



Career Service Board Meeting #2370

Minutes

Thursday, October 17, 2019, 9:00am

Webb Municipal Building

201 W. Colfax Ave, First Floor, Career Service Hearings Office

Karen DuWaldt (Co-Chair)
Neil Peck (Co-Chair) - Absent
David Hayes
Patricia Barela Rivera - Absent
Tracy Winchester

I. Opening: *Meeting was called to order at 9:02am*

1. **Approval of the Agenda for the October 17, 2019 Board Meeting.**
The Board unanimously approved the agenda for the October 17, 2019 meeting.
2. **Approval of the Minutes for the September 19, 2019 Board Meeting.**
The Board unanimously approved the minutes for the September 19, 2019 meeting.

II. Board Comments: *None.*

III. Public Comments: *None.*

IV. Public Hearing:

1. Public Hearing Notice No. 609 – Prevailing Wage: Parking Electronic Technician

Alena Duran, Sr. Classification & Compensation Analyst, presented Public Hearing Notice No. 609 to adopt a change in the pay and/or fringe benefits of the wage classification series of, "Parking Electronic Technician" in accordance with section 20-76(c)(3) of the Denver Revised Municipal Code.

Based on this review, the following pay and fringe benefits revision was proposed, based on the base and fringe rates for Parking Electronic Technician. The Service Contract method was used to determine the wage rates and fringe benefits.

	<u>Current</u>			<u>Proposed</u>		
	<u>Base Wage</u>	<u>Fringes</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Base Wage</u>	<u>Fringes</u>	<u>Total</u>
Parking Electronic Tech	\$24.35	\$7.29	\$31.64	\$24.85	\$7.41	\$32.26

Board Member David Hayes asked how the classification is benchmarked, to which Ms. Duran replied a maintenance mechanic who repairs equipment is considered to be a reasonable match. Mr. Hayes asked if Ms. Duran knew how many employees are in this classification, which Ms. Duran stated she did not, as the Auditor's Office reviews the payroll information for prevailing wage notices.

The Career Service Board unanimously approved Public Hearing Notice No. 609.

2. Public Hearing Notice No. 610 – Prevailing Wage: Fuel Handlers

Alena Duran, Sr. Classification & Compensation Analyst, presented Public Hearing Notice No. 610 to adopt a change in the pay and/or fringe benefits of the wage classification series of, “Fuel Handlers” in accordance with section 20-76(c)(3) of the Denver Revised Municipal Code.

Based on this review, the following pay and fringe benefits revision was proposed, based on the base and fringe rates for Fuel Handlers. The Service Contract method was used to determine the wage rates and fringe benefits.

	<u>Current</u>			<u>Proposed</u>		
	<u>Base Wage</u>	<u>Fringes</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Base Wage</u>	<u>Fringes</u>	<u>Total</u>
Fuel Distribution System Operator	\$23.31	\$7.17	\$30.48	\$23.41	\$7.18	\$30.59
Lead Fuel Distribution System Operator	\$24.37	\$7.29	\$31.66	\$24.48	\$7.36	\$31.84
Fuel Distribution System Mechanic	\$30.61	\$8.01	\$38.62	\$30.74	\$8.09	\$38.83
Lead Fuel Distribution System Mechanic	\$32.00	\$8.17	\$40.17	\$32.14	\$8.25	\$40.39

Board Member Tracy Winchester asked if the ordinance requires a prevailing wage notice to be issued even if the proposed increase in pay is very small versus, for example, waiting until increase is more substantial. Ms. Duran responded the ordinance does require a notice even if the increase is only one cent.

Board Co-Chair Karen DuWaldt asked if the ordinance requires Classification & Compensation to review the wages annually, which Ms. Duran replied in the affirmative.

The Career Service Board unanimously approved Public Hearing Notice No. 610.

3. Public Hearing Notice No. 611 – Prevailing Wage: Furniture Movers

Alena Duran, Sr. Classification & Compensation Analyst, presented Public Hearing Notice No. 611 to adopt a change in the pay and/or fringe benefits of the wage classification series of, “Furniture Movers” in accordance with section 20-76(c)(3) of the Denver Revised Municipal Code.

Based on this review, the following pay and fringe benefits revision was proposed, based on the base and fringe rates for Furniture Movers. The Service Contract method was used to determine the wage rates and fringe benefits.

	<u>Current</u>			<u>Proposed</u>		
	<u>Base Wage</u>	<u>Fringes</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Base Wage</u>	<u>Fringes</u>	<u>Total</u>
Furniture Mover	\$17.36	\$6.48	\$23.84	\$17.36	\$6.54	\$23.90
Furniture Driver/Packer	\$17.43	\$6.49	\$23.92	\$17.66	\$6.58	\$24.24
Lead Furniture Mover	\$18.22	\$6.58	\$24.81	\$18.46	\$6.67	\$25.13

The Career Service Board unanimously approved Public Hearing Notice No. 611.

4. Classification Notice 1627 – Pretrial Services Officer

Susan O’Neill, Sr. Classification & Compensation Analyst, presented Classification Notice No. 1627 to amend the Classification and Pay Plan by creating five new classifications for the Department of Safety-Community Corrections.

These new job descriptions will be beneficial for the recruitment process by ensuring the candidates are applying for the pretrial services career path. The current probation officer classification series will continue to be used throughout the city by other agencies.

NEW CLASSIFICATIONS

<u>Job Code</u>	<u>Proposed Class Title</u>	<u>Proposed Pay Grade & Range</u>
CN3187	Pretrial Services Officer I	N-617 (\$21.12-\$25.98-\$30.84)
CN3188	Pretrial Services Officer II	N-620 (\$24.13-\$29.68-\$35.23)
CN3189	Pretrial Services Officer III	N-621 (\$25.23-\$31.04-\$36.84)
CN3190	Pretrial Services Officer IV	N-623 (\$27.58-\$33.93-\$40.27)
CN3191	Pretrial Services Supervisor	N-812 (\$65,594-\$85,272-\$104,590)

ABOLISHED CLASSIFICATIONS

CN1898	Probation Officer Electronic Monitoring
CN2375	Probation Officer Electronic Monitoring Lead

Ms. O'Neill stated this change will impact 38 employees who will be reallocated to the new classification and there is no budget impact. Board Co-Chair Karen DuWaldt asked if any of the employees would be reallocated to a lower pay grade, to which Ms. O'Neill replied in the negative, noting the affected employees would be reclassified to either Pretrial Services Officer III or IV.

Ms. DuWaldt stated she is confused as to why the abolished classifications have a starting pay rate of \$25 per hour, whereas the new classification series has a starting pay rate of approximately \$21 per hour. Ms. O'Neill responded the Probation Officer Electronic Monitoring Lead classification was being abolished and will be replaced by the Pretrial Services Officer role.

Board Member Tracy Winchester asked why there are two Probation Officer Electronic Monitoring classifications being abolished. Ms. O'Neill stated the classification is being replaced by the Pretrial Officer series, to which Ms. Winchester asked which specific position. Ms. O'Neill replied Pretrial Services Officer III.

Ms. DuWaldt stated she assumes what Ms. O'Neill means is none of the 38 employees are being reclassified to Pretrial Services Officer I or II. Ms. O'Neill clarified this was not the case as there are individuals in the classification of Associate Probation Officer or Probation Officer who would be in the I or II series. Ms. O'Neil stated the Probation Officer series is used by Denver County Court and is not being abolished.

Ms. DuWaldt responded she was confused as she thought all the employees being reclassified were already in the two abolished classifications that have higher pay rates, not realizing they were in other class titles that are still valid, but the distinction is now clear.

Ms. O'Neill introduced Greg Mauro, Director of Community Corrections, to answer additional questions. Ms. Winchester commented it appears all the employees are doing the same thing, however, they have a different title. Ms. DuWaldt stated it seems the difference depends on whether the work is related to pretrial or afterward.

Ms. DuWaldt asked Mr. Mauro to explain why it is necessary to have additional classifications for the role. Mr. Mauro noted pretrial duties sits in a different place in the criminal justice system than probation, as clients are still innocent at this stage versus having already served time, and the skillset required to provide services at the two are different. Mr. Mauro stated he feels having the new classification specializing in pretrial services will allow the Department of Safety to recruit the best talent for both positions.

The Career Service Board unanimously approved Classification Notice No. 1627.

5. Public Hearing Notice 612 – Proposed Revision to Career Service Rule 13

Lauren Locklear, HR Compliance Officer, presented Public Hearing Notice 612 regarding proposed revisions to Career Service Rule 13-Pay for Performance to reflect the amount allocated by the City Council for merit increases in 2020 and to adjust performance review deadlines. The 3.0% merit increase is subject to final approval by the City Council.

Ms. Locklear noted Rule 13-31A provides that employees who receive a performance rating of 2 are considered “below expectations”, and meet many, but not all established goals and job requirements. Outcomes are generally less than expected, with improvement required in one or more specific areas affecting performance or behavior.

A proposed revision will change the terminology to “development needed” to reflect that an employee may not have spent enough time in the position to demonstrate proficiency in meeting the established goals. The revision will also provide managers the ability to award a small merit opportunity of 2% to reward employees for meeting some of the goals.

Board Member Tracy Winchester asked what the rationale is for this revision. Ms. Locklear stated a review of the 2018 performance ratings revealed out of a total 7,600 employees rated, three were unacceptable and 88 were below expectations, which is a very low percentage.

The intent is to remove the stigma of using a 2 rating and to broaden the definition to include newly hired or promoted employees who have not had the opportunity yet to demonstrate their proficiency. Ms. Locklear noted an employee may be demonstrating growth in the role, but additional development is needed, allowing for a small merit increase, rather than receiving no increase at all.

Board Co-Chair Karen DuWaldt asked whether there is concern that by rating a new employee with a 2, their potential enthusiasm for the job is immediately diminished. Ms. Locklear replied all managers and supervisors receive considerable training in conducting performance reviews and accurately rating performance, but asked Rory McLuster, Deputy Director of the Office of Human Resources (“OHR”), to provide further comment.

Ms. McLuster stated the concern was valid and noted there are two “buckets” of employees who potentially receive a Development Needed rating. One is a newly hired or promoted employee who simply has not yet been in the role long enough to be fairly evaluated on the responsibilities, but has met most of their goals, is progressing, and should receive a merit increase. The other is the employee who is not meeting expectations and needs immediate improvement, which does not warrant awarding an increase.

Ms. McLuster noted the present rating does not allow for appropriate messaging to employees who are showing enthusiasm and progress in their roles, but are not meeting all the expectations at present while doing an overall good job.

The choice for a manager is to either inflate the rating to Successful, which is not accurate, to ensure a merit increase, or, to rate them as Below Expectations where they receive no increase at all. Ms. McLuster reiterated this is a very small number of people overall.

Board Member David Hayes asked whether any kind of ratings calibration is performed or if agencies generally rate their employees as they choose to do so. Ms. Locklear replied there is no forced ratings distribution performed at the city, however, conversations do happen to ensure that managers are accurately rating performance and reviewing the criteria for the ratings.

Ms. McLuster added there has been significant training over the last two years to ensure accurate ratings, which has resulted in the percentages of the highest ratings coming down.

Ms. DuWaldt asked what the maximum merit increase award was, to which Ms. Locklear replied was 5% for 2020.

Ms. Winchester commented that she agreed with the change in the language to send a positive message to employees who are new to their role or actively trying to improve their performance.

Ms. Winchester noted the city used to provide automatic cost-of-living increases in addition to the merit opportunity, which she recalled was eliminated a long time ago. Ms. Winchester asked whether the thinking behind the rating change was also because employees only receive a raise under a pay-for-performance system.

Ms. Locklear replied the percentage of employees who received no raise last year was very small and the general tendency is managers overinflate ratings to ensure the highest raise possible is awarded. There is generally no cost impact from the proposed change.

Ms. DuWaldt noted she had concerns about rating a new employee in this manner, but wondered why a manager would wish to award a merit increase to an employee who is failing in the job and what message is being sent by doing so.

Ms. McLuster reiterated managers are not obligated to award a merit increase to an employee who receives the new rating, however, for those individuals who are truly trying to improve their performance and working towards success, managers have the option to do so.

Ms. Locklear stated the general tendency for managers everywhere is to try and ensure employees who are truly making an effort receive some kind of raise, rather than zero, as they know to withhold will result in further disengagement and dissatisfaction.

Mr. Hayes asked whether the scenario for an employee receiving a merit raise under this rating is, for example, meeting expectations on three of their five goals, but not doing so on two of them.

Ms. Locklear stated it is difficult to generalize as the agencies have widely different functions, with some employees having very defined, metric-based goals, while others are more developmental and strategic in higher level positions.

Mr. Hayes agreed the rating can be helpful, but commented it was more important to ensure an appropriate narrative for the conversation with the employee takes place to ensure they understand why they received it.

Ms. DuWaldt agreed and asked whether the city had ever used "Too New to Rate" in performance reviews. Ms. McLuster replied in the negative and Ms. Locklear noted the Rules require every Career Service employee to receive a performance review and rating.

Ms. DuWaldt stated she is concerned about a newly hired employee who was a superstar with their previous employer receiving a low rating simply for being with the city for a few months.

Ms. Locklear stated this does not happen at present as managers tend to overinflate ratings, however, OHR could evaluate the impact to the ratings distribution after implementation.

Ms. McLuster stated she agreed this was not an issue and the intent was to really address the employee who is heading downward with their performance, but still has the opportunity to change the trend with coaching before becoming a problem.

Ms. DuWaldt asked if OHR will require managers to justify awarding a 2% merit increase to employees who receive this rating, to which Ms. McLuster replied in the negative. Ms. DuWaldt stated she agrees it is important to send an encouraging message to employees who are making positive progress, but is concerned about criteria.

Ms. McLuster noted there is a process of calibration required in every agency in awarding merit increases that provides an opportunity for executive leadership to question ratings and change them if that is deemed to be appropriate.

However, she understands the question in terms of OHR ensuring that managers have development plans for the employees who are receiving a merit award.

Ms. DuWaldt stated she agreed and it was very important to have a process in-place as receiving a 2% raise is not much of a difference than receiving 3% for doing a great job. Ms. McLuster noted OHR had debated what the appropriate percentage should be, as awarding someone 1% tends to be completely demotivating to an employee who is trying to improve.

Ms. DuWaldt asked whether employees who receive a 2.5% raise for successful performance would become upset if an employee who is perceived as failing receives 2%. Ms. Locklear replied managers do not share individual merit increases and if someone has concerns, they would be encouraged to have a conversation with their manager or OHR.

Ms. DuWaldt commented she felt employees who are already mediocre, but generally make some effort to ensure they receive a rating of successful and a subsequent raise, will now have no incentive to do if they can receive 2% for being below expectations.

Ms. McLuster stated the expectation is managers have appropriate conversations with the employee and ensure a distinction is being made between low, medium, and high ratings in awarding merit increases.

Ms. DuWaldt stated she feels the revision acknowledges managers are not assigning an appropriate distinction between poor performers and successful ones. She asked what percentage of employees generally receive a 3% merit increase.

Nicole de Gioia-Keane, Director of Classification & Compensation, reviewed the 2018 data and noted 51% were rated successful, 42% rated exceeds, 5.5% rated exceptional, and 1.5% rated below expectations.

Ms. DuWaldt asked if the intent was to move a certain percentage of successful into the development needed to ensure an accurate rating, while providing for a raise, which Ms. McLuster answered in the affirmative.

Ms. DuWaldt asked how likely it is that a manager who rated an employee successful last year will now rate the employee more appropriately at "development needed".

Ms. McLuster noted the likelihood is probably slim, but the percentage of employees in this category is very small. Ms. Locklear stated a review of the 2018 termination data and the performance ratings showed most of the termed employees had ratings of 1 or 2.

Ms. DuWaldt stated she is very much in favor of anything that encourages managers to accurately rate employees' performance, however, she does not like the message that employees who are not meeting their objectives will still receive a merit increase, nor that new employees will be rated this way if they are new to the position.

Ms. DuWaldt suggested she would feel more comfortable if there was more rigor around the process with additional review of employees rated in this category and awarded a merit increase, or a lower percentage increase of no more than 1%.

Ms. Locklear suggested OHR could review the data after the change to determine if that is actually happening, but the message to new employees is not they will automatically receive a 2 rating due to their short tenure in their role. If they do not yet meet their objectives, they might receive this rating and a small merit increase, but if they are doing well, they will receive the higher rating and larger merit increase.

Ms. DuWaldt asked the Board for additional comments. Mr. Hayes asked what percentage of employees received a below expectations rating last year, to which Ms. Locklear replied was 1%. Mr. Hayes commented that is a very small number in his experience.

Ms. Winchester stated she liked the idea of having a new rating of “development needed” to encourage and empower managers to more accurately rate their employees, which she feels provides managers with some tools to incentivize their employees to continue to improve their performance.

Ms. DuWaldt said she agreed, however, she wants to see a more formalized process in which managers are required to submit a development plan to OHR for employees who are not meeting expectations, but receive a merit increase.

Ms. DuWaldt stated she also does not want to encourage more avoidant behavior whereas managers can simply give a problem employee “development needed” and a raise, but not have to do anything to ensure improvement.

Mr. Hayes said he agreed and stated in his experience, anyone receiving an unacceptable rating automatically is placed on a performance improvement plan. He also noted the city’s 2018 distribution, in which 1.5% of employees were rated unacceptable/needs improvement is low, and 42% being rated exceeds expectations is too high. Mr. Hayes stated even though Ms. McLuster indicated that is an improvement from the past, there is work to be done in this area.

Ms. Locklear responded the Rules require anyone receiving an unacceptable rating must be placed on a performance improvement plan and OHR can proactively review employees who receive a 2 rating and are given a merit increase.

Ms. McLuster noted that, at present, anyone placed on a performance improvement plan is one step away from being terminated, so there is additional work needed to create development plans instead.

Ms. DuWaldt stated she is concerned about the timing of the change, noting she assumes OHR is proposing this revision in order to be able to use this new rating for the current performance cycle.

Ms. DuWaldt stated she would like additional language added to the rule requiring managers to submit a development plan to OHR for any employee receiving this rating that is awarded a merit increase of more than 1%. Mr. Hayes and Ms. Winchester agreed this would be ideal.

Mr. Hayes noted having this type of rating does open up the performance review process, especially in years where the organizational goals are more challenging and difficult to achieve. Employees who are used to being highly rated, may suddenly be rated lower and it was important to have an effective and appropriate discussion of what has changed.

Ms. McLuster commented she believed the city’s managers are becoming more skilled at accurately rating their employees’ performance and she believed implementing this change will encourage the managers to appropriately evaluate.

Ms. DuWaldt stated she agreed, however, she feels it is very important to require justification for awarding a 2% merit increase for someone who is below expectations, which Mr. Hayes agreed.

Ms. Locklear stated she could add the appropriate language below the rating table. Ms. DuWaldt asked Bob Wolf, City Attorney to the Board, if the additional language is required to be spelled out clearly in the rule, or whether this can be considered an internal policy.

Mr. Wolf responded not all city agencies are subject to the Career Service Rules (Denver County Court, Department of Safety uniformed services, mayoral appointees) and these leaders are free to award the approved merit increase in any manner they choose.

If there is specific language in the Rules requiring additional justification, it could create tension between Career Service employees and those who are not subject to it.

Ms. DuWaldt asked if it must be written in the rule if the Board wishes to ensure OHR is consulted when a raise is given under those circumstances, Mr. Wolf replied in the affirmative.

Ms. DuWaldt asked if there was sufficient time to reissue notice of the rule change in time for the current performance review cycle. Ms. Locklear suggested the language be modified to "consult with OHR" if a 2 rating is given. Mr. Wolf commented there should be enough time to make the change.

Ms. DuWaldt asked whether a new notice will be required with revised language in order to proceed. Mr. Wolf stated he did not believe it was a substantive enough change to require a new public hearing.

Ms. Locklear noted there was a time limitation in terms of loading in the merit increase percentages into Workday. Ms. de Gioia-Keane also pointed out there was extensive communication materials ready to be issued to agencies, which would have to be modified in time to meet the proscribed deadlines.

Mr. Hayes expressed reservations about making a change that may affect how leaders distribute their total available merit dollars based on performance ratings.

Mr. Wolf responded the Board needed to decide if they desire to give OHR veto power over how agency leaders award merit increases, which is not really possible. Mr. Hayes noted he would feel more comfortable if this was a guideline, rather than a rule requirement.

Ms. DuWaldt stated she is willing to move forward provided OHR analyzes the impact of the new rating and reports back to the Board in a year. Mr. Hayes added he would also like to see what impact the change had in the merit distribution in terms of freeing up additional dollars to be awarded to those receiving higher ratings.

Ms. DuWaldt suggested the Board approve the change and reserve judgment about the financial impact, as the percentage of employees in this category is very small, and evaluate whether additional language changes are necessary.

Ms. DuWaldt noted someone in the audience had raised their hand to speak and asked they come forward and identify themselves. Dominic Martinez, Crew Leader in Public Works Street Maintenance, introduced himself to the Board.

Mr. Martinez stated he agreed with the intent in changing the guidelines, noting there are a lot of employees in his agency who just want to skate by. However, there were also a lot of supervisors who are sympathetic to the fact that employees experience four to five percent annual cost increases for health insurance and pension and award the highest rating they can.

Mr. Martinez noted he has been employed by the city since 2007 and Former Mayor Hickenlooper eliminated the annual cost-of-living raises during the 2008-09 economic crisis. As a result, supervisors have continued to push the ratings higher across the board to compensate employees for the loss of the cost-of-living raise.

Mr. Martinez noted, for example, the 2020 pension contribution increase for employees is 1.75%. Ms. DuWaldt stated she can appreciate why supervisors would do that.

Mr. Martinez stated as a crew leader he appreciated having the ability to differentiate between employees who are really trying to improve their performance versus those who are just sliding by, but he also understood the pressures that supervisors feel from the ever-increasing costs of benefits to all employees.

Ms. Winchester thanked Mr. Martinez for his comments and for making a very important point to consider. She asked him to estimate what percentage of his staff he thinks are rated 2, and which are higher rated.

Mr. Martinez replied he finds it hard to rate them higher sometimes because when there is a higher volume of work, he felt almost everyone works really hard, but there is also considerable downtime where they are not doing much.

Ms. Winchester asked if he thought about one to two percent of his staff were doing the bare minimum, and Mr. Martinez agreed that sounded about right.

Ms. Winchester stated she was pleased to hear that as she is always concerned about one bad apple spoiling the bunch, but in general, she believes the majority of the city's workforce works hard and wants to do a good job.

Ms. Locklear stated if Karen Niparko, Executive Director of OHR, was present today she would argue that managers are going to give employees a 2% raise anyway, so why not provide them with the ability to accurately rate their performance and provide a development plan.

Ms. DuWaldt said she agreed that was a great point and was now convinced, provided the Board agrees to review the impact in a year.

Karla Pierce, Assistant City Attorney and Section Supervisor for Labor & Employment, asked if she could make an additional comment as a manager of employees, not as a representative of the City Attorney's Office.

Ms. Pierce stated the city's compensation and benefits program is broken and a huge source of frustration for her in managing a group of high-performing attorneys.

Ms. Pierce noted the change to a performance-based merit system and the subsequent revisions in the ratings criteria makes it difficult to provide adequate incentives for newer employees who joined the city over the last five years. The elimination of cost-of-living increases and the distribution of merit means many of newer employees will remain at the lower end of the pay scale for a long time, resulting in pay compression issues.

Ms. Pierce noted over the last twenty years, the city's compensation and benefits offering has declined, with newer employees receiving inferior pension and time-off benefits compared to the older employees like herself.

Ms. Pierce stated newer employees are not given sufficient PTO versus the generous bank of time grandfathered employees enjoy for vacation and sick. This change was made during the 2008 recession and has not been revisited since. Ms. Pierce suggested the city should explore improving the PTO allocation without increasing its financial liability, although a paid family leave policy is being implemented next year.

Ms. Pierce noted the difficulty in recruiting and retaining talent in this environment, particularly when new hires realize how unfavorable their benefits are compared to their peers who have been with the city longer.

Ms. de Gioia-Keane responded that Class & Comp is currently working with the City Attorney's Office in reviewing pay across the board and is expected to make recommendations in the near future.

OHR has engaged Gallagher to review the city's compensation plan, as OHR is well-aware of how cumbersome and difficult it can be to navigate. Gallagher is actively conducting focus groups with all agencies to gain insight into what changes and recommendations should be brought before the Board in the future.

Mr. Hayes commented these are typical challenges and nothing he has heard today is any different than what other companies experience in assessing and making these changes. Ms. DuWaldt thanked everyone for their comments today.

The Career Service Board unanimously approved Public Notice No. 612.

V. Director's Briefing: *None*

VI. Pending Cases: *None*

VII. Executive Session:

The Board went into executive session at 10:08am. The following appeals were adjudicated:

1. Motion for Consideration: Melehea Glapion vs. Denver Human Services, Consolidated Appeal Nos. 73-18, 76-18, 80-18
The Career Service Board granted the Appellant's Motion for Consideration and ruled the Board has jurisdiction over the case, pursuant to the City Charter and CS Rule 21-20, and the Appellant may choose to file a motion to dismiss the case, written order to follow.
2. Motion for Extension of Time to File an Opening Brief: Melehea Glapion vs. Denver Human Services, Consolidated Appeal Nos. 73-18, 76-18, 80-18
The Career Service Board granted the Appellant's Motion for an Extension of Time to file an Opening Brief, which is due on October 31, 2019, written order to follow.
3. Wayne Jochem vs. Denver Sheriff's Department, Appeal No. 25-15 (On Remand)
The Career Service Board affirmed the Hearing Officer's decision, written order to follow.
4. Steven Crews vs. Denver Sheriff's Department, Appeal No. 79-18
The Career Service Board affirmed the Hearing Officer's decision, written order to follow.

VIII. Adjournment: *Adjournment was at 10:33am.*