



Career Service Board Meeting #2288

Minutes

Thursday, May 19, 2016, 9:00 a.m.

Webb Municipal Building

201 W. Colfax Ave, Fourth Floor, Room 4.G.2

Gina Casias (Chair)
Patti Klinge (Co-Chair)
Derrick Fuller

I. Opening: *Meeting called to order at 9:02 a.m.*

- 1. Approval of the Agenda for the May 19, 2016 Board Meeting.**
The Board unanimously approved the agenda for the May 19, 2016 meeting.
- 2. Approval of the Minutes for the May 5, 2016 Board Meeting.**
The Board unanimously approved the minutes for the May 5, 2016 meeting.

II. Board Comments: *None.*

III. Public Comments: *None.*

IV. Public Hearing:

1. Classification Notice No. 1521 – Stockroom Manager

John Hoffman, Senior Classification and Compensation Analyst from the Office of Human Resources, presented Classification Notice No. 1521 to the Board.

Mr. Hoffman said an inappropriate pay relationship was identified between the Stockroom Manager and Stockroom Supervisor classifications. As a result, he proposed the following change to the pay grade:

<u>Classification</u>	<u>Current</u>	<u>Proposed</u>
Stockroom Manager	808-J (\$48,040-\$76,864)	810-J (\$54,898-\$87,837)

The Board unanimously approved Classification Notice No. 1521.

2. Classification Notice No. 1522 – Hearings Officer

Nicole de Gioia-Keane, Classification and Compensation Manager and Hameed Pousti, Senior Classification and Compensation Analyst, both from the Office of Human Resources, presented Classification Notice No. 1522 to the Board. This presentation was a follow-up to a proposal brought before the Board on April 7. At that time, the Board asked for additional data and a revised proposal.

Ms. de Gioia-Keane stated that, per the Board's request, she and Mr. Pousti had obtained additional market data for comparison with the Hearings Officer classification. They requested data from 19 comparable jurisdictions. Out of the 15 jurisdictions that responded, there were seven with a match to the Hearings Officer classification. She emphasized that the comparison was based solely upon job duties and not on the title of the position.

As a result of the newly obtained data, Ms. de Gioia-Keane and Mr. Pousti revised their previously recommended pay grade of 815-L (\$80,309-\$128,494) and now recommend 816-L (\$85,850-\$137,360) for the Hearings Officer classification.

Board member, Gina Casias, asked if any research had been conducted as to why the pay grade is currently 821-L (\$119,847-\$191,755).

Mr. Pousti responded that several years ago, the Hearings Officer classification was originally 815-L. As a result of an internal comparison to the City Attorney's Assistant, a pay grade increase was recommended. It was later determined that the scope of the duties between the two classifications are not similar and that the current pay grade of 821-L is incorrect.

Public hearing speaker, Valerie McNaughton, Hearings Officer from the Career Service Hearings Office, discussed some concerns she has with the current proposal. She stated that 55% of her duties consist of management and program administration and 45% are hearing duties. She said that contrary to the Classification Manual, the classification was not amended to accurately reflect her duties. She said this proposal for a reduction in pay grade is based on an inaccurate classification. She said she was hired into the 816-L pay grade and by reducing the current 821-L pay grade, it reverses the three reclassifications that have occurred since her hire in 2004.

Ms. McNaughton also stated that the Denver-area Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) classification should be considered a match to the Hearings Officer classification. She said the ALJ II positions in Denver earn \$192,000. She said she wants to make sure the correct information is used in this decision.

Ms. McNaughton asked that this proposal not be approved so that a correct classification can be determined. She also requested that the seven classification matches be provided to the Hearings Officers so they can determine if these classifications truly are similar.

Public hearing speaker, Bruce Plotkin, Hearings Officer from the Career Service Hearings Office, also expressed concern with the current proposal. He said that since he previously submitted written comments he would not go over them in detail. He said he does not believe the Hearings Officer job description is adequate which means a meaningful comparison cannot occur.

Mr. Plotkin also said he does not think the three increases to the classification over 10 years should be disregarded. He says a five-step decrease in pay grade is unprecedented and illogical.

Board member Patti Klinge pointed out that pay levels can increase or decrease over time and that it is all dependent on competitive data.

Mr. Plotkin also pointed out that current data for legal jobs overall has increased. He said it does not make sense that one judicial position in one jurisdiction merits a five-step decrease.

Ms. de Gioia-Keane responded to Ms. McNaughton's statement that her job encompasses 55% management and administrative duties stating that the classification was not changed to reflect this because it would actually bring a lower pay rate in the market, considering these duties are less complex than the hearing duties.

Ms. de Gioia-Keane then read the duties of the classification aloud and stated that it was those duties that were used in finding comparative data.

Ms. McNaughton stated that the managerial and administrative work she does should not result in less pay since it is in addition to her hearings officer duties. She said the

Classification Manual states that managerial or supervisory duties should result in a 10% increase in pay.

Ms. de Gioia-Keane pointed out that the Classification Manual is obsolete and said it was created in 2009 to be used solely as a training document.

A discussion ensued regarding federal ALJs and the use of this classification for additional comparison.

Karen Niparko, Executive Director of the Office of Human Resources, suggested that Ms. de Gioia-Keane and Mr. Pousti further research the federal ALJ positions for additional comparative data.

Ms. McNaughton asked again that the seven jurisdictions with classification matches be released for review.

Ms. de Gioia-Keane responded that they are not at liberty to share the data because they have licenses to it. She said she is reluctant to release this data since it is not done for any other case.

The Board deferred the decision on Classification Notice No. 1522 until further information is presented and another proposal is made.

V. Director's Briefing:

- 1. Patti Rowe, Director of Learning and Development from the Office of Human Resources presented an update regarding citywide learning and development. She discussed training that has been implemented and reviewed the Learning and Development strategy.*
- 2. Valerie McNaughton, Hearings Officer from the Career Service Hearings Office, presented the 2016 first quarter report which outlined the appeal and mediation statistics for the current year. She also said they will likely implement Salesforce for use with case management which would eliminate most of the clerical work within their office.*
- 3. Karen Niparko, Executive Director of the Office of Human Resources introduced Anna Forsberg to the Board. Ms. Forsberg was recently hired as the new Recruiting Manager for Talent Acquisition.*

VI. New Cases:

- 1. Frank Espinoza v. Department of Safety, Denver Sheriff's Department, Appeal No. 42-15. The Career Service Board affirmed the decision of the Hearings Officer, written order to follow.*
- 2. Franklin Gale v. Department of Safety, Denver Sheriff's Department, Appeal No. 02-15A. The Career Service Board affirmed the decision of the Hearings Officer, written order to follow.*

VII. Pending Cases:

- 1. Marion Stewart v. Denver Sheriff's Department, Consolidated Appeals 38-15 and 60-15. The Career Service Board granted a motion to stay, written order to follow.*

VIII. Executive Session:

The Board went into executive session at 10:22 a.m. to discuss cases and staffing matters.

The Board re-convened the meeting at 11:13 a.m.

IX. Adjournment: *Adjournment was at 11:14 a.m.*