

**Career Service Authority Board Meeting #2094**

**Minutes**

**Thursday, April 17, 2008**

**9:00 A.M.**

**Webb Municipal Building**

**201 W. Colfax, Fourth Floor, Room 4.F.6 and 4.G.2**

**Luis Toro (Co-Chair)  
Tom Bonner (Co-Chair)  
Ashley Kilroy  
Kit Williams  
Nita Henry**

**I. Opening: Board called to order 9:00 a.m.**

**A. Approval of the Agenda for the April 17, 2008 Board Meeting**

*The Board approved unanimously the agenda for the April 17, 2008 meeting.*

**B. Approval of the Minutes for the April 3, 2008 Board Meeting**

*The Board approved the minutes three to one from the April 3, 2008 meeting. Board member Kilroy abstains because of nonattendance.*

**II. Board Comments: None**

**III. Director's Briefing:**

**A. Payroll Centralization update-** Director Dolan commented that this will stay on the agenda for continuing dialogue, there are no major highlights at this time.

**B. FY 09 Budget Preparation-** Mr. Dolan commented that the finance manager and communications manager are working together to compile a binder of up to date information. Board member Kilroy asked what the Mayor's initiatives are for the upcoming year. Mr. Dolan stated that there have been none given to them at this time. Mr. Dolan also commented that the equipment in the wellness center will now be put on a usage calendar for future replacements. Also, tuition reimbursement will be reviewed to see how it can be improved and then added to the budget in 2009. Mr. Dolan commented that with the payroll centralization CSA is looking to see how Benefits can assist with the Office of the Controller. Mr. Dolan announced that Leon Duran has been offered the Executive Assistant position and will be introduced to the Board shortly.

**C. Hearings Office Quarterly Report -** Ms. Valerie McNaughton presented that the Hearing Office began reviewing their two performance goals to

assure prompt resolution of appeals for the benefit of all parties. The Board has instructed them to set hearings within 60 days of the date the appeal is filed. Mrs. McNaughton commented that the average appeal filed in this first quarter of 2008 was set for hearing within 65 days, so slightly longer than the goal because of three multi-day hearings, including Civil Service hearings. The second goal, which is incorporated in C.S.R. 19-55, is to issue decisions within 45 days after close of the record. During this quarter, all nine decisions on the merits were issued in compliance with the goal. As of the end of the quarter, we were carrying 40 pending appeals, and closed 27 appeals. The number of appeals filed this quarter was 21, compared with 14 filed during the same quarter last year. In August 2007, whistleblower jurisdiction has been added to their jurisdiction.

The integration of the mediation program within the hearing office has been very successful. Board member Kilroy wanted to know how they are performing the mediation, i.e. outside vendors. Mrs. McNaughton commented that it is done by peer mediators when that is appropriate given the nature of the dispute. When necessary the mediation program does refer requests for mediation to mediation providers outside the peer mediation program. Since the majority of appellants are requesting mediation, CSA requested that the hearing office undertake mediation as a program within the office. Court Technical Clerk Linda Tizon schedules mediations for CSA employees with any kind of workplace dispute. It is proving to be a good fit thus far, since Linda already handles scheduling for all of their deadlines and hearings, and maintains appeal statistics for board reports. Thus far they have had three mediations, two of which have settled. Commissioner Crystel Jorgensen of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service is one of the outside mediators who have taken mediations at no cost to the city. The hearing office separates all settlement efforts from the hearing office function in order to assure a neutral hearing if cases do not settle. Board member Kilroy asked if it is ultimately still overseen by CSA. Mrs. McNaughton stated that it was a CSA program, and therefore CSA is still consulted on how it is run. Board member Bonner asked if there have been any concerns from employees. Mrs. McNaughton commented that one person questioned whether mediations could affect the appearance of neutrality of the hearing office. Mrs. McNaughton stated that should be minimized by its internal procedures, which prohibit the hearing officers and hearing staff from learning facts arising from the mediation side. If settlement facts are learned by one hearing officer, the other hearing officer can be assigned to hear the appeal. In addition, Mrs. McNaughton stated that all the hearing office receives is the result from the mediation, no other details. Board member Henry commented that previously the program was not utilized. Director Dolan commented that we are trying to utilize it more with external eyes and an opportunity to bring in expertise that the City does not have in house. Mrs. McNaughton and Director Dolan have been working together very closely to streamline the process and gain employee participation. Mrs. McNaughton said that they are designing the program by putting the mediation request form on the web as a first step.

The Hearing Office has met with stakeholders to gain an outlook on how the process can be improved.

**IV. Public Comments: NONE**

**V. Approval to Post: NONE**

**VI. Public Hearing:**

- A. Classification Notice No. 1264-** The proposed change amends the Classification and Pay Plan by adding Cost Estimator Analyst and Senior Cost Estimator Analyst presented by Steve Adkison, Classification. The results of an individual position audit on the duties of an employee at DIA revealed the need for the creation of Cost Estimator classes to accurately classify the duties assigned. DIA will be the first to utilize this classification and provides for a future need to others. Upon approval one employee at DIA will be reallocated. Engineering management at DIA currently assigns cost estimating, scheduling and contract management of third party cost estimating services to one individual who would be classified as a Senior Cost Estimator Analyst. Other City agencies were consulted regarding their potential use of these classes. Facilities Planning and Management indicated a potential need for this classification in the near future and provided input in the duties and requirements included in these specifications.

***The Board unanimously approved Classification Notice 1264.***

- B. Classification Notice No. 1265-** The proposed change amends the Classification and Pay Plan by deleting Board of Adjustment Code Investigator, presented by Hameed Pousti, Classification. The position is a single position single class. This class will not be used to fill a future position by the agency. This is an agency specific class with no position assignments.

***The Board unanimously approved Classification Notice 1265.***

- C. Classification Notice No. 1266-** The proposed change amends the Classification and Pay Plan by changing the title and pay grade of Ramp Tower Lead (620-A) to Ramp Tower Supervisor (622-A) presented by Steve Adkison, Classification. Employees in the classification of Ramp Tower Lead at Denver International Airport have been assigned supervisory duties instead of lead work duties over Assistant Aviation Operations Managers assigned to the B Tower. The class specification and pay of Ramp Tower Lead have been modified to reflect this change of duties. It was created in May of 2006 to assign more duties and serve as an additional set of eyes. There are currently five employees in this classification. Board Member Toro asked whether there are two towers at DIA. Adkison stated that there are two, the one tower serves ramp

operations which are very difficult to do, and the other is used by the FAA. DIA is one of three airports in the country that perform this duty.

***The Board unanimously approved Classification Notice 1266.***

- D. Classification Notice No. 1267-** The proposed change amends the Classification and Pay Plan by adding Associate Enterprise Resource Planning Developer, Associate Enterprise Resource Planning Systems Analyst, Senior Enterprise Resource Planning Developer, Senior Enterprise Resource Planning Systems Analyst, Staff Enterprise Resource Planning Developer and Staff Enterprise Resource Planning Systems Analyst presented by Melissa Palmer, Classification. Managers within Technology Services approached CSA with two concerns with regard to its Enterprise Resource Services (ERS) operations: 1) the compensation for ERS positions is not competitive with similar positions in the market place and 2) the ERS unit is experiencing recruitment and retention issues. The agency proposed two solutions to alleviate these concerns: 1) create separate class specifications for ERS positions and 2) conduct a pay analysis to determine if the pay for these classifications are appropriate. Research was conducted on industry practices to determine if organizations (with formal classification systems) have separate job titles for their Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) operations. Although it is not an established practice for organizations to have separate job titles and descriptions for all of their ERP positions, it was found that larger entities, comparable in size to the City and County of Denver, were more likely to have separate positions, usually for a Systems Analyst and/or Programmer. In order to better support business operations, it is recommended that separate classifications be created for ERP Systems Analyst (all levels) and ERP Developer (all levels). Pay data was collected from two compensation surveys: Mountain States Employers Council's Information Technology Compensation survey and Watson Wyatt's Information Technology & e-Commerce Personnel survey. There is no employee or budget impact with this recommendation. Board member Bonner commented that CSA faced this same situation in the 1990's and commented that it is good that staff is staying on top of the issue and making changes proactively.

***The Board unanimously approved Classification Notice 1267.***

- E. Classification Notice No. 1260-** Continuation of Pay Survey Discussion presented by Roberta Monaco briefed the Board on legal references to the City Charter, Ordinances and Career Service Rules and pay survey implementation. As required by City Charter and further defined by City Ordinance, Career Service authority has conducted the 2008 annual pay survey analysis. The findings and recommendations were posted in Classification Notice 1260 on March 20, 2008. The implementation of pay survey does not deliver pay, results are applied to the pay structure.

The analysis was conducted utilizing the survey data from the metropolitan area data collected by Mountain States Employers Council (MSEC) and the Colorado Municipal League (CML); national data was collected by Watson Wyatt Data Services; and Department of Labor

(DOL) data for the Denver-Boulder area was incorporated into the analysis for trend line comparisons. Local data and the national data were blended together that consisted of weighting the local and national data based on the percent of national applicants and local applicants to the overall applicant pool for each occupational group. DOL data was used as a tool to create a trend line comparison. The trend line is compared with the local market data which assists with validating the local market data and identifying any peculiarity in the market changes. DOL data was incorporated into the analysis in 2006 based on direction from the board, and the trend line data validated the pay survey results for the 2008 range adjustments.

In accordance with the City Ordinance, the recommendations include the implementation method of adjusting the structure of the pay tables, also known as “sliding” the ranges, to be effective on July 1, 2008.

The recommended structure adjustment for each occupational group is as follows:

- 7 recommended for a no step structure adjustment
  - Professional
  - Doctors
  - Health Technical and Related Support
  - Health Professional
  - Legal
  - Enforcement, Compliance and Protective Service
  - Trades
  
- 7 recommended for 1 step structure adjustment
  - Clerical
  - Engineering & Science
  - Art, Design, Media, Recreation and Entertainment
  - Information Technology
  - Labor
  - General Support Services
  - Fiscal

In addition to the occupational group structure adjustments, Career Service is recommending pay grade bumps for 7 classifications in 3 of the occupational groups. The list of classifications are on page 2 of Classification Notice 1260 included in the Boards packet. They include:

311 Customer Service Agent	612-S	613-S
311 Lead Customer Service Agent	613-S	614-S
311 Customer Service Operations Supervisor	805-S	807-S
Information Security Manager	813-I	814-I
Information Technology Technician Supervisor	809-I	810-I
Drafter	615-E	616-E
Senior Drafter	617-E	618-E

The effect of the pay survey recommendations on employees pay will have no impact to the employees' pay for the structure adjustments except for those employees whose pay falls below step one of the new range and who move to step 1. There will be a cost impact associated with the pay grade bumps. This cost is based on Career Service Rule 8-43 Pay Maintenance; section B). The rule provides employees with a 4.55% increase per pay grade if their classification is bumped upwards, so employees in classifications being bumped will also see a pay increase.

Consistent with previous practice, a public hearing will be held for the Pay Survey recommendations during two Board meetings: April, April 3, 2008 and again on April 17, 2008. The presentation on the 17<sup>th</sup> I will provide changes to what was originally posted based on classification and pay plan changes approved by the Board today. Ms. Monaco also asked the Board that they incorporate any class notices approved since the posting of the Pay survey including: 1259, 1262, 1263, 1264, 1265, 1266, and 1267. Ms. Monaco then commented that Class Notice 1261 had already been abolished and since they were inactive in the system there was confusion and there was no need for the Board to abolish the notice a second time. Board member Toro wanted clarification if the Board needed to modify the motion as to the other classification notice changes. Ms. Monaco stated that they would need to make a modification. Board member Kilroy wanted to clarify the class notice changes as 1259, 1262, 1263, 1264, 1265, 1266, and 1267. Ms. Monaco commented that those are the correct numbers.

***The Board unanimously approved Classification Notice 1260 with the incorporation of Class Notices 1259, 1262, 1263, 1264, 1265, 1266, and 1267.***

- VI. New Cases: NONE**
- VII. Pending Cases: NONE**
- VIII. Executive Session: Board went into executive session at 9:45 a.m.**
- IX. Adjournment: Reopened at 10:45 a.m. adjourned at 10:46 a.m.**