

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION DENVER, COLORADO – AUGUST 5, 2016 MEETING No. 344

Commissioners Present: Neal G. Berlin, President
Federico C. Alvarez, Vice President
Anna Flores, Commissioner
Joseph G. Sandoval, Commissioner
Larry D. Trujillo, Commissioner

Staff Present: Earl Peterson, Executive Director
Antoinette Torres-Janke, Human Resources Supervisor
Jeff Wilson, Senior Human Resources Professional
Felisa Urdiales, Senior Human Resources Professional
Jeannette Madrid, Associate Human Resources Professional
Susan Billotte, Staff Human Resources Professional

Guests: Bob Wolf, City Attorney
Greg Pixley, Captain, Denver Fire Department

CSC President Berlin, called the meeting to order at 9:30am Commissioners Alvarez, Berlin, Flores, Sandoval, and Trujillo were present.

OPENING:

CSC President Berlin stated that a motion was in order to accept the minutes of July 15, 2016. Commissioner Alvarez so moved; Commissioner Trujillo seconded the motion. Motion was passed.

NEW BUSINESS:

Susan Billotte called for a motion for Commissioners' approval of the 2015 Annual Report. Commissioner Alvarez so moved; Commissioner Sandoval seconded the motion. Motion was passed.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

- Executive Director

Earl reported that CSC's move to the Denver Post building has been postponed to September, after Labor Day. He added, that he hoped the CSC staff would be getting a tour of the new office space within the next two weeks.

Earl announced his plan to schedule a training/award/acknowledgement session at the DPD Academy during the second or third week in October. Background Investigators, CSC Commissioners and staff, DPD & DFD recruiters, psychologists, and polygraph examiners will be

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

included; either breakfast or lunch will be provided. Commissioner Trujillo added that he looks forward to the opportunity to discuss the Suitability Assessment process with the psychologists.

Lastly, Earl mentioned the Commission's plan to review the Commission Rules, to incorporate Charter changes and other revisions to simplify and clarify processes. CSC will hold weekly meetings in order to complete an update of all Commission Rules.

- *2016 Fire Captain Assessment Center Assessor and Candidate Evaluation Summary
- *2016 Police Lieutenant Assessment Center Assessor and Candidate Evaluation Summary

Jeff presented documents summarizing Assessor and Candidate Evaluations of the 2016 Fire Captain Assessment Center, and the 2016 Police Lieutenant Assessment Center. (See attachments)

- Calendar
- Comments from Staff/Public

Captain Greg Pixley reported on the phenomenal success, and nationwide media coverage of the Denver Fire Department's Career Exploration Camp. There were (78) youngsters who participated in two co-ed 3-day sessions, comprised of a diverse group of (48) girls and (30) boys. The response was so great that some youngsters had to be turned away. Captain Pixley added, that the program received "lots of positive feedback." Moving forward, Captain Pixley stated his goal is to create an ongoing, sustainable program that gets boys and girls thinking about a career as a firefighter. He added that he'd like to expand the program to a week-long experience.

There were no additional comments from CSC staff or guests.

At 9:50am Commissioner Berlin stated that a motion was in order to go into Executive Session. Commissioner Sandoval so moved; Commissioner Trujillo seconded.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

- Deliberative Review (8) Civilian Firefighters
- Deliberative Review (1) Cadet Firefighter
- Deliberative Review (3) Fire Systems Technical Specialists (Electrician)
- Deliberative Review (24) Police Officers
- Preliminary Review (3) Police Officers
- Review of Hearing Officer Applicant

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

At 11:10am, Commissioner Berlin stated a motion was in order to go out of Executive Session. Commissioner Alvarez so moved; Commissioner Sandoval seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

OPEN SESSION:

Commissioner Trujillo moved to pass six (6) and fail two (2) entry-level firefighter applicants. Commissioner Flores seconded; motion passed. Commissioner Trujillo moved to pass (1) Cadet; Commissioner Sandoval seconded. Motion passed. Commissioner Trujillo moved to pass three (3) FSTS (Electricians); Commissioner Sandoval seconded. Motion passed.

Commissioner Trujillo moved to pass sixteen (16) and fail eight (8) police officer applicants. Commissioner Sandoval seconded; motion passed. Commissioner Sandoval moved to fail three (3) police officer applicants in Preliminary Review. Commissioner Trujillo seconded; motion passed.

The review of Hearing Officer applicant was postponed to the next Commission Meeting.

Commissioner Trujillo requested that the CSC Commissioners and staff consider changing Commission meetings from the first and third Friday of the month, to the second and fourth Thursday of the month. Commissioners and staff will discuss this matter at the next Commission Meeting.

There being no further action taken and no other business to be heard, the Civil Service Commission meeting of August 5, 2016 was adjourned at 11:15am on the motion of Commissioner Alvarez; seconded by Commissioner Sandoval.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION:

Neal G. Berlin, Commissioner/President

Federico Alvarez/Vice President

Anna Flores, Commissioner

Joseph G. Sandoval, Commissioner

Larry D. Trujillo, Commissioner

ATTEST: _____
Earl Peterson, Executive Director

Susan Billotte, Staff H.R. Professional

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

ASSESSOR EVALUATION SURVEY RESULTS 2016 CAPTAIN DENVER FIRE DEPARTMENT

All nine (9) of the assessors responded.

1. **The training I received from the consultant was adequate for me to conduct the evaluations in a fair, consistent and impartial manner.**

Strongly Disagree (0 = 0.0%)

Disagree (0 = 0.0%)

Agree (5 = 55.6%)

Strongly Agree (4 = 44.4%)

Comments: None

2. **The facilities and logistics for the assessment center were**

Poor (0 = 0.0%)

Adequate (3 = 33.3%)

Good (4 = 44.4%)

Excellent (2 = 22.2%)

Comments:

- a. Rooms were small, warm at times.
- b. Lodging would have been more enjoyable if closer to Assessment Center, and center of town to experience more of Denver.
- c. Too far from hotel.

3. **The assessment center was administered in a professional and organized manner.**

Strongly Disagree (0 = 0.0%)

Disagree (0 = 0.0%)

Agree (4 = 44.4%)

Strongly Agree (5 = 55.6%)

Comments: None.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

CAPTAIN DENVER FIRE DEPARTMENT ASSESSMENT CENTER CANDIDATE EVALUATION SUMMARY JUNE 2016

All twenty-two (22) candidates who participated in the assessment center completed an evaluation form.

Fairness

1. **Was the assessment center fair? (N = 22)**

- a. It was unfair. (0 or 0.00%)
- b. It was basically fair. (4 or 18.2%)
- c. It was fair and it was obvious that great efforts were taken to ensure fairness. (18 or 81.8%)

Comments:

- a. Well done – a lot of time to expand our ideas.
- b. Good.
- c. Great staff.
- d. Very related instructions,
- e. One In-Basket Item was not consistent with our policies regarding sick time/FLMA. **(The SMEs assisted in the development of all of the exercises and ensured that they were consistent with Department policies.)**
- f. I wish we had more time to present so we could expand on ideas.
- g. Previous assessment center videos were made available to some candidates, however when I requested to review my Lieutenant Assessment Center video I was told that the videos were not kept for that long. I feel this gave some candidates an unfair advantage. I recommend keeping all videos on file throughout career. **(We only retain videos for a few years.)**
- h. The change in the Tactical Exercise without the opportunity to ask questions is a glaring mistake in the fairness process.

Contents of the Assessment Center

2. **Did the assessment center differ from what you were led to expect based on the Orientation Program that was given? (N = 22)**

- a. The Assessment Center was significantly different from what I had been led to expect from the Orientation Program. (3 or 13.6%)
- b. The Assessment Center did not differ significantly from what I had been led to expect from the Orientation Program. (9 or 40.9%)
- c. The Orientation Program was well done and helpful, and considering the amount of information one can realistically expect to receive about a future test, it provided me with realistic expectations about the assessment center. (10 or 45.5%)

Comments:

- a. Good.
- b. The change of the Tactical Exercise after the Orientation Session was different, but

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

**ASSESSOR EVALUATION SURVEY RESULTS
2016 LIEUTENANT
DENVER POLICE DEPARTMENT**

All ten (10) of the assessors responded.

1. **The training I received from the consultant was adequate for me to conduct the evaluations in a fair, consistent and impartial manner.**

Strongly Disagree (0 = 0.0%)

Disagree (0 = 0.0%)

Agree (5 = 50.0%)

Strongly Agree (5 = 50.0%)

Comments:

a. The Chief coming in with his ideas was helpful.

b. Booth Research Group does a good job of explaining how to grade and how to ask questions.

2. **The facilities and logistics for the assessment center were:**

Poor (0 = 0.0%)

Adequate (2 = 20.0%)

Good (5 = 50.0%)

Excellent (3 = 30.0%)

Comments:

a. Would have liked a set-up without the chance of running into a candidate.

b. Using electronic based system was very efficient and expedited the process.

c. Room was cramped a bit.

3. **The assessment center was administered in a professional and organized manner.**

Strongly Disagree (0 = 0.0%)

Disagree (0 = 0.0%)

Agree (2 = 20.0%)

Strongly Agree (8 = 80.0%)

Comments: None.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

LIEUTENANT DENVER POLICE DEPARTMENT ASSESSMENT CENTER CANDIDATE EVALUATION SUMMARY JUNE 2016

All twenty-eight (28) candidates who participated in the assessment center completed an evaluation form.

Fairness

1. Was the assessment center fair? (N = 28)

- a. It was unfair. (0 or 0.00%)
- b. It was basically fair. (12 or 42.9%)
- c. It was fair and it was obvious that great efforts were taken to ensure fairness. (16 or 57.100%)

Comments:

- a. Professional and challenging. No issues with the process.
- b. Absolutely!
- c. Very fair and reasonable scenarios.
- d. The Written Exercise portion gives the advantage to people who type fast.
- e. Questions posed by the assessors need to be more related to the scenarios. The questions (follow-ups) were often vague and did not allow for an accurate response.
- f. Definitely pressed for time. Too much to say and not enough time. Typical assessment center.
- g. The long period between the assessment center and the release of the list is questionable.
- h. The process leads to some interesting conversations. I think a better explanation of why cut-offs and scores take so long to be set. The list could be published sooner with an effective date.

Contents of the Assessment Center

2. Did the assessment center differ from what you were led to expect based on the Orientation Program that was given? (N = 26)

- a. The Assessment Center was significantly different from what I had been led to expect from the Orientation Program. (0 or 0.0%)
- b. The Assessment Center did not differ significantly from what I had been led to expect from the Orientation Program. (13 or 50.0%)
- c. The Orientation Program was well done and helpful, and considering the amount of information one can realistically expect to receive about a future test, it provided me with realistic expectations about the assessment center. (13 or 50.0%)

Comments:

- a. The instructions were slightly unclear on the Tactical Exercise as far as if it was evolving or only one update within 10 minutes.