:14:19.170 --> 0:14:20.10

Mark Landauer

So thank you.

0:14:21.410 --> 0:14:21.960

Scott Stauffer

Thank you, mark.

0:14:21.970 --> 0:14:22.600

Scott Stauffer

I appreciate that.

0:14:22.610 --> 0:14:26.730

Scott Stauffer

So I've been happy to do it and not to nerd out, but I'm looking forward to the bylaws part.

0:14:26.950 --> 0:14:27.190

Scott Stauffer

OK.

0:14:27.530 --> 0:14:29.100

Scott Stauffer

Umm, OK.

0:14:29.110 --> 0:14:36.310

Scott Stauffer

So we haven't had a full it's a moved and seconded on the motion any further discussion seeing that all in favor say aye or raise your hand.

0:14:36.250 --> 0:14:37.600

Mark Landauer

I I.

0:14:39.910 --> 0:14:40.330

Scott Stauffer

All right.

0:14:40.340 --> 0:14:46.300

Scott Stauffer

I see 4 yeases and one extension probably understood as to the nature of that extension.

0:14:45.370 --> 0:14:46.760

ALBERT Todd \* PRA

Yes, I'm abstaining.

0:14:47.510 --> 0:14:48.230

ALBERT Todd \* PRA

Yes, thank you.

0:14:47.100 --> 0:14:49.650

Scott Stauffer

And no, no objections?

0:14:49.660 --> 0:14:52.230

Scott Stauffer

The motion carries and we will refer this to the Council.



0:14:52.240 --> 0:14:53.50

Scott Stauffer

I'll make that change.

0:14:53.400 --> 0:14:59.850

Scott Stauffer

I'm heading into the City Council meetings myself here in a moment, so this probably won't be done till tomorrow, but I will get it to you, Todd, as soon as I can.

0:14:59.970 --> 0:15:0.640

Scott Stauffer

Probably tomorrow.

0:15:1.470 --> 0:15:1.900

Scott Stauffer

Uh.

0:15:1.910 --> 0:15:6.510

Scott Stauffer

With that, that completes the uh subcommittees work, and we're just one minute over.

0:15:6.520 --> 0:15:13.610

Scott Stauffer

When we said we'd be done so if there are no other comments or remarks for the moment, I will consider as adjourned.

0:15:15.350 --> 0:15:16.50

Mark Landauer

Thanks again.

0:15:15.910 --> 0:15:16.330

CHIAPELLA Andrea \* DAS

Thank you.

0:15:16.920 --> 0:15:17.690

Smith Andrew

Thanks everybody.

0:15:17.940 --> 0:15:18.560

Smith Andrew

Nice to meet you.

0:15:19.100 --> 0:15:19.580

Scott Stauffer

Nice to meet you.

0:15:20.460 --> 0:15:20.820

ALBERT Todd \* PRA

Thanks.